

# John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory. The Rosendal papers*.  
Edited by Thórhallur Eythórsson.

© 2008. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)).

Please contact [rights@benjamins.nl](mailto:rights@benjamins.nl) or consult our website: [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

## CHAPTER 4

# The rise and development of analytic perfects in Italo-Romance

Michela Cennamo  
University of Naples Federico II

This chapter discusses the rise of Latin *esse* 'be' and *habere* 'have' as active auxiliaries and the development of their reflexes as markers of split intransitivity in Italo-Romance, with reference to the spread of the auxiliary HAVE at the expense of BE in old Neapolitan, and the penetration of BE into the HAVE domains in some contemporary Campanian varieties. It is claimed that the emergence of Latin *esse* and *habere* as perfective auxiliaries is one of the outcomes of changes affecting the encoding of the argument structure of the clause in late Latin, and that the replacement of BE with HAVE in old Neapolitan, as well as the modern reintroduction of BE within the HAVE domains, are both sensitive to a gradient model of split intransitivity, though in a reverse way. It is also shown that the three changes under investigation appear to reflect language internal principles and follow an orderly progression as regards the cancellation and (re)introduction of an active coding system (through auxiliary choice).

### 1. Introduction

In this chapter we discuss the rise of Latin *esse* 'be' and *habere* 'have' as analytic active perfects and the development of their reflexes as markers of split intransitivity in Italo-Romance. We argue (§ 2) that the emergence of *esse* and *habere* as perfective auxiliaries is one of the outcomes of changes involving the loss of the voice dimension and the initially active and subsequently neutral realignment of grammatical relations in the transition from Latin to Romance (Cennamo 1998, 2001c, 2005).

After considering the late Latin origin of these patterns (§ 2), we discuss the evolution of these verbs as perfective markers with one-argument verbs in one early Italian vernacular, old Neapolitan (§ 3), which testifies to the gradual process of the widening of the functional domains of *habere* as a perfective auxiliary (Cennamo 2002). We also discuss the opposite phenomenon, the gradual spread of the auxiliary BE into the functional domains of HAVE in contemporary Campanian varieties (where HAVE is the prevalent perfective auxiliary, except in copular and passive patterns) (Cennamo

2001b) (§ 4), which appear to show a change in progress, the re-establishing of an active-coding system through auxiliary selection, with BE gaining ground over HAVE, probably owing to the influence of Italian.

We demonstrate (§ 5) that both changes follow an orderly progression and are sensitive to the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (ASH) put forward by Sorace (2000), though in a reverse way. In particular, they show that grammatical categories with a radial structure are eliminated starting from their periphery (i.e., their marked environments) and are introduced starting from their core (i.e., the unmarked environments), as recently pointed out by Lazzeroni (2005), partially following Andersen (2001a, 2001b).

## 2. Late Latin origin of BE and HAVE as perfective auxiliaries

### 2.1 *Habere* + pp as a periphrastic active perfect

The rise of periphrastic active perfects (realized by means of a form of the verbs *esse* and *habere* in (fully) auxiliary function + the past participle of the lexical verb) is a well-known change taking place in the transition from Latin to Romance. The *habere* + past participle (pp) periphrasis, attested initially only with transitive verbs, is usually regarded as resulting from the gradual emptying of the lexical content of the divalent verb of possession *habere*, which, already in archaic Latin, occurred in predicative constructions, in patterns where *habere* was followed by an object + a (passive) past participle expressing a property of the object (i.e., a result state) due to a ‘former action, process or state in which it was involved’ (Pinkster 1987: 197):

- (1) a. qui eum vincium habebit (*Lex XII Tab* 3,4)  
 who.NOM he.ACC hold-in-bonds.PP.M.S.ACC have.FUT.3S  
 ‘Who shall hold him in bonds (lit. who him in-bonds will-hold)’  
 b. ubi milites congregatos habebat  
 where soldier.PL gather.PP.M.PL.ACC have.IMP.F.3S  
 ‘Where he had the soldiers gathered (lit. where the soldiers gathered he- had/held)’

Initially the verbs occurring in this construction are, most typically, resultatives, i.e., accomplishments (e.g., *coquere* ‘to cook’, *collocare* ‘to gather’, *claudere* ‘close’, *scribere* ‘to write’) and the pattern is biclausal: it consists of two predicates, *habere* and the passive past participle of the verb of the subordinate clause (*vincium*, *congregatos* in (1a–b)) – which is predicated of the object of *habere* – whose DO is coreferential with the object of the matrix verb *habere*, as schematized in (2):

- (2) [Subject<sub>i</sub> *habere* Object<sub>j</sub>] [Verb Subject<sub>k</sub> Object<sub>l</sub>]  
 have passive pp

The biclausal nature of the construction is clearly reflected in the interpretation of the pattern, with the lack of identity between the subject of *habere* and the implied agent

of the (passive) past participle, as in (1a–b), where the actions of holding in bonds and gathering have been carried out by a participant which is not identical to the subject of *habere*.

Also activity (e.g., *dicere* ‘to say’, *exquisire* ‘to ask/examine’) and stative (e.g., *perspicere* ‘to perceive, examine’) verbs are attested in this pattern. The former are rare in early and classical Latin, whereas the latter, though rare in early Latin, are common from the classical age onwards (see Thielmann 1885; Pinkster 1987; Nuti 2005, int. al.). In fact, during the classical age and at a later stage the construction frequently occurs also with non-resultative verbs, e.g., verbs of communication (3) (with early examples from Plautus)<sup>i</sup> and perception/cognition (4). With the former the pattern is clearly monoclausal: the subject of *habere* is identical with the subject of the participial subordinate clause and the verb therefore appears to be a temporal auxiliary denoting anteriority. With the latter, depending on the aspectual nature of the verb/predicate, there may be identity between the agent of the past participle and the subject of *habere*, as in (4b), with the stative verb *perspicere* ‘to perceive’, although this need not be the case, as in (4a), where *cognita*, the past participle of the accomplishment verb *cognoscere* ‘to get to know’, is predicated of the object of the verb *habere*, *consilia*, and there is no identity between the agent of *habere* and the agent of the past participle, which surfaces as a prepositional phrase, *a Furnio*. The ambiguity of interpretation may indeed arise also at a late stage, when *habere* is clearly established as a temporal auxiliary (see (4c), from the 6th century A.D., where the past participle *invisum* (from the stative verb *invidere*) has an adjectival function) (Bonnet 1890:689–690, see also Cennamo, in prep.):

- (3) De Caesare satis hoc tempore *dictum habeo*<sup>1</sup> (Cic. Phil. 5, 52)  
 about Caesar-ABL enough this.ABL time.ABL say.PP.N.SG have.1S.PRES.IND  
 ‘I shall regard what I have said of Gaius Caesar as sufficient at present’
- (4) a. *haberem a Furnio . . . tua . . . consilia cognita* (Cic. Fam. 10, 12, 1)  
 have.SUBJ.IMPF from Furnius.ABL your intention.PL.known.PP.PL  
 ‘I had been made thoroughly acquainted with your purposes by our friend Furnius’
- b. *perfidiam Haeduorum perspectam habebat* (Caes. Gall. 7.54)  
 wickedness.ACC Haedui.GEN..PL perceive.PP.F.S.ACC have.IMPF.3S  
 ‘He had realized/recognized/perceived the Haeduis’ wickedness’

1. It is worth comparing (3) with an analogous example from Plautus (i), reported by Pinkster (1987: 220, note 14), where *habere* seems to be a temporal auxiliary:

- i. *satis iam dictum habeo* (Pl. *Persa*, 214)  
 enough already say.PP.N.SG have.PRES.IND.1SG  
 ‘I have said enough’

According to some commentators, e.g., Woytek (1970), in (i) the past participle *dictum* is in predicative function, in that the Agent of *dictum* is not identical with the subject of *habeo*. However, as pointed out by Pinkster (1987: 220, note 14) ‘there is no proof for either opinion.’

- c. quem regina invisum habet  
 who.ACC queen.NOM hate.PP.M.SG.ACC have.PRES.IND.3SG  
 (Greg. Tur. *h.F.* 6.35; Bonnet 1890: 690)  
 ‘Who the queen dislikes (lit. regards as despicable)’

In many cases, however, the past participle of cognition and perception verbs has a truly adjectival (i.e., predicative) function, in patterns such as *cognitum*, *compertum*, *exploratum*, *perspectum habeo* ‘I have it (as) known, certain etc . . .’ (Thielmann 1885: 508ff., Ernout & Thomas 1964: 223).

In classical authors there also occur examples with omission of the object and the past participle in the non-agreeing neuter form (5) as well as with a sentential object (*quod sit . . . numen*) (6) which is not governed by the object of *habere* alone but by the whole sequence *habere* + pp (Pinkster 1987: 204):

- (5) de ea re supra scriptum habemus (Vitr. 91,14)  
 about this.ABL thing.ABL above write.PP.N.S have.PRES.IND. 1PL  
 ‘(As) we have written above on the matter’
- (6) cum cognitum habeas quod sit summi  
 when know.PP.N.S have.2s.PRES.IND what be.3s.PRES.SUBJ supreme.GEN  
 rectoris. . .numen (Cic. *Fin.* 4,11)  
 lord.GEN will  
 ‘When you realize the will of the supreme lord’

According to several scholars (Thielmann 1885; Pinkster 1987: 205; Ramat 1983) the first step towards the use of *habere* as a perfective auxiliary indeed lies in expressions such as (5)–(6) above, where there is clear identity between the subject of *habere* and the agent of the verb in the participial form and where therefore the construction is monoclausal, with *habere* + the past participle forming one constituent.

