ON THE PROPERTIES OF THE ANCIENT GREEK INFINITIVE[i]

Christina Sevdali   UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Περίληψη

Ο στόχος αυτού του άρθρου είναι η ανάλυση των δομών *Accusativus Cum Infinitivo* (AcI) της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής (ΑΕ), όπου το υποκείμενο των απαρεμφάτων, στην ετεροπροσωπία εμφανίζεται σε αιτιατική πτώση. Θα υποστηρίξω πως τα απαρέμφατα της ΑΕ έχουν Χρόνο σύμφωνα με θεωρίες όπως του Stowell (1982), της Enc (1987) και των Φιλιππάκη-Warburton & Κατσιμαλή (1989) για τα ΑΕ, και συγκεκριμένα *σχετικό (relative)* Χρόνο (Comrie, 1985). Τα ΑΕ απαρέμφατα θα υποστηριχθεί πως είναι Φράσεις Συμπληρωματικού Δείκτη (CPs) και αυτό υποστηρίζεται επίσης και από τις επιρρηματικές απαρεμφατικές προτάσεις των ΑΕ, που εισάγονται με *πριν* και *ώστε*. Μια ανάλυση βασισμένη σε χαρακτηριστικά (features) θα προταθεί ώστε να δείξω τη σχέση μεταξύ των κόμβων του Χρόνου και του Συμπληρωματικού Δείκτη και τη σημασία τους στην απόδοση της σωστής χρονικής αναφοράς της απαρεμφατικής πρότασης σε σχέση με την κύρια. Η συντακτική πραγμάτωση αυτού του φαινομένου είναι το γεγονός πως τα ΑΕ απαρέμφατα μπορούν να δώσουν πτώση στα υποκείμενά τους.

1.   Aims And Scope of The Paper

The main aim of this paper is to provide an account of the *Accusativus-Cum-Infinitivo* (AcI) construction of Ancient Greek[ii] (AG) infinitives. This can be described as the property of the subject of the infinitival clause to appear overtly in the Accusative Case, in much more wider contexts that in English for example: in English this property of infinitives is only limited to ECM verbs, while in AG the subject of the infinitive can be always overt and in the Accusative as long as it is different from the subject of the matrix clause, or if it is emphatic.

My claim relies on the basic idea that AG infinitives have temporal properties. I argue that both on the basis of the particular morphology of the AG infinitive and on certain approaches in the literature that argue that infinitives in general have tense. My analysis will rely on a syntactic and a semantic manifestation of the infinitival tense, the former being responsible for the licensing of the Case of the infinitival subject. A closer investigation of verbal forms like the AG infinitive that arguably has temporal properties in addition to the already well-known Portuguese inflected infinitives, will help us reach valuable conclusions concerning the idea of finiteness cross-linguistically.

The paper will be organized as follows: in Section 2, I will give a brief presentation of the properties of the AG infinitives along with some examples that show their distribution. In Section 3,

I will briefly present and discuss previous analyses of AcI in the literature, on Latin and AG. In Section 4, I will articulate the semantic status of the infinitival tense and I will also present my syntactic analysis. In the last Section, I will conclude by illustrating briefly the theoretical implications of such an account.

2.   Properties And Distribution Of The AG Infinitive

The AG infinitive is morphologically distinct from all other verbal forms in AG because it had its own endings. It is inflected for four tenses (present, past, future and present perfect) and also for three voices (active, medio-passive and passive). The following table illustrates all the infinitival forms of the verb *'luo'* (= solve).

(1)

	Active	Medio-Passive	Passive
Present	*luein*	*luesthai*	*luesthai*
Aorist / Past	*lusai*	*lusasthai*	*luthe:nai*
Future	*lusein*	*lusesthai*	*luthe:sesthai*
Present Perfect	*Lelukenai*	*lelusthai*	*lelusthai*

The verbal infinitive had several uses for which I give the relevant examples below[iii]:

(2) *Subject Infinitival clauses :*

Omologeitai   ti:n polin   e:mo:n   arhaiotati:n   einai.

