A Modern Greek Complementizer and its Significance for Universal Grammar*

GEORGIA AGOURAKI

1 Introduction

In this paper I investigate the status of the particle *na* in MG. My main position is that *na* is a complementizer that assigns a +TenseDependent feature to the verb of its clause. By this I mean that the verb form in a *na*-clause, although always tensed, has the time reference of the matrix verb serving as the axis for the specification of the time reference of the embedded verb. The +/-TenseDependent feature will also be advanced as part of UG to replace the +/-Tns feature that applies to embedded CPs and comes in the subcategorization frame of a verb. The broad structure of the paper will be as follows: First I will present data showing the distribution of *na*. The goal any analysis of *na* should set itself is to account for all the environments of occurrence of *na* without needing to resort to solutions advocating the existence of more than one *na* element. Next I present schematically the different hypotheses already formulated with respect to *na* as well as other logical possibilities that could be invoked and go on to discuss briefly two serious alternative theories, namely the Subjunctive hypothesis and the Infinitive hypothesis. The rest of the paper, which is also the major part of it, is devoted to the presentation of my position as well as of arguments for it. Finally the significance of the study of *na* for Universal Grammar is looked into.

2 Distribution

Before proceeding to the distribution of *na*-clauses, a few words are appropriate on their categorial status. *na*-clauses are CPs. The evidence for this is of two kinds: *na*-clauses (a) permit wh-movement, (b) satisfy the +WH requirement of verbs. Cf.:

(1)   pu na páme?
        where *na* go-we
        'Where shall we go?'
(2)   rótisa ti na káno
        asked-I what na do-I
        'I asked what to do.'

na-clauses are tensed clauses. Any finite verb form can occur in *na*-clauses[1]. Next follows the presentation of the distribution of *na*-clauses.

(i)   *s-selected na-clauses*

        1. Complement CPs of verbs, nouns and adjectives:

        (3)   théli na spudhási
                wants na study-he
                'He wants to study.'
        (4)   i epithimía tu na taksidhépsi
                the desire his-cl na travel-he
                'his desire to travel'
        (5)   próthimos na voithísi
                eager na help-he
                'eager to help'

        2. The associate in expletive associate chains. The expletive is null, namely pro:

        (6)   pro prépi na pas
                must-it na go-you
                'You must go.'

(ii)   *non-s-selected na-clauses*

        1. Subject predicates:

        (7)   o Thrásos íne na ton pjis sto potíri
                the Thrasos is na him drink-you in the glass
                'Thrasos is very handsome.'

---

[1]This is to the exception of tha 'will' verb forms. I will account for the na -tha incompatibility in section (7).

2. Object predicates:

(8)   évlepa tin kerasiá na meghalóni
      saw-I the cherry-tree na grow-it
      'I could see the cherry-tree growing.'

3. DPs. They are obligatorily preceded by the definite article unless they are sentential subjects, in which case the presence of the article is optional. The crucial thing to note is that nominalised *na*-clauses are in free variation with DPs only in non-s-selected environments. They are c-selected, though, by a verb, noun or preposition:

(9)   i ikanopíisi tu na íse epitikhiménos
      the satisfaction the-gen na are successful
      'the satisfaction of being successful'

4. In some participle uses:

(10) aftós na théli na dhulépsi ? adhínato
      he na wants na work-he impossible
      'Him wanting to work ? Impossible.'
(11) kurástika na ti frodízo
      got-I tired na her-cl look-I after
      'I got tired looking after her.'

5. Main clauses. The interpretation of matrix *na*-clauses is either deontic or epistemic. In 'The Modality Counterargument' section I explore how these interpretations are derived. Matrix *na*-clauses can also be interpreted as either wishes or curses. Moreover constituents of main *na*-clauses can undergo wh-movement without any concomitant change in the meaning of the sentence. In the interrogative form main *na*-clauses keep their deontic or epistemic interpretation. Cf.:

(12) na érkhese pjo sikhná
      na come-you more often
      'You should come more often.'
(13) ti na káno
      what na do-I
      'What should I do ?'
(14) na káno kafé
      na make-I coffee
      'Shall I make coffee ?'

6. Adjunct clauses. In particular, *na*-clauses may be interpreted as conditional, concessive, result, final, relative or temporal clauses. Cf.:

(15)   na íksere na dhiavázi tha álaze i zoí tu
        na knew-he na read-he would change-it the life his-cl
        'If only he knew how to read, his life would change.'

7. Adverb complements:

(16)   akóma na mayirépsis
        yet na cook-you
        'Haven't you cooked yet ?'

8. Preposition complements:

(17)   adí na míno
        instead na stay-I
        'instead of staying'

9. Conjunction complements. *na* is at times optional:

(18)   óspu na fígho
        until na leave-I
        'Until I leave.'

3 Hypotheses

This section is concerned with a schematic presentation of various hypotheses concerning the status of *na*. Crucially, it will be explained what is at stake in the study of *na* and its import for Universal Grammar. My position is that *na* is a complementizer. There are two serious alternatives to this position. One is that *na* is a Subjunctive marker and the other is that it is an Infinitive marker. Once it is proved that *na* is a complementizer, this will be shown to have implications for UG. First with respect to the theory of complementizers: the Doubly-filled-Comp Filter will be questioned and our knowledge of the potential range of properties of complementizers will advance. Second it will be shown that the +/-TenseDependent dichotomy I need anyway in my theory of *na* should also replace the +/-Tns dichotomy wherever the latter is used in UG, namely subcategorization frames and Binding Theory. In the rest of this section I touch upon the various analyses of *na* in a bit more detail but certainly not exhaustively, concentrating on the two more plausible alternatives to my analysis.