During the imperial age the auxiliary function of *habere* is only rarely attested and is apparently confined to some registers (e.g., the chancery language (7a) and to fixed formulae/phrases (Thielmann 1885: 538–540; Pinkster 1987: 200, int. al.). On the contrary from the 6th century A.D. onward *habere* is well-attested as a perfective auxiliary, most typically with the past participle agreeing with the object (7a–b), although some rare examples with lack of agreement also occur (7c) (Thielmann (1885: 547; Th.LL; VI 2454):

- (7) a. si miles, qui habebat iam factum testamentum,  
 if soldier.NOM who.NOM have.MPF.3S already make.PP.N.S will  
 aliud fecisset (Ulp. *Org.* 29,1,19)  
 another make.PLSP.3S  
 ‘If a soldier who had already made a testament were to make another one’
- b. episcopum . . . invitatum habes (Greg. Tur. *Vit. patr.* 3,1)  
 bishop.ACC invite.PP.M.ACC have.PRES. IND2S  
 ‘You have invited the bishop’

- c. *haec omnia probatum habemus* (Orib. *Syn.* 7,48)  
 this.PL all.PL experience.PP.N.S have.PRES.IND.1PL  
 ‘We have experienced all these things’

The pattern with lack of agreement between the past participle and the object is usually regarded in the literature as the last stage in the auxiliarization process of *habere* and a clear sign of its true auxiliary status: the past participle cannot have a predicative interpretation and *habere* + pp can only form one unit (Ramat 1983: 1458–1459, int. al.).

Pinkster (1987), developing some remarks made in the literature (Happ 1967, Thielmann 1885), which suggest that already in early Latin there are instances of *habere* + pp with ‘the force of a present perfect’ (Bennett 1910: 439), notes that already in early authors (e.g., Cato) as well as in the classical age, there occur examples where there is identity between the subject of *habere* and the agent of the past participle, and which can be interpreted as instances of the use of *habere* as a temporal auxiliary denoting anteriority (8) (see also 4b) (Bennett 1910: 439; Thielmann 1885; Pinkster 1987):

- (8) *quid Athenis exquisitum habeam*  
 what Athens.ABL find-out.PP.N.SG have.PRES.SUBJ.1S (Cato, ad fil. *Frg.* 1)  
 ‘(I will say about those Greeks, my son Marcus, in due place) what I have found out in Athens’ (exquirere = to investigate, to look for, to try to find out’)

Interestingly, the verbs occurring in (8) and (3) above are activity verbs, so the data point to the use of *habere* + pp in a predicative construction with all verb classes already at an early stage, though undoubtedly resultatives, i.e., accomplishments, are more frequently attested than other verb classes in early Latin (Nutti 2005) and with statives the past participle generally has an adjectival (i.e., predicative) function (Thielmann 1885).

Pinkster (1987: 212–213) points out that with resultatives in present contexts, that is in one of the two contexts in which the synthetic perfect would be normally used, both the synthetic perfect and *habere* + pp may occur (e.g., respectively *absolvi* and *habeo absolutum* in (9)), with identical interpretation, the difference being one of style:

- (9) *quod me hortaris ut absolvam, habeo*  
 what I.ACC urge.PRES.IND.2S for finish.PRES.SUBJ.1S have.PRES.IND.1S  
*absolutum* (= *absolvi*) . . . *epos ad Caesarem* (Cic. *Q. fr.* 3,9,6)  
 finish.PP.N epic to Caesar.ACC  
 ‘As to you urging me to finish my job, I have now finished my epic to Caesar,  
 and a charming one it is in my opinion’

Taking up Pinkster’s remarks and the examples already occurring in archaic Latin in which *habere* + pp can be interpreted as a periphrastic perfect, we may therefore argue that *habere* already occurred as a perfective auxiliary in archaic Latin, with ambiguity between a biclausal and a monoclausal interpretation of the construction, i.e., between the adjectival (= predicative) and verbal function of the past participle with accomplishments (e.g., *vincere* ‘to tie’, *congregare* ‘to gather’, *absolvere* ‘to finish’, *scribere* ‘to write’) (cf. (1a) vs (9)) as well as with statives (e.g., *concipere* ‘to understand’, *invidere*

‘to disregard’, *deliberare* ‘to examine’) (though especially at a late stage with the latter class (cf. (4a) vs (4b)). With activity verbs, however (e.g., *dicere* ‘to say’, *exquisire* ‘to investigate’) the pattern could only be monoclausal, i.e., it could only instantiate an analytic perfect. One might therefore argue that already in early Latin the auxiliary function of *habere* co-existed with its other functions, among which its use in possessive predicative constructions (see Cennamo, in prep., and La Fauci 2005 for an interesting recent proposal on *habere* as an auxiliary verb in Latin, in all its uses).

As for word order, most typically *habere* follows the past participle (cf. ex. (1)–(5)). In late texts, e.g., the *Lex Curiensis*, from the 8th century A.D., *habere* may also precede the past participle (10a), alternating with the pattern in which *habere* follows the pp (10b) (Thielmann 1885: 547):

- (10) a. causam bene habet exquisita (Lex Cur. 57, 8)  
 issue.ACC well have.PRES.IND.3S investigate.PP.F.S.ACC  
 ‘He has investigated the issue well’
- b. (post) quam ipsos bene exquisitos habuerit (id. 131, 25)  
 after that they.ACC well interrogate.PP.M.PL.ACC have.PERF.SUBJ.3S  
 ‘Once he had interrogated them thoroughly’

Word order, however, does not seem to affect the interpretation of the construction, which, instead, appears to depend on the aspectual nature of the verb/predicate. One could therefore argue that the biclausal (i.e., predicative function of the pp) vs the monoclausal (i.e., verbal function of the pp) interpretation of the construction depended on the aspectual nature of the predicate, all other things being equal in the clause (Cennamo, in prep.).

In late Latin, with frequent attestations by the 6th century A.D. (Thielmann 1885: 541–549, int.al.), *habere* + pp, that in archaic and classical Latin in present contexts with some verbs/predicates (e.g., accomplishments) was already interchangeable with the synthetic perfect, to denote the current relevance of a past event (present perfect function) as opposed to its aoristic function (aoristic interpretation = denotation of a past event), also occurs in narrative contexts of the *perfectum*, gradually ousting the synthetic perfect in the former (i.e., present perfect) function. One may claim that this is the case once verb morphology becomes arbitrary and opaque, owing to the loss of grammatical voice, and once case-marking no longer always identifies and differentiates verbal arguments (in particular A and O), with early examples of both phenomena by the end of the 4th century A.D. (see discussion in §§ 2.2–2.4).

The real change in late Latin, therefore, is not the auxiliarization of *habere*, but its use as a marker of A status (as opposed to *esse*, which consolidated its use as an O marker – a function that it already had in the *perfectum* of the passive – and came to mark the S<sub>O</sub> function as well).<sup>2</sup>

2. In fact, *esse* was a copula in Latin, which also occurred in the *perfectum* of the passive as well as in the perfect of deponents, verbs which were ‘passive’ in form but ‘active’ in function/meaning.

The alleged grammaticalization/reanalysis of *habere* + pp as a tense-aspect marker in late Latin was therefore nothing more than the shift of a 'marginal' construction probably characteristic of particular registers (Thielmann 1885: 535; Ramat 1983: 1457) from the periphery of the category to its core, once the morphology and syntax of voice no longer matched their original functions and new tools were needed to convey tense-aspectual distinctions (for a full discussion of this point see Cennamo, in prep.). This is in line with many other changes taking place in late Latin in the transitivity domain (see Cennamo 1998, 2001a, 2005a and § 2.2).

## 2.2 Voice distinctions and grammatical relations in late Latin

A major change taking place in the transition from Latin to Romance in the encoding of transitivity is the disruption of grammatical voice and the concomitant loss of a firm notion of grammatical relation. In fact, owing to equivalences and interchangeability among voice forms, the active may be used in passive function (11) and the passive may occur in active function (so-called Deponentization (Flobert 1975) (both in the tenses of the *infectum* (marked by the (medio)passive *-R* suffix) and of the *perfectum* (expressed by a form of *esse* + pp) (12a–b) (see Cennamo 1998, 2001a, forthc.a for a full discussion and attestations from earlier centuries):

- (11) *item si a rota vexaverit* (sc. equus) (Pelag. 233; Feltenius 1977: 137)  
then if by wheel-ABL trouble.PERF.FUT.3SG (horse)  
'Then if it (= the horse) will be troubled by the wheel'
- (12) a. *si quislibet . . . eam coercebatur* (*Chron. Salern.* 65; Norberg 1943: 155)  
if somebody.NOM she.ACC force.IMPF.IND.PASS.3SG  
'If somebody punished her (lit. is-punished her)'
- b. *Provinciam lues debellata est* (Greg. Tur. H.F. 8,39; Bonnet 1890: 411)  
province.ACC plague win.PP.F.SG.NOM be.PRES.IND.3SG  
'The plague conquered the province (lit. is conquered the province)'

Therefore a perfect passive form such as *amatus sum* (13) out of context could be ambiguous among a passive (13a), an active (13b) (see also Bonnet 1890: 400) and a present predicative construction (13c), according to the verb, and it was also developing into a present passive (13d), whereby *amatus sum* could also equal the synthetic passive form *amor* (Winters 1984, Cennamo 2005 and references therein):

- (13) *amatus sum*
- a. 'I was loved/I have been loved' (passive)
- b. 'I loved/have loved' (active) (= *amavi*, active perfect)
- c. 'I am beloved' (*amatus* = adjective; predicative construction)
- d. 'I am (being) loved' (= *amor*)

As long as case-marking operated on a nominative-accusative basis, verbal arguments could still be identified and differentiated. Therefore communication was not impaired, despite the fact that voice forms had become opaque (with the passive no longer



consistently signaling an O/S<sub>O</sub> argument in subject function, and the active no longer unequivocally indicating an A argument in subject function) (see Cennamo 2001a).

