

Auxiliary selection and participial agreement

MICHELE LOPORCARO

49.1 Introduction

Auxiliary selection in perfective periphrases and participial agreement represent two closely related topics, as exemplified in (1) and (2) (for the functions of these periphrases across Romance, see §58.3):

- (1) a. Ana a luat/**-ă cheia. (Ro.)
 b. Ana ha tomado/**-a la llave. (Sp.)
 c. A Ana tem levado/**-a a chave. (Pt.)
 d. L'Ana ha pres/**-a la clau. (Cat.)
 e. Anne a pris/**-e la clé. (Fr.)
 f. Anna ha preso/**-a la chiave. (It.)
 'Ann has taken.MSG/FSG the.FSG key.F(=the.FSG)'
- (2) a. Maria a mers/**mearsă la cinema. (Ro.)
 b. María ha id-o/**-a al cine. (Sp.)
 c. A Maria tem id-o/**-a ao cinema. (Pt.)
 d. La Maria ha anat/**anad-a al cine. (Cat.)
 Mary has gone.MSG/FSG to(.the) cinema
 e. Marie est allée/**allé au cinéma. (Fr.)
 f. Maria è andat-a/**-o al cinema. (It.)
 Mary is gone.FSG/MSG to.the cinema

In the transitive clause (1), the auxiliary is HAVE and the participle agrees with neither argument, witness the masculine singular default form. In (2), by contrast, (2a-d) display the same constellation as in (1), whereas in French and Italian BE is selected and the participle agrees with the argument of the intransitive 'go'. If however we consider the same transitive predicate in a different structural context (3a-f), auxiliary selection remains unaffected but the participle agrees not only in French and Italian, as in (2e,f), but also in Catalan:¹

- (3) a. (Cheia) a scos-o /
 key.F=the.FSG has taken.out.MSG=it.FSG
 **scoas-o Ion. (Ro.)
 taken.out.FSG=it.FSG Ion
- b. (A chave) o João tem-na levado/**-a. (Pt.)
 the key the João has=it.FSG taken.MSG/FSG
- c. (La llave) la ha tomado/**-a Juan. (Sp.)
 the.FSG key.F it.FSG= has taken.MSG/FSG Juan
- d. (La clau) l' ha **pres/presa en Joan. (Cat.)
- e. (La chiave) l' ha **preso/presa Gianni. (It.)
 the.FSG key.F it.FSG= has taken.MG/FSG (the) John
- f. (La clé) Jean l' a **pris/prise. (Fr.)
 the.FSG key.F Jean it.FSG= has taken.MSG/FSG

Clearly, auxiliary selection and participial agreement can only be handled parametrically. All current formal analyses of these data build on Perlmutter's (1978; 1989) Unaccusative Hypothesis (see Ch. 50), which highlights the distinct behaviour of two subclasses of intransitives, namely unaccusatives like those in (2) and unergatives like those in (4).

- (4) a. a Ana a plâns/dormit. (Ro.)
 b. Ana ha llorado/dormido. (Sp.)
 c. A Ana tem chorado/dormido. (Pt.)
 d. L'Ana ha plorat/dormit. (Cat.)
 e. Anna ha dormito/pianto. (It.)
 f. Anne a pleuré/dormi. (Fr.)
 'Anne has cried/slept.'

The argument of unergatives uniformly shows the same morphosyntactic properties as the transitive subject in (1),

¹ The commonplace, according to which linear order makes the difference here, between agreement in (3) and non-agreement in (1), is contradicted by dialects in which object clitics follow the participle and yet control agreement on it: cf. Aostan Francoprovençal (Chenal 1986:540-45)

cett-a mèison, dz'=i bati-a-la 'this-FSG house.F, I've built.F it.F'. North-western Lombard dialects like that of Quarna di Sotto also provide the same kind of evidence (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2005, II:560): *i u vòrt=ey/vert-e=ye* 'I have opened.M=it.M/opened.F=it.F'.

whereas the argument of unaccusatives may share properties with the transitive direct object, and indeed starts out as a direct object in the syntactic representation of (2), according to Perlmutter. Participial agreement and auxiliary selection in French and Italian provide bona fide evidence for this contrast, since control of agreement is a property shared by (a subset of) direct objects (3e,f) and the argument of unaccusatives in (2e,f), and the latter predicates also select BE rather than HAVE. Note however that in earlier stages the cross-linguistic differences seen in (2) and (3) were much less pronounced, as exemplified with old Spanish in (5) (cf. e.g. RAE 1989:449; García de Diego 1970:234):

- (5) a. los seys días [...] pasados los an (OSp., *Cid* 306, cf. Menéndez Pidal 1964:360) ‘the six days.M, they passed.MPL them.M.’
 b. vedada l’an compra (OSp., *Cid* 62) ‘they have forbidden.FSG him the purchase.F.’
 c. las cuitas por ó era passada (OSp., *Apolonio*, ed. Alvar 1976:608d) ‘the afflictions she had gone.FSG through’
 d. toda su cuita por ó había pasado (OSp., *Apolonio*, ed. Alvar 1976:174b) ‘he told her all the affliction she had gone.MSG through’

Participles could agree with direct objects, both clitic and lexical (5a,b), and the same goes for all other medieval Romance languages (Par 1923: 319; Griera 1957:112 on old Catalan; Foulet 1930:102 on old French; Lucchesi 1962:229 on old Tuscan), except that agreement with clitics is variable only in old Ibero-Romance, pointing to a later development (Huber 1933:251; Paiva Boléo 1936:232 on old Portuguese).² Likewise, unaccusatives display participle agreement, and, in addition, selection of BE as in French and Italian, though, unlike in these languages, BE is already in free variation with HAVE (5c,d). Both features persist in some dialects today, as reported for Paraguay Spanish (*si el fuera venido ayer* ‘if he had (lit. were) come yesterday’, Lipski 1994:312), Aragonese (*ellos se son tornaus* ‘they(M) have (lit. are) turned’, Alvar 1953:292; Zamora Vicente 1967:282f.; Saralegui 1992:49).

Many have objected that *seer* ‘be’ in old Spanish is not really a perfective auxiliary (Rodríguez Molina 2010:1122-7; Rosemeyer 2012) but rather a copula in a stative-resultative construction. This is crucially disconfirmed—in addition to the arguments provided by Company (1983:244-5), Romani (2006:276-82; 2008)—by selection of BE with unaccusatives under modals, where a stative

reading is excluded, as exemplified for old Catalan in (6) (Pérez Saldanya 1998:214):

- (6) e no n’era volguda exir fins aquell benaventurat dia (*Tirant*, ed. Hauf and Escartí 1990-92, II:852) ‘and she had (lit. was) not wanted to get out of there until that lucky day’

49.2 Past participial agreement

Following Corbett (2006), agreement involves a domain, a controller, specified for certain features, and a target, which agrees with the controller for (some of) those features. In terms of the domain, we are interested in past participial agreement in the various compound perfective periphrases which behaves quite differently from participial agreement in other structural contexts. For instance, in Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan, and Romanian agreement has not been lost in participial clauses (cf. Loporcaro 2006b:207f. for Ibero-Romance, and Iliescu and Popovici 2013:294 for Romanian), e.g. Sp. *leída/**-o la sentencia, el juez se retiró* ‘(having) read.PTCP.FSG/MSG the.FSG sentence.F, the judge withdrew’. Nor has the passive participle ceased to agree with its initial direct object and superficial subject in any Romance language (cf. Bughy 1957:107; REA 1989:379; Loporcaro 1998b:151;157; Pană Dindelegan 2013e:227), e.g. Ro. *eleva este ajutată de profesori* ‘pupil=the.FSG is helped.PTCP.FSG by teachers’. The following subsections address features (§49.2.1), targets (§49.2.2), and conditions (§§49.2.3) of past participle agreement.

49.2.1 Features involved in Romance past participial agreement

Romance past participial agreement involves the features gender and number,³ both specified binarily (M/F, SG/PL) in most Romance systems, with the masculine singular also serving in most languages to signal non-agreement (cf.1, 4) as well as agreement with non-canonical (clausal) controllers, e.g. It. *mentire è diventato/**-a facile* ‘lie.INF is become.M/FSG easy’. Even where the controller is a distinct neuter pronoun, this also triggers masculine singular agreement, witness Catalan (Wheeler et al. 1999:184):

² This variation is reported to have occurred in old Catalan as well, e.g. *la princesa de tal socors los havia amprat* (quoted by Griera 1957:112 from *Tirant* III 191). However, recent editions print *lo havia amprat* (edn. Hauf and Escartí 1990-92:582, cap. CCLXIX.27), i.e. ‘the princess had had recourse to him [= Tirant] in this way for assistance’.

