Restructuring and the development of the Romance conditional verb forms.

Bianca Slobbe

In this paper, we present a generative morphosyntactic account of the development of the Romance conditional verb forms from the Latin periphrasis ‘infinitive + habere’. We reject the hypothesis of D’Hulst (2001) who claims that this development took place in three stages (biclausal --> monoclausal --> synthetic) and was the result of a process of gradually moving up temporal information from lower functional projections. Instead, we propose that the Romance conditional verb forms developed from a functional restructuring infinitive construction (cf. Wurmbrand 2001) and that this development was caused by changing properties of the auxiliary.

1. Introduction

It is generally accepted (cf. Bourciez 1967; Roberts 1992; Rohlf 1968; Thielmann 1885) that the Romance conditional verb forms have developed from the Latin periphrasis ‘infinitive + habere’ (cf. examples (1) and (2)).

(1) cantare    habebam --> chanterais (Fr.),
sing-INF.PR.ACT. have-1SG.IND.IMPF.ACT. cantaria (O.It.)

(2) cantare    habui --> canterei (O.It., It.)
sing-INF.PR.ACT. have-1SG.IND.PF.ACT.

Agreement has not been reached, however, on the questions how and why this development took place. In this paper, we will try to provide a satisfactory answer to these questions, based on an exhaustive corpus containing (almost) all occurrences of the Latin periphrasis ‘infinitive + habere’ as well as the earliest manifestations of the Romance conditional.

---

1 Lanly (1973) claims that the conditional verb forms have developed from the Latin past subjunctive, augmented by an additional past morpheme (appella-re-ses --> appella-re-bas --> appelle-rais). This hypothesis has effectively been refuted by Arnaveille (1995), Nocentini (2001) and Posner (1998). We will not discuss it in this paper.
The paper is organised as follows. We will commence by presenting the Latin data (section 2). In section 3, we will argue that the most recent generative syntactic hypothesis, which has been proposed by D’Hulst (2001), should be rejected. In section 4, we will offer an alternative hypothesis based on Wurmbrand’s (2001) categorisation of infinitival complements in four categories. In section 5, we will provide Old Romanian data which sustain the hypothesis presented in section 4. Finally, in section 6, we will present the phrase structures of three Latin ‘infinitive+habere’ constructions.

2. The data

2.1. Selection of the data

All previous analyses (cf. Coleman 1971; D’Hulst 2001; Fleischmann 1982; Roberts 1992) are based on a relatively small amount of data. In fact, they are all, directly or indirectly, based on the data presented by Thielmann (1885) and Bulhart. The authors have based their research on a large electronic corpus, containing almost all Latin texts dating from 240 B.C. to 1965 A.D.: the Library of Latin Texts (CLCLT). We have limited our attention to texts dating from 240 B.C. until 800 A.D., together comprising approximately 26 million words.

From this corpus, we have extracted all phrases combining the verb habere with an infinitive. These phrases may be divided into seven types, exemplified in (3).

(3) Types of ‘infinitive + habere’

a) habeo unde cantare
have-1SG.IND.PR.ACT. from where sing-INF.PR.ACT.
‘I have something as a result of which I can sing’

b) habeo cantare
have-1SG.IND.PR.ACT. sing-INF.PR.ACT.
‘I can / must / will sing’

c) necesse habeo cantare
necessarily have-1SG.IND.PR.ACT. sing-INF.PR.ACT.
‘I necessarily must sing’

d) satis habeo cantare
sufficient have-1SG.IND.PR.ACT. sing-INF.PR.ACT.
‘I find singing sufficient.’

e) habeo potestatem cantare
have-1SG.IND.PR.ACT. power-ACC.SG.F. sing-INF.PR.ACT.
‘I have the power to sing’

