Syntax and Semantics of Latin HAVE-statives
Lieven Danckaert & Gerhard Schaden (University of Lille)

1. Introduction The Latin construction 'HABERE+NP.ACC+PaPa.ACC' is uncontroversially the historical source of the Romance periphrastic perfect, but opinions as to the status of the Latin source construction have varied widely: while Hertzenberg (2015) suggests that this construction could have full-fledged perfect readings from very early attestations on, others (among which Acosta, 2011; Tara, 2014) have been much more circumspect, attributing to the construction a (pre-)resultative meaning and structure only. Our aim is to evaluate these claims, and to link them to the recent discussion of the structure of the participle in passives (see Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer, 2015; Maienborn, Gese, and Stolterfoht, 2016). We pay special attention to adverbial modification, and the distinction between event-types and event-tokens.

2. More than one structure? Latin constructions of the type 'HABERE+NP+PaPa' are widely assumed to have different syntactic forms and/or semantic interpretations. Setting aside adnominal usages where the participle is purely adjectival, Acosta (2011) distinguishes an *Attained State* reading (1), where the subject of HABERE is identical to the (understood) Agent of the PaPa, from an *Affectee* interpretation (2), where the higher subject and the lower Agent are not identical. In addition, Hertzenberg (2015) claims that Latin also had genuine *Periphrastic Perfects*: an example of this would be (3). In all cases, the NP.ACC can be a referential pronoun, as *istos* ('those') in (1):

(1) istos   [...] mercede   conductos   habebimus?
     DEM.ACC.M.PL   payment.ABL rented.ACC.M.PL have.FUT.1PL
     'Shall we have them as mercenaries?' (Cic. Att. 2.1.8, 60 BCE)

(2) cuius   salutem   a senatu   [...] commendatam   habebam
     whose.SG welfare.ACC by senate.ABL   commended.ACC.F.SG have.IPFV.1SG
     'whose welfare was commended to me by the Senate' (Cic. Fam. 15.4.6, *ca.* 50 BCE)

(3) quid   Athenis   exquisitum   habeam
     what.ACC.N.SG Athens.LOC found.out.ACC.N.SG have.PRS.SBJV.1SG
     'what I have found out in Athens' (Cato, *ad Filium* fr. 1, *ca.* 175-150 BCE)

3. Hypothesis: Have-statives as passive pre-resultatives We will assume as our working hypothesis that examples (1)–(3) are instances of the same underlying structure, which we will henceforth refer to as *have*-statives. Our analysis thus differs from that of Hertzenberg (2015) in three respects. First, we reject the idea that HABERE is ever ditransitive, taking both the NP.ACC and the PaPa as arguments. Rather, we take it that in all cases the NP.ACC and the PaPa form a predicative unit, corresponding to a small clause with an adjectival predicate, which acts as the complement of HABERE. There is independent evidence that HABERE can select complements with a purely adjectival nucleus (4).

(4) Anxium   me   et inquietum   habet   petitio
     anxious.ACC.M.SG me.ACC and worried.ACC.M.SG have.PRS.3SG candidature.NOM
     Sexti   Eruci   mei.
     Sextus.GEN Erucius.GEN my.GEN
     'The fact that my friend Sextus Erucius is running for office makes me anxious and worried.'
     (Pli. Ep. 2.9.1, *ca.* 105 CE)

Second, (3) is unlikely to exemplify a true periphrastic perfect, with HABERE reduced to the status of an auxiliary: given the wide range of predicate types that can enter into the small clause complement of HABERE, we take it that (3) and similar examples are indeed compatible with a resultant state reading. Finally, (2) shows that there is no requirement that the subject of HABERE be the agent of the underlying agentive PaPa: we take it that cases where we see identity of the subject of HABERE and of the PaPa (e.g., with mental verbs like *cognoscere* 'know') also do not

provide proof for grammatical perfecthood, as such corefentiality can be inferred pragmatically. In other words, though we agree with Acosta (2011) that only the pattern in which the subject of HABERE and the agent of the PaPa are coreferential can be the historical source of the Romance perfect, we do not see a compelling reason to assign different structures to (1) and (2).

