

On Arguing for Serial Verbs (with Particular Reference to Modern Greek)

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University

1. Introduction

As is well-known from the literature on the serialization of verbs and on serial verbs,¹ there is little agreement as to just how the phenomenon of serial verbs is to be defined, though there is some general agreement on the grosser aspects of this phenomenon. Clearly, however, any definitional problems will necessarily have a serious impact on how one might decide, for any given candidate construction in a given language, whether or not it is an instance of a serial verb construction. Without clear guidelines, such a decision is difficult, if not impossible.

Related to this matter of definition is another methodological problem. In particular, even when a language presents some indications pointing to the possible presence of serial verbs, the question must be considered of how much evidence is needed to firmly establish this analysis. That is, the point at which the indications are strong enough to warrant labelling a given construction as a serial verb construction is not at all obvious.

A test case for this issue is provided by Modern Greek. Greek presents a number of candidates for serial verb status, but an evaluation of these constructions, essentially via a process of elimination according to a few of the generally agreed upon characteristics of serial verbs, leads to results that are at best ambiguous.

2. Some Candidate Constructions in Greek and Their Evaluation as Serial Verbs

In the broadest sense, any sequence of verbs is potentially a serial verb construction; at the very least, certainly, such sequences provide a starting point for evaluation. Under such a liberal view of serialization, Modern Greek presents several possibilities, though ultimately there is cause to reject the identification of most of these as serial verb constructions, as the discussion below makes clear.

In particular, if a somewhat more restrictive definition of serial verbs is adopted, then one can begin to make some sense out of the range of possibilities that Greek provides. As a minimally restrictive--but nonetheless useful--definition for serial verbs, one that most linguists seem to have agreed upon, the following is adopted: a serial verb construction must be a sequence of two uninterrupted verb phrases, preferably with a minimum of inflection on at least one of the two (presumably the nonhead), that represent a single event.²

Such a definition immediately rules out one possible candidate given in (1), consisting of a verb plus an active participle (also known as the gerundive):

(1) o jánis éfije jelóndas

the-John/NOM left/3SG laughing/ACT.PPL

'John left laughing(ly)'.

Even though éfije jelóndas is a verb-verb sequence with minimal inflection on the second verb (which has an invariant form, as the gerundive is always with the suffix -ondas regardless of the person and number of its implicit subject and the tense of the main verb), it seems clearly to represent two events, the event of laughing and the event of leaving. Moreover, the two verbal forms in (1) need not occur juxtaposed, since éfije o jánis jelóndas is an acceptable word-order variant of (1), so that (1) fails on the criterion of uninterruptedness. These properties, then, indicate that (1) may be ruled out as an instance of a serial verb construction.

Similar considerations lead to concatenated imperatives, as in (2), being disqualified as serial verbs:

(2) trékse, vrés mu líyo aláti
run/IMPV.SG find/IMPV.SG me/GEN little salt

'Run (and) find me a little salt'.

Again, two separate events are being referred to, the event of running and the event of finding. It is also significant that these concatenated imperatives are separated by an intonational break--a 'comma pause'--and thus perhaps do not qualify as serial verbs because of the criterion of uninterruptedness. The relevance of this point becomes apparent later on in the discussion of other imperatival sequences in relation to the question of serial verb constructions in Greek.

Another potential candidate for serial verb status is the verb-verb combination exemplified by the forms in (3):

- (3) a. aniyoklíno 'I open-and-close' (2SG: aniyoklínis, 3SG: aniyoklíni, etc.)
[cf. aníyo 'I open', klíno 'I close']
b. pijenoérxome 'I go-and-come' (2SG: pijenoérxese, 3SG: pijenoérxete, etc.)
[cf. pijéno 'I go', érxome 'I come']

