Finite complementation in the synchrony and diachrony of Greek and in other Balkan languages

Ioannis Fykias and Konstantinos Sampanis
University of Salzburg
Ioannis.Fykias@sbg.ac.at and *Konstantinos.Sampanis@sbg.ac.at*

Abstract: This paper will focus on some previously unnoticed differences among the particular finite constructions employed in some Balkan languages. We will compare the finite subjunctive clauses and some alternative constructions involved and pay close attention to factors like their exact Tense or Aspect specification and the requirement on Tense-Agreement between matrix and complement clause.

The goal of this approach is to demonstrate how a cross-linguistic analysis involving structural affinities can support us in providing a more adequate account of what is going on in the synchrony and diachrony of another language of the *Sprachbund*. Finally, we will try to determine the (more abstract) level at which the languages or systems involved behave in a structurally similar or affine way.

Key words: Koine, Balkan Sprachbund, mood, subjunctive, complementation, future, tense agreement, infinitive, infinitive loss.

1. Some background and basic assumptions

In our paper[1], which draws heavily on ongoing research conducted in connection with the PhD thesis of Konstantinos Sampanis (forthcoming), we want to investigate in detail some of the structures of postclassical Greek, which arose in Hellenistic Greek and gradually replaced Classical Greek infinitive structures, against the background of some salient phenomena of Balkan languages. To be more specific, we will try to trace the defining typological characteristics that make up the profile of the finite complement clauses that were employed in the postclassical nonliterary Greek of the New Testament.

We intend to draw attention to some unnoticed or less well studied topics and areas which may offer us new insights in the analysis of those structures both in the framework of a diachronic syntax of Greek and from a Balkan linguistics perspective.

Let us start our investigation with a common assumption in the field of Balkan linguistics, as it was expressed by Tomić (2006: 413): "The most perspicuous and most widely spread and discussed property of the Balkan Sprachbund languages is the loss of the infinitive and its replacement by structurally comparable subjunctive constructions."

Of course, this statement is true, but it is far from being the whole story. A considerable number of classical Greek infinitive structures have been systematically replaced by ὅτι complement clauses. ἵνα structures have been analyzed in detail in a series of syntactic studies treating the successive stages of their grammaticalization and in connection with the syntactic category of mood (Philippaki-Warburton and Spyropoulos 2000, 2004; Roberts and Roussou 2003). We believe, however, that ὅτι

---

[1] At this point we want to thank an anonymous reviewer, whose comments have helped us to correct some errors and to formulate some arguments of this paper more carefully. We also want to express our gratitude for our colleague Dr. Christina Katsikadeli, who discussed with us some of the points of this paper and who went over our draft and provided assistance.

finite clauses deserve more attention and, elsewhere, we try to provide some evidence that a more detailed study of them may contribute to a better understanding of some language change processes (see Fykias and Sampanis 2010).

As a first point, we want to focus upon the methodological and metatheoretical assumptions behind our inquiry.

We are convinced that the comparative study of Balkan languages can help us attain a better understanding of the nature of some structures that are involved in almost every historical phase of the languages involved. Discussing language convergence on the Balkans, Jeffers and Lehiste (1979:146) see it possible "to set up a sentence model toward which the languages are converging", and, as pointed out by Joseph (1992), Kazazis (1966) has in effect produced such a sentence model in his fragment of a transformational grammar of the Balkan languages, with "Pan-Balkan" rules that allow for language-specific lexical insertion.

What we want to demonstrate is that these convergences need not be analyzed as *sensu stricto* identical structures but rather as affine phenomena. On the other hand, it would be very attractive, if we could develop a formalism that captures some nontrivial generalizations and provides a model both for convergence and divergence phenomena. Being precise and explicit on minor divergence patterns can help us appreciate and at a later stage formalize adequately some syntactic phenomena. At the same time, we are granted the opportunity to show in a clear manner how the respective structures converge at a more abstract level.

Similar structural patterns which are realized in connection with the functional category X in the Balkan language A can be observed in a Balkan language B in connection with the functional category Y. In order to demonstrate the similarity, we must have at our disposal a powerful theoretical account or framework, which enables us to see beyond X and Y, strictly speaking, and penetrate into the true nature of the categories involved. A temporary working hypothesis is to assume a kind of underspecification which might enable us to see the common points between the functional categories involved. A formulation involving some FP, F' or F in connection with a specific lexical category (which it F takes as its complement), that remains the same across all languages of the *Sprachbund* would help us see the overall similarity and at the same time the fine differences among the various Balkan languages. There are some plausible candidates both in nominal and in verbal structures.