³ In addition, the case values [\pm nominative] must have been distinguished in proto-Romance, *pace* Lehmann (1982:216n24), witness old French contrasts such as *Willeme fu li filz clamez* ‘William was the son called.NOM’ vs *(Guillame) l’ont apele* (not ***apelez*) ‘(William) him=they.have called.OBJ’ (Wace’s *Roman de Rou* 10171f., edn. Andresen 1877-1879, II:432, 180).

- (7) Heu descubert quan arribarà l' avió? – No, have.2PL discovered when will.arrive the plane no encara no ho hem pogut/**poguda saber. (Cat.) still not it.N we.have been.able.M/FSG know.INF 'Have you discovered when the plane gets in? No, we haven't been able to find out yet.'

Two notable exceptions are Surselvan and some dialects of central Italy (cf. §§15.2.2, §57.3.2) which present an additional fifth (neuter) form in the participial paradigm to signal lack of agreement and agreement with non-canonical controllers (Stimm 1976:42; Wunderli 1993:144; Loporcaro 2011d:332–36). This is shown in (8a,b) respectively, to be contrasted with the agreeing masculine singular form of the participle in (8c):

- (8) a. Persunas che han cumpleniu
persons.F who have.3PL complete.PTCP.NSG
il 18avel onn. (Srs.)
the.MSG 18th.MSG year.M
'People who have completed their eighteenth year.'
- b. Tgei ei succediu? (Srs.)
what is happen.PTCP.N?
'What happened?'
- c. Il temps ei cumpleniu. (Srs.)
the.MSG time.M is complete.PTCP.MSG
'Time is up.'

The feature values involved in participial agreement may display asymmetries. One widespread configuration is where only third person direct objects categorically control agreement, whereas first/second person direct object clitics either do not at all, as in Sardinian (9), or may only do so optionally (10), as in Italian (note that in all following examples, stress is paroxytonic unless otherwise indicated):

- (9) a. l / lɔz / laz appɔ
3SG= 3MPL= 3FPL= I.have
ið-u/-a/-ɔzɔ/-aza (Nuo./Lgd.)
see.PTCP-MSG/-FSG/-MPL/-FPL
'I have seen him/her/them.M/F.'
- b. mi / ti / nɔz / bɔz a
me= you.SG= us= you.PL= (s)he.has
bbið-u/**-a/**-ɔzɔ/**-aza (Nuo./Log.)
see.PTCP-MSG/-FSG/-MPL/-FPL
'(S)he has seen me/you.SG/us/you.PL.'
- (10) a. l' / li / le ho vist-o/-a//i//e. (It.)
3SG= 3MPL= 3FPL= I.have see.PTCP-MSG/-FSG//MPL//FPL
'I have seen him/her/them.M/F.'

- b. Mi / ti ha vist-o/-a. (It.)
me= you.SG= (s)he.has see.PTCP-MSG/-FSG
'(S)He has seen me/you.SG.'
- c. Ci / vi ha vist-o/-i/-e. (It.)
us= you.PL= (s)he.has see.PTCP-MSG/-MPL/-FPL
'(S)he has seen us(M/F)/you.PL(M/F).'

The indefinite direct object clitic may also be involved in these asymmetries. In Italian and Sardinian it patterns with first/second person clitic pronouns (11); in Catalan it behaves like third person clitics (12) (cf. Jané 1968:116; Wheeler et al. 1999:411f.):

- (11) a. (Cose brutte) ne=ho vist-o /-e tant-e. (It.)
b. (kɔzal féaza) n=appɔ ið-u/*-al
(ugly things.F) thereof=I.have seen-MSG/-FPL
meða. (Log.)
many
'(Ugly things) I have seen so many (of them).'
- (12) a. T'=hem convidat a la festa.
2SG=we.have invited.MSG to the party
'We invited you(SGF/M) to the party.'
- b. (Ous) n'=han dut-s.
(eggs.M) thereof=they.have brought-MPL
'(Eggs) they brought some.'

Besides person, there occur (more rarely) asymmetries in the way the feature specifications for gender and number license agreement, as in Catalan, for which a gradient is reported (cf. Wheeler 1988a:194; Wheeler et al. 1999:411) (Table 49.1).

In the most conservative option (i), agreement is realized throughout: only when the direct object is a masculine singular clitic is this undistinguishable from non-agreement. The next option (ii) involves loss of agreement with the masculine plural, then (iii), with the feminine plural clitic. The final stage (iv) involves loss of agreement with the feminine singular clitic too, eliminating agreement altogether as in Spanish. The steps through which this loss proceeds in Table 49.1 are not shaped by contact (with Spanish), nor are they due to sound change, or local economy (Cortés 1993:205, n.13): this could explain preservation of agreement with the feminine singular vs loss with the masculine singular (homophonous before auxiliaries), but not loss of participial agreement with the masculine plural rather than the feminine plural clitics, which are phonetically distinct. Similar gradients are reported for Badiotto (Manzini and Savoia 2005, II:595) and varieties of popular French (Bauche 1946:110; Séguy 1951:54).

Table 49.1 Implicational scale of participial agreement in Catalan

	i.	ii.	iii.	iv.			
a.	(la carta) l'he trobad-a '(the letter) I found it'	+	+	+	-	l'he trobat	FSG
b.	(les claus) les he trobad-es '(the keys) I found them'	+	+	-	-	les he trobat	FPL
c.	(els paquets) els he trobat-s '(the parcels) I found them'	+	-	-	-	els he trobat	MPL
d.	(el diari) l'he trobat '(the newspaper) I found it'	syncretic ±Agr				l'he trobat	MSG

[+ = participial agreement, - = lack of participial agreement]

As stated in note 3, a binary case contrast must have been involved in participial agreement in proto-Romance, whereas no case contrast occurs in the modern languages. A possible, marginal exception might be Corsican (13; cf. Salvioni 1916:846, n.2; also Manzini and Savoia 2005, II:93) and a very small number of central Italian dialects in (14; cf. Elwert 1958:128, 154):

- (13) a. li l ajju prumessi (Bastia, Cor.)
 3_{DAT}= it= I.have promised.PTCP
 'I promised it to him.'
- b. l a skumbussolati u tferbellu (Bastia, Cor.)
 3_{DAT}= has over.turn.PTCP the brain
 'It unsettled him.'
- (14) a. kwesta si maj'no tutto kwelo ke
 this.one.F self= ate all that that
 ll 'evono dati (Sant'Oreste, Laz.)
 3_{DAT}= they.had given.PTCP
 'She ate everything that they had given her.'
- b. l ajjo pure tjarlati ma n
 3_{DAT}= I.have even spoke.PTCP but not
 m a rispwestu (Sant'Oreste, Laz.)
 me= has replied
 'I even spoke to him but he did not answer me.'

As in Tuscan, in these systems the *-i* inflection on the participle normally encodes masculine plural agreement (e.g. S. Oreste tʃa 'fatti dor'mi 'it has made.MPL us sleep'), but exceptionally the *i*-agreement is triggered by an indirect object (independently of gender and number). Thus, the participial inflectional paradigm in these varieties appears to have five cells, with the fifth specified for the indirect object syntactic function as well as for third person (cf. lack of participial agreement on rispwestu in (14b)): that it coincides with a form identical with the masculine plural

is synchronically coincidental (*pace* Manzini and Savoia 2005, II:564) and has a diachronic explanation (homophony of the third person indirect object and the masculine plural clitic *li*).

49.2.2 Target of past participial agreement

In languages such as Italian, Sardinian, Spanish, Catalan, or Portuguese, participial agreement (for Ibero-Romance just in the passive, e.g. Pt. *a oferta foi aceita por ela* 'the.FSG offer.FSG was accepted.FSG by her') is signalled only through canonical affixal inflection. Any allomorphy may be totally irrelevant to participial agreement, as in Romanian (e.g. *mâncat* 'eaten.MSG' vs *mâncă[ts]* 'eaten.MPL'). Allomorphy becomes relevant in varieties with metaphony (cf. §25.1.5). Consider Table 49.2, where different dialects from central-southern Italy exemplify subsequent steps along one diachronic path.

