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Abstract

This paper discusses V features, nominative case checking, and V movement in the minimalist program, explaining the facts of the English subjunctive and imperative, and contrasting them with those in Greek. The feature matrices [−Tense, +Agr] and [+Tense, −Agr] have been proposed for the subjunctive and imperative respectively; the auxiliary do can be inserted into [+Tense], while [+Agr] is a dependent case checker which must be activated by another head under adjacency. Furthermore, finite V carries [+Tense, +Agr] in English, but [+Tense, +Agr, +Mood] in old English and Greek. The claim is that V movement can be maintained, keeping the unitary Infl system, by counting the number of positive features.

Key words: agreement, do-support, English verbs, Greek verbs, features, imperative, mood, nominative case, subjunctive, tense, verb movement

1. Introduction

Since Murakami (1992), I have entertained the idea that V movement can be accounted for in the non-split Infl system, where Infl is a bundle of features, without recourse to AgrP and its parameterisation (Pollock 1989). The contrast be-

* This is a modified version of the identical paper published in the Journal of the Faculty of Letters, Prefectural University of Kumamoto, Vol. 7 (2000). I am indebted to the University for permission to reproduce it here and grateful to Melinda Whong-Barr at the University of Durham, as well as the anonymous reviewer and the volume editor in Thessaloniki for their critical reading of earlier drafts.
tween English and French regarding V movement has often been discussed in the literature, but instead of French, I will integrate some Greek data into my analysis.

2. V Features

2.1 Tense, Agr, and Mood

V features (formerly Inflectional features) are essentially based on verbal morphology. Table 1, adapted from Mitchell and Robinson (1992: 46), illustrates a verb paradigm of weak or regular inflection in Old English (c. 500-1150):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>INDICATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>fremme</td>
<td>fremme</td>
<td>fremme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>fremest</td>
<td>fremme</td>
<td>fremme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>fremet</td>
<td>fremme</td>
<td>fremme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDICATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>fremma b</td>
<td>fremmen</td>
<td>fremma b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>fremma b</td>
<td>fremmen</td>
<td>fremmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>fremma b</td>
<td>fremmen</td>
<td>fremmen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDICATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>fremede</td>
<td>fremede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>fremedest</td>
<td>fremede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>fremede</td>
<td>fremede</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDICATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>fremedon</td>
<td>fremeden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>fremedon</td>
<td>fremeden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>fremedon</td>
<td>fremeden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INFINITIVE

fremman, to fremmenne

This paradigm demonstrates that the past morpheme is ed, the subjunctive morpheme is e, and other various suffixes represent person and/or number. Moreover, the second singular forms for indicative, subjunctive, and imperative are distinct from each other — there was always a V feature ‘Mood’ (M) in OE. In addition to Tense and Agr, OE finite verbs carried [+M], the value of which can be indicative, subjunctive, or imperative. The V feature matrices for OE must be as follows:
Table 2. *V* features for earlier English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being positively marked for *Tense, Agr, and Mood* is what finiteness means for OE and other European languages such as Greek.

In the period of Middle English (c. 1150-1500), however, subjunctive morphology was lost due to phonological change. The verbal inflections, which encoded the subjunctive or indicative distinction, no longer existed in later ME (Traugott 1972: 148-149). As a matter of course, what followed the loss of mood morphology was the loss of *Mood* as a *V* feature. That is, English lost the rightmost column of Table 2, yielding the hypothetical system represented in Table 3:

Table 3. Hypothetical stage\(^{1}\) in the history of English inflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Agr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English could never have maintained three different moods at this stage of identical feature matrices. With the loss of *Mood*, what had to happen was a reaction to conserve the mood distinction, namely, the change of feature matrices for the subjunctive and imperative, as depicted in Table 4:

Table 4. *V* features for present-day English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Agr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1}\)I do not assume that this stage actually existed, but rather that the features in Table 2 and those in Table 4 overlapped for a considerable time, covering the period of Early Modern English (c. 1500-1700).
The motivation for this feature reinterpretation is obvious: syntax compensated for the loss of morphology, at the expense of finiteness in the subjunctive and imperative. By making the subjunctive \([-T]\) and the imperative \([-Agr]\), it became possible to distinguish them from each other and from the indicative, by the specifications of their \(V\) features. It is crucial that this is not the other way around: the subjunctive carries \([-T, +Agr]\), and the imperative \([+T, -Agr]\) for the following four reasons.\(^2\)

Firstly, there is no tense concord in subjunctives; because of this, subjunctives have been informally considered tenseless:

1. a. I demand that he leave.
   b. I demanded that he leave/*left.