In the present paper we will not be able to offer fully fledged samples of implementation of the type of formal analysis envisaged above. We will, however, present some of the data that will receive this kind of analysis in future work and we will try to demonstrate that this novel way of approaching diachronic and *Sprachbund* convergence phenomena can help us to see the connection between a number of phenomena that have been treated separately by now. So, the grouping together of our *explananda* will be our first step.

Dealing with the diachrony of finite subjunctive clauses constructions in later Greek, makes it natural to have an interest in the future tense forms, where subjunctive constructions are crucially involved. So, it does not come as a surprise that the investigation of future forms will be the first part of our paper. The second part will be devoted to some aspects of the subjunctive constructions in their function as finite complements.

2. Uniformity and variation phenomena
2.1. Future formation

As Tomić (2004: 38-40) correctly points out, "the Balkan Sprachbund languages have future tenses with "will" modal clitics, which have evolved from configurations in which subjunctive constructions appear in complement positions of lexical "will" modals. These future tenses can be of three types: (a) inflected "will" modal clitics plus subjunctive constructions; (b) non-inflecting "will" modal clitics plus subjunctive constructions; (c) non-inflecting "will" modal clitics plus tensed verbs whose forms are analogous to the forms of the verbs in the subjunctive constructions of the languages in question".

> "Nevertheless, historical evidence and the forms of the verbs – analogous to the forms of the verbs in subjunctive constructions and often distinct from the present tense forms – testify to the fact that the Macedonian, Bulgarian and Modern Greek future tenses originated as structures such as those in the future tenses of Albanian and Aromanian, and ultimately as structures such as those in the Serbo-Croatian future tenses with subjunctive structures".

2.2. Uniformity phenomena (with minor differentiations)

The **periphrastic future tenses** are illustrated by examples from Modern Greek, colloquial Romanian, Albanian and Bulgarian (all of them roughly meaning: 'I will work.'):

(1)
(a.) θα   δουλεύω
      tha   dhulevo   (Modern Greek)
      will.Mod.Cl   *work*.lSg.Pres.
      "I will be working"

But also:

(b.) θα   δουλέψω
      tha   dhulepso   (Modern Greek)
      will.Mod.Cl *work*.lSg.Pres.

(c.) *o   să   lucrez*   (Colloquial Romanian)
      will.Mod.Cl   Prt. *work*.lSg.Pres. Subj.

(d.) *do   të   punoj*   (Albanian)
      will.Mod.Cl. Subj. Prt. *work*.lSg.Pres. Subj.

(e.) *šte   rabotja*   (Bulgarian)
      will.Mod.Cl. *work*.lSg.Pres.

Apart from the fine grained differences already commented on in the preceding paragraphs, we can observe some interesting features of the structures above which deviate from the general pattern (the progressive future tense of Modern Greek in contrast to the most other Balkan languages). Modern Greek is unique, as far as the aspectual differentiation between progressive and non progressive future forms is concerned. This distinction is not expressed or realized in Albanian and Romanian.

With Bulgarian, we have a somewhat different situation, since Aktionsart might produce similar contrasts. And, what is more important for our diachronic study of Greek, it is exactly this feature that differentiates Ancient (Classical) Greek future formation from the corresponding Modern Greek forms.

Do we have any evidence in later Greek, and in NT Greek in particular, that the subtle aspectual distinction [+/- progressive] in future tense constructions has begun to gain ground in later Greek? The answer seems to be positive.

What we have in mind are some interesting remarks on the use of some periphrastic forms of the future in New Testament Hellenistic Greek in the work "Syntax and Moods in New Testament Greek" by Ernest de Witt Burton (1900).

The most clear cases are periphrastic future forms involving present or future tense forms of the copula and participial forms. Ernest de Witt Burton notes in §71: **"A Future tense composed of a Present Participle and the Future of the verb εἰμι, is found occasionally in the New Testament. The force is that of a Progressive Future, with the thought of continuance or customariness somewhat emphasized.**

Luke 5:10; ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν, *thou shalt catch men,* i.e. *shalt be a catcher of men.* Luke 21:24; Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη, *Jerusalem shall [continue to] be trodden under foot."*

In what follows, we compare several translations into modern Balkan languages[2] of the Biblical passages in question. In our opinion, it is relevant how these forms are rendered in Modern Greek (progressive future forms) on the one hand and in Albanian and Romanian on the other. As far as Romanian is concerned, we must point out that the less colloquial future formation involving the infinitive is preferred in the Biblical translations we have at our disposal.