The status of *na* in the various stages of the Greek language is usually taken to constitute an example of diachronic change, an element that has changed grammatical category. Thus the Classical Greek conjunction-complementizer *Ina* is taken to have become a MG subjunctive or infinitive marker, depending on your favourite theory. I view *na* in a different way, namely as an element that has kept its grammatical category throughout; except that its grammatical category has acquired additional properties due to the disappearance of some of the Classical Greek verb forms, i.e. Infinitive, Subjunctive, and the restrictions put on the use of some other Classical Greek verb forms, namely the demise of the predicative use of participles.

For the sake of presentational adequacy I next cite four different views concerning the status of *na*. As the previous section has made apparent the data each hypothesis has to account for are quite varied. The four views can be schematically represented as follows:

1. *na* takes the Subjunctive.
   a. *na* is a conjunction followed by the Subjunctive. (Tzartzanos (1945), Mirambel (1959))
   b. *na* is a Subjunctive marker.
      (i) This Subjunctive marker is a complementizer.(Triadafyllides (1976), Householder, Kazazis and Koutsoudas (1964))
      (ii) This Subjunctive marker is not a complementizer.(Ingria (1981), Veloudis and Philippaki-Warburton (1983,1984), Rivero (1987a), Campos (1989), Tsimpli (1990))

2. *na* takes an Infinitive.
   a. *na* is a complementizer.
   b. *na* is not a complementizer.(Efthimiou (1989))

3. *na* takes the Indicative.
   a. *na* is a complementizer. (Andriotis (1934)[2])
   b. *na* is not a complementizer.

4. *na* is some feature in C.

My position is (3a). As far as I know (4) has not been argued for by anyone. It is presented here because I take it to be a valid alternative. (1b.ii) and (2b) are the two alternatives I will comment on. (2b) will be discussed in the remaining part of this section, while (1b.ii) will be referred to repeatedly in the presentation of my analysis and its supporting arguments. For ease of reference,

---

[2]See Andriotis (1934) for claim (3), a very good argumentation and a historical survey of the loss of the Subjunctive in MG.

in what follows I will dub (1b.ii), (2b) and (3a) the Subjunctive hypothesis, the Infinitive hypothesis and the Indicative hypothesis, respectively[3]. Concerning (3b), it is possible that (4) is one of its options.

Efthimiou (1989) claims that *na*-clauses are infinitival clauses marked for aspect and agreement. For her *na* is a marker specified +Aspect, -Tense. Following Drachman (1988) and Fykias (1988), she puts *na* under INFL. It has been claimed independently in the theory that there is obligatory V-to-INFL raising. This is why, for Efthimiou the unity between *na* and V cannot be broken by a subject. Note that it is also via V-to-INFL(Mood) raising that the advocates of view (1b.ii) account for the indivisibility between *na* and the verb. From INFL the *na* +V complex moves to COMP. Efthimiou maintains movement of *na* +V to COMP in order to account for the alleged incompatibility of a wh-word in the Specifier of a *na*-clause. Efthimiou notes identical behaviour of clauses introduced with the complementizer *óti* and *na* -clauses with respect to the presence of wh-phrases in the Spec of CP position. But the observation of Efthimiou concerning wh-phrases and *na*-clauses is not accurate. The ungrammaticality of the examples she uses is not due to the properties of *na* but to a violation of the subcategorization frame of the matrix verb. The matrix verb in all the examples she uses cannot subcategorize for a +WH complement. I repeat below the examples she mentions, keeping her numbering.

(7)   *   thélo pjos / pjon na skotósi
            want-I who/whom na kill-he
       *   'I want that who kills / that he kills whom.'

(15)   *   pistévo pjos na nikísi
            believe-I who na win-he
       *   'I believe that who wins.'

If we choose a matrix verb that subcategorizes for +WH complements, my model would predict that the sentences will be grammatical. The prediction is borne out. Consider the examples in the section on the Doubly-filled-Comp Filter argument, my discussion of the facts there and the discussion concerning the conditions under which wh-phrases fill the Spec of embedded clauses that do not depend on verbs that subcategorize for +WH complements.

The Infinitive hypothesis also has the problem that it cannot account for the adjunct *na*-clauses except for final clauses. Many languages are known to have final infinitives. But even concerning the offspring of the Classical Greek

---

[3] I narrow down to the values of the hypotheses that interest me most, although, of course, (1), (2) and (3), each as a whole, could be named the Subjunctive hypothesis, the Infinitive hypothesis and the Indicative hypothesis, respectively.

final infinitive historical evidence indicates that it is best analyzed as a complement clause with *na* in the COMP position. *Ina* is the ancestor of the MG *na* and was initially used together with the final Classical Greek infinitive.

4 The Indicative hypothesis

In this section I will outline my main claim, namely that *na* is a complementizer that takes the Indicative, and elaborate on its properties. The basic tenet will be that *na* is a complementizer which causes V-to-Comp raising for reasons to be explained.

According to GB theory, it is specified in the subcategorization frame of a verb whether it selects a tensed or a nontensed complement. Given that the +/-Tns distinction is not what differentiates *na* -clauses from the other embedded clauses and yet selection is involved, I will consider the possibility of some dichotomy other than the +/-Tns dichotomy that could account for the MG data as well. It should not be thought, though, that the only problematic data for the +/-Tns dichotomy are the MG data. Picallo (1985) shows that Subjunctive clauses, though tensed, crosslinguistically do not count as tensed clauses for the purposes of Binding Theory. The aim would be to come up with a dichotomy that can be either correlated with the +/-Tns dichotomy or be proved to be superior to the +/-Tns dichotomy in terms of predictions. In fact it will be shown that the latter is the case. The reason why I am looking for some more primitive dichotomy than the +/-Tns one is because the dichotomy between *na* and the other MG complementizers involves selection in the lexicon, a property that, exactly like theta-roles, should not vary crosslinguistically. For example a specific verb may take in one language an infinitival complement, in another language a gerundive complement, in a third language a Subjunctive complement and in MG a *na*-clause complement. What we should endeavour to do is to abstract the common factor from these four subcategorization requirements and have that as a selection requirement holding crosslinguistically, in the same way that theta-roles do.