Is-accepted   the town-Acc   our-Gen   very ancient-Acc   to-be.

'It is widely accepted that our town is very ancient.'

(Isokrates, *Epistolae*, IV, 23)

(3) *Object Infinitival clauses:*

(a)   Epistemic verbs and verbs of saying:

Nomizeis   dustuxein   eme?

Think-you   to-have-bad luck   me-Acc

'Do you think that I have bad luck? / Do you believe me to be unlucky?'

(Sophokles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, 800)

(b)   Control verbs :

(…) metria   de   eho:n   toutois   peiro :mai vautikois ergazesthai.

    Moderate   then have-participle these   try-I   in-the-sea to-work

'Since I have these things moderately, I try to work in the sea.'

(Demosthenes, *Contra Apatourium*, 4.6)

(c)   Volitional verbs : (final infinitive)

Voulomai toinun umas   meta parri:sias   exetasai   ta paronta pragmata ti:i polei (…)

Want-I then   you-Acc with courage   to-review the current things   the-town-Dat

    'Therefore I want you to review the issues of our town with courage…'

<div align="right">(Demosthenes, De Chersoneso, 2.1)</div>

    (4) Adjunct Clauses^{iv}:

    (a) Temporal clauses introduced (only) with prin (=before).

Oi proteron   en Amfipolei oikountes   prin   Filippon   lavein,

The-nom before-adv in Amphipolis live-prt-nom   before Philip-Acc to-get-past

ti:n Athinaio:n   ho:ran eihon.

the-fem of-Athenians-gen country had-they.

'The previous inhabitants of Amphipolis had the country of the Athenians, before Philip got it.'

<div align="right">(Demosthenes, De Halonesso, 28:2)</div>

    (b) Purpose clauses introduced with o:ste (=so that)

Kai ton te proofeilomenon apedo:ke,   o:ste   to strateuma polu prothumoteron   einai. And the

and (what) is-been-owed gave-he, so that the army-Acc very willing-Acc   to-be.

'And he gave the salary that has been owed to them, so that the army would become more willing (to fight).'

<div align="right">(Xenophon, Kyrou Anavasis, 1.5.7.3.)</div>

Accusativus-Cum-Infinitivo is exhibited in examples (2), (3a), (3c) (4a) and (4b), where the subject of the infinitive is different from the subject of the main clause. I will not have anything insightful to say for cases of Control like (3b) above. The only case of the above that can be accounted for in a 'traditional' way is (3a) that the main verb is an ECM verb. However, an account for all the above cases as a whole is needed and this is where my analysis stems from.

    As mentioned earlier, AG infinitives are inflected for tense. However, traditionally it has been thought that tense morphemes are actually used to convey aspectual distinctions (Binnick, 1991) because infinitival clauses do not have temporal properties independently of the tense of the main clause (Jannaris, 1897). Differences in aspect are accommodated as follows: the present infinitive shows durative aspect, the past and the future infinitive both show punctual aspect and the perfect infinitive shows perfect aspect. Doubt can be shed to this claim, considering the overlap in the use of future and past infinitives as both showing punctual aspect. This seems fairly uneconomical, why should a language have two ways of conveying the same thing? One could try to see whether there is more to those two forms than aspect and of course the next natural thing to look at would be tense, since it is actually tense morphemes, which distinguish these two forms. The major source of confusion concerning the tense and aspect morphemes is the fact that they are not easily distinguishable in AG: the letter 's' which is exhibited in the future and past infinitives of active and medio-passive voice (cf. table 1) could be isolated as the punctual aspectual morpheme, but, as we can see, it is absent in the future and past infinitives of passive voice and this of course cannot mean

<div align="center">3</div>

that future and past infinitives in the passive voice do not denote punctual events. My claim is not that AG infinitives do not denote aspectual information *at all*, instead I will explore the possibility that in addition to aspect they also denote tense. The exact content of their temporal properties will be discussed in Section 4.