In the dialects at issue, metaphony applied only to mid vowels, hence weak participles, whose stressed vowels were either low (-ATU) or high (-ITU, -UTU), were not affected. This change modified the exponence of gender/number. In Table 49.2, in the proto-Romance stage (a) gender/number-marking is purely affixal. The following stage, (b), is still attested by dialects of central Italy such as Maceratese and those of the extreme south such as Lecce, where metaphony has applied but final vowels have not merged. Consequently, gender and number are still marked affixally and gender is signalled also on the stem by metaphony which, at this stage, is still phonologically motivated. In this system number relies on simple canonical exponence, whereas gender has extended exponence. The latter rescues the marking of gender when final vowels are merged in the dialects of the upper south. At this stage (c), gender is marked on just some subclasses of strong participles, as exemplified for Altamura in (15a):

Table 49.2 Participial metaphony in dialects of central-southern Italy

a.					
MSG	køk-t-u	>	kott-	-u	>
MPL	køk-t-i		kott-	-i	>
FPL	køk-t-e		kott-	-e	>
FSG	køk-t-a		kott-	-a	>

	b. Mac.	= Lec.		c. Alt.	= Nap.
	kott-	kwett-	>	kwettə	kwottə
	kott-	kwett-	>	kottə	kottə
	kott-	kott-	>		
	kott-	kott-	>		

- (15) a. *ajə ssøltə/* ***sseltə* *la* weak participles (Liégeois examples from Remacle 1956:148);
 I.have F\unfasten.PTCP/ M\unfasten.PTCP the.FSG (*èle dji l'è a vèyou/**vèyouw-e* '(she) I've seen.M/F her'). In short,
ʃum'mwënd (Alt.) the morpho-
 mare.F logic of the target is usually irrelevant to the
 'I've untied the mare.'
 b. *ajə nnyttə* *la* *ʃum'mwënd* (Alt.)
 I.have bring.PTCP the.FSG mare.F
 'I've brought the mare.'

49.2.3 Conditions on participial agreement

Conversely, (15b) contains a participle which did not develop any metaphonic root vowel alternation, and cannot consequently show participial agreement. All productive inflectional classes of participles behave like (15b) (e.g. first class *kandətə* 'sung'). This widespread uninflectedness impoverishes the surface evidence for the agreement rule, which is however unaffected (as seen in (15a)), provided there are at least some participles that inflect for gender. A similar situation obtains in standard French where only strong participles whose participial stem-final consonant /z/ or /t/ has been deleted word-finally in the masculine still signal participial agreement (16a; cf. Kilani-Schoch and Dressler 2005:145f.), though agreement continues to be marked orthographically (16b):

- (16) a. (La voiture) il l'è a mise/ ***mis*
 the.FSG car.F he it.F=has put.PTCP.FSG put.PTCP.MSG
 dans le garage. (Fr.)
 in the.MSG garage.M
 '(The car) he put it in the garage.'
 b. (La voiture) il l' a lavée. (Fr.)
 the.FSG car.F he it.F= has wash.PTCP.FSG
 '(The car) he washed it.'

- (17) a. *Imo pèrz' a scummissa*
 we.have lost.F the.FSG bet.FSG
 (San Leucio del Sannio; cf. MSG *pierz'*)
 'We lost the bet.'

- b. *addzə kottə/**kwottə a pastə* (Nap.)
 I.have cooked.F/M the.FSG pasta.F
 'I cooked the pasta.'

- c. *addzu isti tanti vaḡnuni* (Trepuzzi)
 I.have seen.MPL so.many.M boys
 'I saw many boys.'

Failure to inflect does not correlate with the pervasiveness of the syntactic participial agreement rule (see §49.2.3). Despite massive erosion of the relevant inflections, participial agreement is preserved in French (though lost with causatives; see 21a), whereas it has been completely lost in Wallon, notwithstanding the retention of a gender distinction even in

Participial agreement in this context is also reported for several Occitan (18a; cf. Salow 1912:85, n.1; Ronjat 1937:591),

Gascon (18b; cf. Rohlfs 1970:223), and Catalan (18c; Badia i Margarit 1962:466; Wheeler 1988a:194) dialects:

- (18) a. Abiò pla dubertos sas dos aurelhos.
he.had very opened.FPL his.FPL two ears.F
(Ségala, Villefranche-de-Rouergue)
'He had well opened both ears.'
- b. Oun ass icados éras culhéros?
where you.SG.have placed.FPL the.FPL spoons.F
(Arrens, Vallée d'Azun)
'Where did you put the spoons?'
- c. He trobats els amics. (Bal. Cat.)
I.have found.MPL the.MPL friends.M
'I found the friends.'

The varieties in (17) and (18) are most conservative in this respect, as their participial agreement rule has survived unchanged since proto-Romance. Preservation of agreement in this context therefore implies its retention in all other relevant syntactic constructions (Table 49.5). The next step in the retreat of participial agreement is its loss from just this context, which first occurs variably, as in several dialects of central Italy (19a; Lorenzetti 1992:286; Tufi 2005:257), Friulian (19b; Benincà and Vanelli 1984; Haiman and Benincà 1992:223), and some Occitan dialects (19c,d; Camproux 1958:327; Miremont 1976:53-55):

- (19) a. (Noi) semo magnato/-e/**-i 'e mela.
we are.1PL eaten.MSG/FPL/MPL the.FPL apples.F
(Castelli Romani)
'We ate the apples.'
- b. O ai comrade/comprât une biele
I have.1SG bought.FSG/MSG a.F nice.FSG
giachete. (Frl.)
jacket.F
'I bought a nice jacket.'
- c. Avem fach/facha la paz.
we.have made.MSG/made.FSG the.FSG peace.F
(Périgourdin)
'We made up.'

- d. Abiò fach/fachos prouchos banados. (Gvd.)
he.had made.MSG/FPL many.FPL drinking.FPL
'He had often gone drinking.'

Structurally, loss of agreement in this context amounts to the introduction of a condition that, for participial agreement, it is not sufficient for the clause to contain a direct object, but it must also become intransitive by the end of the derivation (as first recognized by La Fauci 1988:91) through one of several syntactic processes which may affect direct objects, two of them schematized in Table 49.3.

Comparison of (i)-(iii) in Table 49.3 shows that in Spanish only direct objects which advance to subjects through passivization control participial agreement. As shown in (5a,b) by comparison with older stages of the language (cf. García de Diego 1970:234; RAE 1989:449), this is the product of syntactic change rendering the participial agreement rule more restrictive. At the other extreme, in (conservative) Balearic (14c) nothing has changed, whereas in standard Catalan only third person direct object clitics, but not lexical direct objects, still control agreement (albeit subject to the morphosyntactic constraints in Table 49.1), implying that the rule has become more restrictive.

The increase in restrictiveness may take different paths, as revealed by comparison of (20)- (21):

- (20) a. (Les atletes) l'entrenador les ha
the.FPL athletes the.trainer them.F= has
fetes córrer. (Cat.)
made.FPL run.INF
'(The athletes(F)) the trainer made them run.'
- b. (La noia) no l' hem vista. (Cat.)
the.FSG girl not her= we.have seen.FSG
'(The girl) we did not see her.'
- c. L' Antonia ha anat al cine. (Cat.)
the Antonia has gone.MSG to.the cinema
'Antonia went to the cinema.'
- d. Les noies s' han mirat al
the.FPL girls selves= have looked.at.MSG to.the
mirall. (Cat.)
mirror
'The girls looked at themselves in the mirror.'

Table 49.3 Intransitivization processes affecting direct objects

	i. Balearic	ii. standard Catalan	iii. Spanish	[+ = controls Agr]
a. DO stays	+	-	-	
b. DO cancelled	+	+	-	
c. DO advances to subject	+	+	+	

- (21) a. (Marie) ce garçon l' a fait/**-e
 Marie this boy her= has made.MSG/FSG
 pleurer. (Fr.)
 cry.INF
 '(Marie) this boy made her cry.'
- b. (La porte) Jean l' a ouverte. (Fr.)
 the.FSG door.F Jean it.F= has opened.FSG
 '(The door) John opened it.'
- c. Marie est morte (Fr.)
 Marie is died.FSG
 'Marie died.'
- d. La femme s' est couverte d' un voile. (Fr.)
 the.FSG woman self= is covered.FSG of a veil
 'The woman covered herself with a veil.'

In French, a third person direct object clitic controls agreement of the participle only of the lexical predicate of which it is an argument, but not of the participle of causative *faire* 'make', whereas in Catalan it does, whatever the clause type. Along this dimension, agreement has retreated over time, inasmuch as previous stages of French displayed it here. In the seventeenth-century example (22a), *fait(e)* agrees with the direct object clitic, whereas (22b) shows that in old French the participle of the causative predicate could (variably) agree with lexical direct objects:

- (22) a. [ma flamme...] l' a faite ainsi
 my.FSG flame.F it.F= has made.FSG thus
 croître (OFr., Desportes 1607:110, son.xxiv.8)
 grow.INF
 '[...] that has nourished my flame and has let it
 grow thus'
- b. (la mure) desur le frunt li ad faite
 the.FSG tip.F on the forehead 3DAT= has done.FSG
 descendre
 descend.INF
 (Roland 3919, ed. Segre and Tyssens 1989:291)
 '(the tip of the sword) he let it go down on his
 forehead'

To this day there are varieties in which participial agreement with a third person clitic is retained, notwithstanding the lack of a direct predicate/argument link between the two, as reported by Bauche (1946:99) for popular Parisian or Séguy (1951:54) for Toulouse regional French: *je l'ai faite venir* 'I've made.F her come'.

Comparison of French and Catalan in (20) and (21) also highlights that French is more conservative along another dimension, since in modern Catalan all unaccusatives and reflexives have lost participial agreement.