(2)   Luk (5:10): and in like manner also James and John, sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon; and Jesus said unto Simon, `Fear not, henceforth thou shalt be catching men;'
       a. Luk (5:10): ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους   ἔσῃ   ζωγρῶν.
                   From the now humansAccPl will be2sg catch pres participle

       b. (Metaglottisis)
       από τώρα ανθρώπους   θα ψαρεύεις   ζωντανούς συνεχώς.
       From now humansAccPl will Fut prt catch2sgSUBJ [-perf] alive continuously
       c. (Bulgarian) отсега   човеци   ще   ловиш.
                   From now humanPl   Future prt catch2sg
       d. (Romanian) de acum înainte vei fi   pescar   de oameni.
                   From now   will 2sg be fisher   of   humanPl

       e. (Albanian) Që tani   do   të zësh   njerëz   të gjallë
                   From now will3Sg Prt catch2SgpresSUBJ humanPl   alive

(3) Luk 21:24 and they shall fall by the mouth of the sword, and shall be led captive
to all the nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by nations, till the times of
nations be fulfilled.

> **a. Luk 21:24** καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ <u>ἔσται πατουμένη</u>   ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν
>   and Jerusalem   be FUT3sg tread pres participle by nations
>
> b. Metaglottisis: και η Ιερουσαλήμ <u>θα πατιέται   συνεχώς</u>   από τα έθνη,
>   and Jerusalem   FUT3sg trodden continuously by the nations
>
> c. Bulgarian: и Ерусалим <u>ще бъде тъпкан</u>   от народите,
>   and Jerusalem FUT beSUBJ3sg trodden by nationsthe
>
>
> d. Romanian: şi Ierusalimul <u>va   fi călcat</u> în picioare de neamuri,
>   and Jerusalem will3sg be trodden down   by nations
>
> f. Albanian: dhe Jeruzalemin <u>do   ta   shkelin</u>   paganët,
>   and JerusalemAcc   will   prt+-clpr tread3pl paganPl theNom

It is also of importance that further periphrastic future constructions which are not exact
equivalents of future indicative forms (e.g. constructions involving a combination:
μέλλει with infinitive) with varying aspectual potential start becoming popular.

In §72 and 73 (de Witt Burton1900) we read: "Μέλλει with the Infinitive is also used
with a force akin to that of the Future Indicative. It is usually employed of an action
which one intends to do, or of that which is certain, destined to take place.
Matt. 2:13; μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρῴδης <u>ζητεῖν</u> τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό, *for Herod will
seek the young child to destroy it.*
By the use of the Imperfect of μέλλω with the Infinitive it is affirmed that at a past
point of time an action was about to take place or was intended or destined to occur.
John 7:39; τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ὃ <u>ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν</u> οἱ πιστεύσαντες
εἰς αὐτόν, but this spake he of the Spirit which they that believed on him were to
receive. "

The widespread use of those periphrastic forms offers evidence for the strong
position infinitives and participles still had at this period. It is also important to bear in
mind that there are still no signs of a "will" periphrastic future form in New Testament
Greek.

3. Uniformity and variation phenomena in connection with finite complementation
3.1. Finite complement clauses
In a great number of cases, the functions of the infinitive have been taken over by
subjunctive constructions with tensed verbs. The subjunctive markers are contrasted
with "that"-complementizers,

(4)[3]

>   Modern Greek:
> a.i. Προσπαθώ   να διαβάσω   ένα   βιβλίο
>   *prospatho   na   dhiavaso ena   vivlio*
>   *try*.1Sg.   Prt.   read.1 Sg.Perf. one.Acc.n.   book.Acc
>   "I am trying to read a book."
> a.ii. Σκοπεύω   να   έρθω
>   *skopevo   na   ertho*
>   intend.1Sg. Prt.   come.1 Sg.[+Perf].

---

[3] Cf. Sampanis 2010: 264.