As an alternative, we assume that the differences between the purely adjectival (4) and the (at least partially) verbal structures in (1)-(3) are determined by the amount of (verbal) functional structure of the PaPa. Since in many of the Latin cases the PaPa is clearly passive, we will explore the hypothesis that the relevant structures are similar to what has been described in German as a *haben*-passive (see Gese, 2013). We take this to be our main contribution to the literature, since to the best of our knowledge, there has not been much attention to the precise syntactic and semantic structure of the participle in such constructions in Latin. In what follows, we will evaluate how much functional structure the adjectivized participle can have, taking as our starting point the discussion of passive participles in Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer (2015) and Maienborn, Gese, and Stolterfoht (2016).

4. The functional make-up of the Latin PaPa There is solid evidence for the participial being at least a VoiceP, as attested by the presence of agent-oriented adverbs such as *diligenter* 'carefully' (5): such adverbs cannot combine with states, and thus, modification of HABERE can be excluded.

(5)   tunc diligenter tusos   et   cretos   habebis
       then carefully crushed.ACC.M.PL and sifted.ACC.M.PL have.FUT.2SG
       'Then you will have them [grapes] carefully crushed and sifted.' (Pall. Agr. 11.14.5, *ca.* 350 CE)

We further consider whether in the Latin construction, we face an event-token or rather an event-type. Recent literature on (stative) passives has insisted on this distinction, and established that in German stative *sein*-passives and *haben*-passives, the participle does not denote an event-token, but only an event-type. It is not obvious to find conclusive evidence in favor of or against *token*-denotation in the participle, given that standard tests (availability of anaphoric uptake) are difficult to apply in a dead language. However, sentences like (6) seem to indicate to us that reference to an event-token was possible in Latin.

(6)   eos   [. . .] facies   habere   combustas   eo   igne,
       DEM.ACC.M.PL   faces.ACC have.PRS.INF scorched.ACC.F.PL DEM.ABL.M.SG fire.ABL
       quem   sibi   succenderant
       which.ACC.M.SG REFL.DAT.M.PL light.PLPRF.3PL
       'that their faces are scorched by that fire, which they had lit for themselves' (Jerome, *Commentarii in Isaiam* 6.13.6, 408 CE)

In (6), we have the indication of an instrument, which is determined by a demonstrative (*eo igne*, 'by that fire'). This does not seem to be compatible with a stative causal interpretation, as described in Maienborn and Herdtfelder (2017). Furthermore, the faces in question seem to be referential, and the interpretation of the events episodic, rather than generic.

5. Conclusion We argue, in agreement with Acosta (2011) and Tara (2014), that the Latin construction 'HABERE+NP.ACC+PaPa.ACC' is not yet a full-fledged perfect, but rather a grammatically passive structure whose main verb is HABERE. In our talk, we will provide a full analysis of the syntactic structure, and its compositional semantics, combining insights of Legate (2014) and Maienborn, Gese, and Stolterfoht (2016) with the analysis of *have* by Myler (2016). We defend the hypothesis that the participle and its complement denote event (and state) tokens, contrary to what has been described for stative passives in languages like German. One other conspicuous difference between the Latin and the German construction, viz. the full productivity of (semantically) indefinite NP.ACC constituents in the former but not the latter, is explained in terms of the absence of grammaticalized definiteness in Latin.

References

Acosta, D. de (2011). "Rethinking the genesis of the Romance periphrastic perfect". In: *Diachronica* 28.2: pp. 143–185.

Alexiadou, A., E. Anagnostopoulou, and F. Schäfer (2015). *External Arguments in Transitivity Alternations. A Layering Approach.* Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gese, H. (2013). "Another passive that isn't one: On the semantics of German *haben*-passives". In: *Non-Canonical Passives.* Ed. by A. Alexiadou and F. Schäfer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: pp. 163–183.

Hertzenberg, M. J. (2015). "*habere* + pp and the Origin of the Periphrastic Perfect". In: *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 14.1: pp. 33–63.

Legate, J. A. (2014). *Voice and v: Lessons from Acehnese.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Maienborn, C., H. Gese, and B. Stolterfoht (2016). "Adverbial Modifiers in Adjectival Passives". In: *Journal of Semantics* 33: pp. 299–358.

Maienborn, C. and J. Herdtfelder (2017). "Eventive versus stative causation: the case of German causal *von*-modifiers". In: *Linguistics and Philosophy* 40: pp. 279–320.

Myler, N. (2016). *Building and Interpreting Possession Sentences.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Tara, G. B. (2014). *Les périphrases verbales avec* habeo *en latin tardif.* Grammaire et linguistique. Paris: L'Harmattan.