Spanish, Portuguese, and Romanian—as well as the Oil patois of Alsace and Wallonia and the dialects of Sicily and southern Calabria—combine the increase in restrictiveness along both dimensions (the 'French' one regarding clitic direct objects and the 'Catalan' one in relation to unaccusatives/reflexives) such that only direct objects which advance to subjects under passivization preserve agreement (Loporcaro 1998b:243; 2010a:229), as exemplified by the following Calabrian examples (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2005, II:798):

- (23) a. (La mákina) l avíanu lavatu/**-a.
 the.FSG car.F it.F= they.had washed.MSG/FSG
 (Monterosso Calabro)
 '(The car) they had washed it.'
- b. Avíanu venutu/**-i. (Monterosso Calabro)
 they.had come.MSG/MPL
 'They.M/F had come.'
- c. N avíamu lavatu/**-i. (Monterosso Calabro)
 us= we.had washed.MSG/MPL
 'We.M/F had washed ourselves.'

Participial agreement also differs dramatically across Romance in pronominal verb constructions. Daco- and Ibero-Romance (including Catalan) uniformly display non-agreement here, whereas French and Italian contrast different subtypes (cf. La Fauci 1989:222-32).⁴

- (24) a. Marie s' est **dépeint/-e comme
 Marie self= is depicted.MSG/FSG as
 l'unique candidate possible. (Fr.) + Agr
 the.sole candidate possible
 'Marie depicted herself as the only possible candidate.'
 vs:
- b. Marie et Jeanne se sont
 Marie and Jeanne selves= are
 longuement écrit/**-es. (Fr.) -Agr
 long.time written.MSG/FPL
 'Marie and Jeanne wrote to each other for a long time.'
- c. La veuve s' était écrit/**-e/**-es
 the.FSG widow self= was written.MSG/FSG/FPL
 de fausses lettres. (Fr.)
 of false.FPL letters.F
 'The widow had written herself some fake letters.'

⁴ Hereafter, whenever a dataset shows a contrast (in terms of participle agreement and/or auxiliary selection), the different options are demarcated by a divide.

- (25) a. Maria si è lavata/**-o. (It.)
 Maria self= is washed.FSG/MSG
 'Maria washed herself.'
- b. Maria e Anna si sono scritte/**-o. (It.)
 Maria and Anna selves= are written.FPL/MSG
 'Maria and Anna wrote to each other.'
- c. Gli studenti si sono concessi/-a/**-o
 the.MPL students.M selves=are conceded.MPL/FSG/MSG
 una pausa. (It.)
 a.F break.F
 'The students allowed themselves a break.'

Both languages coincide in requiring participial agreement with direct transitive reflexives. However, in standard French participial agreement is barred (24b,c) in indirect reflexives, whereas in Italian it is compulsory and, with transitive clauses (25c), there is the option of agreement with either argument of the predicate. The distribution in (24) is not an artificial product of prescription in French, as proven by the fact that many non-standard Romance varieties from entirely different areas draw exactly the same distinction, including that of Casale Corte Cerro in the Lombard-Piedmontese transition area (Weber Wetzel 2002:128), where agreement is compulsory in direct transitive reflexives (26a), but optional in indirect reflexives (26b,c):

- (26) a. la kla·rə s ɛ/ s ɛ lə'va:/ **lə'va
 the Clara self has/ self is washed.FSG/ washed.MSG
 'Clara washed herself.' +Agr
- b. la kla·rə s ɛ skritʃ /s ɛ skritʃ-a
 the Clara self has written.MSG /self is written-FSG
 dəpɛr le:ʝ -Agr
 by herself
 'Clara wrote to herself.'
- c. la kla·rə s ɛ lə'va /s ɛ
 the Clara self has washed.M.SG /self is
 lə'va: i mɛŋ
 washed.F.SG the hands
 'Clara washed her hands.'

Other varieties draw the divide differently, as shown by lower Engadinian and Logudorese Sardinian data in (27) and (28) (Ganzoni 1983; Jones 1988b:334; La Fauci and Loporcaro 1993:163-5; Loporcaro 1998b:127f.):

- (27) a. a. Ellas sun idas. (Egd.)
 they.F are gone.FPL
 'They(F) went.' Aux E
 vs:

- b. Ella s' ha lavada. (Egd.) Aux H
 she self= has washed.FSG
 'She washed herself.'
- c. Dora e Mengia s' han scrittas. (Egd.)
 Dora and Mengia selves= have written.FPL
 'Dora and Mengia wrote to each other.' +Agr
 vs:
- d. Ella s' ha lavà ils mans (Egd.) -Agr
 she self= has washed.FSG the.PL hands.F
 'She washed her hands.'
- e. El ha fingià muns (trais vachas). (Egd.)
 he has already milked.MSG three cows.F
 'He has already milked (three cows).'

- (28) a. maria ɛs palti:ða (Log.)
 Maria is left.FSG
 'Maria left.'
- b. maria z ɛl besti:ða (Log.)
 Maria REFL= is dressed.FSG
 'Maria dressed herself.'
- c. maria z ɛr rispōsta (Log.)
 Maria REFL= is answered.FSG
 'Maria answered herself.' +Agr, Aux E
 vs: -Agr, Aux H
- d. maria z a ssamuna:ðu zal ma:nəs (Log.)
 Maria REFL= has washed.M.SG the.FPL hands.F
 'Maria washed her hands.'
- e. maria a mmaniya:ðu (za minɛstra) (Log.)
 Maria has eaten.MSG (the.FSG soup.F)
 'Maria ate (the soup).'

Here participial agreement is excluded in indirect transitive reflexives (d examples), contrary to Italian, but is compulsory in indirect unergative reflexives (b examples), unlike modern French. The picture of microvariation is still more complex: dialects such as Milanese (Nicoli 1983:320) retain participial agreement with indirect transitive reflexives, though only with the indirect object (and subject), while participial agreement with the argumental direct object is ungrammatical, unlike Italian.

These distributions can be schematized as in Table 49.4 (Italian is used as metalanguage).

Table 49.4 represents an implicational scale, since no Romance variety presents discontinuous distributions of participial agreement in relation to the syntactic contexts

Table 49.4 Participial agreement with reflexives

	Italian	Milanese	Logudorese	French	Catalan
a. direct transitive reflexives <i>Maria si è vista allo specchio</i> 'Maria has seen.fsg herself in the mirror'	+	+	+	+	-
b. indirect unergative reflexives <i>Maria si è sorriso allo specchio</i> 'Maria has smiled.FSG TO (= at) herself in the mirror'	+	+	+	-	-
c. indirect transitive reflexives (IO) <i>Maria si è lavata le mani</i> 'Maria has washed.FSG(to herself) the.FPLhands.F'	+	+	-	-	-
d. indirect transitive reflexives (DO) <i>Maria si è lavate le mani</i> 'Maria has washed.FPL(to herself) the.FPLhands.F'	+	-	-	-	-

(a-d).⁵ It also mirrors steps in diachronic change. Thus, indirect objects in indirect transitive reflexives controlled participial agreement in old French (29a; cf. Tobler 1906:65-70; Herzog 1910:175), and continued until quite recently in the literary language, witness the early eighteenth-century example in (29b; cf. Grevisse and Goosse 1993:1345), and may still do so in popular regional varieties (29c; cf. Séguy 1951:53):

- (29) a. *fierce escremie s' ont rendue.*
fierce.FSG battle.F selves= they.have delivered.FSG
(OFr., *Benoît de Sainte-Maure, Roman de Troie* 16225)
'they delivered fierce battle to each other.'
- b. *une femme s' est mise dans la tête qu' [...]*
a woman self= is put.FSG in the head that
(Montesquieu, *Lettres persanes*, 103.48, ed. Ehrard and Volpilhac-Augier 2004: 421)
'a woman convinced herself that [...]
- c. *Elle s' est offerte ce chapeau.*
she self= is offered.FSG this.MSG hat.M
(Tolosan Fr.)
'She treated herself to this hat.'

⁵ One potential exception is reported by Lorenzetti (1992:286) for dialects of the Castelli Romani, where agreement is possible with the argumental direct object, but not with the indirect object in indirect transitive reflexives.

Evidence for such gradual change is available for all branches of Romance. For instance, participial agreement with reflexives (or reciprocals) is attested in old Portuguese and old Spanish, whereas in the modern languages the participle remains invariable. Loporcaro (1998b; 2010a:239-43) showed that the implicational relations with regard to the presence/absence of participial agreement with reflexives constitute a subset of a broader network of such conditions which also involve further syntactic constructions. Take the Trentino variety of Pergine Valsugana, where reflexives show the same pattern as French with participial agreement limited to direct transitive reflexives (30a), but differ in displaying agreement with direct object clitics in causatives (30b) and agreement of the participle of the passive auxiliary (30c):

- (30) a. *le putèle le s= a lavad-e/**la'va* (Per.)
the girls.F SCL self= have washed-FPL/washed.MSG
'The girls washed.'
- b. *(la 'letera) l o fat-a skriver* (Per.)
the.FSG letter.F it= I.have made-FSG write.INF
'(The letter) I let (somebody) write it.'
- c. *le matelòte l ε stade/**sta*
the.FPL little.girls.F SCL is been-FPL/been.MSG
kompanad-e da so mama (Per.)
accompanied-FPL by their mum
'The little girls were accompanied by their mother.'