These forms, however, are undoubtedly compounds, more specifically coordinative compounds, and not serial verbs. Their compound status is shown by the fact that they have only one accent and thus constitute a single accentual unit. In addition, only the second element shows any inflection (thus 2SG pijenoérxese, not *pijenisérxese with the 2SG form pijénis 'you go'), and the -o- that links the two verb stems is the element typically found in such coordinative compounds. Thus, pijenoérxome and other forms like it are verbal counterparts to such nominal compounds as andrójino 'couple', literally, 'man-woman', made from the stems andra- 'man' and jin(ek)- 'woman' with -o- as the linking vowel, with but a single accent, and with an uninflected first member (cf. plural andrójina 'couples', not *andrésjina 'couple' with a plural desinence on the first member). As compounds, therefore, pijenoérxome, etc. do not qualify as serial

verbs on syntactic grounds since they are neither linked verbs nor linked verb phrases, but instead are only linked lexical verb stems forming a single compound word.

Next to be considered is the perfect tense formation consisting of an inflected form of έxo 'I have' plus an invariant apparently nonfinite form sometimes called a 'perfective participle'.³ A few representative forms from some of the 'tenses' in the perfect system (omitting, e.g., various types of future perfects) are given in (4) for the verb xtipó:

- (4) a. PRES.PERF.ACT: έxo xtipísi 'I have hit', έxis xtipísi 'you have hit', etc.
 b. PAST.PERF.ACT: ίxa xtipísi 'I had hit', ίxes xtipísi 'you had hit', etc.
 c. PRES.PERF.PASS: έxo xtipiθí 'I have been hit', έxis xtipiθí 'you have been hit', etc.
 d. PAST.PERF.PASS: ίxa xtipiθí 'I had been hit', ίxes xtipiθí 'you had been hit', etc.

These forms seemingly refer to a single event, and thus possibly involve serialization. Moreover, they are auxiliary-like, apparently parallel in structure to the English perfect, and it is not out of the question that auxiliation should be treated as a type of serialization.⁴

Still, the criterion of uninterruptedness speaks against a serial verb analysis, for the two parts of the perfect can be interrupted, most usually by verb phrase material (e.g. an adverb like íði 'already'), which in itself is not problematic for the serialization hypothesis, but also marginally by elements not in the verb phrase, e.g. subjects; (5), for instance, is possible, though not preferred:

- (5) ?έxi o jánis γράpsi to γράma
 has/3SG the-John/NOM write/PERFVE.PPL the-letter

'John has written the letter'.

Moreover, even if auxiliation is subsumed under serialization, there is one difference between the English perfect and that of Greek that might argue against an auxiliary analysis, namely the fact that there are no other clear auxiliaries in Greek. The only two candidates for auxiliary status are the verb έxo 'have' in a variant active perfect formation and the verb ίme 'be' in a variant passive perfect formation, both involving the so-called mediopassive participle (which is probably best treated as a derived adjective--see Smirniotopoulos 1990 for the most recent discussion of this form) as illustrated in (6a) and (6b) respectively with the verb γράfo 'write':

- (6) a. έxo γraméno to γράma
 have/1SG write/PERF.PPL the-letter

'I have written the letter / I have the letter written'

- b. to γράma íne γraméno
 the-letter is/3SG write/PERF.PPL

'The letter has been written / The letter is written'.

As the glosses in (6) indicate, however, these variant formations admit of an analysis other than auxiliation, since (6a) could be 'have' with a small-clause complement and (6b) could be simply a copular structure with a deverbal adjective in the predicate.

The perfect could of course represent an otherwise unparalleled type of verb phrase, since it is clear that not everything that is required in a complete and detailed description of language can find a parallel elsewhere in the account. Even in that case, however, the perfect need not involve auxiliation, for it could simply be a type of complementation, though admittedly, the combination of éxo with a nonfinite form in the perfect would be a unique type of complementation; Greek complementation typically requires a fully inflected and finite verb, most usually with an overt complementizer (pu, pos, or óti, all roughly parallel to English that), or a verb introduced by the subjunctive marker na (about which, see §3).⁵

Auxiliation and complementation, however, are relatively well-understood syntactic phenomena, whereas serialization seems to be a more marked phenomenon.⁶ Given the possibility of other analyses, i.e. auxiliation, whether structurally unparalleled or not, or anomalous complementation, overall it would seem best to hold off calling (4) an construction type that has a marked status cross-linguistically, i.e. a serial verb construction, until stronger indications are found that Greek does in fact have serialization.