Secondly, the crucial criterion for positive or negative Tense is \(do\)-support: by definition, \([+T]\) allows \(do\) to be inserted, while \([-T]\) prohibits it because the auxiliary \(do\) is inherently tensed, whether present or past. In this sense, the auxiliary \(do\) is a dummy Tense carrier. Thus, indicatives and imperatives can accommodate \(do\), while subjunctives and infinitives cannot:

2. a. I did pass the exam. (indicative)
   b. I demand that he (*\(do\)) leave. (subjunctive)
   c. Do come to our new house. (imperative)
   d. You make me (*\(do\)) feel happy. (infinitive)

Thirdly, the claim that imperatives carry \([+T, -Agr]\) can be supported by somewhat peculiar constructions:

3. a. Everybody do/*does sit down.
   b. Don’t/*Doesn’t anybody forget his room number.

4. a. Now do/*dost thou watch, for I can stay no longer.

   Shakespeare (1591: I. iv. 18) *King Henry VI*

   b. Do/*Dost not thou, when thou art king, hang a thief.

   Shakespeare (1597: I. ii. 69) *King Henry IV*

As seen above, the imperative \(do\) never inflects for agreement even when it takes a third person singular subject or the Early Modern English second person \(thou\).

2.2 \(Agr\) as Dependent Case Checker

Deduced from the imperatives-cum-subject in (3) and (4), the independent

\(^2\) See Murakami (1992, Chs 2-3) for a detailed discussion.
nominate case checker must be Tense, instead of Agr. In the absence of Tense, then, how is nominate case of the subject checked off in subjunctive clauses?

Fourthly and lastly here, I address why subjunctives bear Agr, even though there are no morphological signs of agreement. Following Raposo (1987) who discusses nominative Case assignment in European Portuguese (EP) inflected infinitives, Agr is arguably a dependent case checker, which must be activated by another head under head-to-head adjacency. I maintain, here, that nominative case in the subjunctive is analogous to that in the EP inflected infinitive whose Infl visibly consists of [–T, +Agr]: the C position that introduces an English subjunctive or an EP inflected infinitive must be filled with something overt —that in the former or V (raised from I) in the latter— in order to activate Agr. Hence:

(5) I asked [C that/* _] he take the medicine.
(6a) Manuel thinks his friends have +Agr taken the book

*O Manel pensa [C _] os amigos [I ter +em] levado o livro.

b. O Manel pensa [C terem] os amigos [I t _] levado o livro.

Raposo proposed that nominative Case in the EP inflected infinitive (6b) should be assigned as follows:

(7) O Manel pensa [CP [C ter + Agr][I_p os amigos [I t _] levado o livro]]

Case-mark
Case-mark

In a very similar manner, Agr activation in the English subjunctive is as follows (modified or updated from GB theory to minimalist program):

(8) I asked [CP [C that/* he [I + Agr] take the medicine]]

Head-to-head activation

If that is missing in (8), the empty C breaks the chain of Agr activation upon head adjacency. The proposed Raposo-Murakami system of nominative case checking (originally, assignment) theoretically explains why that in subjunctives is not so readily omitted as that in indicatives, in present-day English (Murakami 2000).

In conclusion, we therefore assume these feature matrices for the three English moods: [+T, +Agr] for the indicative, [–T, +Agr] for the subjunctive,
and \([+T, -Agr]\) for the imperative. Recall here that \([+T, +Agr, +M]\) characterises the OE finite clause. The number of positive \(V\) features — whether one, two, or three — is literally to be counted with respect to \(V\) movement.

3. \(V\) Movement

3.1 \(V\) raising as feature raising

In his minimalist program, Chomsky (1995: 195-199) proposes a “checking theory” as a means of accounting for \(V\) movement. Accordingly, \(V\) is selected from the lexicon not as a base form (as in the old system) but as an inflected form at SATISFY. \(V\) then raises to \(I\) for the purpose of feature-matching so that \(I\) may disappear and enter the PF component under SPELL-OUT.