Table 49.5 Romance participle agreement

	Nap.	It.	Srd.	Per.	Fas.	Fr.	Sp.
a. passive (lexical PtP) <i>Maria è stata vista</i> 'Maria is been.FSG seen.FSG'	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
b. transitives with clitic DO <i>Maria l' ho vista</i> 'Maria her=I.have seen.FSG'	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
c. causatives with clitic DO <i>Maria l' ho fatta vedere</i> 'Maria her=I.have made.FSG see.INF'	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
d. passive auxiliary <i>Maria è stata vista</i> 'Maria is been.FSG seen.FSG'	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
e. indirect unergative reflexives <i>Maria si è sorriso allo specchio</i> 'Maria has smiled.FSG to (= at) herself in the mirror'	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
f. indirect transitive reflexives <i>Maria si è lavata le mani</i> 'Maria has washed.FSG (to herself) the.FPL hands.F'	+	+	-	-	-	-	-
g. transitives with lexical DO <i>Gianni ha visto Maria</i> 'Gianni has seen.FSG Maria'	+	-	-	-	-	-	-

A further intermediate option occurs in upper Fassano (Elwert 1943:264f.) with agreement in causatives (31a), but not on the passive auxiliary (31b):

- (31) a. *la 'pitfola) l=a fat-a ve'nir fora*
the.FSG little.F her=she.has made-FSG come.INF out
(Alto Fas.)
'(The little girl) she made her come out.'
- b. *noʃ-a vezina e stat mordud-a* (Alto Fas.)
our-FSG neighbour.F is been.MSG bitten-FSG
'Our neighbour was bitten.'

The varieties considered hitherto can be ordered along a scale modelling the increasing restrictiveness of the participial agreement rule (Italian again used as a metalanguage) (Table 49.5).

Neapolitan represents the most conservative option, retaining participial agreement in (g) on a par with the few varieties in (17). The main literary languages were already in the process of losing participial agreement in this context in their earliest attestations. According to Romani (2006:286), Spanish, for instance, has participial agreement in this context in 11% of cases in the fourteenth

century but no such agreement by the fifteenth. In Tuscan, the turning point seems to be around 1360 (Lucchesi 1962:253-67; Egerland 1996:37-68), though prescriptivism revived this archaic-sounding feature in the sixteenth century, with long-lasting consequences for literary Italian. The scheme in Table 49.5 (and the more complex one in Loporcaro 2010a:229), while based on synchronic comparison, models the steps by which participial agreement retreated, at different paces, across Romance.

49.2.4 Exceptional cases

Though Romance participial agreement is often discussed in studies in theoretical syntax and typology, these studies do not do justice to the potential of this empirical domain as a testing-ground for theoretical claims. In this regard, I offer two telling examples. One is the occurrence of participial agreement controlled by transitive/unergative subjects, an innovation departing from the common Romance development, which arose in some dialects of Abruzzi and the Marche (cf. Harder 1988:230; Loporcaro 1998b:180-82; D'Alessandro and Roberts 2010:43):

- (32) a. *essə a fattə na tortə* (Arl.)
 she have.3 made.PTCP\SG a.FSG cake.F
 'She has baked a cake.'
- b. *jissə a fittə na tortə* (Arl.)
 they.MPL have.3 make.PTCP\PL a.FSG cake.F
 'They baked a cake.'

This agreement is surprising in a Romance context, and is relevant to general theorizing on agreement since formalizations of the principles constraining agreement in Romance (or even Indo-European) such as Baker's (2008b:155) Case-Dependency of Agreement Parameter frequently rule out such cases.

Furthermore, we saw in §49.2.2 that the structure of the paradigm of the agreement target has no influence on the syntactic agreement rule in accordance with Zwicky's (1996) principle of 'morphology-free syntax' (cf. Corbett 2006:184). Now, in at least one case, the northern Calabrian dialects investigated in Loporcaro (2010b:169f.) and Loporcaro and Silvestri (2011:343f.), participial agreement does not seem to obey this principle, since in transitive clauses with a lexical direct object the latter controls participial agreement (33a) only if the participle belongs to a certain inflectional class, including strong participles which mark gender agreement through multiple exponence, but not if the participle involved marks agreement only affixally (33b):

- (33) a. *'patrəma a kkətt-a/**kkuətt-ə n-a kassarəla*
 father=MY has cook.PTCP\F-FSG/\M-MSG a.F pot.F
 I pasta (Vbc.)
 of pasta.F
 'My father has cooked a pot of pasta.'
- b. *dđəseppə a llavat-ə/**-a na kammisa* (Vbc.)
 Giuseppe has wash.PTCP-MSG/-FSG a.F shirt.F
 'Giuseppe has washed a shirt.'

The impact of morphology on the participial agreement rule (in Verbicarese as in nearby Castrovillarese: cf. Pace 1993-4; Loporcaro 2010b:167-70) is limited to this context, where participial agreement tends to disappear first across Romance, whereas in all other syntactic constructions the two kinds of participle behave identically.

49.3 Variation in auxiliary selection

The difference between unaccusative and transitive/unergative constructions in (2) vs (1,3,4) above highlights the contrast between modern French and Italian on the one hand and modern Daco- and Ibero-Romance, on the other: the former

have a binary auxiliation rule, while the latter do not (with partial exceptions such as the remnants of BE-selection in Romanian, which however depend heavily on the analysis adopted.⁶ In fact there are more subtle differences.

First, quantitative differences set apart varieties which, at first glance, can all be classed together in that auxiliary BE occurs with unaccusatives (2e,f). According to Giancarli (2011:8), in Corsican about 350 simple intransitive verbs select BE, whereas for modern standard French the figure ranges from twenty to thirty-odd (Benveniste 1965:181; Giancarli 2011:373f.): unaccusative verbs taking auxiliary BE in French are a small subset of those selecting BE in Italo-Romance. Furthermore, across Gallo-Romance progressive depletion of the BE-selecting class can be observed, ranging from optionality, as reported, for Louisiana French by Conwell and Juilland (1963:156; e.g. *ils ont/sont venu/s* 'they.M have/are come.MSG/MPL') to categorical selection of HAVE in several Acadian French varieties (cf. Gesner 1978:18; Péronnet 1991:89), Wallon (cf. Micheels 1863:33; Remacle 1956:39-45), as well as Alsatian (cf. Aub-Büscher 1962:78-80). One finds dialects in which just one unaccusative verb (still) selects BE: Dauby (1979:35) reports for the Picard of Valenciennes generalized HAVE (e.g. *j'ai arvenu à pied* 'I have returned on foot'), except for *aller* 'go': *j'sus d'allé à l'autobus* 'I have (lit. am) gone by bus'. For the Picard of Nibas (Vimeu, Somme), Vasseur (1996:52) describes generalization of HAVE except for *mourir* 'die', which takes *et* 'be'. When the only verb reported to select BE is 'die' or 'be born', it is possible that what such descriptions classify as the last remnant of auxiliary BE is the use of a copula in a resultative construction. King and Nadasdi (2005:106-8) discuss this point for the Acadian French of New Brunswick, showing that in their corpus *être* 'be' is confined to just *mourir* 'die' and *naître* 'be born' and, though it may be analysed in some instances as a copula, it must still be regarded as a perfective auxiliary in other contexts, not only with the participial form *mouri* 'died', but also with *mort* 'died/dead': *il est mort en '60* 'he died (lit. is died/dead) in 1960', where the punctual time adverbial is incompatible with resultative interpretation (cf. also Péronnet 1991:89f.).⁷

⁶ Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2009) maintain that Ro. *Maria e venită de ieri* 'Maria has (lit. is) come since yesterday' is a compound perfect, contrary to the common opinion which regards *e* as a copula here (e.g. Sandfeld and Olsen 1936:316; Avram 1994:509; Loporcaro et al. 2004:23).

⁷ Specialization of the new formation *mouri* for the compound perfect (*il a mouri*) and restriction of the original participle *mort* to copular resultatives has been described for many French dialects: cf. Bauche (1946:115, n.1), Gesner (1978:18), Gautier (1993:xv), King and Nadasdi (2005:106-7). Significantly, similar changes took place in other Romance varieties such as Sicilian and Portuguese, which also generalized HAVE (or, later, *ter* 'hold' in Portuguese): Pt. *o gato está morto* 'the cat is dead' vs *tem morrido muita gente* 'many people have died'; Sic. *a porta è cchiusa/**cchiuruta* 'the door is closed' vs *a' chiurutu/**chiusu a porta* 'you closed the door' (Leone 1980:48, 126f.).