3. An extension of (4)

At this point, a small digression concerning complementation and clause-types in Greek is in order, for making a few reasonably well-motivated assumptions leads to some potentially relevant results. The clause-types that present the most interest in this regard are those introduced by the element na, which may be embedded, as in (7a-b), or may determine matrix clauses themselves, as in (7c):

- (7) a. arízo na ðjavázo to vivlío
begin/1 SG na read/1 SG the-book

'I begin to read the book'

- b. boró na ðjaváso to vivlío
can/1 SG na read/1 SG the-book

'I can read the book'

- c. na ðjaváso to vivlío mu tóra?
na read/1 SG the-book my now

'Might I read my book now?'

At first, it might seem that these are irrelevant for a consideration of serialization in Greek, since the combination of a verb such as arízo 'begin' with a complement introduced by na would seemingly violate the usual assumption that serial verb constructions do not have a complementizer or subordinating marker of any sort. However, the best analysis for na in conjunction with a verb, as argued by Veloudis and Philippaki-Warbuton 1983 and by Philippaki-Warbuton and Veloudis 1984 is that na is not a complementizer, but rather that embedded na-clauses occur with a zero-complementizer and the na itself is a marker of subjunctive mood.⁷

Moreover, na is a bound-element, and can only be separated from the verb by other bound, dependent elements, such as the subjunctive negator min or the weak pronominal object affixes. However, it is not entirely clear whether na is an affixal marker of mood, i.e. part of the morphology of the verb or a clitic dependent, i.e. a syntactically generated element that comes to be phonologically dependent on its host verb. If it is an affix, e.g. a mood affix, then the type of (7a) and (7b) would involve VERB + VERB combinations with no intervening complementizers or subordinators where both parts are inflected. While it is interesting in this regard to note the existence of serialization with finite verbs in Saramaccan (so Byrne 1987; see also Schiller 1990: Chapter 2), the single-event semantic criterion discussed above would preclude the treatment of such VERB + VERB combinations as a type of serialization.

The clitic analysis is perhaps to be preferred, for it allows for a straightforward generalization regarding the position of negative affixes in the Greek verb (as the leftmost affixes);⁸ in that case, (7a) and (7b) and sentences like them need not be considered to be finite serialization. However, other facts suggest that a different type of serialization might be operative here. What is most relevant here is that it may well be that na is itself a verb, in that some analysts have related it synchronically to the deictic element ná 'Here is!' (see Christides 1987), which is arguably a verb and more specifically an imperative in that it takes postposed weak pronominal object affixes just like imperatival verbs, and in some dialects can take the plural imperative ending -te.⁹

- (8) a. na! 'Here!'
- b. na to aeropláno! 'Here's the airplane!'
- c. na to! 'Here it is!' / *to ná! (compare pés to 'Say it!' / *to pés)
- d. náte 'Here (you all)! (compare éla 'come!' (SG) vs. eláte 'come!' (PL)).

If, as implicit in Christides' account, na the subjunctive marker is a verb at some level--and thus perhaps actually an auxiliary verb, not unlike should in modern English--then the analysis of the sentences in (7) becomes relevant for a consideration of verb serialization, for they are then VERB-VERB sequences and actually in (7a) and (7b) are VERB-VERB-VERB sequences, where the middle verb is apparently uninflected while the outer verbs are inflected.

Admittedly, (7a) could be excluded as involving a verb + complement structure, as could (7b) also, though it comes closer to providing a 'single event' type of semantics than (7a) does. Example (7c), however, seems really to involve the representation of a single semantic event, so that under the verbal analysis of the subjunctive marker na,

(7c) could well be a serial verb construction. One might of course claim that modality of the sort expressed in (7c) would point to an auxiliary verb structure, and, as noted above, auxiliatation does not have an entirely clear status with regard to serialization but it is very likely to be a distinct syntactic phenomenon from serialization; at the very least, though, an auxiliary analysis is undoubtedly the one that most linguists would opt for and would be most comfortable with, even if at this point it is arrived at more by stipulation than by analytic necessity.