2 In: Thesaurus Linguae Latinae s.v. habeo, col. 2454.12-2458.83.

3 The extraction of data from the corpus has been achieved in collaboration with Viara Bourova.
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f) habeo in potestate cantare  
   have-1SG.IND.PR.ACT. in power-ABL.SG.F. sing-INF.PR.ACT.  
   ‘I have singing in my power’  

g) habeo ad cantare  
   have-1SG.IND.PR.ACT. to sing-INF.PR.ACT.  
   ‘I have to sing’  

In construction (a), the infinitive is located in a subordinate CP, selected by habere. In construction (b), the infinitive is located in the matrix phrase. The exact status of the infinitive will be discussed in section 4.2. Construction (c) is similar to construction (b), be it that habere is directly preceded by the adverb necesse, which has considerable syntactic consequences. Construction (d) has a completely different structure and interpretation: habere, which has the reading ‘regard as’, selects a Small Clause containing the nominalized infinitive and the adjective satis. In (e) and (f) the infinitive is the complement of the NP potestatem and the PP in potestate respectively. The last construction, (h), in which the infinitive is introduced by the infinitival marker ad, is comparable to the French j’ai à chanter and the Italian ho da cantare.

As we are looking for a construction in which the infinitive might move up to merge with habere, we will focus on examples (a), (b), and (g). In (c), the presence of necesse prevents the infinitive from merging with habere. In (d), extraction of the infinitive from the Small Clause would result in movement to an A-bar position, rather than merging of the infinitive with habere in an A-position. Finally, in (e) and (f), extraction of the infinitive from the NP potestatem or the PP in potestate would violate the complex NP-constraint.

We have included examples that did not appear in the CLCLT, but were found in Latin sources not included in the CLCLT or quoted by other authors. If a phrase appeared several times (as a result of citation for example), we have only taken the original occurrence into account.

As we have found no regional differences in the development and use of the periphrasis, we have regarded all Latin examples as expressions of the same language.

2.2. The syntactic development of the periphrasis

The rise of the periphrasis has taken place in five stages. In the first century B.C., habere could only be combined with a transitive infinitive (examples (4) and (5)). From the third century A.D. onwards, the construction allows for intransitive and passive infinitives (examples (6) and (7) respectively). The earliest examples containing an overt embedded CP are found in the fourth century A.D. (example (8)). We have found only one example displaying an infinitival marker, which is dated in the eighth century A.D. (example (9)).
(4) (Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 6, 711)

In multis hoc rebus concerning many-ABL.PL.M. this-ACC.G.M. thing-ABL.PL.M.
dicere habemus say-INF.PRF.ACT. have-1PL.IND.PRF.ACT.

‘We can say this about many things.’

(5) (Seneca, *Controversiae* 1,1,19)

Quid habui facere ?
what-ACC.G.N. have-1SG.IND.PF.ACT. do-INF.PRF.ACT.

‘What should / could I have done?’

(6) (Tertullianus, *Adversus Marcionem* 3,11)

... post quem habebat after which-ACC.G.M. have-3SG.IND.IMPF.ACT.
evenire happen-INF.PRF.ACT.

‘... after which it had to / would happen.’

(7) (Tertullianus, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum* 40,47)

... ad futuram gloriam, quae for future-ACC.G.F. glory-ACC.G.F. which-NOM.G.F.
in nos habet revelari in we-ACC.PL.M. have-3SG.IND.PRF.ACT. reveal-INF.PRF.PASS.

‘For future glory, which has to / can / will be revealed in / to us.’

(8) (Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in Pauli Epistulas* 4,28)

... ut habeat unde tribuere so that have-3SG.SUJ.PRF.ACT. from where give-INF.PRF.ACT.
indigentibus needy-DAT.PL.M.
Lit.: ‘... so that he may have from where give to the poor’
--> ‘... so that he may have funds to give to the poor.’

(9) (Pardessus 1843-1849: 330)

... per manus nostras through hand-ACC.PL.F. our-ACC.G.F.
recipimus vel ad recipere receive-1PL.IND.PRF.ACT. or to receive-INF.PRF.ACT.
habemus have-1PL.IND.PRF.ACT.