In the following section I will discuss previous accounts of the Latin and AG infinitives and I will try to demonstrate that they are inadequate and that a new analysis is needed.

3.   Previous analyses: Latin and AG AcI

AG is apparently not the only language that has AcI, the other notable example being Latin where the phenomenon has roughly the same form as in AG. A standard example of Latin AcI is demonstrated below, taken from Pillinger, 1980 (his example 1):

(5) *Latin AcI:*

Gallos   esse altissimos   omnes   credunt.

The Gauls-Acc to be very tall-Acc all-Nom think-they

'Everybody thinks that the Gauls are very tall.'

In order to account for this phenomenon two main views have been put forward: either the subject of the infinitival clause has raised to the object position of the main verb to gets its Case (ECM) (Pepicello, 1977) or there is a null element in the complementizer position of the infinitival clause that is responsible for the accusative on the infinitival subject (Ceccheto & Oniga, 2001 and Tantalou, 2003 for AG), in the same way a null *for* is postulated for English in Kayne's (1984) alternative analysis for ECM.

Pepicello (1977) argues for a raising to object analysis based on data on passivisation like the following (his example 4):

(6) *Nominativus Cum Infinitivo (NcI):*

 …qui unus omnium justissimus fuisse traditur. (Cicero, *pro Sestio*, 67.141)

  who alone of-all   most just   to-be is-said

 '…who alone is said to have been the most just of all.'

In this example the subject 'unus' of the passive verb 'traditur' is semantically the subject of the infinitive 'fuisse'. Therefore in order for it to be able to be passivised in the main clause it must have been at some point of the derivation the object of the main verb, since it is not acceptable to assume direct Subject-to-Subject raising across clauses. Therefore, Pepicello assumes that the subject of the infinitive has to be raised to the object position of the main verb before it can be further raised as the subject of the verb when passivised and he assumes that for all cases of AcI. People like Bolkenstein (1979) and Pillinger (1980) have argued extensively against such an account without giving an articulated counter analysis however. Their arguments are numerous and extremely interesting but

they cannot be reproduced here in any detail. Bolkenstein discusses intransitive verbs like *constat* 'it is possible' that take AcI complements. In these cases, the subject of the infinitival clause even if it raises to the object position of the main verb, there is no accusative case to pick up. Pillinger discusses case-marking violations with a verb that takes an object in dative Case and AcI. It is evident that synchronically such verbs do not have any accusative Case to give to the subject of the AcI and therefore this accusative cannot and does not come from the main verb. On the basis of the above and numerous other arguments, I dismiss a generalized ECM analysis for all cases of AcI also in AG, since these arguments can be shown to work for AG as well (Philippaki-Warburton & Catsimali, 1989 and Tantalou, 2003).

The other alternative, namely the null C, is supported for Latin by Ceccheto & Oniga, 2001 and for AG by Tantalou, 2003 and I will discuss both of these approaches in turn. The former, introduce the 'incompatibility problem': Latin infinitives have tense inflection and this is incompatible with PRO. However, they claim that Latin infinitives do not always denote Tense and in these cases the neutral present infinitive is used. They propose therefore a split in Latin infinitives based on their temporal properties: When the infinitive is tensed (semantically) it has a pro null subject or AcI and its category is a CP, when it is untensed only PRO is possible and the status is VP.

In their own analysis they stress the alteration of AcI with Nominativus cum Infinitivo (NcI) (cf. example 6 above) where arguably raising (subject$_{INF}$ to subject$_{MATRIX}$) has occurred. They claim that in AcI what assigns the accusative is a null C. When this null C fails to project, NcI results. This null C is licensed by the rich inflection of the Latin infinitives and it has an affixal character: it has to be incorporated with the main verb and in order to achieve that they postulate covert movement of the verb at LF to the C position.