Here, though, a criterion suggested by Seuren 1990 and Schiller 1990 concerning negation in serialization may be useful here in deciding the question and making the desired answer less stipulative. Schiller has claimed that "the marker of negation [in serial verb constructions] is generally attached to the syntactic head of the entire sentence, and cannot be attached to the head of the syntactically subordinate clause" (Chapter 2), and that this occurs regardless of the semantic scope of the negation. It would seem then that sentences of the type in (7) do not involve serialization, since--unless this is a case, for a language like Greek, of noncanonical serialization with the second verb as head, not the first--the negation affix na can occur with the verb after na in all three structures:

- (9) a. arízo na min káno típote
 begin/1SG na NEG do/1SG nothing

'I am beginning not to do anything'

- b. boró na min kano tipote
 can/1SG na NEG do/1SG nothing

'I am able to do nothing'

- c. na min kano tipote?
 na NEG do/1SG nothing

'Shall I not do anything?'

In a sense, the question posed by na in these constructions is parallel to that raised by the common occurrence of the verb 'say' as a complementizer in serializing languages (so Schiller 1990: Chapter 2, p. 38, n. 14), and thus perhaps a further reason to exclude the na constructions is that what follows na can be analyzed as a whole sentence, not just a VERB or VERB PHRASE. Indeed, subjects can occur with the verb:

- (10) arízo na líno eγó to próvlima
 begin/1SG na solve/1SG I/NOM the-problem

'I am beginning (myself) to solve the problem'.

Still, what is perhaps most significant here is that this question can be addressed without having to say that this is a serial verb construction, concrete testimony to the utility of carefully defining the properties of this construction-type.

4. A Further VERB-VERB Candidate

Once these various VERB-VERB candidates have been sifted and ultimately disqualified as serial verbs, one further construction is left that constitutes a possible serialization candidate, namely the imperatival sequence illustrated in (11):

- (11) éla pés mu
 come/SG.IMPV tell/SG.IMPV me/GEN

'C'mon tell me!'

This sequence consists of the imperative of érxome 'I come', in (11) the singular form éla, followed immediately by another imperative, here the singular imperative of léyo 'I say, tell'; plural forms are also possible, e.g. eláte péste mu 'C'mon (you/PL) tell me!'.

It is not obvious just what the analysis of this construction should be. On the one hand, it appears to be merely another instance of the concatenated imperative construction discussed above (and exemplified in (2)), but there are two key differences: first, there is no pause in éla pés mu, no intonational break between the two imperatives, and second, a single event only is being referred to in (11), whereas two separate events were represented in (2). Thus éla in (11) does not have a concrete motion or directional sense but rather serves more of an exhortative function, as represented crudely in the translation by 'C'mon', focussing the hearer on the primary event, that of telling (embodied in pés). Moreover, as would be expected in serialization, there is no complementizer or subordination marker at all, rather just the two bare imperatives.

Another potentially relevant feature concerns the inflection on the verbs in (11). As already noted, both verbs can be either singular or plural, in the imperatival form, and the usual case is for both to be plural or for both to be singular, as in the two examples already presented. It is also possible for there to be disagreement between the two verbs, in two ways. First, éla, the ostensible singular form, can cooccur with a plural imperative, i.e. éla péste mu is possible. Second, éla can cooccur with a first person plural imperatival form, which in Greek is found as a separate form only with one verb, páme 'let's go',¹⁰ as in éla páme mazí 'C'mon let's go together'. While it has sometimes been suggested that serial verbs must have the same subject (so Foley and Olson 1985), Schiller (1990: Chapter 2) has brought together examples of apparent serial verb constructions in several languages in which there is no shared subject, and he labels the "same subject constraint" as among the "tests [for serialization] that fail". Thus éla constructions such as éla péste mu or éla páme mazí do not argue against a serial verb analysis in and of themselves.