‘...we receive or have to / will receive through our hands’

Alongside the present infinitive, Latin had a perfective infinitive at its disposal: *canta-v-isse*. We have found one example of the periphrasis using a perfective infinitive (example (10)). Here, we are dealing with a defective verb: the perfective forms of *odisse* are interpreted as present tense forms.
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(10) (Tertullianus, Apologeticum 37,1)
   Si inimicos iubemur diligere,
   if enemy-ACC.PL.M. order-1PL.IND.PR.ACT. love-INF.PR.ACT.
   quem habemus odisse?
   who-ACC.SG.M. have-1PL.IND.PR.ACT. hate-INF.PF.ACT.
   ‘If we are ordered to love our enemies, who should / can we hate?’

2.3. The semantic development of the periphrasis

The earliest examples of the periphrasis are ambiguous between a possessive and a modal reading. This was already illustrated by example (5) above, repeated in (11). The first examples with a purely modal reading are found in the first century A.D. (example (12)). From the third century A.D. onwards, the periphrasis might have a future or future-in-the-past reading (examples (13) and (14) respectively). Finally, in the fourth century A.D., we find occurrences with an interpretation that resembles the reading of the modern Romance conditional verb forms (example (15)).

(11) (Seneca, Controversiae 1,1,19)
   Quid habui facere?
   what-ACC.SG.N. have-1SG.IND.PF.ACT. do-INF.PR.ACT.
   ‘What should / could I have done?’

(12) (Ovidius, Epistulae ex Ponto 3,1)
   nec te si cupiat
   and not you-ACC.SG.M. if want-3SG.SUB.PR.ACT.
   laedere rumor habet
   harm-INF.PR.ACT. rumor-NOM.SG.F. have-3SG.IND.PR.ACT.
   ‘and the rumor cannot harm you even if it wants to.’

(13) (Sacerdos, Ars cf. Pinkster 1987: 206)
   quidam tempus praesens esse
   some-NOM.PL.M. tense-NOM.SG.N. present-NOM.SG.N. be-INF.PR.ACT.
   negant, dicentes res aut
   deny-3PL.IND.PR.ACT. say-P.P.A.ACT. thing-ACC.PL.F. either
   factas esse aut habere
   do-P.P.P.-ACC.PL.F. be-INF.PR.ACT. or have-INF.PR.ACT.
   fieri.
   do-INF.PR.ACT.
   ‘Some deny that there is a present tense, saying that things either have
   been done or will be done.’
3. Previous hypothesis: D’Hulst (2001)

In this section, we will discuss the most recent generative syntactic analysis, proposed by D’Hulst (2001).

3.1. Semantic and syntactic frameworks

Concerning the semantic representation of tense, D’Hulst assumes a revised Reichenbachian framework as proposed by Hornstein (1990). Within this framework, it is assumed that the temporal interpretation of a verb is brought about by a double binary relationship between three temporal entities: S(peech time), R(eference time) and E(vent time). The relationship between S and R indicates whether an event takes place in the past (R precedes S: \( R_S \)), present (S and R coincide: \( S,R \)) or future (S precedes R: \( S_R \)). The relationship between R and E determines the verb has a perfective (E_\( R \)), neutral (E,R) or prospective (R_\( E \)) reading.

Concerning the syntactic realisation of these temporal relationships, D’Hulst follows Giorgi & Pianesi (1997) in assuming two tense projections: T1P and T2P. According to their hypothesis, T1P realises the relationship between S and R and T2P realises the relationship between R and E. Crucially, they claim that these projections are only present in the structure if the temporal entities they represent do not coincide.

3.2. The development of the Romance conditional verb forms

D’Hulst claims that the development of the Romance conditional verb forms from the Latin periphrasis ‘infinitive + habere’ took place in three stages. In stage 1, the periphrastic constructions habebam cantare and habui cantare reflect a biclausal structure as in (16). In stage 2, the infinitive moves up to the matrix clause and habere becomes an auxiliary as in (17). This stage is preceded by a Perfect-Shift, causing the perfectivity features to shift from T2P
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to T1P. In stage 3, the infinitive moves up to T1 and merges with the auxiliary as in (18). This stage is preceded by a Future Shift, causing the prospective features to shift from T2P to T1P.