Let us now suppose that there actually exists this more primitive dichotomy which I am going to call the TenseDependence dichotomy. I will next try to show how it works. The claim is that lexical categories (verbs, nouns, adjectives) subcategorize for +/-TenseDependent complements. What this means in the case of verbs is that:

(19)   A +TenseDependent (TD) complement acquires its time reference on
        the basis of the time reference of the verb that selects it.

It should be made clear that by +/-TD I do not mean +/-sequence of tenses as that is instantiated in reported speech. The time reference of every verb in

reported speech is established on the basis of utterance time. The +TD specification, on the contrary, dictates interpretation with respect to the tense of the matrix verb.

Except for the case where the verb in the *na*-clause marks a failed present situation, all the other relations between the action of the main verb and the action of the embedded verb, i.e. posteriority, simultaneity or anteriority, also appear in -TD embedded clauses. The only difference is that the time reference of *na*-clauses is specified on the basis of the matrix verb time and not on the basis of the speech time, as is the case with all other clauses. This is why there are restrictions as to the form of the verb in the *na*-clause. Only those verb forms that make sense if considered as depending on the matrix verb are permissible.

Crosslinguistically speaking, -Tns complements are a subcase of +TD complements. +TD complements that are also tensed show tense distinctions always with respect to the matrix verb. Infinitival clauses are either nontensed or tensed (cf. Classical Greek infinitives) but the matter of the fact is that crosslinguistically both nontensed and tensed infinitives are +TD complements. Subjunctive clauses are tensed, +TD complements. In the two-value system I put forward all matrix clauses are taken to be -TD. Coming back to the MG data, if a -TD CP is selected the complementizer is *óti/pos* or *pu* , depending on the lexical specification on the matrix verb. If, on the other hand, a +TD CP is selected the complementizer is *na*.

The system seems to work for the MG data. But that is not enough. The validity of the +/-TD dichotomy must be checked with respect to more languages. This is not the place to go into a detailed examination of this. I am content with saying that if the +TD dichotomy is used in the place of the +/-Tns dichotomy for the purposes of Binding Theory, the behaviour of Subjunctives ceases being problematic. The +/-TD model seems to be making the right predictions with respect to Subjunctives and Binding Theory. All we need to say is that a governing category should be defined not as the minimal +Tns CP but rather as the minimal -TD CP. It is significant to note that Subjunctives, in languages where these exist, are in complementary distribution with Infinitives. The +/-Tns dichotomy is not a notion relevant for UG. It fails to offer us a universal selection generalisation and it also makes the wrong predictions with respect to Binding Theory.

After having presented the general principle of the theory and having justified it on both MG and UG grounds, the next step is to work out the mechanics of the rule in the case of MG. Given that in MG +TD verb forms do not differ from -TD verb forms, the +TD feature on the CP has to pass somehow on to the verb. My claim is that the head of a +TD CP, namely *na*, inherits the +TD feature of its maximal projection and subsequently assigns it to the verb. What this means for the verb of the *na*-clause is that it does not have independent time reference; it is always the case with respect to

embedded *na*-clauses that the time reference of the matrix verb serves as the axis for the specification of the time reference of the embedded verb. Note that the same verb forms that occur with *na* have independent time reference when occurring with any other complementizer or in main clauses. This means that the dependent time reference is not something inherent in the verb forms but rather some property that *na* attaches to them. More evidence pointing to the same direction comes from the fact that there are cases where *na* is followed by uncontentiously non-'Subjunctive' forms, i.e. the Imperfect or the Past Tense of the Indicative, and dependent time reference is obligatory in those cases, as well. It is not, therefore empirically motivated to claim that it is the alleged Subjunctive forms that are responsible for dependent time reference. This is rather a property of *na*.

I will now look at the environment for the +TD assignment by *na* to the verb form. The required condition is adjacency between *na* and the verb form. It is a standard assumption in GB theory that feature assignment requires adjacency. Consider Case-assignment and +f assignment[4]. For adjacency to arise either *na* has to cliticize on to the verb or the verb has to raise to the Comp hosting *na*. The theoretical model used in this analysis tends not to favour downward movement. In the recent literature there is independent discussion concerning V-to-Comp raising; this is what I believe to take place in *na* -constructions. From the position it has raised to, the embedded verb acquires time reference dependent on that of the main verb.

I am now briefly going to compare/contrast the present analysis with an alternative possible analysis referred to in the 'Hypotheses' section under 4. This would be to analyze *na* as some feature, presumably +TD, in C. This hypothesis seems to me to be the closest hypothesis to the Indicative hypothesis and it is therefore crucial to consider what would decide the issue between the two. From what I know this hypothesis has not been argued for in the MG literature but is referred to here because it is compatible with current developments in the theory. In the same way that V-2 languages, according to certain analyses (Den Besten (1983)), are claimed to have a C intrinsically endowed with tense features, it could be maintained that MG can have overt features in C, namely *na*. The rest would be as in our proposal, that is the +TD feature in C would attract the verb. While I claim that *na* is a complementizer that assigns a +TD feature, (4) maintains that *na* is the +TD feature itself in C. The difference in the two views is not minor. (4) faces the same problem that the Subjunctive hypothesis and the Infinitive hypothesis faced, namely it renders impossible a unified analysis for all the *na* uses. A +TD feature can presumably never have a complementizer interpretation, as *na* certainly does in adjunct *na*-clauses.

---

[4] For +f assignment to a focused constituent see Brody (1990).

5 Arguments for a complementizer analysis of *na*

A complementizer analysis of *na* does not only give us a neat account of the varied MG data. Crucially, it provides valuable information on the potential range of properties that complementizers may have crosslinguistically, thus contributing to the study of functional categories.