Along this line of reasoning, I found it natural to propose the following hypothesis on the strength of \(Inf\), thereby arguing that what generally counts in \(V\) raising, is the number of positive \(V\) features (Murakami 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(T)</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>All Vs raise in earlier English and Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Only be and the auxiliary have raise in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Vs raise in English subjunctives and imperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The description given in Table 5 concerns overt syntax from SATISFY through SPELL-OUT. I assume that these three features are specified on \(V\) in the lexicon from the beginning, and then checked off against \(I\) through the operation of \(V\) movement.

More recently, Roberts (1998) refines \(V\) raising as Move F or feature raising, following Chomsky’s (1995: 264) notion of “generalized pied-piping.” By the operation of Move F, it is not \(V\) per se, but \(V\) features that raise and check themselves against \(I\), pied-piping \(V\) when they are strong. If they are weak, only features raise before SPELL-OUT, leaving \(V\) behind; under this assumption, Chomsky’s (1995: 198-199). Procrastinate can be eliminated. In Roberts’s (1998:

\(^{3}\) Neil Smith (p.c.) has questioned whether language ability is so directly related to the ability to count numbers when it should be autonomous or independent of other human abilities. It may not be denied, however, that some other cognitive abilities like numeration is involved in language learning. Or rather, the numbers as simple as one-two-three may be perceived as degrees of richness in morphological quantity.
own summary:

"[T]he basic difference between auxiliaries and main verbs is that the content of the former is exhausted by formal features, whereas the latter have inherent lexical content (e.g., 0 roles), which I take to be distinct from formal features. Both auxiliaries and main verbs have \( V \)-features, which, being weak (in English), move to \( T \) for checking without pied-piping \( V \). However, ... all formal features of auxiliaries and of main verbs raise with the \( V \)-feature. This means that the whole auxiliary is effectively raised — hence \( have/be \) raising. I am assuming here that weak \( V \)-features are not required to procrastinate ...."

This concept is felicitous for my feature-based approach to \( V \) movement. Let us, therefore, adopt it with one modification: the auxiliaries \( be \) and \( have \) are not always ‘free riders’, that is, they cannot raise in subjunctives and imperatives, as will be seen in the next section.

3.2 \( V \) Movement in English

Chomsky (1995) does not refer to the subjunctive and imperative in English. Pollock (1989) does not account for these constructions either, as they are problematic for the split Infl hypothesis. However, the differences among the English moods can be elegantly explained by the feature-oriented principle of language as stated in Table 5. As I pointed out (Murakami 1992), the dichotomy of \( V \) features — either strong or weak — does not work; instead, there must be three degrees of strength involved in \( V \) movement.

Below are some concrete examples of derivation. No main verbs raise in English:

\[(9) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad *\text{John loves always Mary} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{John} \left[ \lambda_1 \left[ T, +\text{Agr} \right] \right]_{\text{vp}} \text{always loves} \left( \lambda_2 \left[ T, +\text{Agr} \right] \right) \text{Mary} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{feature raising}
\end{align*}\]

The auxiliary \( do \) should be base-generated, checking features simultaneously, rather than being inserted later (Murakami 1993):

\[(10) \quad \text{Satisfy: John} \left[ \lambda_1 \left( T, +\text{Agr} \right) \right] \text{not love Mary} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{do-support}\]

With two plus features, strong enough for auxiliaries, \( be \) moves overtly in indicatives:
(11) You [I are (T, + Agr)] not [v be] lenient
    feature raising with V

On the other hand, even be cannot raise to the weaker I, with only one plus feature in subjunctives or imperatives:
(12)a. I insist that you not be lenient.
    b. *I insist that you be not lenient. (obsolete)
(13)a. Do not be lenient.
    b. *Be not lenient. (obsolete)

Subjunctive derivation does not allow do in its untensed I which looks vacant:
(14) I insist that you [I + Agr] not [v be (+ Agr) lenient]
    feature raising

In the affirmative, an imperative may optionally employ do in its tensed I, while in the negative, it must always do so:
(15) [I + Tense)] [v Be (+ Tense) lenient]
    (Do) feature raising

(16) [I Do (+ Tense)] not [v be lenient]
    do-support

Looking back to historical English, the facts of V movement indicate that not only be and have but also main verbs unexceptionally raised from V to I (and

---

4 Ianthi Maria Tsimpli (p.c.) has commented on Greek – ωντακοντας gerunds, where all Vs raise despite the lack of T and Agr features – only Mood and Asp are specified and nothing else in her analysis, e.g.:
(i) Περνώντας o Γιάννης τον δρόμο, τον χτύπησε ένα αυτοκίνητο.
    crossing the-nom Janis the street, him-hit one car
    ‘While Janis was crossing the street, a car hit him.’

