

## XP-movement of participles and the rise of periphrastic tenses in Romance

Sonia Cyrino (University of Campinas)

1. The aim of this paper is twofold: to present a specific generative syntax analysis for periphrastic tenses in Romance, and to show how this sort of proposal is able to explain syntactic change that otherwise cannot be coherently understood. This latter aim will be accomplished after a thoroughly investigation of some existing structures in Latin has been presented, and the chronology of their appearance has been shown to provide a more logical explanation for the emergence of the auxiliary+participle construction in Romance.

2. Traditionally, periphrastic tenses in Romance have been described as the result of a grammaticalization process (cf. (2)), whereby the lexical verb *habere/tenere* ('to have, to possess') in a sentence as in (1) becomes an auxiliary, and an adjectival/stative/resultative participle, the Adjective Phrase (AP) in (2), is interpreted as a component in the periphrastic tense which denotes anteriority (cf. Salvi 1987, Vincent 1982, among others):

- (1) habeo            epistulam        scriptam  
      have.1<sup>st</sup>.sg    letter.ACC        written.ACC  
      'I have the written letters' = the letters are written
- (2) NP [<sub>VP</sub> *habeo* [<sub>AP</sub> NP AP] > NP [<sub>VP</sub> 'habeo' [<sub>VP</sub> V NP...]]

However, this story, in my view, is not satisfactory if we think in terms of current syntactic theory. The account of a semantic change preceding a syntactic change does not explain, for example, why adjectival/resultative participles still exist in Romance along with the periphrastic tense constructions. Moreover, it is very difficult to see how the resultative Latin equivalent of *I have the written letters* could have given rise to the periphrastic Romance equivalent of *I have written letters*, since one could possess letters not written by him/herself in the former, whereas he/she necessarily has to be the author of the letters in the latter construction.

3. To understand the issues at hand, I first present my account for auxiliary+participle structures, whereby there is XP-movement of the non-finite verbal phrase to the specifier of the relevant head. This same kind of movement was proposed for passives by Collins (2005), and dubbed "smuggling", since its net effect is to get the DP (internal argument) close enough to the spec, IP position, without directly bypassing the argument DP (external argument) in spec,vP. Hence the internal argument is "smuggled" inside the moved participle phrase, thus avoiding a Minimal Link Condition (cf. Chomsky 2000:122)/Relativized Minimality (cf. Rizzi 2003) violation seen in (3):

- (3) \*The book was by John written.

4. I argue that the same operation is at work in the case of periphrastic tenses, whereby the participle moves to the specifier of *have* (assuming auxiliaries are merged as V heads), triggered by an Edge Feature (EF) it inherits from *v*\* (cf. Chomsky 2005), cf. (4):

- (4) ... [<sub>VP</sub> Juan [<sub>V</sub> ha+v\* [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>PartP</sub> <Juan> [<sub>Part</sub> leí+do [<sub>VP</sub> <le> el libro]]] [<sub>V</sub> <ha> [<sub>AspP</sub> <PartP>]]

The existence of a phase in the case of *have* as opposed to the case of *be* accounts for the participle fronting facts of some Slavic languages, as well as participle agreement in Italian (for the latter, cf. also D'Alessandro & Roberts 2008). This proposal, which resembles some proposals for restructuring in Romance (eg Roberts 1997) (in fact I assume elsewhere the

same operation is present in those contexts), explains why Romance accusative clitics obligatorily climb to the auxiliary in periphrastic tenses.

5. Periphrastic tenses, I claim, did **not** arise from the Latin resultative/stative participle construction (as described above), although they may have played a role, through the existence of the construction with cognitive verbs (cf. Salvi 1987:230), as (5):

- (5) haberem a Furnio... tua... consilia cognita  
Had-1<sup>st</sup>.sg from Furnius your intentions-ACC known-pl-ACC  
'I knew your intentions from Furnius' (Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares* X.12.1)

In my analysis, perfect tense analytic constructions arose from the existence of the **perfect of Latin deponent** verbs, which were always analytic and composed of auxiliary (be)+participle. In these structures, I argue, there was the same "smuggling" operation we find in passives, but, crucially, the subject of the auxiliary is **always** the same as the subject of the main verb in the constructions with this class of verbs, cf. (6):

- (6) *Locūtus sum*  
'I am (in a state of) having spoken' (perfectum)

This fact makes these constructions a better candidate for the source of periphrastic tenses in Romance than the ones in (1). Additionally, the relevant literature (Flobert 1975, Tuttle 1986, Cennamo 1998, Bauer 2000, Drinka 2001, among others) shows that the use of deponents in Latin spread from verbs denoting emotion, entreating, fulfilling of function, changing of state or position (i.e. unaccusatives) to intransitives and transitives. All of those retained a periphrastic perfect with *esse* (be)+participle.

Besides that, closer examination of data reveals that the chronology for the appearance of the aux+participles in Romance from Latin is more coherent with its development coming from the deponent perfects than from the resultatives. According to Drinka (2001:117), for example, "in Cicero's time, a proliferation of the use of passive transitive deponents with past participles had appeared", a fact which shows that a transitive perfect (deponent) exhibiting a structure more like the present periphrastic tenses than the structure in (1) was available that early.

The choice of the auxiliary each daughter language will have will vary: roughly, some languages will have only *be* (e.g. Terracinese, a central Italian dialect, cf. Tuttle 1986); other languages will have both *be* and *have*, depending on the nature of the main verb (e.g. Italian - the variation even getting inside the person-number paradigm in some dialects); and others will only allow *have* (e.g. Spanish).

6. This diachronic development was possible because of the existence of XP-movement in the presence of a PartP – both passive and active participles have the same structure, in my view. As I will show, the crucial difference between passive and active participles is that the internal argument is "smuggled" in the former structures, while the external argument is raised along with the participle phrase in the former. Edge Features, ie, the requirement for an argument to be at the specifier position of a functional category, existing either by inheritance (in the auxiliary V) or not (the one in the Participle head) can be fulfilled either by internal or external merger. The emergence of periphrastic tenses from a related structure existing in Latin can only make sense if we acknowledge the syntactic process involved in these structures as being one and the same. This can only be achieved if we assume a syntactic analysis that brings together the behavior of participles, as I show in this paper.