The competition between the auxiliaries in these varieties is a complex issue, and while it has been suggested that semantics (cf. §49.3.4) plays a role, with telic change of location verbs at the rearguard in the demise of auxiliary *BE* (cf. Balcom 2005:91), it seems clear that external sociolinguistic factors play a major role in determining variation: cf. the overview of *BE/HAVE* variation in Ottawa, Quebec, Ontario, and Vermont French in King and Nadasdi (2005:111). For Montreal French, Sankoff and Thibault's (1977) study uncovers extensive variation within the speech community and the lexicon (e.g. *passer* 'pass' selects *HAVE* in 90% of occurrences, *aller* in only 7% of cases), while Sankoff (2009) shows that use of *être* 'be' has been progressing since the 1970s. It has even been claimed that *avoir* 'have' has generalized (cf. Guiraud 1969:40f.) or almost generalized (Bauche 1946:105) with all intransitives in popular French.

Besides variation across the lexicon and/or speech community, another sense in which the binary auxiliatioon contrast first introduced in (1)-(4) is oversimplified is that other structural morphosyntactic factors (to which the following subsections are devoted) have an impact.

49.3.1 Relevance of TAM for perfective auxiliatioon

The only standard language where auxiliary selection is sensitive to TAM is Romanian, where categorical selection of *HAVE* is limited to the present perfective indicative (cf. 1a, 2a). In addition, old Romanian had an analytic pluperfect which could be formed with *HAVE* or *BE*: in Coresi (1581), one finds both *și multe ceasuri era trecute* 'and many hours had (lit. were) passed' (unaccusative) and *auzită avea* 'heard he had' (transitive) (cf. Pușcariu and Procopovici 1914, I:346, 441, cited in Zamfir 2005-7, II:197, 201). *Aveam cântată/cădzută* 'I had sung/fallen' survives as the pluperfect indicative in Aromanian (Capidan 1932:463f.; Nevaci and Todi 2009:141). The expression of perfectivity requires *BE* in the future perfect ((*v*)oi fi cântat/fugit 'I will have (lit. be) sung/run away'; cf. Iliescu and Popovici 2013:237), past conditional (*aș fi cântat/fugit* 'I would have (lit. be) sung/run away'), and subjunctive (*nu cred să fi cântat/fugit* 'they don't believe that I/you/(s)he/we/you/they have/(has) (lit. be) sung/run away'; cf. Ledgeway 2014a:6-7).

Elsewhere TAM-driven asymmetries may arise, especially at intermediate stages during the spread of one auxiliary at the cost of the other. While old Catalan had the common Romance binary auxiliary selection rule and modern standard Catalan has generalized *HAVE*, there are conservative dialects such as Alguerés which preserve a complementary 'have/be' distribution throughout the tense/mood system (e.g. *antuneta es/era/sigará tunara* lit. 'Antonietta is/was/will.be gone' vs *la munera*,

no las preza 'the money.F, you haven't taken.F it.F'; cf. Loporcaro 1998b:119f.), and some less conservative varieties like the northwestern dialect of Pont de Suert (Alta Ribagorça; cf. Alturo Monné 1995) where *HAVE* has generalized in all tenses/moods, except in the pluperfect indicative where unaccusatives and reflexives preserve *BE* (34a,b):

- (34) a. Hi erom anat.
'We had (lit. were) gone there.'
- b. Paquita ja s'era casat.
'Paquita had (lit. was) already married.'
- c. Alonso m'ho havia dit.
'Alonso had told me.'

TAM-driven distributions of auxiliary selection are prevalent across central-southern Italy, especially in mixed auxiliatioon systems (§49.3.3). For instance, in the Lazio dialects of Vallerotonda (Cocchi 1995:124) and Roiate (Orlandi 1989:66f.), *BE* has generalized to all persons in all tenses/moods, except the present perfect where *HAVE* remains in the third persons. This generalization of *BE* may spare different persons: in Corese (province of Latina) *HAVE* remains only in the third person plural of the present perfect (Chiominto 1984:178-80), whereas in Zagarolo (province of Rome; cf. Lacetera 1982:112; Loporcaro 1999b:206-8) it continues in the third singular and plural of transitives and unergatives, but only in the third plural of unaccusatives (cf. Tuttle 1986:268).

The options are numerous: on a par with the dialects just mentioned, generalization of *HAVE* outside of the present perfect is documented, for instance, in the Laziale dialects of Acquafondata and Viticuso (Cocchi 1995:124). Similarly, the Pugliese of Gravina di Puglia (Manzini and Savoia 2005, III:29f.) has person-driven variation in the present perfect, but generalized *HAVE* in the pluperfect: *avajə vənəutə/dərməutə* 'I had come/slept', *m avajə lavətə* 'I had washed myself'. Nearby Altamura has mixed auxiliatioon in the present perfect (cf. Loporcaro 2007b:183, 203-4), whereas in the indicative pluperfect *HAVE/BE* vary freely with all verbs in all persons (35a), while they contrast semantically in the subjunctive (35b,c):

- (35) a. la sor (ɪ sə'rɔr) 'erə(nə)/avaj(nə)
the sister the sisters *be*.IPFV.SG(PL)/*had*.IPFV.SG(PL)
dittə/ʃɔt (Alt.)
said/gone
'The sister(s) had said/gone.'
- b. fwessə ʃɔtə / ɔ fwessə dittə la
be.IPFV.SBJV.3SG gone it= *be*.IPFV.SBJV.3SG said the
sɔr (Alt.)
sister
'If only the sister had gone/said it!' (optative)

Table 49.6 HAVE and BE in dialect of Galliate

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL	
a.	u	ti	la	i uma	i	ina	ny/drymé 'I have come/slept'
b.	i soj	ti si	li				kuntentu 'I am/you.SG are/(s) he is happy'
				i suma	i si	ina	kuntintji 'we/you.PL/they are happy'
c.	i eva	ti eva	al eva	i eva	i eva	i eva	ny/drymé 'I had come/slept'
d.	i seva	ti seva	l eva				kuntentu 'I was/you.SG were/he was happy'
				i seva	i seva	i eva	kuntintji 'we/you.PL/they are happy'

Table 49.7 Romance auxiliation options

		INACTIVE				ACTIVE
		UNACCUSATIVE	REFLEXIVE			TRANSITIVE/ UNERGATIVE
			RETROHERENT	DIRECT TRANSITIVE	INDIRECT UNERGATIVE	INDIRECT TRANSITIVE
a.	It.	E				H
b.	Srd.	E				H
c.	Pcn.	E				H
d.	OFlo.	E				H
e.	Egd.	E				H
f.	Sp.					H

- c. avessə ʃotə /l avessə dittə la
 have.IPFV.SBJV.3SG gone it= have.IPFV.SBJV.3SG said the
 sojr (Alt.)
 sister
 'The sister might have gone/said it.' (epistemic)

Paradigmatic intermixing of the two auxiliaries sometimes results in morphological blends, in which case, no contrast exists any more (cf. Cennamo 2010). For instance, in the Piedmontese of Galliate (Table 49.6) HAVE has generalized, but synchronically one has to factor out third plural forms of the present perfect (a) and the third singular and plural of the pluperfect (c), since these are synchronically non-distinct from the corresponding forms of BE occurring as copula (b, d) (Belletti 1978; Manzini and Savoia 2005, III:17f.).

49.3.2 A syntactic gradient for perfective auxiliation

The binary contrast introduced in (1e,f) vs (2e,f), which has been said to mirror the proto-Romance situation, must be

elaborated on, since transitives/unergatives (1), (4) vs unaccusatives (2) are opposite poles, but by no means exhaust the relevant clause types. This was already apparent—though not explicitly commented on—from the datasets in (25)-(28), from which different auxiliation options emerged, which are a subset of those inventoried in the scales in Loporcaro (1999b; 2007b; 2011d:80), here illustrated in Table 49.7.⁸

The two distributions not examined so far (c,d) are attested in Picernese (cf. Pescia 2011:236-41; 2012) and old Romanesco (cf. Formentin 2002:206-9), on the one hand, and old Florentine on the other. In the latter, as instanced in Dante's oeuvre (cf. La Fauci 2004), only retroherent unaccusatives categorically select BE like plain unaccusatives (36a), whereas HAVE occurs in the remaining clause types:

⁸ Hereafter, E = BE (any outcome of Latin ESSE), H = HAVE (any outcome of Latin HABERE). 'Retroherent' (in the terminology of Rosen 1988) denotes unaccusative predicates which, unlike plain unaccusatives, occur with a non-argumental reflexive clitic (e.g. It. *sposarsi* 'get married'). The headings active/inactive hint at the fact that the perfective auxiliation contrast, like past participle agreement, arose in proto-Romance, as first argued by La Fauci (1988), as a part of a series of properties which showed active/inactive alignment, contrasting with the prevailing nominative/accusative alignment inherited from Classical Latin.