Included in the possibilities for inflection in this construction is negation, taking negation in Greek to be affixal in nature and thus a matter of inflectional morphology.¹¹ Thus it is possible to have as the second part of the construction after éla the negative

imperative, expressed with the negator mi(n) and a finite form of the verb, e.g. éla min klés 'C'mon don't cry!'.

There are essentially two difficulties, however, with taking this construction to be a matter of verb serialization. First, one might question whether éla pés mu really involves two verbs; that is, given (especially) that nonagreement is possible, as in éla péste mu, one might be inclined to say that éla is nothing more than a particle, and that the construction therefore does not involve a sequence of verbs. Indeed, Baker (1989: 539n. 18) suggests that claiming that certain apparent serial verbs in Yoruba 'have lost their verbal status ... having become grammatical particles' is a way to explain a theoretical embarrassment they pose for the usual distinction made between arguments and adjuncts.

The claim has been made, though, by Zwicky 1985, that linguistic theory should not tolerate a lexical category of 'particle'¹² and that all words should be assigned to a lexical/syntactic category. Under such a view, which is adopted here, éla has to have a lexical category, and it would seem that the most suitable category is that of verb, given the formal identity of éla with the imperative singular of the verb érxome and the fact that éla can have a concrete directional sense of 'Come (here)!', though not in this construction.

A second potential problem is that this construction seems somewhat isolated in the overall grammar of Greek, not being found with a great many verbs and not with a great many verb forms, being restricted basically to having only imperatives as the first member. This fact is potentially problematic, since some linguists have taken the view that productivity and the extent to which potential serial constructions occur in a language is a deciding factor in the ultimate identification of a construction as an instance of serialization; Baker (1989: 519n. 3), for instance, has implicitly rejected the English go get construction as serialization for this reason, referring to it only as a "serial-like construction" of American English.

With regard to the éla + imperative construction in Greek, while it is productive as far as combinations with éla itself is concerned, it is true that this construction is pretty much limited to éla, as far as obvious verbs of the language are concerned. Thus by Baker's implicit criterion, the Greek construction would only be "serial-like" and not true serialization. However, the éla + imperative construction is not totally isolated (nor is the English go get construction, of course), since at least one other construction, as well possibly as others, seems parallel to the one under consideration, namely the occurrence of imperatives with an element já preceding them, as in the following (where 'Hey' in the translation is an imperfect approximation of the force of ja):

(12)a. já kíta
ja look/IMPV.SG

'(Hey,) (you/SG) look!'

b. já kitákste

ja look/IMPV.PL

'(Hey,) (you/PL) look!'

What makes this imperatival usage relevant here is the fact that ja is plausibly taken as a verb itself. In particular, ja independently can take noun phrase arguments, as in (13a), and verbal complements with na, as in (13b):

___(13)a. ja mja stiγmí
ja one-moment

'Wait a moment!'

b. ja na ðúme
ja SUBJUNC see/1PL

'Let's see!'

Moreover, while ja does show some affixal properties, all the affix-like features it shows are ones that follow from serialization as well; for example, strict ordering before a verb and not after could be a result of being part of a serial verb construction, and the selectivity it shows is basically such that it is restricted to occurring with imperatives, i.e. with the one verb type that offers, via éla pés mu, the appearance of seriation.

It is possible also that there are further elements that can occur in the Greek serial imperatival construction that give it a broader overall distribution. For example, as suggested in Joseph 1985, imperatives preceded by the 'interjection' ánde 'come (on)! go on!', as in ánde fije 'Go on, get out of here' (with the imperative of févγo 'I leave'), and the lexicalized expression káne (ke líγo) kráti 'Have (a little) restraint!',¹³ may provide further examples of serial imperatives in Greek. It is worth pointing out that if the English go get construction is considered an instance of serialization, then it shows some of the same properties as the Greek putative serial verbs, in that the first verb is restricted formally to uninflected forms (imperative, infinitive, present forms other than 3SG, etc.) and lexically to just a few verbs (go, come, run, and maybe a few others).