(a) The na +Indicative argument

na cannot be unambiguously a Subjunctive marker, if it also appears with Indicative forms that do not have homonymous Subjunctive equivalents, namely the Imperfect and the Past Tense of the Indicative. Cf.:

(20)   tháthela na ísuna edhó
          would like-I na were you here
          'I wish you were here.'

(b) The na-incompatibility argument

One of the arguments for the complementizer status of *na* is supplied by the incompatibility of *na* with other complementizers. In my analysis this is expected behaviour, while the other analyses stipulate that *na*-clauses take a null complementizer. Cf.:

(21)   *   epiméni óti / pos na fíji
              insists that na leave-he
              'He insists on leaving.'
(22)   *   lipáte pu na fíghume
              is sorry that na leave-we
              'He is sorry that we will leave.'

(c) The negation argument

An examination of negation data indicates an additional argument for my hypothesis. Modern Greek has two negation forms, *dhen* and *mi*, in complementary distribution. The significant fact emerges from an examination of the position occupied by each of the negation elements. *dhen* precedes the verb form, while *mi* does not, if we take the verb form to include the alleged Subjunctive marker. The environment for *mi* with respect to *na* has to be the following *na+ mi+* Verb form. The same argument is advanced in Kayne (1984) in support of the complementizer status of the French *de* and the Italian *di* and against claims that they are -Tns markers. Negation follows, rather than precedes, *de/di*.

How can proponents of the 'Subjunctive' theory account for the fact that negation breaks the unity of the verb... entity given that the negation is not an infix for any other verb form in MG? Maybe by claiming that *na* selects the specific type of negation[5]. But this will only work, if it is the case that no other clause type except the alleged Subjunctive clauses takes *mi*. The above testing condition does not hold. Imperatives and gerunds are also negated by mi. What determines, then, the complementarity of the two sentence negation forms? I want to claim that there is complete correspondence between *dhen/mi* and -/+TD. It seems that +/-TD is the element in MG that selects for negation. This is the way to explain why gerund negation and Imperative negation are also *mi* and only *mi*. What gerunds and Imperatives share with *na*-clauses is the +TD feature.

How, then, is the selection for the negation element to be made? What needs to be looked into is, I think, what 'selection' means for different heads. I am not talking here about selection of arguments but about selection of functional categories. And what is more is that this would not just be a case of categorial selection but more specifically a case of selection of the content of the head of a functional projection by the immediately dominating head of another functional projection. This is an unprecedented type of selection for the GB model and the status of the theory as it has developed after Pollock (1989).

(d) The foci/topics argument

An argument that Veloudis and Philippaki-Warburton (1984) present in arguing that *na* cannot be a complementizer is that topics and foci in MG move to the left of *na* but to the right of complementizers, and that only rarely can topics surface on the left of *óti/pos*. In the broad sense that is relevant for the present discussion their notion of topic and focus is the same as mine.

I want to challenge the above generalization. I have argued elsewhere (Agouraki (1990)) that topics and foci in MG can occur on either side of a complementizer, depending on licensing conditions. Concerning their claim that foci cannot occur to the left of complementizers consider the perfectly grammatical example (23), where exactly this happens.

(23)   mu fpe to YORGHO óti théli na dhi
        to me-cl told-she the YORGHOS that wants na see-she
        'She told me that it is Yorghos she wants to see.'

---

[5]A proposal invoking selection of mi by na is that in Tsimpli (1990). The structure she assigns to Subjunctive clauses is one in which MoodP immediately dominates NegP, which, in turn, immediately dominates AGRP, and there is no TP.

And it is not a rare phenomenon either for a topic to surface on the left of *óti/pos*. Consider (24) in this respect:

(24)   mu ípe ta mfla óti tha ta fái arghótera
        to me-cl told-she the apples that will them-cl eat-she later on
        'As for the apples, she told me that she is going to eat them later on.'

Consider the following example that Veloudis and Philippaki-Warburton (1984:151) adduce in support of their claim (I keep their numbering but the glosses are mine).

(6')   (b)   *   thélo na i María fíji
                     want-I na the Maria goes

I agree that (6'b) is out, but that does not prove what the above authors claim it proves. Its ungrammaticality is due to the fact that V-to-Comp raising has not applied. If it had applied, the topic, namely i María , would be to the right of *na*, and the sentence would be grammatical despite what Veloudis and Philippaki-Warburton (1984) lead us to expect. Cf.:

(25)   thélo na fíji i María
        want-I na goes the Maria
        'I want Maria to go.'

(e) Sentential subjects

Additional evidence that *na* is a complementizer comes from an examination of nominalized CPs in MG. *na*, in the same way as *óti*, can head CPs that are nominalized and are then used as sentential subjects. Nominalization of *na*-clauses does not necessarily involve the addition of the neuter determiner *to*, while that of *óti*-clauses does.Consider below examples of nominalized *na*-clauses and *óti*-clauses.

(26)   to óti írthe me lipí
        the that came-he me-cl grieves
        'It grieves me that he came.'
(27)   (to) na kséris ghaliká íne prosón
        the na know-you French is asset
        'It is an asset to know French.'

According to the theory it is not possible to add a Determiner to a VP or to an IP and thus turn the whole thing into a DP. Only CPs can be nominalized. For

a CP to be nominalized and function as an argument, it needs to be introduced by a complementizer. *na* clearly functions in this way in examples like (28).

(28) na min ékhis leftá íne meghálo próvlima
      na not have-you money is big problem
      'Not to have any money is a big problem.'

(f) The main clause counterargument

What the types of main *na*-clauses show is that *na* is unspecified or neutral for the value +/-Q(uestion). Remember that it occurs in both declarative and interrogative main clauses. The terminology sometimes traps us. The term 'complementizer' usually makes people think that the sole function of elements filling the C position is to introduce embedded clauses. But if this were the case, then by definition the C position should remain unused in matrix clauses. This is not the case. Quite apart from the claim I am making about MG *na*, consider V-to-Comp raising in English interrogatives, the V-2 phenomenon as well as proposals about morphosyntactic features in C (Borer (1989), Picallo (1985), Stowell (1981)).