"I intend to come."
Albanian:

b.i.   parashikoj   të   nisem   nesër.
       intend.1Sg.   Prt.   *depart*.1Sg. *tomorrow*
       "I intend to depart tomorrow"

b.ii. Tentoi   të   vijë.
       try.3Sg.Aor   Prt.   *come*.3Sg.Subj.
       "(S)he tried to come."   (Tomić 2006: 590)
       Romanian:

c.i.   Victor încearcă   să   cînte.
       Victor try.3Sg.   Prt.   *sing*.3Sg.
        "Victor is trying to sing"   (Alboiu 2004: 57)

c.ii   Evită   să   te   vadă
       avoid.3Sg. Prt. *you*.Sg.Dat.Cl. *see*.3Sg.Subj.Pres.
       "(S)he avoids seeing you"   (Tomić 2006: 524)
        Bulgarian:

d.i.   Ne možax   da   kupja   knigata   včera
       not could.1Sg. Prt. *buy*.1Sg. *book* – the *yesterday*
       "I could not buy the book yesterday"

d.ii   Iskam   da   dojdeš
       want.1Sg.   Prt. *come*.2Sg.
       "I want you to come"

3.2. Variation phenomena in connection with finite complement clauses: the consecutio temporum *issue*

Apart from the surface uniformity of these clauses in the Balkan languages, there is also significant variability. Therefore cross linguistic comparison can reveal some essential differentiations in the non-finite complementation system of Balkan languages, beyond their surface syntactic similarity. In this paper we will treat just one such case.

   In Albanian, we can observe a *consecutio temporum* or (in more modern terms) a tense agreement of the following kind: If the matrix verb is in present tense, the subjunctive clause complement is also a combination: Prt. + Present verbal form ("Present Subjunctive"), whereas if the matrix verb is in Simple Past or Imperfect tense, the subjunctive complement displays the combination Prt. + Imperfect ("Imperfect Subjunctive"[4]):

(5)
     (a.) fillon   të   punojë   në   kopsht
          start.3Sg. Prt.   work.3Sg. ("Pres. Subj.") in   garden.Acc.
          "He starts working in the garden"
     (b.) filloi   të   punonte   në   kopsht
          started.3Sg. Prt.   work.3Sg. ("Imp.Subj.") in   garden.Acc.
          "He started working in the garden"

The systematic nature of the tense agreement pattern in Albanian (in sharp contrast to the total absence of this phenomenon both in the other Balkan languages and in New

---

[4] Of course, we have to examine whether the term imperfect subjunctive is justified as a correct rendering of this category.

Testament Greek) is borne out by the following comparisons of biblical passages and their translations:

(6) Mat (14:36): And *they* begged Him that they might touch the fringe of His robe. And as many as touched were cured.

    Mat (14:36): καὶ <u>παρεκάλουν</u> αὐτὸν ἵνα μόνον <u>ἅψωνται</u> τοῦ κρασπέδου
           and beg 3plImpf him Conj only touch3plSUBJ **the fringeGSg**
           τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·
           garmentGSg his

    Albanian: ata <u>përgjëroheshin</u> që t' i <u>preknin</u>[5] të paktën.
           and beg 3plImpf conj prt ClPr touch3plSUBJImpf at least
           thekun e rrobës
           fringe the Acc Art garment theGSg

    Bulgarian: и <u>молеха</u> Го да се <u>допрат</u> само до полата на дрехата Му;
           and beg3plImpf him prt touch3pl only to **fringe-the** of clothes His

    Romanian: Şi-L <u>rugau</u> ca numai să se <u>atingă</u>
           and himCl beg Impf 3pl only prt touch3plSUBJ
           de poala hainei Lui;
           to **fringe the** of clothes His

    Metaglottisis: και τον <u>παρακαλούσαν</u> μόνο <u>να αγγίξουν</u> το κράσπεδο
    and him Cl beg Impf 3pl just Prt touch3plSUBJ[-progr] **the fringe**
    του ρούχου του.
    the garment GSg his,

(7)   Mat (16:20)**Then did he charge his disciples that they may say to no one that he is Jesus the Christ.**

    Mat (16:20)· τότε <u>διεστείλατο</u> τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα μηδενὶ
           Then charge3sgAor the discipleDatpl His Conj noone Dat
           εἴπωσιν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός.
           tell-3plSubjAor that he be3sgPres Jesus-the Christ

    Albanian: Atëherë ai i <u>urdheroi</u> rreptësisht dishepujt
           Then he ClprAccpl charge3sgAor solemnly disciples the AccPl
    që të mos i <u>thoshin</u> askujt se ai <u>ishte</u> Krishti.
    that prt Neg ClprDatSg tell 3pl Impf nooneDat that he be 3sgImpf Christ-the