(16)  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a) } [\text{CP} [\text{T1P habe}\text{bami} [\text{VP ti} [\text{CP} [\text{VP cantare} ]]]]] \\
&\text{b) } [\text{CP} [\text{T2P habe}\text{bu}i [\text{VP ti} [\text{CP} [\text{VP cantare} ]]]]]
\end{align*}
\]

(17)  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a) } [\text{CP} [\text{T1P habe}\text{bami} [\text{VauxP ti} [\text{T2P cantare} [\text{VP tj}]]]]] \\
&\text{b) } [\text{CP} [\text{T1P habe}\text{bu}i [\text{VauxP ti} [\text{T2P cantare} [\text{VP tj}]]]]]
\end{align*}
\]

(18)  
\[
[\text{CP} [\text{Agr1P chanterais / cantaria / canterei, [T1P ti [VP tj]]]]]
\]

3.3. Remarks regarding the hypothesis of D’Hulst (2001).

A crucial assumption in the framework assumed by D’Hulst is that the syntactic structure does not contain neutral tense projections. This assumption has to be made in order to accommodate the infinitive in the matrix clause in structure (17). For if *habere*’s neutral relationship between R and E were to be realised in the structure, *habere* would leave a trace in T2, making it impossible for the infinitive to occupy that position. However, this assumption has a high price: it makes it impossible to distinguish between neutral and absent tense projections. Consequently, this framework does not make any syntactic distinction between present tense verb forms, which represent neutral relationships between S, R and E, and in finite verb forms, which are generally assumed to lack an S point (cf. Hornstein 1990).

Furthermore, to facilitate the transition from stage 1 to stage 2, D’Hulst has to assume the occurrence of a Perfect Shift as proposed by Giorgi & Pianesi (1997). Against this hypothesis several theoretical objections can be made: (i) the process tears apart bundles of features; (ii) after the Perfect Shift, T1P checks two different types of features at the same time; (iii) it is difficult to account for the fact that such a drastic change has only affected analytical verb forms, leaving synthetic verb forms unaltered.

Now let us turn to the data. D’Hulst hypothesis predicts that once *habere* becomes an auxiliary (stage 2), it should lose its lexical interpretation of possession. This entails that a past perfect form of *habere*, when combined with an infinitive, may only have a possessive reading, as only a biclausal structure has both a T1 and a T2 available for *habere*. (In a monoclausal structure, the T2 is occupied by the infinitive.) We have found four occurrences of the periphrasis displaying a past perfect form of *habere*, all of which have a purely modal reading (cf. example (15), repeated in (19)). Thus, the prediction made by D’Hulst’s hypothesis proves incorrect.
Furthermore, we have not found any evidence for the precedence of a biclausal stage; on the contrary. First of all, the earliest occurrences of the periphrasis are ambiguous between a lexical and a modal reading, indicating a monoclausal structure. Second, the first examples with an overt embedded CP appear in the 4th century A.D. (example (8), repeated in (20)), i.e. nearly five centuries after the rise of the periphrasis.

To summarise: we have argued that the assumption that neutral projections are not realised in the syntactic structure should be rejected on theoretical grounds. Furthermore, we have shown that the Perfect Shift hypothesis as well as the assumption that the monoclausal stage was preceded by a biclausal one are contradicted by the data. Consequently, the analysis as proposed by D’Hulst should be rejected.

4. Alternative hypothesis

In this section, we will propose an alternative analysis, based on Wurmbrand’s (2001) categorisation of infinitival complements into four categories.