The fact that *óti* and *pos*, which are undisputed MG complementizers, appear only in embedded clauses, while *na* appears also in main clauses cannot decide the issue as to the complementizer status or otherwise of a particle. It all depends on the properties of each complementizer.

Concerning main *na*-clauses note that MG is not unique in allowing complementizers in main clauses. Consider an interrogative sentence from Proust, which has a word-for-word MG equivalent:

(29) Et pourquois que je me retirerais ?
      and why that I would withdraw
      'And why would I withdraw ?'
(30) ke jatí na aposirthó
      and why na withdraw-I
      'And why would / should I withdraw ?'

I provide the French data not in place of an explanation but simply in order to show that the behaviour of *na* is not strange for a complementizer. The verb forms in both (29) and (30) have a modal interpretation. In the French sentence the modal interpretation is apparently due to the verb form used; but why do we get the modal interpretation in the MG example? The reader should keep this question in mind. An answer will be given in the Modality Argument section.

Another case where French uses complementizers in main clauses is in optatives. Cf.:

(31)   Que le diable l'emporte.

na-clauses are also used in the same way, to express wishes or curses.

I now turn to consider adjunct *na*-clauses. Complementizers are in traditional grammar terms conjunctions. Therefore, the occurrence of *na* in adjunct clauses should not be a problem. I am referring to the multiplicity of interpretations that *na* qua conjunction can have. It is descriptively more adequate to claim that *na* is a conjunction/complementizer followed by Indicative and that the wealth of meanings evidenced in adjunct *na*-clauses has nothing to do with the verb form but is wholly attributed to the semantic properties of *na* as a conjunction[6]. Spanish exemplifies a similar situation. Spanish has the conjunction *que*, which functions either as its sole complementizer or as a final, conditional or causal conjunction. Cf.:

(32)   La cucaracha ya no puede caminar porqué no tiene, porqué le falta marijuana que fumar.
       'The cockroach can no longer walk because it does not have marijuana to smoke.'
(33)   Hable más fuerte, que oigo mal.
       'Speak louder because I cannot hear you.'
(34)   Que no viene, nos arreglamos sin él.
       'If he does not come, we will manage without him.'

Consider also the English *for*, which is a complementizer and a preposition, as well. Without giving the relevant examples I mention that the French complementizer *que* may also function as a time, final, causal or consecutive conjunction.

---

[6] The case of a conjunction which can also function as a complementizer is not unique either to MG or within MG. Another MG complementizer, namely *pu* may also function as a causal, result or adversative conjunction. Cf.:

(1) lipáme pu árjisa
    I am sorry that I am late
    'I am sorry I am late.'
(2) tu khrostó evghnomosíni pu me voíthise
    to him-cl owe-I gratitude for me-cl helped-he
    'I am grateful to him for his help.'
(3) kurástika tóso pu dhen borísa na páro ta pódhia mu
    got-I tired so much that not could na move the feet my-cl
    'I got so tired that I could not move my feet.'
(4) símera dhjávase polí pu áles méres dhen káni típota
    today studied-he a lot whereas other days not does anything
    'Today he studied a lot, whereas other days he does not do anything.'

(g) The modality argument

The question of the modality interpretation of *na* in main clauses should be addressed at this point. In fact it is significant that the modal interpretation arises only in main clauses. For me the modal interpretation arises when a sentence is +TD and there is no matrix / higher verb that could provide a time frame. The modality reading on a verb can arise in one of three ways: from a modal auxiliary of the verb form, from mood marking on the verb or from a +TD marking on a verb that cannot avail itself of a time frame (this can happen only in main clauses). Thus while in main Subjunctive sentences in French the modality reading is due to the Subjunctive, in main *na*-clauses in MG the modality reading is due to *na*. The modality interpretation involved in the MG sentence is not a property of *na* but of the whole *na*-clause. I take it to be a property of a main clause with no independent time reference of its own and which being a main clause can only acquire time reference with respect to the present time. In order to prove my point that what goes on is actually a property of main clauses with dependent time reference, it suffices to look at the interpretation of some other main clauses with dependent time reference across languages. Let us consider infinitival main clauses in English.

(35)   Why go there, after all ?
        '...should I go...'
(36)   Why go there, if they don't like me ?
        '... would / should I go...'
(37)   na zi kanís i na mi zi?
        na live-he one or na not live-he
        'To be or not to be?'

The interpretation of the English examples above is, I believe, no different than the interpretation of main *na*-clauses. It should be emphasized that the modality interpretation arises only in main *na*-clauses in MG and in main infinitival clauses in English.
    Another kind of modality interpretation that matrix *na*-clauses may have is the epistemic interpretation. The same explanation as for the previous examples can, I think, account for examples as the following:

(38)   to polí na íne íkosi khronón
        the most na is-he twenty years old
        'He must be at most twenty years old.'

The 'advantage' of MG over English lies in the fact that +TD verb forms in MG are tensed while in English they are not. Thus while the epistemic reading

in English can only have present or future time reference, in MG the appropriate verb form can give us past reference. Cf.:

(39)   na pſye sto khoró?
        na went-he to the ball
        'Can it be that he went to the ball?'

