

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; Rohlfs 1968; Thielmann 1885) that the Romance conditional verb forms have developed from the Latin periphrasis ‘infinitive + *habere*’ (cf. examples (1) and (2)).¹

- | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------------------|---|
| (1) | cantare | habebam | --> chanterais (Fr.),
cantaría (O.It.) |
| | sing-INF.PR.ACT. | have-1SG.IND.IMPF.ACT. | |
| (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-res --> appella-re-bas --> appelle-rai). This hypothesis has effectively been refuted by Arnavielle (1995), Nocentini (2001) and Posner (1998). We will not discuss it in this paper.

- (4) (Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* 6, 711)
 In multis hoc rebus
 concerning many-ABL.PL.M. this-ACC.SG.M. thing-ABL.PL.M.
 dicere habemus
 say-INF.PR.ACT. have-1PL.IND.PR.ACT.
 ‘We can say this about many things.’
- (5) (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?’
- (6) (Tertullianus, *Adversus Marcionem* 3,11)
 ... post quem habebat
 after which-ACC.SG.M. have-3SG.IND.IMPF.ACT.
 evenire
 happen-INF.PR.ACT.
 ‘... after which it had to / would happen.’
- (7) (Tertullianus, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum* 40,47)
 ... ad futuram gloriam, quae
 for future-ACC.SG.F. glory-ACC.SG.F. which-NOM.SG.F.
 in nos habet revelari
 in we-ACC.PL.M. have-3SG.IND.PR.ACT. reveal-INF.PR.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.SUB.PR.ACT. from where give-INF.PR.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.SG.F.
 recipimus vel ad recipere
 receive-1PL.IND.PR.ACT. or to receive-INF.PR.ACT.
 habemus
 have-1PL.IND.PR.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.

- (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.’

- (14) (Tertullianus, *Adversus Marcionem* 4,8)
 Nazareus vocari habebat
 nazareus-NOM.SG.M. call-INF.PR.PASS. have-3SG.IND.PR.ACT.
 secundum prophetiam
 according to prophecy-ACC.SG.F.
 ‘According to the prophecy he would be called Nazareus.’
- (15) (Arnobius Iunior, *Commentarii in Psalmos* 104,51)
 Nisi deus admonuisset me
 if not god-NOM.SG.M. warn-3SG.SUB.PLPF.ACT. I-ACC.SG.M.
 habueram peccare in te.
 have-1SG.IND.PLPF.ACT. sin-INF.PR.ACT. against you-ACC.SG.M.
 ‘If god had not warned me, I would have sinned against you.’

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

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) a) $[_{CP} [_{T1P} \text{habebam}_i \quad \quad \quad [_{VP} t_i [_{CP} [_{VP} \text{cantare}]]]]]]$
 b) $[_{CP} \quad \quad \quad [_{T2P} \text{habui}_i [_{VP} t_i [_{CP} [_{VP} \text{cantare}]]]]]]$

- (17) a) $[_{CP} [_{T1P} \text{habebam}_i [_{V_{auxP}} t_i [_{T2P} \text{cantare}_j \quad [_{VP} t_j]]]]]]$
 b) $[_{CP} [_{T1P} \text{habui}_i \quad [_{V_{auxP}} t_i [_{T2P} \text{cantare}_j \quad [_{VP} t_j]]]]]]$

- (18) $[_{CP} [_{Agr1P} \text{chanterais} / \text{cantaria} / \text{canterei}_i [_{T1P} t_i [_{VP} t_i]]]]$

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 infinite 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.

- (19) (Arnobius Iunior, *Commentarii in Psalmos* 104,51)
 Nisi deus admonuisset me
 if not god-NOM.SG.M. warn-3SG.SUB.PLPF.ACT. I-ACC.SG.M.
 habueram peccare in te.
 have-1SG.IND.PLPF.ACT. sin-INF.PR.ACT. against you-ACC.SG.M.
 ‘If god had not warned me, I would have sinned against you.’

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.

- (20) (Ambrosiaster, *Commentarius in Pauli Epistulas* 4,28)
 ... ut habeat unde tribuere
 so that have-3SG.SUB.PR.ACT. from where give-INF.PR.ACT.
 indigentibus
 needy-DAT.PL.M.
 Lit.: ‘... so that he may have from where give the poor’
 --> ‘... so that he may have funds to give to the poor.’

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.

4.1. Wurmbrand (2001) : restructuring versus non-restructuring infinitives

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).

- (23) (Cassiodori Discipulus, *Comm. in Ep. S. Pauli ad Ephesos* 3,29)
 non habemus unde gloriari
 not have-1PL.IND.PR.ACT. from where honor-INF.PR.PASS.
 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
 alms-ACC.SG.F. give-INF.PR.ACT.
 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 *habeo cantare* has several properties in common with the construction *habeo 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)).⁵

- (25) (Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses* 3,20,3)
 a Dei adiumento habuimus
 by God-GEN.SG.M. help-ABL.SG.N. have-1PL.IND.PF.ACT.
 salvari
 save-INF.PR.PASS.
 ‘We had to / could / would be saved with the help of God.’
- (26) (Tertullianus, *De Anima* 55,8)
 habes et regionem inferum
 have-2SG.IND.PR.ACT. and area-ACC.SG.F. dead-GEN.PL.M.
 subterraneam credere et illos
 subterraneous-ACC.SG.F. believe-INF.PR.ACT. and they-ACC.PL.M.
 cubito pellere qui ...
 bed-ABL.SG.M. chase away-INF.PR.ACT. who-NOM.PL.M.
 ‘You have to believe in a subterraneous area for the dead and chase away from your bed those who...’