- (36) a. io mi sarei bruciato (OFlo., *Inf.* XVI 49)
 I me= would.be burnt.MSG
 'I would have burnt myself' Aux E
 vs:
- b. la donna che [...] ci s' hae mostrata
 the woman that us= self= has showed.FSG
 (OFlo., *VN* XXXVIII 3) Aux H
 'the woman that showed herself to us'
- c. Quand' io m' ebbi dintorno alquanto
 when I me= had around somewhat
 visto (OFlo., *Inf.* XXXII 40)
 seen.MSG
 'After I looked around myself for a while'

The dialect of Picerno distinguishes between all monadic reflexives (retroherent and direct transitive reflexives), which pattern with unaccusatives in selecting BE, and the rest which display free variation of BE/HAVE:

- (37) a. so ppar'tu / **addzə par'tu (Pcn.)
 I.am left I.have left
 'I've left.'
- b. mə so ppən'du / **m addzə pən'du (Pcn.)
 me= I.am repented me I.have repented
 'I've repented.'
- c. mə so dda'va / **m addzə ra'va (Pcn.)
 me= I.am washed me= I.have washed
 'I've washed myself.' Aux E
 vs:
- d. mə so ddəʃpəʃtə / m addzə rəʃpəʃtə ra
 me= I.am replied me= I.have replied by
 solə (Pcn.) Aux E/H
 alone
 'I've answered myself.'
- e. mə so dda'va / m addzə ra'va li
 me= I.am washed me= I.have washed the
 pijə (Pcn.)
 feet
 'I've washed my feet.'
- f. so mmaŋ'ŋa / addzə maŋ?'ŋa (la mela) (Pcn.)
 I.am eaten I.have eaten the apple
 'I've eaten the apple.'

Three remarks on Table 49.7 are in order. First, this gradient (a subset of the one(s) relevant for participial agreement, cf. Tables 49.4 and 49.5) is motivated in structural terms, since pronominal verb constructions are ordered so as to highlight their structural similarity either with unaccusatives (increasing leftwards in Table 49.7 or upwards in (36) and (37)) or with transitives (increasing

rightwards in Table 49.7, or downwards in (36)–(37)). Second, Table 49.7 helps model diachronic change: old Spanish, for instance, had a system of type (d)—though already with *seer/haber* 'be/have' variation in unaccusatives—which changed to type (f), the same happening in Catalan and Portuguese, as well as Sicilian (La Fauci 1992:56–8). From the same starting point, namely the contrast between (36a, b) and (36d–f), old Florentine moved in the opposite direction, as did old Romanesco which was of type (c) (Table 49.7) whereas modern Romanesco is of type (a) on a par with Florentine-based standard Italian. The same direction of change is documented for Sardinian, where Logudorese has been of type (b) (cf. 28) since its earliest attestations (Herzog 1910:176), whereas Campidanese dialects have moved towards type (a), some displaying today free variation or even categorical selection of BE in all reflexives including (the equivalents of) (28d) (cf. Loporcaro and Putzu 2013:208).

Third, what matters in Table 49.7 is the occurrence of distinct auxiliiation patterns, not the auxiliaries occurring in each of them. Thus, while type (f) is mostly instantiated by HAVE-generalization (in Spanish, Catalan, Sicilian, many dialects of Calabria, etc.) and Portuguese generalized *ter* 'have' (< TENERE 'hold'), generalized BE in some dialects of central-southern Italy (on Terracinese, cf. Tuttle 1986:267) or Catalan (on Rossellonès, cf. Alcover 1903:470f.; Fabra 1912:136) are structurally also instances of the same type. These systems have in common that auxiliary selection has ceased to encode contrasts among clause types, a result which may also be determined in ways other than generalization of one auxiliary (see §49.3.3).

49.3.3 Mixed auxiliiation systems: unary, binary, or triple

Many Romance varieties, concentrated especially in the upper part of southern Italy, show either a person-driven distribution of 'have/be' or free variation (at least in some clause types, tenses, and persons), or else combine both. The most frequent person-driven distribution, exemplified in (38) with the Abruzzese of L'Aquila (Giammarco 1973:162), displays HAVE in third persons, and BE elsewhere:

- (38) a. sɔʃi/a/se:mo/se:te/au ʃkrittʉ (Aql.)
 'I am/you.SG. are/he.has/we.are/you.PL are/
 they.have written.'
- b. sɔʃi/a vvenutu//se:mo/se:te/au venuti (Aql.)
 'I am/you.SG. are/he.has come.SG // we.are/
 YOU.PL ARE/they.have come.PL.'

- c. me sɔ/te ʃi/se a llavatu//ʃe se:mo/ve se:te/s au lavati (Aql.)
 'I am/you.SG. are/he.has washed my-/your-/himself // we.are/you.PL are/they.have washed our-/your-/themselves.'

This sort of person-driven split is often limited, like other splits, to the present perfect, whilst other perfective tenses generalize either HAVE or BE: among the dialects studied in Cocchi (1995:124), for instance, the Marchigiano of San Benedetto del Tronto displays this alternation in both present perfective and pluperfect, whereas the southern Laziale dialects of Acquafondata and Viticuso generalize HAVE in the pluperfect.

Regarding free variation of HAVE/BE, I know of no cases where it occurs across the board in the verb paradigm in all clause types. The varieties coming closest to this are spoken in northern Puglia: Minervino Murge (Manzini and Savoia 2005, III:27f.) has full free variation (cf. Altamura, 35a) in the pluperfect (39a), whereas an auxiliatio contrast persists in the present perfect just in the third singular (39c), in contrast with free variation in all other persons exemplified with the first singular (39b):

- (39) a. jevə / avevə məneutə /dərmeutə
 I.was I.had come slept
 (Minervino Murge)
 'I had come/slept.'
- b. sɔ / jəjə məneutə /dərmeutə
 I.am I.have come slept
 (Minervino Murge)
 'I have come/slept.'
- c. jɛ / ɔ məneutə ≠ ɔ / **jɛ
 (s)he.is (s)he.has come (s)he.has (s)he.is
 dərmeutə (Minervino Murge)
 slept
 '(S)he has come/slept.'

More frequently free variation occurs in just some clause types (cf. Table 49.10 below) or some cells of the paradigm where it combines with person-driven splits of different sorts, as exemplified schematically with the three Pugliese dialects (a-c; cf. Manzini and Savoia 1998:130f.; 2005, III:29f., 33) and four Abruzzese dialects (d-g; cf. Giammarco 1973) in Table 49.8.

One observes very many different combinations of the three possible values of the perfective auxiliary variable (viz. either E or H or free variation E/H) across the six grammatical persons (cf. Manzini and Savoia 2005, II:728; III:14, 33; 2007:225f.). The $3^6 = 729$ conceivable combinations grow exponentially ($729^2 = 531,441$) if one considers that dialects showing this kind of mix may also, unlike those in

Table 49.8 Some auxiliatio patterns in Pugliese and Abruzzese dialects

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
a. Gravina di Puglia	E/H	H	E/H	H	H	H
b. Bisceglie	H	E	H	H	H	H
c. Giovinazzo	E	E	H	H	H	H
d. L'Aquila	E	E	H	E	E	H
e. Vasto	H	E	E/H	H	H	H
f. Introdacqua	H	E	H	H	H	H
g. Notaresco	E	H	H	H	H	H

Table 49.8, contrast two auxiliatio patterns for different clause types (like those in Table 49.7), as exemplified above for Minervinese (39c). Consider now the Abruzzese of Pietrarsieri, whose contrast in auxiliatio is exemplified for the third singular only in (40):

- (40) a. kelle dɔnnə e ju:tə (Ptr.)
 that woman is gone.FSG
 'That woman has gone.'
- b. kelle dɔnnə s= e warda:tə (a ru spɛççə) (Ptr.)
 that woman self= is looked.at.FSG (at the mirror)
 'That woman has looked at herself (in the mirror).'
- c. kelle dɔnnə s= e skrittə (pə ttandə 'tiəmbə) (Ptr.)
 that woman self= is written.FSG (for much time)
 'That woman has written to herself (for a long time).'
-
- vs:
- d. mariə s= a messə ru
 Maria self= has F\put.PTCP.FSG the.MSG
 kap'piəllə (Ptr.) Aux E
 hat.M
 'Maria has put her hat on.'
- e. mariə a missə ru kap'piəllə ŋga:p
 Maria has M\put.PTCP.MSG the.MSG hat.M on.head
 a ru fiʎʎə (Ptr.)
 to the son
 'Maria has put the hat on her son's head.'