    Bulgarian: Тогава заръча на учениците, никому
           Then charged disciples AccPl tonoone
    <u>да не казват</u>, че Той е [Исус] Христос.
    prt Neg tell 3pl that he be 3sgpres Jesus Christ-the

    Metaglottisis: Τότε <u>διέταξε</u> αυστηρά στους μαθητές <u>να μην πουν</u>
           Then chargeAor3Sg solemnly disciples prt Neg tell 3pl SUBJ [+perf]

---

[5] In all the Albanian examples from (6) through (8) we have the pattern: past tense in the matrix clause and imperfect tense in the finite complement clause.

σε κανέναν ότι αυτός είναι   ο Χριστός.
 to noone that he   bePres3sg the Christ

Romanian: Atunci a <u>poruncit</u>   ucenicilor Lui
            Then has   charged   disciples theD His
      <u>să</u> nu <u>spună</u>   nimănui   că El este   Hristosul.
      Prt Neg   tell3plpres   nooneD   that He be 3sgpres Christ-the

(8)   Mat (27:20): And the chief priests and the elders did persuade the multitudes that they might ask for themselves Barabbas, and might destroy Jesus;

     Mat (27:20): *Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι <u>ἔπεισαν</u>   τοὺς ὄχλους*
           The but highpriests and the elders   convince aor3pl the crowds
      ἵνα <u>αἰτήσωνται</u>   τὸν Βαραββᾶν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν <u>ἀπολέσωσιν</u>.
      Conj ask3pl SUBJ[+perf] the Barabbas the but Jesus destroy3plSUBJ[+perf]

     Albanian: Por krerët e priftërinjve dhe pleqtë ia <u>mbushën mendjen</u> turmës
           but heads the priestsGenand eldersthe Clpr fill aor3pl mind crowdGen
        <u>të kërkonin</u>   Barabën, kurse Jezuin   <u>ta   vritnin</u>.
        Prt ask forImpf3Pl Barabbas whereas Jesus Prt+Cl kill Impf3Pl

     Bulgarian: А главните свещеници и старейшините <u>убедиха</u> народа
           but heads the   priestly and eldersthe   convince 3plAor nation theAcc
        <u>да изпроси</u> Варава,   а   Исуса   да погубят.
        Prt askfor3Sg Barabbas but JesusAcc Prt destroy3Pl

     Metaglottisis: Αλλά οι αρχιερείς και οι πρεσβύτεροι <u>έπεισαν</u> τους όχλους
     but The highpriests and the elders convince aor3pl the crowds
     να <u>ζητήσουν</u>   το Βαραββά,   ενώ τον Ιησού να τον θανατώσουν.
     prt askforSUBJ3pl[+perf]the Barabbas the but theJesus   prt him kill 3plSUBJ[+perf]

     Romanian: Însă arhiereii și bătrânii au <u>ațâțat</u> mulțimile
            but The highpriests and the elders have crowds
     ca să <u>ceară</u>   pe Baraba,   iar pe Iisus să-L piardă
     prt askforSUBJ3pl[+perf] ACCBarabbas but ACCJesus prt him kill SubjAor3pl

Notice, however, that there are some isolated examples in the Greek New Testament, where the 'Albanian' pattern is followed. As Ernest de Witt Burton notes (§348): "Both in Classical and New Testament Greek, the Imperfect occasionally stands in indirect discourse after a verb of past time as the representative of a Present of the direct discourse, and a Pluperfect as the representative of the Perfect. Thus exceptional Greek usage coincides with regular English usage. …John 2:25; *αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, for he himself knew what was in man.*"

   On the other hand, it is also relevant to point out that the pattern of tense agreement *per se* is not totally absent in Modern Greek. A similar pattern involving a *consecutio temporum* of some kind can be observed in the following paratactic constructions under (9) which are in a paraphrase relation to the corresponding structures involving **να**-clauses under (10) (Roussou 2005):

(9)

    (α) Άρχισε   κι έτρεχε.
       start.3Sg.Aor. *and run*.3Sg.Impf.
       "(S(he)) started running"

    (β) Μπορούσε   κι έτρεχε.
       be-able.3Sg.Imp. *and run*.3Sg.Impf.
       "(S(he)) was able to run."