The one troubling aspect left concerning a serialization analysis of the Greek construction under consideration is the fact that all the inflection that is found in the construction occurs with the second verb (excepting the possibility of plural eláte), and the second verb is the one that is semantically primary. Thus it would appear that the second verb is the head of the serial imperatival sequence. Greek in general seems to have Verb-Complement as its canonical order in verb phrases, e.g. the direct object typically follows the verb as do sentential clauses dependent on a verb. Schiller (1990: Chapter 2) has proposed that in canonical subordinating serial verbs constructions, "the order of the V's reflects the head-complement order of the language". In order to maintain the serial verb analysis for Greek, therefore, it would have to be admitted that

this construction is not a canonical type, but then so too with regard to the English go get construction.

5. Conclusion

The argumentation that leads to a serial verb analysis for certain Greek sequences of imperatives, it must be admitted, is a bit tenuous. Basically, it is via a process of elimination that an argument is constructed, and via a set of parallels with an English construction that is admittedly only somewhat controversially identified as a serial verb construction itself. It is worth pointing out, however, that the numerous refinements in the notion of "serial verb" that have arisen out of the renewed interest in this construction in recent years (e.g. the work of Sebba, Seuren, Schiller, Zwicky, and others) are exactly what make it possible even to entertain the notion at all that the Greek construction is an instance of serialization and to try to give substantive supporting arguments.

Greek provides a test case, then, in that it at best presents only the most minimal amount of evidence bearing on the analysis of these constructions; thus, if it is possible to argue for serialization for Greek, using the various criteria alluded to in the work of Schiller and others, then it ought to be possible to argue the case for practically any language. That result, however, may not be a healthy one and so it is probably best to reject the possibility of serial verbs in Greek, and in general to guard against seeing serialization in everything; the Greek construction could just as easily be an eccentric and idiomatic type of verb complementation as an isolated different type of construction.

Notes

*Several linguists--among them Victor Friedman, Craige Roberts, Eric Schiller, Pieter Seuren, and Arnold Zwicky--have provided comments on some of the ideas contained in this paper that proved invaluable in furthering my understanding of the issues discussed herein. In addition, Tasos Christides, Art Palacas, and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton have provided important help on some crucial points of data. To all of them, I offer thanks as well as absolution from complicity in my conclusions.

1. Following the important clarification in Schiller 1990, these really should be referred to as 'serial verb phrase constructions'; nonetheless, the term 'serial verb' will be used here, as it is the most familiar designation for the construction. Schiller's several papers on serial verbs, including the paper contained in this volume, provide ample references to the relevant literature on this construction, as do the other papers found herein.

2. I realize that it is far from obvious just what constitutes a 'single event', but the notion is widely referred to in the literature on serial verbs, and thus I adhere to its use here.

3. See Joseph (1983: 77-80) for discussion of the status of this form.

4. Unless, of course, auxiliaries are taken to be a separate lexical category and not a subset of verbs. Even if auxiliaries are treated as a type of verb, auxiliation need not be reduced to serialization--a clause union analysis is possible in some languages for at least some instances of combinations that descriptively are AUX + VERB.

5. A possible exception to this claim is a sentence such as (i):

(i) parakalíste aníkste tin pórtá
request/2PL.PASS open/PL.IMPV the-door/ACC

```
'You are requested: "Open the door"'.

```

It is more likely, though, that (i) represents direct speech and as such would not be true complementation.

6. As Pieter Seuren remarked during the conference at which this paper was read, serial verb constructions are 'perceptually salient', at least they were to linguists confronting West African and Carribean Creole languages; that salience is suggestive of the distinctive--and therefore marked--status that these constructions enjoy.

7. Note for instance that na can cooccur, as in (i), in relative clauses with pu, an element whose purely complementizer function is shown in (ii):

(i) psáxno énan ánthropo pú na me voiθísi
seek/1SG a-man/ACC COMP SUBJUNC me/ACC help/3SG

'I'm looking for a man that might help me'

(ii) xárika pu se ìda
was-glad/1 SG COMP you/ACC saw/1 SG

'I am glad that I saw you' .