(h) The na-tha incompatibility counterargument

Let us now return to a problem noted earlier on, namely the *na-tha* incompatibility. Consider the following exemplificatory uses of *tha* (The abbreviation 'imp' stands for imperfective aspect, while 'p' stands for perfective aspect.).

    tha févyi 's/he will / must be leaving'
    tha leave-imp

    tha fíyi 's/he will leave'
    tha leave-p

    tha éfevye 's/he would leave' / 'it must be the case that s/he was leaving'
    tha was leaving

    tha éfiye 's/he must have left'
    tha left

    tha ékhi fíyi 's/he will / must have left'
    tha has left

We see that *tha* is either some sort of time marker or a modality marker. In this paper *tha* is not taken to be a Tns marker, namely the Future marker, as is standardly assumed. Note in this respect that the Future is optionally marked with *tha* in certain circumstances, namely after the conjunctions *ótan* 'when', *an* 'if' among others. If *tha* was treated as a tense marker, I would be faced with an implausible situation where *na*, a complementizer, would be compatible with some tense markers.

The reason why *na* and *tha* are incompatible is not because the first is a particle of the Subjunctive while the second is a particle of the Indicative. The line I take is the following: As a time marker, *tha* does not necessarily take the moment of speech for time reference as the use *tha éfevye* shows. The additional use of a +TD feature, namely *na*, would be redundant. Also as a modal marker, *tha* should not be expected to occur in main *na* -clauses,given

that *na* in main clauses has a modal interpretation. We could not possibly have two modal markers in one clause.

(i) The indivisibility between na and the verb counterargument

Veloudis and Philippaki-Warburton (1984) also adduce the close unity between *na* and the verb as proof that *na* is actually 'part of the verb form', namely a Subjunctive marker. It is true that no constituent except clitics can intervene between *na* and the verb, in the same way that only clitics can intervene between tha and the verb. Bear in mind, though, that sentence negation also intervenes between *na* and the verb but not between tha and the verb.

We should look in our language inventory and check whether complementizer status is always incompatible with a close unity between complementizer and verb. Far from it. And I need not resort to 'exotic' languages to prove my point. English, French, Hebrew and Arabic can very well serve this purpose. Concerning English my reference is Borer (1989:76-7), who in turn attributes the relevant data to Henry (1987). The latter presents data showing that in Belfast English, *for* , while sometimes a Case-marking complementizer in Comp, may also be cliticized to *to* in a post-subject position. The phenomenon is referred to as 'complementizer cliticization'. Consider the following examples (I keep the numbering in Borer (1989)):

(14)　(a)　John seems for to be happy.
　　　(b)　John isn't likely for to win.
　　　(c)　I wanted John for to win.

Although the Belfast English data are also an instance where adjacency is required between the complementizer and the verb, I do not think *na*-clauses in MG are best accounted for in a similar way, namely by claiming that *na* cliticizes to the verb. I cite Henry's data for the indivisibility that Belfast English instantiates between the complementizer *for* and the verb form.

Kayne (1984) has shown that French *de* is a complementizer and not a -Tns marker. The crucial thing to note is that only clitics and negation can intervene between *de* and the verb form, as is the case with *na*.

Neither is it the case that *na* is similar to the Hebrew complementizer *se*. The latter is an instance of a much more general 'complementizer cliticization'. According to Shlonsky (1990) it moves out of C, without leaving a trace, in order to cliticize on to the following constituent, whatever that is. *na* only 'cliticizes' to the verb. In that sense *na* is closer to Belfast English *for*. An analysis of *na* along the lines of *se* could in principle give us an account of why *na* does not cause any violation of the Doubly-filled-Comp filter. If *na* lowered to I in order to cliticize on to the V+I complex, no violation would arise if an XP moved into the Spec of CP given that in Shlonsky's system

complementizer lowering leaves no trace. Shlonsky explains in this way why *se* does not violate the Doubly-filled-Comp filter. Such an account, though, cannot hold for MG because *na* only cliticizes to the verb and not to any other constituent.

Let us now look at the Standard Arabic paradigm. I take the relevant information from Aoun (1985). Standard Arabic exhibits two types of complementizers appearing with embedded clauses. The occurrence of each of these complementizers depends on the choice of the matrix verb: believe-type verbs require *?anna* and want-type verbs *?an*. *?anna* is a Case-assigning element and *?an* a mood-assigning element; they assign Accusative and Subjunctive, respectively. The Accusative and Subjunctive features generated with the complementizers will be paired with a lexical NP and a verb, respectively. This pairing requires adjacency. For this reason *?anna* is followed by a lexical NP and *?an* by a verb. Aoun does not go on to make more explicit how this adjacency is achieved, especially regarding *?an* and the verb. Jamari (1989) achieves adjacency between *?an* and the verb in Standard Arabic by claiming that when the complementizer is *?an* there is no Spec of IP position. *?an* selects I'. This account seems to me to be ad hoc because of the selection restriction it posits. The Standard Arabic case is close to the MG situation, but not identical. I would like to suggest that V-to-Comp raising could also account for the Standard Arabic data.

We should now have a fresh look at the Belfast English data. Bearing in mind the Standard Arabic complementizers we see that Belfast English *for* has in free distribution the properties of both *?anna* and *?an*. Thus it can be either a Case-marking complementizer, as *?anna* is, or a complementizer assigning some verbal feature - it remains to be specified which one - as *?an* is. For this reason it seems to me it would be more theoretically appropriate to talk in the second case not in terms of complementizer cliticization but rather in terms of V-to-Comp raising.

Concerning the data from the different languages I have looked at, the next natural step would be to find some common denominator across languages that would explain the descriptively adequate statement that Belfast English *for*, French *de*, Italian *di*, Standard Arabic *?an* and MG *na* exhibit obligatory adjacency with the verb form. Hebrew *se* does not form part of this picture because it forms a unit with any following constituent and not only with the verb form. The common feature between the first four languages is that the verb forms following the complementizers in question are all specified +TD. It seems to me that the data in these four languages are amenable to exactly the same analysis as the MG data.