At some point in time, however, case-marking started to operate on an active-inactive basis (as testified by the use of the accusative in 'subject' function, to mark Os as well as the 'inactive' S arguments of equative clauses (14), anticausatives (15), passives (16), impersonals (17) and intransitive verbs denoting change of state (18a-b), location (18c), non-agentive activity (18d), alternating with the nominative form, which continued to be the canonical case for subjects), with early attestations by the 2nd–3rd century A.D. in some areas of the empire (northern Africa) for [+An] second and third declension nouns, with intransitive verbs denoting change of state/location (*cadere* 'to fall') and agentive anticausatives (*vertere* 'to turn' (Herman 1987: 103–105, 1997: 25; Cennamo 2001c, forthc.a)). Subsequently (with examples from the end of the 4th century) case-marking came to operate on a 'neutral' basis as well, once the accusative occurred to mark the A argument of transitive clauses (19), so that case-marking no longer always identified the role of verbal arguments (A and O) (Plank 1985; Herman 1995, 1997; Cennamo 2001c, forthc.a, forthc.b, int. al.):<sup>3</sup>

- (14) ut *crudastros* *sint* (Anthim. 3)  
in-order-to underdone.PL.ACC be.PRES.SUBJ.3PL  
'So that they are underdone'
- (15) *ficum contundito usque dum minutum fiat* (id. 890)  
fig.ACC cut.2PL.IMP until small.ACC become.PRES.IND.3S  
'Cut the fig until it is reduced to small pieces'
- (16) ut *sardam exossatur* (Apic. 9, 10)  
so-that pilchard.ACC fillet.PASS.PRES.IND.3S  
'So that the pilchard is filleted'
- (17) *cutem . . . non manducetur* (Anthim. 41)  
skin.ACC not eat.PASS.PRES.SUBJ.3S  
'One should not eat the skin/the skin should not be eaten'
- (18) a. *nascitur . . . contractionem aut claudicationem* (Chiron 516)  
be-born.PRES.IND..3S spasm.ACC or lameness.ACC  
'There arises a spasm or lameness'
- b. *si inter eos . . . causam advenirit* (Lex Cur. 2,2)  
if between they.ACC quarrel.ACC happen.IMP.F.SUBJ.3S  
'If there arose a quarrel between them'

3. The chronology, distribution and incidence of the phenomenon, which is part and parcel of the more general issue of the breaking down of the case-system between late Latin and early Romance, varies according to the areas and the types of texts. It spans from the 3rd to the 9th century A.D and occurs mainly in the southern provinces of the empire (Africa, Italy, Spain), with late (8th century) attestations from Gaul as well (see recent discussion in Cennamo 2001, forthc.a, and references therein, as well as Rovai 2005 for a quantitative analysis).

- c. *si ipsum currit* (Lex Alama. XCIV codd. A)  
 if he.ACC run.PRES.IND.3S  
 ‘If he runs’
- d. *crepitavit panem in furno* (Agnell. 391, 26)  
 crackle.PERF bread.ACC in oven.ABL  
 ‘Bread crackled in oven’
- (19) *si quod iumentum morbum renalem temptavit* (Chiron 55)  
 if some beast-of-burden.NEUT illness.ACC renal.ACC affect.PERF.IND.3SG  
 ‘If a beast of burden suffers from kidney trouble’

Therefore a construction in the passive voice such as *puellam amata(m) est* (20) out of context could be ambiguous between an active interpretation, with *puellam* marking the A (20a) or O argument (20b), as well as a passive interpretation, with *puellam* as the O argument (20c–d):

- (20) *puellam amata(m) est*  
 a. ‘The girl has loved’ (*puellam* = A)  
 b. ‘She has loved the girl’ (*puellam* = O)  
 c. ‘The girl was/has been loved’ (*puellam* = O)  
 d. ‘The girl is (being) loved’ (*puellam* = O)

The interaction of the two phenomena (i.e., a verb that no longer has voice and an argument whose syntactic and semantic status is unclear, like *puellam* in (20) above) are at the nub of a number of changes taking place in the encoding of the argument structure of the clause in the transition to Romance, one of which involves the rise of *esse* and *habere* as markers of O/S<sub>O</sub> and A/S<sub>A</sub> status respectively, so-called perfective auxiliaries.

At some point, in fact, in the *perfectum esse* + pp occurred both in active and passive function, with both transitive and intransitive verbs. With intransitives the opacity of voice morphology and case-marking did not affect the interpretation of the construction. With transitive verbs instead in some cases it was impossible/very difficult to identify the A/O status of verbal arguments. New tools were pressed into service therefore in order to mark A/O status, which end up being signaled, respectively, by *habere* (usually/most typically with agreement of the past participle with O (21a), the object, though also past participle agreement with the A argument is attested (21b–d)), and *esse*, which therefore restricted the range of arguments with which it could occur, marking only O (13a) and S<sub>O</sub> arguments (cf. (24a) *deventi essent*):

- (21) a. *et da ipsi filii mei ipsam terram cum*  
 and from same.NOM sons.NOM mine.NOM that.ACC land.ACC with  
*casa comparatam habui* (Cod. Cav. VIII, 292, 11) (9th cent. A.D.)  
 house.ABL buy.PP.F.S.ACC  
 ‘And I had bought this land from my own children’
- b. *unde aliqua femena (O) . . . abuit interpellatus (A)* (Form. Andec. Nr. 16,  
 p. 10, 11) (id: 542)  
 whereby some.NOM woman.NOM have.PERF.3S ask.PP.M.S.NOM  
 ‘Whereby somebody had asked a woman. . .’

- c. *datus habuisset* . . . (Formul. Marculf., p. 67, 5) (Thielmann 1885: 545)  
 give.PP.M.S.NOM have.PULP.SUBJ.3S  
 ‘He had given’
- d. *admiratus habeo* (TLL s.v. 247: 36f; Pinkster 1987: 199)  
 admire.PP.M.S.NOM have.PRES.IND.1S  
 ‘I have admired’

Initially, however, *habere* only marks A status. Its use to signal  $S_A$  arguments, as in the Romance languages, is very late. Apparently only one isolated example from a 7th century text is attested (22a) alongside the absolute intransitive use of transitive verbs, sometimes with alternation between the ‘new’ analytic and the old synthetic forms, as in (22b–c) from the 8th century A.D. (Thielmann 1885: 545–546):

- (22) a. *sicut parabolatum habuistis* (Form. Merkel.260, 7) (Thielmann 1885: 545)  
 as speak.PP.N.S have.PERF.2PL  
 ‘As you had said (lit. spoken)’
- b. *sicut iuratum habuit* (Ann. Lauriss. 788) (Thielmann 1885: 546)  
 as SWER.PP.MNSG have.PERF.3SG  
 ‘As he had sworn’
- c. *iuravit* (id. 7) (ibid.)  
 ‘He swore/has sworn’

### 2.3 The rise of *esse* + past participle as a periphrastic active perfect

The patterns with agreement of the past participle with the subject, as in (21b–d), indeed do point to an earlier deponent form (*interpellatus sum*, *datus sum*, *admiratus sum*).

The received opinion on the rise of the Romance periphrastic perfect with *esse* is that it stems from the perfect of deponents (Vincent 1982; 1988, int. al.), consisting of the past participle of the lexical verb + a form of the verb *esse* ‘to be’. Its first attestations are regarded as dating back to the imperial age, with intransitive verbs denoting change of state/location (Norberg 1943: 152; Bassols de Climent 1948: § 30; Väänänen 1982 [1971]: § 342), developing by analogy to other intransitive deponents of similar meanings, such as *sequor* ‘to follow’, *morior* ‘to die’ as in (23), cast on the model of *mortuae sunt* (the perfect of *morior*), with *obitae* = *mortuae*, a form which was very frequent in epitaphs (see also Cennamo 1998):

- (23) a. *sorores una die obitae sunt* (CIL VI 17633) (= *obierunt*)  
 sisters.NOM same.ABL day.ABL die.PP.F.PL.NOM be.PRES.IND.3PL  
 ‘The sisters died on the same day’
- b. *praeteritus est dies* (= *praeteriit*) (Plin. *Epist. Traian.* 10, 46)  
 go.PP.M.SG.NOM be.PRES.IND.3SG day.NOM  
 ‘The day is over’ (lit. is gone)

We, however, take a different view, arguing that the rise of *esse* as an active perfect is related to the reorganization of voice distinctions taking place in late Latin, whereby *esse* +pp may occur in active function, not only in the *perfectum* of deponents, but of all verbs, both transitive (23d) and intransitive (23e) (i.e., Deponentization), with clear attestations from the imperial age onwards (Norberg 1943: 152-158) (see also (12b):

- (23) c. et . . . *cogniti sunt Romulides* (= *cognoverunt Romani*) (Agnell. 81)  
 (p. 333, 25) (6th cent. A.D) (Norberg 1943: 155)  
 and learn.PP.M.PL.NOM be.3PL.PRES.IND  
 ‘And . . . the Romans (have) learnt’
- d. *certati sunt cursu* (Hygin. *Fab.* 273, 12) (Norberg 1943: 153) (1st cent. A.D)  
 compete.PP.PL.M.NOM be.3PL.PRES.IND race.ABL  
 ‘They (have) had a race (lit. they were competed in the race)’
- e. *lacrimatus est* (Vetus Latina, *Joh.* (a) 11, 35) (Flobert 1975: 209)  
 (3d cent. A.D.)  
 cry.PP.PL.M.NOM be.3SG.PRES.IND.  
 ‘He was in tears (lit. He is cried)’

At some point in late Latin therefore, the passive voice (i.e., the *-R* suffix in the tenses of the *infectum* and *esse* + pp in the tenses of the *perfectum*) could occur in active function with all verbs. The rise of periphrastic perfects with *esse*, though undoubtedly cast on the model of the original *perfectum* of deponents (a form of *esse* + the past participle of the lexical verb), is however to be seen within the wider context of the changes affecting the voice domains in the transition to Romance, whereby the passive and active forms no longer consistently correlated respectively with O and A/S<sub>A</sub> arguments in subject function, in that the *-R* suffix and *esse* +past participle could also occur to mark A and S<sub>A</sub> arguments, as in (23c) and (23d–e). Whereas in early and classical Latin the phenomenon was confined to a small class of verbs (so-called deponents or semi-deponents), in late Latin all verbs were susceptible to occur in the passive voice (see Flobert 1975 for a detailed survey), which no longer consistently marked the linking of the verb to its O argument, as in earlier stages. It is in this light that the emergence of *esse* and *habere* as split intransitivity markers are to be viewed.