8. See Joseph 1990 and Joseph (forthcoming) for discussion of the status of negation in Greek.

9. See Joseph 1981 for a defense of this analysis, though in that paper I attempt to separate out the two *na*'s (deictic *na* and subordinating/subjunctive *na*). It is usually assumed that the two *na*'s are etymologically distinct--a position countered, to my knowledge, only in Christides 1987--but linking the two synchronically need not be precluded by the absence of an etymological connection between them.

10. For other verbs, a subjunctive form with the marker na or the more purely hortative marker as is used, e.g. na púme / as púme 'let's tell'.

11. See Joseph 1990 and Janda and Joseph 1990 for some discussion of the status of the negation markers in Greek.

12. Though see Christides 1990 for an attempt to maintain the category of 'particle'.

13. This expression is literally 'do/IMPV.SG (and a-little) hold/IMPV.SG', where kráti is not the synchronically regular imperative of krató 'I hold' but rather is a fossilized older imperative.

References

- Baker, Mark. (1989). Object Sharing and Projection in Serial Verb Constructions, Linguistic Inquiry 20.4.513-553.
- Byrne, Frank. (1987). Grammatical Relations in a Radical Creole: Verb Complementation in Saramaccan. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Christides, Anastasios-Ph. (1987). On the Interplay of Deixis and Anaphora in the History of Greek: Ancient Greek h[n, 'ina, Modern Greek nav, na. In J. Killen, J. Melena, & J.-P. Olivier, eds., Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek Presented to John Chadwick (+ Minos XX-XXII), pp. 97-111.
- Christides, Anastasios-Ph. (1990). Mória [Particles]. In Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 10th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (9 - 11 May 1989), 307-322. Thessaloniki: Ekdotikos Ikos Afon. Kiriakidi.
- Foley, W. and M. Olson. (1985). Clausehood and Verb Serialization. In Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause (ed. by J. Nichols and A. Woodbury), 1-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janda, Richard D. and Brian D. Joseph. (1990). On Constellations in Morphology: Crosslinguistic Evidence and Modern Greek mi(n)(-), (unpublished ms.).
- Joseph, Brian D. (1981). On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Modern Greek NA, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 7.139-154.
- Joseph, Brian D. (1983). The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, Supplementary Volume).
- Joseph, Brian D. (1985). Complementizers, Particles, and Finiteness in Greek and the Balkans, Folia Slavica 7.390-411.
- Joseph, Brian D. (1990). The Benefits of Morphological Classification: On Some Apparently Problematic Clitics in Modern Greek. In W. Dressler, H. Luschützky, O. Pfeiffer, & J. Rennison, eds., Contemporary Morphology (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 49), pp. 171-181. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

From: B. Joseph & A. Zwicky (eds.) When Verbs Collide: Papers from the Ohio State Mini-Conference on Serial Verbs. Ohio State Working Papers in Linguistics 39 (1990), pp. 77-90.

Joseph, Brian D. (Forthcoming). The Morphosyntax of the Verbal Complex in Modern Greek.

Philippaki-Warbuton, Irene and Giannis Veloudis. (1984). I ipotaktikí stis simbliomatikés protásis [The Subjunctive in Complement Clauses]. In Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 5th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki (2 - 4 May 1984), 149-167. Thessaloniki: Ekdotikos Ikos Afon. Kiriakidi.

Schiller, Eric. (1990). An Autolexical Account of Subordinating Serial Verb Phrases. University of Chicago Ph. D. Dissertation.

Seuren, Pieter. (1990). The Definition of Serial Verbs, paper presented at The Ohio State University Mini-conference on Serial Verbs, May 1990 [published version in this volume].

Smirniotopoulos, Jane C. (1990). Lexical Passives in Modern Greek. Ohio State University Ph. D. Dissertation.

Veloudis, Giannis and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. (1983). I ipotaktikí sta ná elinikí [The Subjunctive Mood in Modern Greek]. In Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki (16 - 18 May 1983), 151-169. Thessaloniki: Ekdotikos Ikos Afon. Kiriakidi.

Zwicky, Arnold M. (1985). Clitics and Particles, Language 61.283-305.