(j) The Doubly-Filled Comp Filter counter-argument

Long (1974) takes the incompatibility between a particle and a wh-phrase in the Spec of its XP as a straightforward piece of evidence that this particle is a complementizer and not the marker of some verbal functional category. Veloudis and Philippaki-Warburton (1984) use this criterion and take the fact that *na*, contrary to the undisputed MG complementizers, can coexist with interrogative and relative pronouns as evidence that *na* cannot occupy the Comp position. Cf.:

(40)   kséro ti na káno
        know-I what na do-I
        'I know what to do.'
(41)   thélo mja kathiyítria i opía na ékhi katanóisi
        want-I a teacher who na has understanding
        'I want a teacher with understanding.'

One could bypass the 'problem' posed by (41) by taking the relative pronoun to be a topicalised constituent and claiming that topicalised constituents in MG adjoin to CP. I would still have to account, though, for the grammaticality of (40).

I will start with the assumption held throughout this paper, namely that *na* is a complementizer, and try to account for this lack of violation of the Doubly-filled Comp Filter. Cf.:

(43)   *Doubly-filled Comp Filter*
        The Spec of CP and C cannot be both filled.

The only two ways I can proceed, if I am not to drop my main assumption about the complementizer status of *na* , is to either challenge altogether the validity of the Doubly-filled Comp Filter or suggest some reformulation of it so that the MG data no longer present a problem. I will take the first option. More specifically, I advance the claim that we do not need the Doubly-filled Comp Filter. All we need is a principle independently existing in the grammar, namely principle (44) below:

(44)   Subcategorization frames must be obeyed.

This principle entails that if a verb has more than one subcategorization frames, those frames cannot be mixed. This entailment will exclude (a) coexistence of a declarative and an interrogative complementizer and (b) coexistence of a declarative complementizer and a wh-word. The system we need is along the

following lines: Verbs subcategorize for +/-WH CPs and each of the two frames is further marked for +TD CPs, -TD CPs or both.

Both the Doubly-Filled-Comp Filter and (44) derive the violations under (a) and (b) above. The advantage of (44) lies in that it makes the right predictions concerning the wh-phrases and *na* compatibility while the Doubly-Filled-Comp Filter fails to do that.

My point is that in the same way that an English verb subcategorizes, for example, for a +WH -TD CP (cf. example (45) below), there should not be a problem with the same subcategorization frame in MG. Cf.:

(45)   I told them where to go.
(46)   tus ípa pu na páne
       them-cl told-I where na go-they
       'I told them where to go.'

In cases like (45) and (46) the subcategorization frame is satisfied by the wh-phrase. That this is so is shown by cases of embedded clauses in MG that can have both a wh-phrase and *na* but would be ungrammatical if they had only *na*. Cf.:

(47)   tus eksíyisa pos *(na) kánun tin áskisi
       them-cl explained-I how na do-they the exercise
       'I explained to them how they could do / to do the exercise.'

The above example shows that *na* is not always, even in embedded clauses, part of the main subcategorization frame. The ungrammaticality of the corresponding English sentence without *how* shows that concerning English, as well, a -TD CP is not always a main subcategorization requirement. Cf.:

(48)   I explained to them *(how) to do the exercise.

My analysis of the 'problematic' cooccurrence of a wh-phrase and *na* in MG is further supported by the observation that when the subcategorization frame is satisfied by a wh-phrase in either English or MG and there is also *na* or an infinitive in English, the *na*-clause/infinitive have a modal interpretation.

What I have shown so far is that grammatical MG clauses analyzed as violations of the Doubly-filled Comp Filter are far from that. I suggested that the Doubly-filled Comp filter should be reduced to a UG primitive (44)[7].

---

[7]With respect to MG, principle (44) and a language-specific restriction against multiple wh-phrases in clause-initial position, it should be stressed that not all cases of linear adjacency between a wh-phrase and a +/-wh complementizer give rise to ungrammatical sentences. A violation arises only if the wh-phrase occupies the Spec of CP position.

Given that principle (44) cannot be violated in any language, the MG apparent only counterexamples were shown to have another explanation. Interpretational facts support the proposed explanation.

6 On complementizers

The '*na*-indivisibility argument', the 'main clause argument' and the 'Doubly-filled Comp Filter counterargument' showed that we need to rethink the whole idea of complementizers, as well as their properties. The term 'complementizer' is rather deceiving. It makes one think that its sole function is to introduce non-matrix clauses. But this is not so. Furthermore 'complementizer' is a syntactic term. Grammatically, complementizers are

---

Consider examples (1) and (2) below:

  (1) me rótises PJON an ídha
     me asked-you WHOM if saw-I
     'You asked me if I saw WHO ?'
  (2) su ípe PJON óti tha féri
     to-you-cl told-he WHOM that will bring-he
     'He told you he will bring who ?'

If the wh-phrase occupies the Spec of FP, as is the case with (1) and (2), no ungrammaticality arises if we also have a +/-wh complementizer. The restrictions on the interpretation of such wh-phrases strongly indicate that my analysis of them is on the right track. A wh-phrase linearly immediately preceding a +/-wh complementizer must have an echo interpretation, if we want the sentence to be grammatical. An echo interpretation equals a focus interpretation. It is crucial to note that a focused wh-phrase in a left peripheral position of an embedded clause does not satisfy the subcategorization requirements of the matrix verb; hence its acceptability with a -wh complementizer, as well (cf. (2)). So neither is principle (44) relevant for (2), nor is the language-specific restriction against multiple wh-phrases in clause-initial position relevant for (1). Concerning (1), MG would not allow for both an interrogative complementizer and a wh-phrase in Spec of the embedded CP; thus the wh-phrase has to occupy the Spec of FP immediately dominating CP and be therefore interpreted as focus. Concerning (2), principle (44) dictates that the wh-phrase has to have an echo / focus interpretation. Compare now (1) and (2) with (3) below, where an interrogative immediately precedes na .

  (3) mu ípe pjon na féro
     me-cl told-he whom na bring-I
     'He told me who to bring.'

Significantly, the wh-phrase in (3) need not be focused for the sentence to be grammatical. This is in accordance with and predicted by principle (44).

conjunctions; therefore it should not surprise us, if some complementizers also function as various types of conjunctions.