Wurmbrand (2001) distinguishes four types of infinitival complements in German: lexical restructuring infinitives, functional restructuring infinitives, reduced non-restructuring infinitives and full non-restructuring infinitives. Table 1 below displays the four infinitival categories and their relevant syntactic properties as given by Wurmbrand (2001).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Structure properties, distribution</th>
<th>(Im)Possible operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring</td>
<td>Lexical INF = VP-layer</td>
<td>- no embedded (PRO) subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- no embedded structural case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- no embedded tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- no embedded negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- obligatory control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional INF = main predicate</td>
<td>- thematic properties are determined by the embedded predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced INF = vP or TP</td>
<td>- embedded (PRO) subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- embedded structural case possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- embedded tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- embedded negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- non-obligatory control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clausal INF = CP</td>
<td>- embedded (PRO) subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- embedded structural case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- embedded tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Latin ‘infinitive + habere’ clauses

In this section, we will apply Wurmbrand’s categorisation to the three types of Latin ‘infinitive + habere’ construction as selected in section 2.1 (*habeo unde cantare*, *habeo cantare* and *habeo ad cantare*).

Let us start with the clearest example: *habeo unde cantare*. The presence of an overt subordinate CP (example (22)) leaves only one option: it has to be a full non-restructuring infinitive. As is expected under this analysis, passivisation of the phrase affects the infinitive (example (23)). This implies that the infinitival complement contains an embedded structural case position, which is confirmed by example (24). All phrases contain an embedded PRO subject, as both the possessive *habere* and the infinitive assign an agent thetarole. Finally, long object movement and scrambling do not occur.

(22) (Cassiodori Discipulus, *Comm. in Ep. S. Pauli ad Corinthos* II,8,15)  
non habet cui dare  
not have-3SG.IND.PR.ACT. who-DAT.SG.M. give-INF.PR.ACT.  
‘He does not have (anybody) whom to give ... to’

In this table, Wurmbrand does not indicate the exact status of a functional restructuring infinitive. However, on page 138 she assigns it the phrase structure as given in (21), indicating that the infinitive is a vP, selected by an F°. We will consider the status assigned to the infinitive in (21) to be the exact status of a functional restructuring infinitive.

(21) ![Functional restructuring verb]![v subject]![vP main verb (infinitive)]

\[\text{[FP functional restructuring verb [vP subject [VP main verb (infinitive)]]]}\]
(23) (Cassiodori Discipulus, Comm. in Ep. S. Pauli ad Ephesos 3,29)
non habemus unde gloriari
Lit. : ‘We do not have from where be honored.’
--> ‘We do not have anything based on which we may be honored.’

(24) (Augustinus, Sermones 335,9)
ut habeamus unde
so that have-1PL.SUB.PR.ACT. from where
eleemosynam dare
Lit. : ‘So that we would have from where give alms’
--> ‘So that we would have something that would allow us to give alms.’

The construction have cantare has several properties in common with the construction have unde cantare: passivisation affects the infinitive (example (25)) and the infinitival complement contains an embedded structural case position (example (26)). Long object movement does not occur, but non-focus scrambling does (example (27)).

(25) (Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses 3,20,3)
a Dei adiumento habuimus
salvari
‘We had to / could / would be saved with the help of God.’

(26) (Tertullianus, De Anima 55,8)
habes et regionem inferum
credere et illos
cubito pellere qui...
‘You have to believe in a subterraneous area for the dead and chase away from your bed those wh...’

5 The presence of an embedded structural case position and the possibility to have non-focus scrambling contradicts Chomsky’s claim that ‘Move α applies to an element α only if morphological properties of α itself are not otherwise satisfied.’ (Chomsky 1995:201). Based on these data, we are forced to conclude that this claim is incorrect. Additional counter evidence will be provided in section 5.
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(27) (Praedestinatus 1,60)

\begin{verbatim}
  ergo  deus    illas    sordes
  therefore god-NOM.SG.M. that-ACC.PL.F.  filthiness-ACC.PL.F.
  habuit      sustinere
  have-3SG.IND.PF.ACT. endure-INF.PR.ACT.
\end{verbatim}

‘Therefore god had to endure these obscenities.’