Their analysis captures neatly the alteration between AcI and NcI. However, the idea of an arbitrary null Case assigner fails to link the overt subject of AcI with the temporal properties of these infinitives that they themselves point out. I think that it is too much of a coincidence to be neglected the fact that Latin and AG that both have overt tense morphology in their infinitives, allow overt subjects in wider contexts. My analysis, although still resorts to a null C, it does it by linking it to the temporal properties of the infinitive and C plays an important role in the anchoring of the temporality of the infinitival clause. Finally, the postulation of the covert movement of the verb into the C position at LF, is a mechanism theory internal and stipulative.

Tantalou (2003) extends the Ceccheto & Oniga (2001) proposal to AG and she also claims that accusative in the infinitival subject in AcI constructions comes from a null C. She argues against the generalization of an ECM-type analysis for the Greek data in a persuasive way, employing standard arguments like the one about subject infinitival clauses (cf. example 2 above). In these cases, it is evident that the passive verb cannot be responsible for the accusative due to Burzio's generalization: no external theta-role also means no accusative. Although, her analysis treats infinitival clauses as CPs, she does not think that ECM is entirely absent from the grammar of AG:

this is a weakening point and it does not seem extremely elegant to say that although AG has a well-established mechanism of assigning Case to the subjects of infinitives from inside the infinitival clause (whatever that may be), another 'exceptional' mechanism is also present.

Her arguments of the existence of the null C position involve sequence of tense (SOT): she claims that given that AG infinitives display SOT, they are characterized [+T/ -Agr]. Therefore, following Stowell, 1982 if an infinitive is tensed there is also a C position needed for the T operator to move to at LF in order for it to take scope over the whole clause and the correct temporal interpretation to be established. An additional point is that infinitives in AG are both interchangeable and coordinated with finite clauses and this underlies their CP status and their temporal properties. As much as I share Tantalou's spirit, I cannot subscribe fully to it. Not only because of the point made above about ECM (and consequently about two types of infinitives: TPs and CPs) but also because of the operator analysis. Although she links the null C she postulates with the temporal properties of the infinitives much better than Ceccheto & Oniga (2001) that leave it entirely accidental, resorting to a mechanism as the raising of an operator at LF, is something that I don't agree with. Based on Enc's approach against an operator analysis for Tense and for an anchoring relation between C and T, my analysis does a better job in capturing the intuition that infinitives are CPs and this C position plays a crucial role into licensing the accusative subject of AcI.

I have now finished discussing prominent previous analyses of the AcI phenomenon and in the following section I will argue for my analysis that entails that infinitives can and indeed do convey tense differences, but not *irrespective* of the tense of the main clause. I will argue that their temporality is always dependent on the main clause's temporal properties. I will moreover provide a syntactic analysis that demonstrates the syntactic use of the infinitival T and will identify it as the node responsible for the accusative Case in the infinitival subject.

4. Tense And The AG Infinitive

4.1 What kind of tense is the infinitival tense?

4.1.1 Semantic Content

The main *desideratum* of my analysis concerning the tense of the infinitives is to show that even if their tense is not independent of that of the main clause, it can still exist. The type of tense I am referring to is presented by Comrie (1985) in what he refers to as relative tense: (1985: 56) "...the reference point (of the relative tense) for location of some situation is *some point in time given by context*, not necessarily the present moment." So, contrary to *absolute* tense, the tense that is canonically expressed in main clauses and that is interpreted with respect to the present moment, relative tense is initially interpreted with respect to the tense it depends upon (main clause tense) and *then* it is interpreted with respect to the present moment. The notion of relative tense is not

restricted to infinitives (or non-finite forms in general, for that matter), of course. Actually, all embedded clauses are always interpreted temporarily with respect to the tense of the main clause. Their tense is commonly referred to as *dependent* tense and this has never shed any doubt as of whether they have temporal properties in the first place. Why would it imply lack of temporality in infinitives, then?