#### 2.4 *Esse* and *habere* as split intransitivity markers in late Latin

By the 7th century A.D., *esse* and *habere* appear to start differentiating two subclasses of intransitives, corresponding to what are usually known in the literature as unaccusatives/class S<sub>O</sub> verbs and unergatives/class S<sub>A</sub> verbs), with past participle agreement too coming to mark this partitioning. The presence of *esse*, in fact, always entails the agreement of the past participle with the subject, whereas the selection of

*habere* correlates with lack of this type of agreement, the past participle occurring in the unmarked, neuter form, as exemplified in (24):

- (24) a. In Pannonia *deventi sunt* (Agnell. 95, p. 338, 32) (Norberg 1943: 153)  
 (+AGR)  
 arrive.PP.M.PL.NOM be.PRES.IND.3PL  
 ‘They have arrived, in Pannonia (lit. are arrived)’
- b. (= 22a) sicut *parabolatum habuistis*. (-AGR)  
 ‘You had spoken’

The use of *habere* as a perfective auxiliary with intransitive verbs, however, is a late and rare phenomenon, compared with the use of *esse* (see §§ 2.2–2.3). As already pointed out (§ 2.1), we argue that there was no auxiliarization as such of *habere* in late Latin (since it already had auxiliary function), but a specialization of its use, whereby it ends up as a marker of perfectivity (i.e., a tense-aspect marker), and comes to signal A and later  $S_A$  status, with *esse* gradually restricting its scope to mark O arguments (the canonical function it had in early and Classical Latin) and  $S_O$  arguments (24a).

At some point in late Latin, then, roughly by the end of the 4th–5th century A.D., there arise various types of active coding systems, both in nominal and verbal syntax (some of which develop already existing patterns of active syntax in early Latin) (see discussion in Cennamo 1999, 2001c, *forthc.a*, *forthc.b*). Indeed, one might wonder to what extent the loss of the grammatical dimension of voice, which in some Merovingian texts (e.g., the *Liber Historia Francorum*, of the first half of the 8th century A.D.) is testified by the abandonment of the passive as a strategy and the active being preferred instead, sometimes with impersonality of the pattern (Herman 2002), is related to the rise of (head-marked) active coding systems in the transition to Romance (see discussion in Cennamo 2001c, *forthc.b*).

### 3. Reflexes of Latin *ESSE* and *HABERE* as split intransitivity markers in old Neapolitan

The early Italian vernaculars show quite a varied picture as regards auxiliary selection and past participle agreement (as well as the marking of split intransitivity in general), which still awaits investigation (see Cennamo 2002).

In this section we discuss the paths of development of the reflexes of Latin *esse* and *habere* as perfective auxiliaries with one-argument verbs in one early Italian vernacular, old Neapolitan, which testifies to the gradual elimination of an active coding system marked through auxiliary selection and past participle agreement, with unaccusatives/class  $S_O$  verbs selecting the auxiliary BE (Neap. *esse*) and showing past participle

agreement with the subject (25), and unergatives/class  $S_A$  verbs, which select instead the auxiliary HAVE (Neap. *avè*) and lack participial agreement with the subject, the past participle occurring in the unmarked masculine singular form (26):

- (25) *Helena* [. . .] *era andata a quillo tiemplo* (LDT 99.25) *Unaccusatives*: BE  
 [+ agreement]  
 Helen be.IMPF.IND.3s go.PP.F.S  
 ‘Helen had gone to that temple’
- (26) *Achilles avea combattuto* (LDT 224.32) *Unergatives* HAVE [-agreement]  
 Achilles have.IMPF.IND3s fight.PP.M.S  
 ‘Achilles had fought’

The scrutiny of a number of 14th and 15th century texts<sup>4</sup>, however, reveals the first signs of the process leading to the use of HAVE as the only perfective auxiliary in some contemporary Campanian varieties, with HAVE gradually invading the functional domains of BE, often correlating with lack of past participle agreement with the subject, though agreement may also occur (Cennamo 2002).

This change can be conceived, following La Fauci 1994, as one of the outcomes of the never-ending conflict in the history of the Romance languages, between pre-existing coding systems of the active-inactive type, which developed in late Latin and ‘new’ emerging coding patterns of the nominative-accusative type.

In particular, HAVE occurs with verb classes generally selecting BE (with past participle agreement with the subject), namely verbs denoting **existence of a(n abstract/mental) state** (with a [ $\pm$  An] subject (e.g., *dolere* ‘to be sorry’, *bastare* ‘to suffice’, *parere* ‘to seem’, *plazere* ‘to like’) (29 occ.) (and [ $\pm$ AGR] of the past participle with the subject) (27), **telic change of location** (either inherently (28a) or compositionally telic (28b) with a [ $\pm$ An] subject, [ $\pm$ AGR] (e.g., *andare* ‘to go’, *arrivare* ‘to go’, *volare* ‘to fly’ etc.) (24 occ.) and, marginally, **indefinite change of state** (with a [ $\pm$  An] subject, [ $\pm$ AGR] (*soccedere* ‘to happen’, *apparire* ‘to appear’, *crescere* ‘to grow’, *scolorire* ‘to fade’ (9 occ.) (29), often in contexts of irrealis modality, conveyed by the past conditional (as in (27), (28b) and the pluperfect subjunctive (30b) (see Cennamo 2002, Ledgeway 2003). There are instead only very few examples of HAVE with verbs denoting the **continuation of a state/condition** (*durare* ‘to last’, *stare* ‘to stay’) (4 occ.) (30a–b) and only

---

4. The old Neapolitan data are taken from Cennamo 2002, where a number of 14th and 15th century texts are investigated, only some of which are quoted in this chapter (see list of sources in the references). The figures for the occurrences of the auxiliary HAVE with the different verb classes refer to the frequency of this auxiliary for each class in the whole corpus (see Cennamo 2002: 186–187 for further details).

one occurrence with **definite change of state** verbs (*scoppiare* ‘to burst’) (with a [-An] subject) (31):

**Unaccusatives:** HAVE [ $\pm$ agreement]

*Existence of a state*

- (27) *avarria abastata a ffare* (Cronaca 144r.10)  
 have.COND.3S suffice.PP.F.S  
 ‘It would have sufficed to do’

*Telic change of location*

- (28) a. *aveva tornato indereto* (Cronaca 111r.22)  
 have.IMPF.IND.3S go.PP.M.S.back  
 ‘He had gone back’  
 b. *l’averia vollato sopra a pieto* (RDF 24 v.17)  
 he.DAT have.PRES.COND.3SG fly.PP.M.SG onto breast  
 ‘It would have flown onto his breast’

*Indefinite change of state*

- (29) *Aragona ha cressuto e muntiplicato en regni* (Lupo de Spechio II. 9.7)  
 Argon have.PRES.IND.3S grow.PP.M.S and multiply.PP.M.S in reigns  
 ‘Aragon has grown and multiplied its reigns’

*Continuation of a pre-existing state/condition*

- (30) a. *uno . . . haver anche durato fino a* (Plin. Nap. 204r.12)  
 one have.INF also last.PP.M.S up until  
 ‘(They say) one has lasted till . . .’  
 b. *se avesseno stati milli anni nella sua corte* (Lupo de Spechio II.52.6)  
 if have.PST.SUBJ.3PL stay.PP.M.PL one thousand years in his court  
 ‘If they had stayed at his court for one thousand years’

*Definite change of state*

- (31) *habiano insieme scoppiato* (sc., le osse) (Plin. Nap. 197v. 21)  
 have.PRES.SUBJ.3PL burst.PP.PP.M.S together (the bones)  
 ‘That they had burst together’

The occurrence of HAVE with all subclasses of one-argument verbs in 14th–15th century texts, though with a different incidence, suggests that this verb already occurred as the only perfective auxiliary in some (Campanian) varieties and in some idiolects, alternating with BE, which is the most frequent auxiliary with (unaccusative) verbs denoting telic change of location, (definite/indefinite) change of state and continuation of a pre-existing state (we are not considering in the discussion unaccusatives preceded by modal verbs, with which the perfective auxiliary is always HAVE) (see Cennamo 2002).