In this construction, habere never has a purely possessive reading: it is either ambiguous between a possessive and a modal reading or purely modal. If we analyse habere as a modal verb in this construction, we have to conclude it is a raising verb rather than a control verb, as modal verbs are generally assumed not to assign a subject theta role (cf. Bhatt 1998; Vanden Wyngaerd 1994; Wurmbrand 2001). This implies that there is no embedded PRO subject. We are thus led to the conclusion that habeo cantare is a functional restructuring infinitive construction.

As we only have one example of the construction habeo ad cantare (example (9), repeated in (28)), it is extremely difficult to determine the exact structure of the construction. Two things are clear, however: there is no overt embedded CP and habere does not seem to assign a subject theta role. This indicates that we are dealing with a restructuring infinitive construction. Whether it is a case of lexical or functional restructuring cannot be determined based on this example.\(^6\)

(28) (Pardessus 1943-1949 :200)

\begin{verbatim}
  ... per   manus    nostras
  through hand-ACC.PL.F. our-ACC.SG.F.
  recipimus       vel ad recipere
  receive-1PL.IND.PR.ACT. or to receive-INF.PR.ACT.
  habemus
  have-1PL.IND.PR.ACT.
\end{verbatim}

‘...we receive or have to / will receive through our hands’

4.3. The origin of the conditional verb forms

From the data presented above it seems most likely that the Romance synthetic conditional verb forms have developed form the functional restructuring infinitive construction habeo cantare. In that construction, the merging of infinitive and auxiliary is not hampered by the presence of a subordinate CP, an infinitival marker or the adverb necesse as it is in the constructions habeo unde cantare, habeo ad cantare and necesse habeo cantare. Evidence sustaining this conclusion will be presented in section 5.3.

\(^6\) In section 5.2 we will present Old Romanian data which suggest that habeo ad cantare is a lexical restructuring infinitive construction.
Now that we have established a possible origin of the Romance conditional verb forms, we need to determine what caused this development. There are two options: the development may have been triggered by changing properties of *habere* or by changing properties of the infinitive. In this section we will argue for the latter option, based on Old Romanian data.

### 5.1. Romanian ‘avea’

The Romanian verb *avea* ‘have’ has two different declensions: full forms, to be used as an independent, lexical verb (*am, ai, are, avem, aveți, au*) and reduced forms, to be used as an auxiliary (*am, ai, a, am, ați, au*). This will prove to be a useful source of data concerning the development of the Romance conditional verb forms.

### 5.2. Romanian ‘avea + infinitive’

All of the Latin ‘infinitive + habere’ constructions discussed in section 2 have survived in Old Romanian. We will discuss the three types selected in section 2.1.

The first construction to be discussed is *am unde cînta*, the successor of the Latin construction *habeo unde cantare*. As example (29) shows, this construction has an overt embedded CP and an embedded structural case position. The possessive reading of *avea* suggests that it assigns an agent thetarole, which entails that the embedded CP must contain a PRO subject. We therefore have to conclude that we are dealing with a full non-restructuring infinitive construction. As can be seen in example (30), this structure uses the full lexical forms of *avea*.

(29) (v. Eeden 1997:224)

> ai unde te duce ?

*have-2SG.IND.PR.ACT. where you-ACC.SG. bring-INF.ACT.*

Lit.: ‘Do you have where to bring yourself?’

--> ‘Do you have a place to go to?’

(30) (v. Eeden 1997:84)

> IOn nu are in cine se

*IOn not have-3SG.IND.PR.ACT. to who himself-ACC.SG. entrust-INF.ACT.*

Lit.: ‘Ion does not have to whom to entrust himself.’

--> ‘Ion does not have anybody to rely on.’

The second construction is *am cînta*, the successor of the Latin construction *habeo cantare*. This construction lacks an overt embedded CP and allows
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scrambling (example (31)). There is probably no embedded PRO subject, as *avea* has a modal or temporal reading. We have to conclude that this is a case of functional restructuring. Interestingly, this structure uses the reduced forms of *avea*.