Under my analysis the infinitival tense is taken to be that of a relative, dependent tense that is interpreted with respect to the present moment through the tense of the main clause. The claim that AG infinitives may have Tense, though it was not linked with the AcI construction was first made from Philippali-Warburton & Catsimali, 1989.

4.1.2 Syntactic Content

Let me now illustrate if the notion of relative tense can be translated into syntactic reality. The first attempt to formalize the tense of infinitives comes from Stowell (1982) and his theory of the tense of infinitives. He argues for a major split in the grounds of infinitival clauses with respect to their tense properties: control infinitives (subject and object) on the one hand, were taken to pattern with finite clauses in that they exhibit tense properties, while ECM infinitives would pattern with gerunds in that they do not denote tense independent of the matrix clause. The generalization is that unlike control infinitives and tensed clauses, gerunds and ECM infinitives lack the C position entirely. According to Stowell this can account for the differences in the tense structure of these clauses, since it is in the C position where the tense operator appears in LF. Hence, if there is no C, there is no place for the tense operator and the clause is un-tensed. While control infinitives and finite clauses are subsequently CPs, gerunds and ECM infinitives are presumably VPs.

What is crucial in Stowell's analysis is not only the novel observation that (at least some) infinitives may have tense properties inherent to them, irrespective of the matrix verb but also that the C position acquires a significant role in these structures. Although, I am not going to follow Stowell, entirely, I will attempt to capture in a different way the intuition that it is the C & T complex together, that has to do with the fuller articulation of the temporality of the clause.

An alternative way to conceive infinitival tense is following Enc (1987) in her theory of temporal anchoring. What Enc argues for is that the crucial difference between matrix, relative and adjunct clauses on the one hand and complement clauses on the other is a property of their tenses: the former are autonomous while the latter need to be anchored through their local Cs into matrix Ts and therefore into speech time. She also claims that tenses are not operators but R-expressions, arguments of the verb denoting intervals. She provides with a clear-cut syntactic interpretation of the notion of relative tense (tense that requires anchoring) and she does not make any distinctions in the representation of *irrealis* and relative temporality of clauses like Stowell did between Control and ECM infinitives. I will now move on a fuller articulation of my analysis where anchoring of tenses plays a crucial role.

4.2   Anchoring, the role of features and Case licensing

4.2.1 Anchoring relation

Firstly, an important claim of the analysis is that all infinitives in AG are CPs. This can be initially argued for on the basis of the overt complementizers that are exhibited in the adjunct infinitival clauses in examples (4a) and (4b) in section 2. Initially, the distinction between CP and TP infinitives stemmed from the problematic, exceptional status of ECM and their treatment from the theory. Given that it was considered crucial that the Accusative subject of the ECM infinitives would be licensed from the main verb, the infinitival clause should be a TP in order for it to transparent from government from the outside. In my analysis, where as we shall see the Case of the infinitival subject is licensed from the T of the lower clause such a stipulation concerning the status of the infinitival clause (that it is a TP) need not be made. Therefore, I assume that AG infinitives are CPs across the board and their C position plays the role of the anchoring of the infinitival Tense. This is still a working hypothesis and I need more data from raising, word order, interaction of infinitive with negation and adverbs to be argue persuasively that the C position exists. Crucially however, there is nothing that contradicts this assumption so far.

The way that Enc captures the idea of anchoring is through government[v] while I will restate the relation using features. Following Boscovic (1997) and Martin (2001) I assume that the relevant features of the embedded infinitival C are uFin and iT[vi]. The features of the consecutive (matrix) C, (matrix) T, (infinitival) C and (infinitival) T enter an Agree relation[vii] and this is how anchoring is actually established. The relation can be exemplified as follows: the uninterpretable Tense feature of the infinitival T^0 matches with the interpretable T feature of its uFin local C. Then, the uninterpretable finiteness feature of the infinitival C gets activated and matches with the interpretable finiteness feature of the matrix (finite) T. Lastly the uninterpretable Tense feature of matrix T gets activated and is consequently matched with the interpretable Tense feature of the iFin matrix C. This set of features of the matrix C, iFin, iT is also found in adjunct clause C and relative clause C and the equivalence of their temporal properties is successfully captured. The uT feature on the infinitival T ensures that the T needs to be anchored, linked to its local C. And the uFin on C ensures that the C will seek the T of the matrix clause in order for it to be linked to speech time.