This fact poses a serious violation to my hypothesis, as does the fact in Portuguese (see examples in (6)); as discussed in Section 2.2, V raises from I to C with only [+Agr] in the EP inflected infinitive construction. However, after investigating three languages – English in details, and French and German to some extent (Murakami 1992) – I would claim that the majority of the rules in Table 5 are still valid.
then to C) in earlier English. The figure below, adapted from Traugott (1972: 200), shows the time frame of the existence of the now obsolete word order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1150</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subj V not(^5) (Obj)</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>EModE</td>
<td>ModE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. I know not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Subj...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Went he?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) Not is a ME form; in OE the chief negative was ne

**Figure 1. Word order in English history**

Not only indicatives, but archaic subjunctives and imperatives also demonstrate the same syntactic operations:

(17) *Beware thou that thou bring not my son thither again.*
     Bible (1611: 24.6) *Genesis*

(18) *Speak not, reply not, do not answer me;*
     Shakespeare (1594: III.v.164) *Romeo and Juliet*

Whether indicative, subjunctive, or imperative, all Vs used to raise in the past, with strong features \([+T, +Agr, +M]\) in V and I (Murakami 1995).

### 3.3 V movement in Greek

According to Alexiadou, Horrocks, and Stavrou (1999: 4, cf. Philippaki-Warburton 1994a), “While the exact number and order of the functional categories still remains a matter of debate, researchers agree on the fact that Gr[ee]k involves V-raising to the highest INFL head.” Here of course, I would like to suggest that the functional projections be limited to IP and CP in Greek, too, and that all Greek Vs raise since finite Vs carry as many positive features as three or more. Consider a paradigm of Greek inflection, adapted from Mackridge (1985: 364-365) and Yagihashi (1984: 93-94):
Table 6. Weak inflection of the Greek verb ἀγάπω, ‘love’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>INDICATIVE</th>
<th>SUBJUNCTIVE</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
<th>IMPERATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>IMPERFECTIVE PRESENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ἐγώ</td>
<td>ἀγάπω</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῶ</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπῶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ἐσὺ</td>
<td>ἀγάπας</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπᾶς</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπᾶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ἑαυτός/-ή/-ό</td>
<td>ἀγαπά</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπᾶ</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπᾶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLURAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ἐμεῖς</td>
<td>ἀγαποῦμε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαποῦμε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαποῦμε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ἐσεῖς</td>
<td>ἀγαπᾶτε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπᾶτε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπᾶτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ἑαυτοῖ/-έγ/-ά</td>
<td>ἀγαποῦν</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῶν</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>IMPERFECTIVE PAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ἐγώ</td>
<td>ἀγαποῦσα</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαποῦσα</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαποῦσα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ἐσὺ</td>
<td>ἀγαποῦσες</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαποῦσες</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαποῦσες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ἑαυτός/-ή/-ό</td>
<td>ἀγαποῦσε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῶσε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπῶσε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLURAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ἐμεῖς</td>
<td>ἀγαποῦσαμε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαποῦσαμε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαποῦσαμε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ἐσεῖς</td>
<td>ἀγαποῦσατε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαποῦσατε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαποῦσατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ἑαυτοῖ/-έγ/-ά</td>
<td>ἀγαποῦσαν</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῶσαν</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπῶσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERFECTIVE PRESENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ἐγώ</td>
<td>ἀγαπήσω</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῆσω</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπήσω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ἐσὺ</td>
<td>ἀγαπήσεις</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπήσεις</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπήσεις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ἑαυτός/-ή/-ό</td>
<td>ἀγαπήσει</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῆσε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπῆσε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLURAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ἐμεῖς</td>
<td>ἀγαπήσουμε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῆσουμε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπῆσουμε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ἐσεῖς</td>
<td>ἀγαπήσουσε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῆσουσε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπῆσουσε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ἑαυτοῖ/-έγ/-ά</td>
<td>ἀγαπῆσουν</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγαπῆσουν</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγαπῆσουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR</strong></td>
<td><strong>PERFECTIVE PAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ἐγώ</td>
<td>ἀγάπησα</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγάπησα</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγάπησα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ἐσὺ</td>
<td>ἀγάπησες</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγάπησες</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγάπησες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ἑαυτός/-ή/-ό</td>
<td>ἀγάπησε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγάπησε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγάπησε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLURAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ἐμεῖς</td>
<td>ἀγάπησαμε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγάπησαμε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγάπησαμε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ἐσεῖς</td>
<td>ἀγάπησατε</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγάπησατε</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγάπησατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ἑαυτοῖ/-έγ/-ά</td>
<td>ἀγάπησαν</td>
<td>νὰ ἀγάπησαν</td>
<td>θὰ ἀγάπησαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The specifications of Greek tense and aspect should be past/non-past (= present) and perfective/imperfective, respectively, adopting Mackridge’s (1985: 103) dichotomy. There is also a rich variety of agreement morphology. Furthermore, there are four moods, which I classify as: indicative, imperative, subjunctive accompanied by the particle *να, and perhaps another mood represented by the future particle ότα. It is safe to say that Greek finite verbs are positively specified for Tense, Aspect (Asp), Agr, and Mood. Incidentally, in Greek, voice is integrated into verbal morphology, so that not only active, but also medio-passive voice has another inflectional paradigm similar to Table 6. Greek *V features are, then, composed of \(+T, +Asp, +Agr, +M, +Voice\), but I will set aside \(+Voice\) and even \(+Asp\) in accord with English, assuming that the existence of more than three plus features does not undermine my theory as displayed in Table 5.