#### 4. Auxiliary selection in old Neapolitan and Sorace’s (2000) gradient model of split intransitivity

The distribution of auxiliary selection in old Neapolitan may be neatly described and accounted for by means of the syntactico-semantic gradient model of split intransitivity

recently put forward by Sorace (2000, 2004) for one of its manifestations, auxiliary selection.

Sorace shows that the distinction between unaccusative and unergative verbs is a gradient along which intransitive verbs can be organized (fig. 1), determined by the interplay of aspectual and lexico-semantic factors such as the degree of aspectual specification (i.e., the degree of telicity) of the situation expressed by the verb, its concrete/abstract, dynamic/static nature as well as the degree of control and affectedness of the subject) and set up on the basis of experimental studies on native speaker intuitions as regards auxiliary selection with one-argument verbs, their acquisitional path in  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , as well as the degree of variation found in some Western European languages (Sorace 1995; 2000; 2004; Keller & Sorace 2003):

**Table 1.** *The Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (ASH)* (Sorace 1995; 2000: 863)

---

<b>Change of location</b> (It. <i>arrivare</i> 'to arrive') ( <i>core</i> ) <b>Unaccusatives</b> (select BE)
<b>Change of state</b> (It. <i>nascere</i> 'to be born'(def.), <i>crescere</i> 'to grow' (indef.))
<b>Continuation of a Pre-existing state</b> (It. <i>rimanere</i> 'to remain', <i>durare</i> 'to last')
<b>Existence of a state</b> (It <i>esistere</i> 'to exist')
<b>Uncontrolled Process</b>
Bodily function (it. <i>tossire</i> 'to cough')
Emission (of substance/light/smell) (it. <i>squillare</i> 'to ring', <i>rimbombare</i> 'to resound/roar', <i>profumare</i> 'to smell')
Weather verbs (It. <i>piovere</i> 'to rain', <i>nevicare</i> 'to snow')
<b>Controlled Process (motional)</b> (It. <i>camminare</i> 'to walk', <i>nuotare</i> 'to swim')
<b>Controlled Process (non-motional)</b>
Controlled, affecting (It. <i>abdicare</i> 'to abdicate', <i>cedere</i> 'to yield')
Controlled, unaffected (It. <i>lavorare</i> 'to work', <i>giocare</i> 'play') ( <i>core</i> ) <b>Unergatives</b> (select HAVE)

---

The opposite poles on the gradient realize the core of the unaccusative/unergative categories, which never display variation in auxiliary selection. Core unaccusative verbs are characterized by an *Undergoer*/Theme-Patient subject and denote a dynamic, telic situation (It. *arrivare* 'to arrive, *nascere* 'to be born'. In some languages verbs denoting inherently telic change of location (It. *partire*, 'to leave') realize core Unaccusativity, in that variation never takes place as regards this manifestation of Unaccusativity. Verbs denoting the continuation of a pre-existing state such as *durare* 'to last', *rimanere* 'to remain' lie on the high end of the Unaccusativity gradient. In some Western European languages these verbs select BE – a fact which is consistent with their semantics, which has an implicit change component (Sorace 2000: 867) –, unlike verbs denoting the existence of an abstract/mental state (It. *sembrare* 'to seem', *piacere* 'to like', *bastare* 'to suffice') which select HAVE (Sorace 2000: 869). In the selection of auxiliary in old Neapolitan and in some contemporary Campanian varieties, as well as in other manifestations of split intransitivity (such as the distribution of pleonastic reflexives (*se/sibi*) in late Latin and their optional occurrence in some contemporary southern Italian dialects (Cennamo 1999), the core of the category appears to be realized by verbs denoting definite



(i.e., telic) change of state (Neap. *muri* ‘to die’, *nascere* ‘to be born’), whereas verbs denoting telic change of location (Neap. *parti*, ‘to leave’, *arrivà* ‘to arrive’, *Lat. vadere* ‘to go’) are coded as more peripheral (i.e., display alternation) (Cennamo 1999; 2001b).

Core unergatives are characterized by an agentive subject, i.e., an *Actor/Agent*, with high degree of Control over the verbal situation, which is dynamic and inherently atelic (It. *lavorare* ‘to work’). The thematic and aspectual parameters whose interplay determines the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (ASH) illustrated in table 1, are not equally relevant in determining the unaccusative/unergative encoding of verbs. Telicity seems to be relevant for the unaccusative/unergative encoding of verbs denoting change of location and state. The degree of Agentivity and Control of the subject play an important role in the unaccusative or unergative encoding of non-motional activity verbs. Verbs denoting mental processes lie at the periphery of the category of Unergativity: they often denote an uncontrolled, atelic process, with a non agentive subject, which in many cases is affected by the verbal process (i.e., an *Actor/Experiencer*). The degree of variation in auxiliary selection is a function of the position of the verb along the hierarchy: it increases as one moves away from the core of the categories, i.e., with the decrease of the aspectual specification of the situation expressed by the verb and the decrease in the degree of Agentivity and Control of the subject. Variation is maximal in the middle of the hierarchy, i.e., at the stative pole, where telicity is irrelevant and the subject has no/low Agentivity and Control.

From the diachronic point of view, the ASH predicts that verbs at the core of the Unaccusativity/Unergativity categories are more impervious to change that initially involves verbs belonging to the periphery of the categories. In particular, the ASH (which reflects the syntactic and semantic non-homogeneity of unergativity and unaccusativity), allows one to organize and describe the type and the degree of variation in auxiliary selection occurring in old Neapolitan, accounting for various cases of ‘mismatches’ and alternations. (see Cennamo 2002). It also allows one to predict the diachronic path along which HAVE penetrates into the BE domains, to become the only perfective auxiliary selected with one-argument verbs in some Campanian varieties. This change appears to be well-advanced and (probably) nearly completed by the end of the 15th century. The hierarchy in fact predicts the occurrence of variation at the periphery of the categories of unaccusativity/unergativity. For instance, with a non-agentive activity verb such as *figliare* ‘to give birth’ (32a–b), the alternation between the two auxiliaries, BE/HAVE, can be accounted for by the fact that this verb lies at the periphery of the category of Unergativity: the subject has no Control over the process. A different conceptualization of the verbal situation is possible (Ledgeway 2003): if the latter is coded as an event, the auxiliary HAVE is selected (32a) *aveano figliato*; if instead the situation is conceptualized from the point of view of the state resulting from a previous event, BE occurs (32b) *éy figliata*:

- (32) a.    *sta*                      *scripto*            *haverno*            *figliato* (event)  
           stay.PRES.IND.3S    write.PP.M.S    have.INF.3PL    give birth.PP.M.S

- spesse volte (*Plin. Nap.* 203v. 33)  
 several times  
 'It is written that they have given birth several times'
- b. *Èy figliata una cane* [. . .] (*LdR* 54v.18) (result state)  
 be.PRES.IND.3S give-birth.PP.F.S a bitch  
 'A bitch has given birth'

With the verb *figliare*, therefore, auxiliary selection reflects an aspectual difference, the eventive vs. result state interpretation of the pattern.

Also with the indefinite change verb *soccedere* 'to happen', the selection of BE vs HAVE may be regarded as being aspectually determined. One might argue, following a suggestion by Alan Cruse (p.c.), that, whereas BE occurs also in contexts which specify the moment of the past event (compare (33b) where the adverb *mo* ('now') specifies the time of the event, placing it in the recent past), HAVE never occurs in this aspectual context (cf. (33c) *\*uno miracolo che à succzieso mo*). HAVE in fact only occurs in the so-called experiential or existential indefinite perfect (Comrie 1976: 59):

- (33) a. quanto o signuri averria socciesso beatamente cutale concordia (*LDT* 241, 3)  
 when lords have.COND. happen.PP.M.S this harmony  
 'When my lords would there have been such harmony?'
- b. uno (sc. miracolo) che èy succzieso mo (*LdR* 55v.3)  
 one (miracle) that be.PRES.IND.3S happen.PP.M.S now  
 'A miracle that has happened now'
- c. *\*uno miracolo che a succzieso mo*

As for the diachronic path of the spread of HAVE to the detriment of BE, the rare examples of the auxiliary HAVE with verbs denoting change of state (either indefinite (*soccedere* 'to happen') or definite (*scoppiare* 'to burst') and continuation of a state (*durare* 'to last', *stare* 'to stay') as well as the lack of HAVE with verbs denoting definite change of state and an animate subject (e.g., *muri* 'to die'), suggest a lexical-aspectual path in the penetration of HAVE into the BE domains, where the parameter of Animacy also appears to be involved. In particular, HAVE appears to gradually replace BE initially with verbs denoting static, abstract situations, such as *parere* ('to seem'), *plazere* ('to like'), whose auxiliary is limited to HAVE in some 14th century texts, and later with verbs denoting telic change of location (*andare* 'to go', *arrivare* 'to arrive', *fugire* 'to run away', *tornare* 'to come back', *insire* 'to go out', *procedere* 'to go along'). Verbs denoting continuation of a pre-existing state (*durare* 'to last', *stare* 'to stay') and change of state (*soccedere* 'to happen', *scoppiare* 'to burst') appear to be more resistant to its penetration. In particular, HAVE appears to occur initially with verbs denoting indefinite change (*soccedere* 'to happen' *creocere* 'to grow') (with [ $\pm$ An] subjects), later with definite change of state verbs (*scoppiare*), but only

with [-An] subjects, as summarized in table 2, from the bottom of the hierarchy, towards the top:

**Table 2.** Progression of the change in o. Neapolitan

---

<i>definite change of state</i> : <i>scoppiare</i> ‘to burst’ ([-An] subjects) (+ Unaccusativity)
<i>continuation of a pre-existing state</i> : <i>durare</i> ‘to last’, <i>stare</i> ‘to stay’ >
<i>indefinite change of state</i> : <i>soccedere</i> ‘to happen’ >
<i>telic change of location</i> : <i>andare</i> ‘to go’, <i>arrivare</i> ‘to arrive’ >
<i>existence of a state</i> : <i>parere</i> ‘to seem’, <i>plazeze</i> ‘to like’ >     (- Unaccusativity)

---

The data concerning auxiliary selection with one-argument verbs in old Neapolitan then, suggest a slightly different organization of some of the points on the ASH, but consistent with its theoretical assumptions. In particular, verbs denoting definite change of state (*scoppiare* ‘to burst’) show minimal variation in auxiliary selection when compared with verbs denoting telic change of location (*arrivare* ‘to arrive’, *andare* ‘to go’). Therefore the former seem to lie on the higher end of the continuum (Cennamo 2002: 197) (see Table 2).