All these are illustrated in the tree diagram under (7):

(7)

$$\text{CP}_{\text{MATRIX}}$$

```
(7)                        CP_MATRIX
                          3
          C                      TP
      [iFin] [iT]            2
                          Spec        T'
                                   3
                      T_MATRIX      VP
                      [iFin] [uT]       3
                                   V          CP_INF
                                            3
                                      C          TP
                                  [uFin] [iT]      2
                                              Spec      T'
                                                      2
                                                  T_INF       VP
                                                  [uT]
```

4.2.2 Case Licensing

The idea that the Case of a subject need not be licensed by Agreement is not new and as a matter of fact it could even be desirable to link Agreement to Nominative Case and not just any subject Case. Evidence for this claim can be taken from various sources. Firstly, there is the case of the Portuguese Inflected infinitives (cf.Raposo, 1987) that exhibit overt agreement with the subject and have no tense inflection[viii] and they also license their subject in Nominative Case. This claim although it is not conclusive, it can definitely establish a close link between Agreement and Nominative Case marking.

Secondly, following Pesetsky & Torrego (2002) I envisage Case is a uT on D. They construct a theory where Case is linked to Tense, not Agreement and they also attribute temporal properties to C. This is a welcome conclusion in accordance with the analysis I presented above concerning anchoring[ix]. More importantly, for evidence on Greek, I follow Iatridou (1993) and (partly) Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2002). Firstly, Iatridou argues persuasively that while Tense is the head that licenses Nominative Case in Modern Greek, the relevant head for AG is Agreement. This claim is supportive for my analysis for two reasons: firstly she establishes a link between Tense and Case (of the subject) and it supports my claim that this Case can be Accusative in AG infinitives, since the Nominative Case assigner in AG is agreement and not tense. Finally, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2002) make a strong claim concerning Agreement; they argue that it is a PF reflex of formal feature checking either Case or EPP. However, they wish to correlate Nominative

Case with the existence of semantic Tense and not tense in general and they also argue that the absence of semantic tense (absolute tense) implies the absence of the T node entirely. This is a point of departure between my analysis and theirs, since I have shown that relative tense can have semantic content and syntactic function in accordance with absolute tense.

To sum up there is a strong correlation between Nominative and Agreement cross-linguistically. Tense can definitely license Accusative Case for a subject (AG), but it can also license Nominative as well[x]. I could tentatively claim that the exact Case feature that T bares is subject to parametric variation or even constructing a Case theory in the spirit of Maranz (1991). However, this part of the analysis remains to be workout out fully.

5   Conclusion

In this paper I have argued for an analysis concerning the *Accusativus-Cum-Infinitivo* construction in AG infinitives. I attributed it to the temporal properties of the AG infinitive whose tense is identified as relative tense. Moreover, I have argued that the T node hosts the Case features of the infinitival subject and is essentially responsible for the licensing of the Accusative Case. The AG infinitives can illuminate the discussion on finiteness since they can be considered 'in between' forms characterized as [+T, -Agr] while the Portuguese Inflected infinitives can be viewed as [-T, +Agr]. Such an approach would not favor the existence of a finite vs. non-finite dichotomy but instead it would support the idea of a continuum where finite and (all kinds of) non-finite elements can be placed. Maybe this could be done following Vincent (1998) and his claim that Modality is an decisive element for constituting a better theory on finiteness and Agreement and Tense features are not enough. However, this is an open issue for language research and the present paper does not constitute neither decisive nor adequate evidence. Such an idea needs to be further supported in order for it to be adopted. But investigation of such verb forms, like the AG infinitives, is the key for a better articulation of a good theory on finiteness.