Below is some evidence that a Greek main *V raises regardless of the mood it belongs to:

Indicative:

(19) a. Ἡ Μαρία αγαπά πάντα τον Γιάννη.
the Mary loves always the John
"Mary loves always John."

b. Ἡ Μαρία πάντα αγαπά τον Γιάννη.
‘Mary always loves John.’

(20) a. Ἀγαπά πάντα ἡ Μαρία τον Γιάννη;
‘Loves always Mary John?’

b. Ἀγαπά ἡ Μαρία πάντα τον Γιάννη;
‘Loves Mary always John?’

Subjunctive:

(21) a. Να αγαποῦσε πάντα ἡ Μαρία τον Γιάννη!
sbj love-past-3sg always the Mary the John
‘I wish John would always love Mary.’

b. Να αγαποῦσε ἡ Μαρία πάντα τον Γιάννη!

(22) a. Θέλω ἡ Μαρία να αγαπά πάντα τον Γιάννη.
(I) want the Mary always sbj love-pres-3sg the John
‘I want John to love always Mary.’

b. Θέλω ἡ Μαρία πάντα να αγαπά τον Γιάννη.

---

6 Following Mackridge (1985), I have abandoned the traditional tenses imperfect and aorist that I used in my oral presentation. I will not discuss the perfect auxiliary ἐχω in this paper, which seems equivalent to English perfective have. I appreciate Anastasios Tsangalidis’s (p.c.) assistance in arranging Table 6.
**I want Mary always to love John.**

c. Θέλω ο Γιάννης να πάντα αγαπά τη Μαρία.

'I want John to always love Mary.'

Futuristic:

(23) a. Η Μαρία θα αγαπά πάντα τον Γιάννη.

   ftr love-pres-3sg

   **Mary will love always John.**

b. Η Μαρία πάντα θα αγαπά τον Γιάννη.

   'Mary always will love John.'

c. *Η Μαρία θα πάντα αγαπά τον Γιάννη.

   'Mary will always love John.'

Imperative:

(24) a. ?Πάντα αγαπά τον Γιάννη.

   'Always love John.'

b. Αγαπά πάντα τον Γιάννη.

   **Love always John.**

Greek allows all six permutational possibilities of SVO, of which SVO and VSO are the normal word orders. According to Alexiadou (1999: 49-53), a subject DP may get left-dislocated in SVO, though it may remain VP-internal in VSO:

(25) = (19)b  [TopP Ο Γιάννης [IP πάντα αγαπά(+T, +Agr, +M) [VP t t τη Μαρία]]].

(26) = (20)a  [IP Αγαπά (+T, +Agr, +M) [VP πάντα ο Γιάννης τ τη Μαρία]].