(31) (v. Eeden 1994 :258)

Ne-ad-mai întoarce
ourselves-ACC.PL. have-1PL.IND.PR.ACT. +/-again return-INF.ACT.

odată acolo.
someday there

Lit.: ‘We have ourselves return there again someday.’

--> ‘We would return there again someday.’

Finally, we would like to discuss the construction *am a cînta*, the successor of the Latin construction *habeo ad cantare*. This construction has no overt embedded CP and presumably no embedded PRO subject as *avea* has a modal or temporal reading (example (32)). We therefore have to conclude it is a restructuring infinitive construction.

(32) (Iliescu 2000 :433)

eu mult am a te
I-NOM.SG. much have-1SG.IND.PR.ACT. to you-ACC.SG.

sluji
serve-INF.ACT.

‘I have to serve you much.’

Again, the syntactic properties of this example do not permit us to determine whether it is a functional or lexical restructuring infinitive construction: the fact that this example does not contain an element in an embedded structural case position does not mean that such a position was not available. However, the form of *avea* does allow us to determine the exact status of the infinitive. As example (33) shows, the construction *am a cînta* uses the full lexical forms of *avea*.

(33) (Iliescu 2000 :433)

are a vedea
have-3SG.IND.PR.ACT. to see-INF.ACT.

Lit.: ‘He has to see.’

--> ‘He will see.’

The main difference in the properties of the verb ‘have’ in the different constructions is its status: in a non-restructuring structure and in a lexical restructuring structure, it is assumed to be a VP. In a functional restructuring structure it is assumed to be an FP. We propose that the difference in syntactic status is reflected in the appearance of Romanian *avea*: if it is a VP, the full lexical forms will be used (e.g. *are* in example (35)); if on the other hand it is an FP, the reduced forms will be used (e.g. *am* in example (36)). This
assumption leads us to conclude that in *am a cînta, avea* has the status of a VP, indicating a lexical restructuring structure.

5.3. The Old Romanian conditional

Although such a form did not survive in Modern Romanian,⁷ Old Romanian had developed a synthetic conditional verb form. As can be seen in example (34), this conditional used the reduced forms of *avea*, indicating that the conditional has indeed developed from the functional restructuring infinitive construction *am cînta* (*habeo cantare*).

(34) (v. Eeden 1994 :253)

\begin{verbatim}
dâ-rect \quad Domn-ul \quad sâ
give-\INF.ACT.-re-3SG.COND.ACT. \quad Lord-NOM.SG.M.-DEF.ART. \quad that
sosîti \quad teferi
arrive-2PL.SUB.ACT. \quad safe-NOM.PL.M.
\end{verbatim}

‘May the Lord grant that you arrive safely.’

Interestingly, the infinitive still displays the Latin ending –*re*. We may therefore conclude that the properties of *avea* changed before it merged with the infinitive, while the properties of the infinitive changed after it merged with the auxiliary. This indicates that the merging of infinitive and auxiliary took place in order to satisfy changing properties of the auxiliary, which lost its status as an independent verb and became an affix.⁸

6. The phrase structures of the Latin ‘infinitive + habere’ constructions

To conclude this exposition, we will present the phrase structures of the three ‘infinitive + habere’ constructions discussed in this paper.

Let us begin with the matrix phrase structure. An interesting fact is that the tense of the verb determines the position of the verb relative to the direct object. If the verb has simple past, simple future, past perfect or future perfect tense, it precedes the direct object. If, however, the verb has simple present or present perfect tense, it follows the direct object. There are two possible explanations for this difference in word order. One option is that the verb moves overtly to TP when it has a marked value (past / future) and covertly when it has a neutral value (present). Another option is that the direct object moves overtly to a position higher than the verb when the verb has present tense, but not when the verb has past or future tense. Although the first option might seem more logical, we are forced to argue for the latter based on the positions of subject and negation. Overt subjects usually precede the verb.