The different organization of some of the points of the hierarchy reflects the fact that the relevance of the lexico-aspectual features characterizing the ASH may vary, both synchronically and diachronically, for a phenomenon which appears to be sensitive to the ASH in a given language.

Sorace’s scalar model of split intransitivity, therefore, allows one to account for the occurrence of HAVE as the only auxiliary with verbs denoting a static, abstract situation, which realize the maximally aspectually underdetermined class of verbs on the ASH, the alternation between HAVE and BE with verbs denoting telic change of location and, marginally, indefinite change of state and continuation of a pre-existing state, as well as the lack of HAVE with verbs denoting definite change of state and having an animate subject. The gradual widening of the functional domains of HAVE, then, appears to proceed from the periphery of the category of Unaccusativity, where both auxiliaries may alternate, towards its core, where only BE occurred (see Table 2). The data therefore seem to point to verbal classes as the main channel of the penetration of HAVE. We cannot however exclude also the relevance of the semantic parameter of modality in the choice of HAVE when either auxiliary may occur. As already pointed out (§ 3), in many attestations of HAVE as a perfective auxiliary, the pattern expresses irrealis modality, realized by the pluperfect subjunctive and the past conditional, as in (28b) *se illo avesse arrivato*, (33b) *quanto . . . averria socciesso . . . cutale concordia* (see further discussion in Cennamo 2002; Ledgeway 2003).

## 5. Auxiliary selection in some contemporary Campanian varieties

It is interesting to compare the data and path of development emerging for the spread of HAVE into the BE domains in old Neapolitan, with data from contemporary

Campanian varieties where HAVE is the prevalent perfective auxiliary in the perfect (with BE having a very restricted range of occurrences, confined to some verb classes and some persons), except in copular constructions and passives (see Cennamo 2001b and Table 3). These appear to show the opposite phenomenon, the gradual penetration of BE into the system, according to a path which is the reverse of the one we can observe for the penetration of HAVE, but again consistent with the ASH and its assumptions.

The analysis of auxiliary selection in three such varieties, namely Pompei (in the Vesuvio area), Sorrento and Portici (the extreme southern periphery of Naples) reveals a change in progress, the gradual re-establishing of an active-coding system through auxiliary selection, probably owing to the influence of Italian. This change involves, to a different extent, both the working class and the middle class, whose system of auxiliary selection is more clearly oriented towards Italian (see table 3)<sup>5</sup>.

In particular, in **Pompei** in the speech of the working class BE occurs with verbs denoting definite change of state (*nascere* 'to be born', *muri* 'to die') and is confined to the 2nd and/or 3rd person singular (1A.i). In the other verb classes HAVE is the only auxiliary, in all persons (1A.ii.–vi). In the *middle class* BE occurs and/or alternates with HAVE (generally in the 2nd and 3rd sg.) only with verbs denoting change of state/continuation of a pre-existing state/existence of a state (1B.i–iii). Verbs denoting telic change of location, (atelic) motional and non-motional activity, on the other hand, only select HAVE (1B.iv–vi). In the *middle class* auxiliary selection therefore seems to oppose verbs denoting change of state and continuation of a pre-existing state/existence of a state, to verbs denoting motional/non-motional activity (cf. (1A–B) in Fig. 1). In **Sorrento** in the *working class* HAVE is the only auxiliary, with all verb classes, in all age groups. BE occurs however (sometimes in alternation with HAVE) in the 3rd person singular with verbs denoting definite and indefinite change of state such as *nascere* 'to be born', *crescere* 'to grow' (2A.i–ii), and continuation of a pre-existing state/existence of a state such as *ciuncà* 'to remain still' ([et't'fujkata] 'He has remained still') and *avastà/abbastà* 'to suffice', ([evastatə//ɛbbastatə], lit. 'it has sufficed/it is sufficed').<sup>6</sup>

5. The corpus investigated consists of recordings (partly of spontaneous speech and partly based on the use of a questionnaire) of thirty speakers for each variety, representative of two social classes (Working Class and Middle Class) and three age bands (young/middle-aged/elderly informants. Age-range: 18–80). Variation in auxiliary selection involves both classes, and is higher for middle class speakers than for working class informants. In one variety (Portici), variation in auxiliary selection only involves the working class; the middle class conforms to the Italian pattern, with unaccusatives selecting BE and unergatives selecting HAVE (see Cennamo 2001b for further details).

6. In Sorrento, as in several Campanian varieties, there is identity between the 3rd person singular present indicative of the verb HAVE (*avè*) and the 3rd person singular present indicative of the verb BE (*esse*), which both appear as [ɛ], so that only syntactic doubling differentiates between them, as in ([eva'statə] 'lit.(It) has sufficed') (without doubling) vs. [ɛbba'statə] 'lit. (It) is sufficed') (with doubling) (see also the 3rd person singular in (35a)).

In the *middle class*, on the other hand, BE replaces HAVE and/or alternates with it in some persons with verbs denoting (definite/indefinite) change of state, continuation of a pre-existing state/existence of a state and telic change of location (2B.i–iv). With atelic motional and non motional activity verbs, instead, HAVE is the only auxiliary, for all persons (2B.v–vi), but for the occasional alternation with BE in the 1st/2nd plural of atelic motion verbs (2B.v). In **Portici** in some idiolects of elderly and middle-aged speakers of the working class auxiliary selection opposes verbs denoting change of state and continuation of a pre-existing state, existence of a state, which select BE (or mainly BE) (3A.i–iii) to verbs denoting telic change of location/telic motional and atelic motional/non-motional activity, which, respectively, select HAVE (with BE in the 3rd sg.) and HAVE only (3B.iv–vi).

Some of the paradigms discussed above are illustrated in (35)–(36) below, from Sorrento (working class, elderly people). (For a full discussion of split intransitivity in Campanian varieties and current theorizing see Cennamo 2001b):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(35) a. <i>Definite/indefinite change of state</i><br/>         ɛddʒə'natə/ɛddʒə' kreʃ'ʃutə (HAVE)<br/>         je'natə/ jekreʃ'ʃutə (HAVE)<br/>         ɛ'natə/(HAVE)/ɛn'natə (BE) ⇔ ɛkreʃ'ʃutə/ɛkreʃ'ʃutə<br/>         immə'natə/ imməkreʃ'ʃutə (HAVE)<br/>         itə'natə/ itəkreʃ'ʃutə (HAVE)<br/>         ɛnnə'natə/ kreʃ'ʃutə (HAVE)<br/>         'I was born/I have grown up'</p> | <p>b. <i>Existence of a state</i><br/>         ɛddʒəparutə (HAVE)<br/>         je' parutə (HAVE)<br/>         ɛ parutə (HAVE)<br/>         imməparutə (HAVE)<br/>         itəparutə (HAVE)<br/>         ɛnnə parutə (HAVE)<br/>         'I have seemed'</p>   |
| <p>c. <i>Continuation of a pre-existing state</i><br/>         [ɛddʒə tʃuŋkatə] (HAVE)<br/>         [jetʃuŋkatə] (HAVE)<br/>         [ɛt'tʃuŋkatə] (BE)<br/>         [immətʃuŋkatə] (HAVE)<br/>         [itət tʃuŋkatə] (HAVE)<br/>         [ɛnnəʃuŋkatə] (HAVE)<br/>         'I have remained still'</p>   | <p>d. <i>Telic change of location/ non-motional activity</i><br/>         ɛddʒə par'tutə/ɛddʒəfati'katə (HAVE)<br/>         je par'tutə/jefati'katə (HAVE)<br/>         ɛpar'tutə/ɛfati'katə (HAVE)<br/>         imməpar'tutə/ imməfati'katə (HAVE)<br/>         itəpar'tutə/ itəfati'katə (HAVE)<br/>         ɛnnəpar'tutə/ɛnnəfati'katə (HAVE)<br/>         'I have left/I have worked'</p> |

As we can see from table 3, the three contemporary Campanian varieties investigated seem to represent different stages in the gradual change involving the re-introduction of an active coding system through auxiliary selection. In Pompei and Sorrento the change in progress is quite noticeable, though affecting social classes to different extents. In Portici the change is well advanced. Here in the idiolects of some elderly speakers of the lower class auxiliary selection seems to differentiate two subclasses of intransitive verbs, though along different lines from contemporary Italian. Auxiliary selection in fact opposes verbs denoting change of state/continuation of a pre-existing state/existence of a state (which select BE) to verbs denoting telic change of location/telic motional activity (which select HAVE and BE in the 3rd singular) and