In any case, (19)b, (22)b, and (23)b are grammatical, not because V does not raise, but because the adverb πάντα is located higher than I. Take (22) for instance:
(27) Greek subjunctive:

SATISFY: Θέλω η Μαρία (πάντα) (πάντα) να αγαπά τον Γιάννη

SPELL-OUT: Θέλω η Maria (πάντα) να αγαπά (πάντα) t τον Γιάννη

This analysis is not free from problems, however.\(^7\) Firstly, να and the next verb are not always attached to each other; although adverbs cannot, negative μη(ν) or pronominal clitics such as τη(ν) can intervene between them as below:

(28) Θέλω o Γιάννης να μην αγαπά τη Μαρία.
‘I want John to not love Mary.’

(29) Θέλω o Γιάννης να την αγαπά τη Μαρία.
‘*I want John to her love Mary.’

\(^7\) I have made two changes from my previous work: (i) NPs are now DPs following the current tendency; (ii) Adverbs do not modify the V' level, but just adjoin a VP, because I am now convinced of Potsdam’s (1996) discussion of this issue.
The subjunctive particle *va should then be treated independently of the following verb. In this sense, it is reasonable to say that in Greek, morphological moods are indicative and imperative alone. Mackridge (1985: 104) states:

"The terms ‘indicative’ and ‘subjunctive’ are not used in our morphological terminology, since they are differentiated not formally (within the verb form) but according to syntactical context. ... ‘Subjunctiveness’, then, does not inhere in a particular verb form, but is a function of the subjunctive markers."

Secondly, although sentences in (22) and (23) pattern alike, *va and *tha do not behave exactly alike with respect to negation and complementation (Tsangalidis 1993: 79-84). However, these issues are beyond the scope of this article (cf. Philippaki-Warburton 1994b).

The last derivation of interest is that of Greek imperatives, where lexical verbs invariably raise much like other moods:

\[
(30) = (24)b \quad [\text{IP} \ \text{Ἀγαπά} \ ( +T, +Agr, +M) \ [\text{VP} \ πάντα \ \tau \ η \ Μαρία]]
\]

Hegarty (1999: 146) insists that \( V \) moves up to \( C \) in Greek imperatives. A major stylistic difference between imperative and other verbal forms is that clitics follow imperative verbs, while they precede verbs of other moods (Yagihashi 1984: 34-35):

\[
(31) \quad \Delta \omega \sigma \mu \mu \upsilon \ η \ o.
\]

give-imp-pres-2sg me it

‘Give it to me.’

\[
(32) \quad \text{Μου υ \ έδώσε}.
\]

me it give-ind-past-3sg

‘S/he gave it to me.’

Given that clitics are positioned higher than \( I \) as the result of ‘clitic climbing,’ Hegarty should be correct on this point. His claim that \( I \)-to-\( C \) movement occurs because “the imperative verb lacks Agr V-features since it lacks tense,” thus nullifying TP and AgrsP, sounds rather dubious, however. As attested by four distinct forms from Table 6, the imperative verb is fully finite in Greek, thus positively specified for \( T \) and \( Agr \) (cf. Philippaki-Warburton 1998, in which Greek imperative verbs raise to the head of MP due to their morphological finiteness).

4. Conclusion

The conclusion I had drawn earlier (Murakami 1992) has been reached here again with the Greek data adding further support. I have provided a unified ac-
count of V movement in English and Greek within a single Infl system where I is a bundle of features to be checked against by V features. As long as one adheres to the split Infl hypothesis, it will be cumbersome to explain the facts of the English subjunctive and imperative. In terms of feature matrices, however, the two constructions have undergone natural reductions of finiteness from the loss of mood morphology in the history of English.

There seems no need to postulate any functional projections other than IP and CP in Greek either (with some reservation for the mood particles να and θα). As Tsangalidis (1993) convincingly argues throughout his thesis, any attempt to order TP, AgrP, AspP, VoiceP, MoodP, and NegP will fail in Greek; within the fusional morphology of the Greek verb, one can never decide on an appropriate ordering of those projections, casting into doubt the possibility of morphological features as separate heads.

The original intention of setting up AgrP was to make it a barrier to block V raising in English (Pollock 1989). The different behaviour of V movement between English and other European languages can be accounted for in another fashion, not by building up maximal projections, but by multiplying positive V features. In Greek, there is \{(Asp, Mood, Voice)\}, in addition to \{Tense, Agr\} which are the indicative features for present-day English. With three (or five, including Asp and Voice) positive features in \(V\) and \(I\), all Greek verbs raise to \(I\), while English main verbs remain in situ because there are only two positive features.
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