---

⁷ For a discussion of the Modern Romanian tense system, see D’Hulst, Coene & Avram (to app.).

⁸ Again, this contradicts Chomsky’ statement that ‘The operation Move α cannot apply to α to enable some different element β to satisfy its properties.’ (Chomsky 1995:201): in this case, the infinitive has moved up to satisfy the changing properties of the auxiliary.
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(unless the verb has been topicalised in SpecCP) but follow the conjunction. This could indicate that the subject is located in SpecTP and the verb in T°. However, sentential negation always intervenes between subject and verb. Within the Minimalist framework this forces us to conclude that NegP is located below TP, the subject occupies SpecTP and the verb does not raise overtly to T°.\(^9\) We therefore have to conclude that movement of the object to a position higher than its base position – presumably SpecVP – is determined by the tense of the verb: the object only moves to SpecVP overtly if the verb has a neutral tense value (i.e. present).\(^{10}\) These observations lead to the matrix phrase structure as given in (35).

(35) Latin matrix phrase structure

\[
[CP \left[ TP \left[ NegP \left[ vP/AspP \left[ VP \right] \right] \right] \right]]
\]

In the biclausal construction *habeo unde cantare*, the matrix VP selects a CP, which contains the infinitive. The infinitival complement contains a structural case position, but lacks a TP as the infinitive lacks an S point. This results in structure (36a). In the construction *habeo cantare*, *habere* is the head of an FP, selecting the infinitive. Again, the infinitival complement does have a structural case position, but lacks a TP, NegP and CP. This yields the structure as given in (36b). Finally, in the construction *habeo ad cantare*, the infinitive has the status of a bare VP, introduced by the infinitival marker *ad* (structure (36c)).\(^{11}\)

(36) Phrase structures of the Latin ‘infinitive + habere’ constructions

a) *habeo unde cantare*

\[
[CP \left[ TP \left[ NegP \left[ vP/AspP \left[ VP \left[ habeo \left[ CP \left[ vP/AspP \left[ VP \left[ cantare \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]]
\]

b) *habeo cantare*

\[
[CP \left[ TP \left[ NegP \left[ AspP \left[ FP \left[ habeo \left[ CP \left[ vP/AspP \left[ VP \left[ cantare \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]
\]

c) *habeo ad cantare.*

\[
[CP \left[ TP \left[ NegP \left[ vP/AspP \left[ VP \left[ habeo \left[ XP \left[ ad \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right] \right]
\]

7. Conclusion

To conclude, we have shown that there is no genealogical relationship between biclausal and monoclausal ‘infinitive + habere’ constructions in Latin; they are complementary constructions with different underlying structures that have developed independently. Consequently, the hypothesis of D’Hulst (2001), which seemed difficult to maintain from a theoretic point of view, has to be rejected on empirical grounds. We have shown that Latin and Old Romanian

---

\(^9\) Within the framework proposed by Giorgi & Pianesi (1997) and adopted by D’Hulst (2001), this problem could be solved by postulating the existence of a NegP between AgrSP and T1P. We have chosen, however, to adopt the more economical Minimalist structures.

\(^{10}\) A detailed account of this phenomenon lies beyond the scope of this paper and will not be pursued here.

\(^{11}\) The status of the infinitival marker *ad* remains to be determined. So far, we can only say that it is not a C°, nor a T° or v/Asp°.
data sustain Wurmbrand’s (2001) analysis of infinitival complements into four categories and we have argued that the Romance synthetic conditional verb forms have developed from a functional restructuring infinitive construction. We have furthermore argued that the development of the synthetic verb forms was triggered by changing properties of the auxiliary. The data presented in this paper contradict Chomsky’s (1995) claim that ‘Move α applies to an element α only if morphological properties of α itself are not otherwise satisfied’, as (i) movement of the infinitive takes place in order to satisfy morphological properties of the auxiliary and (ii) Latin allows non-focus scrambling of objects whose features are already satisfied.
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