Maybe the way to view complementizers is as elements giving information on aspects that have to do with the overall interpretation of the sentence. They may not just indicate that one clause depends on some constituent of a higher clause, as the English complementizer *that* does. And what does this dependence mean? Potentially that the dependent CP satisfies part of the subcategorization frame of the constituent it depends on. But other complementizers may give information as to whether the CP they introduce has dependent or independent time reference.

Suppose a language x has Indicative, Subjunctive and Imperative moods as well as infinitives, each having distinct morphological marking. What the last two moods together with infinitives have in common is the feature +TD. By this feature they are contrasted with the Indicative, which is specified -TD. Suppose now that we also have a language y which only has Indicative mood but can equally well express the meanings of the Subjunctive and Imperative moods as well as that of infinitives of language x. The question is how this is possible, if not by distinct morphological endings. We can certainly think of a logical possibility where all that would be needed would be the Indicative verb forms plus some kind of +TD marker. Are the differences between the Subjunctive, the Imperative and the infinitive, in languages where these grammatical categories exist, such that a system as the one instantiated in language y could not express them. Far from it. One difference between the Subjunctive and the infinitive is that the first precludes while the second forces identity of reference between the subject of the matrix clause and the subject of the embedded clause. This might have to do with the lack of agreement on the infinitives, with the consequence that non-PRO subjects of the infinitive cannot be licensed. This difference is eliminated in language y by the obligatory agreement marking on the Indicative verb forms. It is also expected that the [+TD]+Indicative complex in language y would not block coreference between pronominal subjects of the matrix and the embedded clauses, precisely because the Indicative forms are +Tns. Now, what about the differences between the Subjunctive and the Imperative? I cannot see any except for the fact that the first has to appear normally in embedded clauses, while the latter only appears in root clauses. It seems, therefore, that a system like that of language y is equally efficient to that of language x. Languages x and y need not be different languages. They can just as well be different stages in the evolution of one language. And we can actually have an intermediary stage between x and y, let's call it z, where there is some overlapping between the two systems in the sense that z has a system like that of y without the Imperative in its x form having yet disappeared, for example. My claim is that Classical Greek is language x and MG language z.

7 Conclusion

In this paper I argued for the view that MG *na* is a complementizer. The implications of this position for the Theory of Grammar and in particular for a theory of complementizers were explored.

The study of *na* within the frame of a complementizer analysis is far from exhausted in the present paper. In work in progress (Agouraki (1991)) I go a step further and advance the claim that *na* is an operator. But this is not the place to expand on this.

References

Agouraki, G. (1990) On the Projection of Maximal Categories: the Case of CP and FP in Modern Greek., *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 183-200.

Agouraki, G. (1991) Ph.D. dissertation in preparation, UCL.

Andriotis, (1934) Iparkhi Ipotakhtiki sti Nea Elliniki?, Nea Estia 15, 445-50.

Aoun, J. (1985) *A Grammar of Anaphora*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Borer, H. (1989) Anaphoric AGR, in Jaeggli, O. and K. Safir (eds), *The Null-subject Parameter*, Dordrecht: Reidel.

Bresnan, J. (1972) Theory of Complementation in English Syntax, PhD dissertation, MIT.

Brody, M. (1990) Some Remarks on the Focus Field in Hungarian, *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 201-225.

Campos, H. (1989) Modern Greek and CP Transparency, *Linguistic Inquiry*.

Efthimiou, (1989) *na*-clauses: the Infinitival Structure in Modern Greek, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 10, 187-204.

Enc, M. (1981) Tense Without Scope: An Analysis of Nouns as Indexicals, PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Enc, M. (1983) Anchored Expressions, in M. Barlow, D. Flickinger and M. Wescoat, eds., *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 2, 79-88, Stanford University, California.

Enc, M. (1986) Towards a Referential Analysis of Temporal Expressions, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9, 405-426.

Enc, M. (1987) Anchoring Conditions for Tense, *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 633-657.

Henry, A. (1987) Infinitives in a For-To Dialect, ms., University of Ulster at Jordantown.

Hornstein, N. (1977) Towards a Theory of Tense, *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 521-557.

Householder, F. W., Kazazis, K. and A. Koutsoudas (1964) *Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki*, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Ingria, R. (1981) Sentential Complementation in Modern Greek, PhD dissertation, MIT.

Jamari (1989), Paper presented at SOAS.

Kayne, (1984) *Connectedness and Binary Branching*, Dordrecht: Foris.

Mirambel, A. (1959) *La Langue Grecque Modern: Description et Analyse*, Paris: Klincksieck.

Philippaki-Warburton, I. and I. Veloudis (1984) The Subjunctive in Complement Clauses, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 5, 149-167.

Picallo, C. (1985) Opaque Domains, PhD dissertation, CUNY.

Pollock, J.-Y. (1989) Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP, *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:3, 365-424.

Rivero, M.-L. (1987) Barriers and the Null Subject Parameter in Modern Greek in *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting NELS*, GLSA, University of Massachusets, Amherst.

Rizzi, (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Smith, C. (1978) The Syntax and Interpretation of Temporal Expressions in English, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2, 43-99.

Smith, N. V. (1981) Grammaticality, Time and Tense, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 295, 253-265.

Stowell, T. (1981) Origins of Phrase Structure, PhD dissertation, MIT.

Triadafyllides, M. (1976) *Neoelliniki Grammatiki*, Athens: OEDV.

Tsimpli, I. (1990) The Clause Structure and Word Order of Modern Greek, *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 226-255.

Tzartzanos, A. (1945) *Neoelliniki Syntaxis*, Athens: Organismos Ekdoseos Skholikon Vivlion.

Veloudis, I. and I. Philippaki-Warburton (1983) The Subjunctive Mood in Modern Greek, *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 4, 151-168.