**Table 3.** Auxiliary selection in some Campanian varieties (Pompei, Sorrento, Portici)

	Change of state definite	Change of state INDEFINITE	Continuation of a state/ existence of a state	Change of location telic	Motional activity atelic	Non- motional activity (atelic)
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)
<b>1. Pompei</b>	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE
A. Working class	BE: 2nd and/or 3rd sg					
B. Middle class	HAVE BE: 2nd/ 3rd sg; BE/HAVE: 1st/2nd/ 3rd PL	HAVE BE: 2nd/ 3rd sg; BE/HAVE: 1st/2nd/ 3rd PL	HAVE BE: 2nd/3rd sg; BE/HAVE: 1st/ 2nd/3rd PL 3rd PL	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE
<b>2. Sorrento</b>	HAVE; BE: 3rd sg	HAVE; BE: 3rd sg	HAVE HAVE/BE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE
A. Working class						
B. Middle class	HAVE; BE; BE/HAVE: 1st sg/3rd PL	HAVE; BE; BE/HAVE: 1st sg/3rd PL	HAVE BE: 1st/2nd/ 3rd PL; BE/ HAVE: 2nd sg	HAVE; BE: 2nd sg; BE/HAVE: 1st/ 2nd/ 3rd PL.	HAVE HAVE/BE: 1st/2 PL.	HAVE
<b>3. Portici</b>					HAVE; BE: 3rd sg (if telic)	HAVE
A. Working class	BE	BE	BE	HAVE; BE: 3rd sg		
B. Middle class	BE	BE	BE	BE	HAVE	HAVE

(HAVE = *avè*; BE = *esse*)

verbs denoting atelic motional/non motional activity, which select HAVE in the whole paradigm (for all persons). (see Cennamo 2001b for further details). What is interesting about the contemporary Campanian data on auxiliary selection is the fact that the variation appears to follow the Unaccusativity gradient, though in a reverse way from the variation displayed by old Neapolitan 14th and 15th century texts. BE in fact appears to be invading the functional domains covered by HAVE starting from the core of the category of Unaccusativity (i.e., verbs denoting definite change of state), moving upwards along the various points of the hierarchy, consistently with the ASH and its implicational relationships. If BE occurs with existence of state verbs, it also occurs with continuation of a pre-existing state and change of state verbs. It is never the case, for instance, that BE occurs with telic change of location verbs and not with change of state verbs. The situation in the three Campanian dialects can be summarized as in Table 4 below, which can be compared with the diachronic findings in Table 2:

There is also a striking convergence between the synchronic and diachronic implicational relationships among verb classes on the ASH, whereby the core of the category

Table 4. Presence of BE in Pompei, Sorrento, Portici

Core Unaccusativity	Pompei		Sorrento		Portici	
	Working	Middle	Working	Middle	Working	Middle
<i>Definite change of state</i>	BE*	BE*	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	BE	BE
<i>Indefinite change of state</i>	HAVE	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	BE	BE
<i>Continuation of a pre-existing State</i>	HAVE	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	BE	BE
<i>Existence of a state</i>	HAVE	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	BE	BE
<i>Telic change of location</i>	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	BE
<i>Motional activity</i>	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE/BE*	HAVE/BE*	HAVE
<i>Non-motional activity</i>	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE	HAVE
<i>Core Unergativity</i>						

\* = with some restrictions on person and number.

of Unaccusativity appears to be realized by verbs denoting definite change of state, whereas verbs denoting telic change of location appear to be more peripheral and rank lower than verbs denoting continuation of a state, which are more resistant historically to the change involving the spread of HAVE (see § 4). On the other hand, verbs denoting definite change of state appear to be affected earlier than telic change of location verbs by the opposite phenomenon, whereby BE gains ground over HAVE.

The slight difference regarding the order of some items on the ASH proposed by Sorace is however in line with its theoretical assumptions: languages may vary as to the parameters triggering the unaccusative/unergative encoding and determining the alternation between them, in that the distinctions languages make on the Hierarchy may be either less or more fine-grained, nevertheless the implicational relations among verb classes remain constant (see Sorace 2000: 886).

## 6. Markedness, prototypicality and the diachrony of perfective auxiliaries in Italo-Romance

The contrasting paths of evolution concerning the spread of HAVE to the detriment of BE and the introduction of BE as a perfective auxiliary in varieties where there mainly occurs the auxiliary HAVE, can be neatly accounted for by a recent proposal

by Lazzeroni 2005, partially following Andersen 2001a, 2001b, concerning the role of markedness and prototypicality in language change.

One might in fact argue that the opposite progression of the changes discussed in §§ 3–5 reflects their different nature as well as the markedness values of the various subclasses of verbs/predicates along the split intransitivity gradient. In particular, the spread of HAVE into the BE domains may be regarded as instantiating the partial cancellation of the category of split intransitivity, whereas the spread of BE to the detriment of HAVE may be viewed as equalling the introduction of the category of split intransitivity, viewing unaccusativity and unergativity as scalar notions.

Starting from this assumption, following Lazzeroni 2005, one may argue that grammatical categories with a radial structure are introduced starting from their core – as is the case in the acquisition of split intransitivity (both in  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ ) and of other grammatical categories (Giacalone Ramat 2005) and as shown by the penetration of BE into the HAVE domains in contemporary Campanian varieties. In contrast, they are cancelled starting from their periphery, as shown for instance by the gradual replacement of BE by HAVE in old Neapolitan, by the breaking down of the system of classifiers in Dyirbal (which is kept for human nouns, the prototype (Lakoff 1980: 97–98) as well as by the erosion of verb morphology and the reduction of case-systems in cases of language death (Lazzeroni 2005, Giacalone Ramat 2005 and references therein).

As we have seen in the course of discussion, the changes involving the cancellation and the introduction of the categories of Unaccusativity/Unergativity appear to follow a unidirectional route along implicational scales, each radiating from a core or prototype, where the various subclasses of verbs are ordered according to their ‘distance’ from the prototype, i.e., according to the number and type of criterial features they have. In particular, the verb classes which are more distant from the core (i.e., from the prototype) may be regarded as the marked members of the scale, whereas the verb classes lying at the high end of the scale (i.e., at the prototype) may be regarded as the unmarked members. Change proceeds from the center towards the periphery in the case of changes involving the constitution of a category with a radial structure, but follows a reverse path (from the periphery towards the center) in the case of the (partial) cancellation of a category with a radial structure (Lazzeroni 2005: 18). In particular, ‘the periphery implies the center, but the center does not imply the periphery’ (Lazzeroni 2005: 20). This may indeed account for the unidirectionality of the implicational sequences along the unaccusativity/unergativity hierarchies that can be observed in the actualization of change (e.g., in the last two changes investigated). In fact, the various points along the hierarchies may vary, but the implicational sequences, i.e., the markedness values among them, remain constant. This indeed takes us to the more general principle which appears to be involved, the notion of markedness, regarded, following Andersen 2001, as a ‘principle of cognitive organization that is reflected in human behaviour and apparently fundamental to it’ (Andersen 2001b: 25), which ‘significantly conditions the progression of language change’ (Andersen 2001b: 52). Markedness is ‘an intrinsic characteristic of linguistic oppositions, . . . values speakers



impute to the terms of any and all oppositions in the process of grammar formation' (Andersen 2001b: 51), which 'not only define synchronic systems, but are intimately involved in the actualization of change' (Andersen 2001a: 3).

Then the two changes investigated fall within the more general principle of markedness: change starts from the unmarked forms and proceeds towards the marked ones in the case of the constitution of a grammatical category with a radial structure. In contrast, change starts from the marked forms and then progresses towards the unmarked ones if it involves the (partial) cancellation of a grammatical category with a radial structure and, if it involves more than one parameter (and this indeed seems to be the case in the spread of HAVE in old Neapolitan, which seems to involve lexico-aspectual features as well as modality), both parameters involved will have the same markedness value (as for HAVE starting to invade the functional domains of BE from peripheral unaccusatives and in contexts of irrealis modality, i.e., from forms which are both marked) (Lazzeroni 2005: 21). The spread of HAVE and BE also give further evidence for the fact that the theory of Markedness allows one to organize the actualization of change in such a way as to 'understand change as the projection of synchronic variation onto the diachronic axis' (Andersen 2001a: 10).

## 7. Conclusions

The changes investigated in this study appear to be a good example of the role played by language internal principles in language change and also show that the cancellation and (re)introduction of an active coding system (through auxiliary choice) follows an orderly progression.

In particular, we have made the following claims:

- *Habere* was already an auxiliary in Latin, therefore no grammaticalization appears to be involved in the transition to Romance. On the contrary, the use of this verb as a perfective auxiliary in late Latin reflects a shift of the construction *habere* + pp from marginal uses in particular contexts and registers, where *habere* already occurred as a tense-aspectual marker, marking the current relevance of a past event (present perfect meaning), to core uses, becoming the 'new' active perfect form.
- The rise of *habere* and *esse* as perfective auxiliaries in (Italo-)Romance is related to a deep restructuring taking place in late Latin in the encoding of transitivity and argument structure, involving the loss of the grammatical category of voice and the rise of active coding-systems, both in nominal and verbal syntax.
- Both the elimination and the introduction of an active-coding system marked through auxiliary selection appear to follow paths and implicational sequences consistent with a gradient model of split intransitivity and reflecting the more general principle of markedness.

## Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Henning Andersen, Giorgio Banti, Tolli Eythórsson, Jan Terie Faarlund, Elly van Gelderen, Alice Harris, Mair Parry, Harm Pinkster, Lene Schøsler and Alberto Zamboni for interesting and stimulating discussion, at different stages, on the topics investigated in the present paper, and for commenting on an earlier draft of the work, therefore contributing to its improvement. The usual disclaimers apply.