    (γ) Την   έκανε   κι έκλαιγε.
       her.Acc. *make*.3Sg.Aor. *and cry*.3Sg.Impf.
       "(S(he)) caused her to cry/ S(he) made her cry

    (δ) Την   έβαλαν   κι   έγραφε.
       her.Acc. *put*.3Sg.Aor. *and write*.3Sg.Impf.
       "They forced her to write."

    (ε) Τον   είδα   κι   έγραφε.
       him.Acc. *see*.3Sg.Aor. *and write*.3Sg.Impf.
       "I saw him writing."

(10)

    (α) Άρχισε   να   τρέχει.
       start.3Sg.Aor. Prt. *run*.3Sg.(-perfective)

    (β) Μπορούσε να τρέχει.
       be-able.3Sg.Imp. Prt. *run*.3Sg.(-perfective)

    (γ) Την έκανε να κλαίει.
       her.Acc. *make*.3Sg.Aor. Prt. *cry*.3Sg.(-perfective)

    (δ) Την έβαλε να γράφει.
       her.Acc. *put*.3Sg.Aor. Prt. *write*.3Sg.(-perfective)

    (ε) Τον είδα να γράφει/**που έγραφε**.
       him.Acc. *see*.3Sg.Aor. Prt. *write*.3Sg. (-perfective) /Conj. *write*.3Sg.
                                       (-perfective)

Those structures are especially interesting, because they illustrate that tense agreement is not possible in subordinate constructions introduced by ἵνα (and later by να) and the same applies to subordinate clauses introduced by ὅτι. We can only have tense agreement in paratactic constructions as well as in που clauses.

    In Classical Greek there existed an even more complex distinctive device to mark tense agreement or something comparable, when the matrix verb was in a past tense. This involved the use of the so called Optative of the indirect speech in the subordinate clauses, when the matrix verb was in a past tense. As we have tried to show in Fykias & Sampanis 2010 this possibility was no longer available in nonliterary later Greek.

4. Conclusion

In this paper we have examined some striking characteristics of postclassical non-literary Greek based on an examination of the text of the New Testament. With the help of New Testament translations into Modern Greek, Bulgarian, Romanian and Albanian, we have compared those phenomena with affine phenomena of Modern Greek and the other members of the Balkan *Sprachbund*. In future work, we will attempt to offer an explanation for the exceptional status of Albanian finite complement clauses, considering the possibility of finding even closer connections with the Modern Greek constructions examined under (9) and (10) and the special role paratactic constructions play in the syntax of Balkan languages.

References

Alboiu, G. (2004). "Shared Arguments in Control". *Toronto working Papers in Linguistics* 22, 53-74.

De Witt Burton, E. (1900). (4ᵗʰ ed.) *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Fykias, I. and K. Sampanis. (2010). "Some remarks on the diachronic syntax of ἵνα, ὅτι and the finite complement clauses of Greek", *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics,* School of Philology, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, May 2-3, 2009, 208-218.

Jeffers, R. and I. Lehiste. (1979). *Principles and methods for Historical Linguistics.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Joseph, B. (1992). "Balkan languages". In: W. Bright (ed.). *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kazazis, K. (1966). "On a generative grammar of the Balkan languages". *Actes du premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes.* Sofia, Academy.

Φιλιππάκη-Warburton, E. & B. Σπυρόπουλος. (2000). "Διαχρονική θεώρηση της έγκλισης: το σύστημα των εγκλίσεων της ελληνιστικής και ρωμαϊκής κοινής". *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα, Πρακτικά της 20ής ετήσιας συνάντησης του Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας.* Θεσσαλονίκη, 567-578.

Philippaki-Warburton, I. & V. Spyropoulos. (2004). A change of mood: the development of the Greek Mood system. *Linguistics* 42-4 (2004), 791-817.

Roberts, I. & A. Roussou. (2003). *Syntactic Change. A minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ρούσσου, Α. (2005). *Συμπληρωματικοί δείκτες.* Αθήνα, Πατάκης.

Sampanis, K. (2010). "Similarities and some variation phenomena in the finite complementation of the Balkansprachbund languages". *Proceedings of the 5ᵗʰ Athens Postgraduate Conference of the Faculty of Philology*, Athens: University Press.

Tomić, Mišeska O. (ed.). (2004). *Balkan syntax and semantics.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Linguistik Aktuell,.

Tomić, Mišeska O. (2006). *Balkan sprachbund morpho-syntactic features*. Netherlands, Springer.