Σημειώσεις

[ii] The term Ancient Greek is equivalent to Classical Greek.

iii Due to space limitations I will neither give examples of two of the verbal uses of the infinitives namely, the absolute infinitive and the infinitive that was used instead of the imperative mood in main clauses nor of the articular infinitive which is always introduced by an overt determiner and was entirely nominalized. My analysis does not discuss such cases at all and therefore I do not include them here.

iv As a matter of fact, it is only with adjunct infinitival clauses that an overt complementizer is exhibited in infinitival clauses. This point is crucial and it will play an important role later, in the actual articulation of the analysis.

v However it is not possible to do so under the current framework because government is no longer a valid notion in Minimalism, therefore I will attempt a feature-driven approach.

vi This is already a departure from traditional views on finiteness where non-finite forms are considered as –Agr, -T. I will come back to the implications on finiteness due to this analysis in the conclusion.

vii Whether Agree in this case is Long-distance or if there also is an OCC feature (Chomsky, 2001) that triggers movement of the infinitive from T to C, it remains to be looked into. In order to be final about it, we would need many data so that we could determine the exact position of the infinitive. Due to the fact that in AG word order is relatively free in main and embedded clauses I do not wish to take a clear view on the matter here.

viii Absence of tense inflection does not also imply absence of temporal properties. For a discussion on this point cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou, 2002.

ix In the tree diagram in (7) I do not include the Case features involved, this part of the analysis is not final yet.

x For another link between Tense and Nomiantive Case, also in infinitives and generally for a thorough analysis much on a par with the one presented here cf Ledgeway (2000).

References

Alexiadou A. & E. Anagnostopoulou , 2002 'Raising without Infinitives.' In *Remnant Movement, Feature Movement and their implications for the T-model* ed. by A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, S. Barbiers, and H-M. Gaertner. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Binnick, R., 1991 *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense and Aspect*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boscovic, Z., 1997 *The Syntax of Non-finite Complementation.* Cambridge: MIT Press.
Ceccheto C. & R. Oniga, 2001 Consequences of the analysis of Latin infinitival clauses for the theory of case and control. Unpublished ms.

Chomsky, N., 2001 Beyond explanatory adequacy. *MIT WOPIL 20.*

Comrie, A. 1985 *Tense.* Cambridge: CUP.

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

Iatridou, S. 1993 On Nominative Case Assignment and a few related things. In *MIT WOPIL 19*, 175-196.

Jannaris, A. 1897 *A historical Greek grammar chiefly of the Attic dialect*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag Ledgeway, A. 2000 A comparative Syntax of the dialects of Southern Italy : A Minimalist Approach. Oxford: Blackwell.

Martin, R. 2001 Null Case and the distribution of PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry 32*, 141-166.

Pepicello, W.J. 1977 "Raising in Latin", *Lingua* 42:209-218

Pesetsky, D & E. Torrego, 2002 Tense, Case and the nature of Syntactic Categories. To appear in *Syntax of Time*, ed. by J.Gueron & J.Lecarme. Cambridge Mass: MIT Press.

Phillippaki-Warburton, I. and G.Catsimali, 1989 Accusativus-cum-Infinitivo in Ancient Greek. *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα* 10.

Pillinger, O. S. 1980 "The Accusative and Infinitive in Latin: a Refractory Complement Clause", *Journal of Linguistics*, 16:55-83

Raposo, E. 1987 Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: the inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry*: 18.

Stowell, T. 1982 The tense of infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry 13*, 561-570.

Tantalou, N. 2003 Infinitives with overt subjects in Classical Greek. *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα*, 23.

Vincent, N. 1998 On the grammar of inflected non-finite forms (with special reference to Old-Neapolitan.′ In *Clause combining and text structure* ed by I.Korzen & M.Herslund. Copenhagen Studies in Language 22.