## Abbreviations

ABL = ablative; ACC = accusative; COND = conditional; DAT = dative; DO = direct object; F = feminine; FUT = future; IMPF = imperfect; IND = indicative; INF = infinitive; N = neuter; NOM = nominative; M = masculine; PERF = perfect; PL/pl = plural; PLUPF = pluperfect; PP = past participle; PRES = present; S/SG = singular; SUBJ = subjunctive

## References

- Andersen, H. 2001a. Introduction. In *Actualization. Linguistic Change in Progress*, H. Andersen (ed.), 1–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Andersen, H. 2001b. Markedness and the theory of linguistic change. In *Actualization. Linguistic Change in Progress*, H. Andersen (ed.), 21–57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bassols de Climent, M. 1948. *Sintaxis Historica de la Lengua Latina*, Vol. 2. Barcelona: Escuela de Filología.
- Bennet, C. 1910. *The Syntax of Early Latin*, Vol. 1. Boston MA: Allen and Bacon.
- Bentley, D. & Eythórsson, T. 2001. Alternation according to person in Italo-Romance. In *Historical Linguistics 1999. Selected Papers from the 14<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, L. Brinton (ed.), 63–74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bentley, D. & Eythórsson, T. 2003. Auxiliary selection and the semantics of unaccusatives. *Lingua* 14: 447–471.
- Bonnet, M. 1890. *Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours*. Paris: Hachette.
- Cennamo, M. 1998. The loss of the voice dimension between Late Latin and Early Romance. In *Historical Linguistics 1997, Selected Papers from the 13<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, M. Schmid et al. (eds), 77–100. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cennamo, M. 1999. Late Latin pleonastic reflexives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 97(1): 103–150.
- Cennamo, M. 2001a. On the reorganization of voice distinctions and grammatical relations in Late Latin. In *De Lingua Latina novae quaestiones. Actes du X Colloque Internationale de Linguistique Latine*, C. Moussy (ed.), 51–65. Paris: Peeters.
- Cennamo, M. 2001b. L'Inaccusatività in alcune varietà campane: teorie e dati a confronto. In *Dati empirici e teorie linguistiche. Atti del XXXIII Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana*, F. Albano Leoni et al. (ed.), 427–453. Rome: Bulzoni.

- Cennamo, M. 2001c. L'extended accusative e le nozioni di voce e relazione grammaticale nel latino tardo e medievale. In *Ricerche linguistiche tra antico e moderno*, V. Viparelli (ed.), 3–27. Naples: Liguori.
- Cennamo, M. 2002. La selezione degli ausiliari perfettivi in napoletano antico: Fenomeno sintattico o sintattico-semantic? *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 87: 175–222.
- Cennamo, M. 2005. Passive auxiliaries in Late Latin. In *Études de Linguistique offertes à József Herman à l'occasion de son 80<sup>ème</sup> anniversaire*, S. Kiss et al. (eds), 177–194. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Cennamo, M. forthc.a. Accusative subjects and argument marking in Late Latin. In *Evolution of Syntactic Relations*, C. Lehmann & S. Skopeteas (eds). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Cennamo, M. forthc.b. Alignment changes and argument structure in late Latin. In *The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in the Development of case*, J. Barðdal & S. Chelliah (eds). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cennamo, M. In prep. Aspectual constraints on the interpretation of *habere* + past participle in Latin.
- Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ernout, A. & Thomas, F. 1964. *Syntaxe Latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Feltenius, L. 1977. *Intransitivizations in Latin*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Flobert, P. 1975. *Les Verbes Déponents Latins des Origines à Charlemagne*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. 2005. Acquisizione e contatto nel divenire linguistico. Paper presented at the Conference on *Minoranze linguistiche e italiano L2 in area abruzzese e molisana*. Pescara, 6–8 April 2005.
- Happ, H. 1967. Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus. *Glotta* 45: 60–104.
- Harris, A. 2003. Cross-linguistic perspectives on syntactic change. In *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, B.D. Joseph & R.D. Janda (eds), 529–551. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Herman, J. 1987. La disparition de *-s* et la morphologie dialectale du latin parlée. In *Latin Vulgar-Latin Tardif*, J. Herman (ed.), 97–108. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Herman, J. 1995. Les ardoise wisigothiques et le problème de la différenciation territoriale du latin. In *Latin Vulgaire-Latin Tardif IV*, L. Callebaut (ed.), 63–76. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Herman, J. 1997. À propos du débat sur le pluriel des noms italiens (et roumains): à la recherche d'une conclusion. In *Italica et Romanica, Festschrift für Max Pfister zum 65. Geburtstag*, G. Holtus, J. Kramer & W. Schweickard (eds), 19–30. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Herman, J. 2002. La disparition du passif synthétique latin: Nouvel essai sur l'écrit et le parlé en latin mérovingien. *Estudios Romanicos* 24: 31–46.
- Keller, F. & Sorace, A. 2003. Gradient auxiliary selection and impersonal passivization in German: An experimental investigation. *Journal of Linguistics* 39 (1): 57–108.
- La Fauci, N. 1994. *Objects and Subjects in the Formation of Romance Morphosyntax*. Indiana IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- La Fauci, N. 1997. *Per una teoria grammaticale del mutamento morfosintattico. Dal latino verso il romanzo*. Pisa: ETS.
- La Fauci, N. 2005. Fondamenti latini di perifrasi perfettive e futuro sintetico romanzi. MS. University of Zurich.
- Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Lazzeroni, R. 2005. Mutamento e apprendimento. In *Acquisizione e mutamento di categorie Linguistiche. Atti del XXVIII Convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia*, L. Costamagna & S. Giannini (eds), 13–24. Roma: Il Calamo.
- Ledgeway, A. 2003. L'estensione dell'ausiliare perfetto *avere* nell'antico napoletano: Intransitività scissa condizionata da fattori modali. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 88(1): 29–71.
- Leumann, M., Hofmann, J. & Szantyr, A. 1965. *Lateinische Grammatik*, Vol. 2. München: Beck.
- Norberg, D. 1943. *Syntaktische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete des Spätlateins und des Frühen Mittellateins*. Uppsala: Lundequistiska Bokhandeln.
- Nuti, A. 2005. A few remarks on the *habeo* + object + passive perfect participle construction in archaic Latin, with special reference to lexical semantics and the reanalysis process. In *Papers on Grammar IX, Vol. 1, Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, G. Calboli (ed.), 393–404.
- Pinkster, H. 1987. The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tense auxiliaries in Latin. In *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*, M. Harris & P. Ramat (eds), 193–223. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Plank, F. 1985. The extended accusative/restricted nominative in perspective. In *Relational Typology*, F. Plank (ed.), 269–310. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ramat, P. 1983. *Habere* + PPP: una nota. In *Scritti Linguistici in onore di Giovan Battista Pellegrini*, 1453–1461. Pisa: Pacini.
- Ramat, P. 1984. Un esempio di rianalisi: le forme perifrastiche nel sistema verbale delle lingue romanze. In *Linguistica tipologica*, P. Ramat (ed.), 141–164. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Rovai, F. 2005. L'estensione dell'accusativo in latino tardo e medievale. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*.
- Sorace, A. 1995. Acquiring argument structures in a second language: the unaccusative/nergative distinction. In *The Current State of Interlanguage*, L. Eubank et al. (eds), 153–175. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sorace, A. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76: 859–890.
- Sorace, A. 2004. Gradient at the lexicon-syntax interface: Evidence from auxiliary selection and implications for unaccusativity. In *The Unaccusativity Puzzle. Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, A. Alexiadou et al. (eds), 243–287. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thielmann, P. 1885. *Habere* mit dem Part. Perf. Pass. *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie* 2: 372–423; 509–549.
- Väänänen, V. 1971. *Introduzione al Latino Volgare*. Bologna: Patron.
- Vincent, N. 1982. The development of the auxiliaries *esse* and *habere* in Romance. In *Studies in the Romance Verb*, N. Vincent & M. Harris (eds), 71–96. London: Croom Helm.
- Vincent, N. 1988. Latin. In *The Romance Languages*, M. Harris & N. Vincent (eds), 26–78. London: Routledge.
- Woytek, E. 1970. *Sprachliche Studien zu Varros Menippea*. Wien: Böhlau.
- Winters, M. 1984. Steps toward the Romance passive inferable from the *Itinerarium Egeriae*. *Romance Philology* 37: 445–454.

### Old Neapolitan texts:

- Cronaca* = Coluccia, R. 1987. (ed.). *Ferraiolo. Cronaca*. Firenze: Accademia della Crusca.
- LdR* = Formentin, V. 1998 (ed.). *Loise de Rosa. Ricordi*. Vols 1–2. Rome: Salerno.

- LDT* = De Blasi, N. 1986. (ed.). *Libro de la destructione de Troya*. Volgarizzamento napoletano trecentesco da Guido delle Colonne, Rome: Bonacci.
- LFT* = Migliorini, B. & Folena, G. 1953 (eds) *Testi non toscani del Quattrocento*. Modena: Società tipografica modenese.
- Lupo de Spechio* = Compagna Perrone Capano, A.M. 1990. (ed.). *Summa dei re di Napoli e Sicilia e dei re d'Aragona*. Naples: Liguori.
- Plin. Nap.* = Barbato, M. 2001 (ed.). *Il libro VIII del Plinio napoletano di Giovanni Brancati*. Naples: Liguori.
- RDF* = McArthur, D. (n.d.) (ed.). *Il Romanzo di Francia. Une Version du 'Libro Fioravante', édité d'après le manuscrit unique conservé à la Bibliothèque nationale*. PhD thesis. Paris: University of Paris.