The same contrast, with a different manifestation, occurs in the plural, which yields the two overall auxiliatio patterns schematized in Table 49.9, type (a) for (40a-c), type (b) for (40d-e):

Many other different cross-dialectal distributions are attested beyond those reviewed so far (and are better accounted for in the morphology; cf. Bentley and Eythórsson 2001:71; Loporcaro 2007b:186), with scope for

further combinations enhanced by the fact that, while a preference for binarism is observed, more than two auxiliati-
 on patterns may occur within one and the same system
 distributed over different clause types. The precondition is,
 again, a mixed system with either free or person-driven
 variation in at least some (but not all) clause types. In what
 follows, exemplification is limited to dialects without person-
 driven alternations (cf. Loporcaro 2007b:200-7; 2014). Inter-
 estingly, all types of triple auxiliati- on system so far described
 can be accommodated by the scale in Table 49.7, as exempli-
 fied by the representative examples in Table 49.10.

In these kinds of system, free variation in all persons is
 observed either in the whole series of reflexive classes (type
 (b); Benincà and Vanelli 1984; Lepschy 1984) or in a subset
 including only dyadic reflexives in Oristanese (Loporcaro
 and Putzu 2013:215-17), only monadic reflexives in Castro-
 villarese (Pace 1993-4:129f.; cf. Loporcaro 2007b:208), and
 only indirect reflexives in Genoese (Toso 1997:152f., 208; p.
 c., August 2008):

- (41) a. e seu de mae maio sun/**an vegnù-e.
 the sisters.F of my husband are/have come-FPL
 'My husband's sisters have come.'
- b. a Maria a s'= é/**a s'= à lavâ.
 the Maria SCL self= is/SCL self= has washed.FSG
 'Maria washed herself.' Aux E
 vs:
- c. a Maria e u Giuan nu se= sun
 the Maria and the Giuan NEG self= are
 rispòst-i/ nu s'= an rispòst-u.
 answered-MPL/ NEG self= have answered-MSG
 'Maria and Giuan did not answer to each other.'
Aux E/H
- d. u Giuan o s'= é/ o s'=
 the Giuan SCL self= is/ SCL self=
 à bruttòu e moæn.
 has dirtied.MSG the hands.F
 'Giuan got his hands dirty.'
 vs:

- e. a Maria e u Giuan an/ **sun
 the Maria and the Giuan have/ are
 taxùo.
 kept.silent.MSG
 'Maria and Giuan kept silent.' Aux H

It is an empirical question whether all mixed, binary, or
 triple auxiliati- on systems fit a scale such as those in
 Tables 49.7 and 49.10. Preliminary work suggests that it is
 indeed rewarding for a syntatic study of auxiliati- on to
 abstract away from the millions of possible combinations
 and concentrate on the much more limited set of options
 made available by different cut-off points along such a scale.

Table 49.9 Auxiliation in the Abruzzese of Pietransieri

	1SG	2SG	3SG	1PL	2PL	3PL
a.	E	E	E	E/H	E/H	E/H
b.	E	E	H	H	H	H

49.3.4 Perfective auxiliati- on at the
 syntax- semantics interface

Semantic factors certainly correlate with auxiliary choice in
 intransitive verbs. While much has been written on the
 topic (e.g. Parisi 1976; Centineo 1986; Van Valin 1990), the
 most influential study is Sorace (2000), proposing an Auxili-
 ary Selection Hierarchy (ASH):

- (42) ASH (Sorace 2000)
 CHANGE OF LOCATION > categorical BE selection
 CHANGE OF STATE >
 CONTINUATION OF STATE >
 EXISTENCE OF STATE >
 UNCONTROLLED PROCESS >
 MOTIONAL PROCESS >
 NON-MOTIONAL PROCESS > categorical HAVE selection

Table 49.10 Some triple auxiliati- on systems

	UNACCUSATIVE	REFLEXIVE			TRANSITIVE/ UNERGATIVE
		RETROHERENT	DIRECT TRANSITIVE	INDIRECT UNERGATIVE	
a. Cvl.	E	E/H			H
b. CVen.	E	E/H			H
c. Gen.	E			E/H	H
d. Ors.	E			E/H	H

Verbs at the extremes are predicted to select consistently *BE* VS *HAVE* cross-linguistically, those in between are predicted to show variation. For modern Romance, the empirical scope of the hierarchy concerns standard and non-standard varieties spoken in Italy and France, part of Raeto-Romance, and the few Catalan and Spanish dialects still preserving binary perfective auxiliiation. Indeed, Sorace (2000:877f.) points out that variable auxiliary selection occurs, for example, with Italian verbs of acoustic emission, e.g. *il tuono ha/è rimbombato* ‘the thunder has/is rumbled’. Since in French *BE*-selection is much more restricted, this central domain of the ASH is not exposed to variation (*le tonnerre a/**est retenti* ‘the thunder has/**is rumbled’) whereas variation occurs in verbs of appearing and change of state (Legendre and Sorace 2003:196), e.g. *le livre a/est paru* ‘the book has/is appeared’.

The scale makes diachronic predictions too, as telic change of location verbs seem to be the last bastion of *se(e)r* ‘be’ selection in the history of Spanish (cf. Aranovich 2003) and, perhaps, Romanian and Acadian French (cf. §49.3). On the other hand, the kind of Aktionsart semantic factors in (42) have been shown by Ledgeway (2000:301, n.22) and Formentin (2001:98f.) to be uninfluential for auxiliary selection in old Neapolitan (*pace* Cennamo 1999b; 2002), while another semantic restriction did play a role, in old Neapolitan (cf. Formentin 2001; Ledgeway 2003a; 2009a:602), old Spanish (Stolova 2006), and old Sicilian (Loporcaro 2015b), where irrealis modality tends to favour *HAVE* over *BE* with unaccusatives.

Many (prominently Van Valin 1990 and Dowty 1991) argue that the relevance of Aktionsart to auxiliary selection suggests that the unaccusative/unergative contrast has no independent structural status. However, semantic-based accounts of auxiliary selection are more complex and limited in scope, being restricted to intransitive verbs and unable to jointly handle transitives and reflexives, which are covered by the same rule in Unaccusative Hypothesis-based accounts: e.g. Bentley and Eythórrsson (2003:468) state three distinct rules for transitives, intransitives, and reflexives. This literature also propagates some dubious data such as It. *la popolarità del governo è scesa/ha sceso notevolmente* ‘the government’s popularity is/has dropped notably’ and *sono/ ?ho rimasto solo* ‘I am/?have remained alone’—judgments reported by Legendre and Sorace (2003:195f.), despite *HAVE* being totally ungrammatical in both examples in standard Italian.

49.3.5 Some exceptional cases

All examples described so far display parametric variation within a structure which constantly involves one auxiliary form plus a participle. This description, however, does not cover, for example, *surcomposé* forms (cf. §58.3.4), occurring in French (§18.4.2.1.2.2; cf. Blanche-Benveniste 1977:102; Ayres-Bennett and Carruthers 1992), Occitan (Schlieben-Lange 1971:37-50, 134-55), Francoprovençal (§20.4.5; cf. Cornu 1953:195-200), non-standard Romanian (displaying an analytic pluperfect; cf. §8.4.6.2), or the dialects of Italy (Ledgeway 1997-9; 2009a:596f.; Poletto 2008), including Friulian (§10.3.2.1) and Sardinian (§17.4.2; cf. Jones 1993:308; Pisano 2010b):

- (43) a. J’ ai eu mangé de l’ oie. (Fr.)
I have had.PTCP eaten.PTCP of the goose
‘I have eaten goose (at some time in the past, occasionally).’
- b. si fis istáu andáu a Ccasteddu,
‘if you.SG.were been.PTCP gone.PTCP to Cagliari
kk’ aías áppiu finíu sa cosa. (Srd.)
that you.SG.had had.PTCP finished.PTCP the thing
‘If you had gone to Cagliari, you would have concluded the matter.’

Pluperfect formation in Pantiscu (cf. Tropea 1988:xli; Brincat 2004:104) departs from the common Romance scheme in casting Latin materials into an Arabic mould, crucially not involving a participle. As in Arabic, the pluperfect is formed juxtaposing two past forms, an invariable third singular imperfect of *BE* + the simple perfect:

- (44) era skrissi / skrivisti / skrissi /
was I.wrote you.SG.wrote (s)he.wrote
'skrissimɔ /skri'vistivɔ / 'skrissirɔ (Pantiscu)
we.wrote you.PL.wrote they.wrote
'I/you.SG/(s)he/we/you.PL/they had written.’

Such exotic features do not necessarily arise via contact: in some Abruzzese dialects (D’Alessandro and Ledgeway 2010b:205-8), the pluperfect is formed by adding two auxiliaries (present of *BE* + imperfert of *HAVE*) to the participle of the lexical verb, e.g. Arl. *so vé vistə la casa* ‘I had (lit. am.1SG had.SG) seen the house’.