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.

- (27) (Praedestinatus 1,60)
 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.
 ‘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)
 ... 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.
 ‘...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 from 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 *nesesse* as it is in the constructions *habeo unde cantare*, *habeo ad cantare* and *nesesse 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.

5. The cause of the development – evidence from Old Romanian

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 theta-role, 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 cîne se
 Ion not have-3SG.IND.PR.ACT. to who himself-ACC.SG.
 încrede
 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

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- am 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)
- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------|
| da-re-ar | Domn-ul | să |
| give-INF.ACT.-re-3SG.COND.ACT. | Lord-NOM.SG.M.-DEF.ART. | that |
| sosiți | teferi | |
| arrive-2PL.SUB.ACT. | safe-NOM.PL.M. | |
- ‘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’s 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.

(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 [TP [NegP [vP/AspP [VP]]]]]

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 [TP [NegP [vP/AspP [VP *habeo* [CP [vP/AspP [VP *cantare*]]]]]]]]]
- b) *habeo cantare*
[CP [TP [NegP [AspP [FP *habere* [vP/AspP [VP *cantare*]]]]]]]]]
- c) *habeo ad cantare*.
[CP [TP [NegP [vP/AspP [VP *habeo* [XP *ad* [VP *cantare*]]]]]]]]]

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.

References

- Arnavielle, T. (1995). André Lanly, 'Retour au conditionnel'. *Revue des Langues Romanes* 99 :1, pp. 186-188.
- Bourciez, É. (1967). *Éléments des linguistique romane*. Éditions Klincksieck, Paris.
- CLCLT-5 (2002). *Cetedoc library of latin texts 5* (cd-rom). Brepols Publisher, Turnhout.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. MIT Press, Massachusetts.
- Coleman, R. (1971). The origin and development of Latin *habeo* + infinitive. *The classical quarterly* 21:1, pp. 215-232.
- D'Hulst, Y. (2001). French and Italian conditionals : from etymology to representation. Guéron, J. & J. Lecarme (eds.), *The syntax of tense and aspect : proceedings of the international conference on the expression of tense and aspect*. Paris 2000.
- D'Hulst, Y., Martine Coene & Larisa Avram (to app.). Future and Future in the past readings. Mišeska Tomić, O. (ed) *Romanian Balkan Syntax and Semantics. Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today 67*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam
- Eeden, W. van (1994). *Grammatica van het Roemeens I : morfologie*. Grammar Publications, Amsterdam.
- Eeden, W. van (1997). *Grammatica van het Roemeens II : syntaxis*. Grammar Publications, Amsterdam.
- Fleischman, S. (1982). *The future in thought and language: diachronic evidence from Romance*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Giorgi, A. & F. Pianesi (1997). *Tense and aspect : from semantics to morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford.
- Hornstein, N. (1990). *As time goes by : tense and universal grammar*. MIT Press, Massachusetts.
- Iliescu, M. (2000). Grammaticalisation et modalités en roumain : le futur déictique et épistémique. Coene, M., W. de Mulder, P. Dendale & Y. D'Hulst (eds.), *Traiani Augusti vestigia pressa sequamur : studia linguistica in honorem Lilianae Tasmowski*. Unipress, Padova
- Lanly, A. (1973). Sur le conditionnel français et roman (à propos d'une remarque de M. Imbs). *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* 11:1, pp. 391-399.
- Nocentini, A. (2001). La genesi del futuro e del condizionale sintetico romanzo. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 117:3, pp. 367-401.
- Pardessus, J.-M. (1843). *Diplomata, chartae, epistolae, leges aliaque instrumenta ad res Gallo-Francicas spectantia: prius collecta a De Brequigny et La Porte du Theil, nunc nova rat. ordinata, plurimumque aucta II: Instrumenta ab anno 628 ad annum 751*. Typographeo regio, Paris.
- Pinkster, H. (1987). The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tense auxiliaries in Latin. Harris, M. & P. Ramat (eds.), *Historical development of auxiliaries*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, Amsterdam, p.193-223.
- Posner, R. (1998). Review of Lanly, A. 'Deux problèmes de linguistique française et romane I: Le conditionnel en -rais (et le future en -rai), II: Le verbe aller et ses frères romans.' *French studies quarterly review* 52:1, pp. 116-117.
- Roberts, I. (1992). A formal account of grammaticalisation in the history of Romance futures. *Folia linguistica historica* XIII, pp. 1-2.
- Rohlf's, G. (1968). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti 2: morfologia*.

- Einaudi, Torino.
- Thielmann, Ph. (1885). Habere mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums.
- Wölffin, E. von (ed.), *Archiv für lateinisches Lexikographie und Grammatik mit Einschluss des älteren Mittellateins*. Hildesheim, Leipzig.
- Wurmbrand, S. (2001). *Infinitives: restructuring and clause structure*. Mouton de Gruyter, New-York.