

Chapter 21

Complex predicates

Adina Dragomirescu, Alexandru Nicolae, and Gabriela Pană Dindelegan

21.1 Outline and scope

This chapter first discusses the various meanings associated with the concept of ‘complex predicate’ (hereafter CPred) and sets up a battery of reliable syntactic diagnostics for the identification of a CPred, which will be invoked throughout the analysis of the Romance empirical data.

We then address the shift from Latin syntheticity to the greater analyticity of the Romance languages, one of the most striking developments of which in the verbal domain is the emergence and subsequent profusion of a whole series of periphrastic verb constructions, which often add to and complement the older synthetic structures inherited from Latin to offer explicit marking of categories which were previously not distinctly marked (e.g., FECI ‘I did’ > synthetic Ro. *făcui* ‘I did’ alongside analytic *am făcut* ‘I did’; SCRIBO ‘I write/am writing’ > synthetic It. *scrivo* ‘I write/am writing’ alongside *sto scrivendo* ‘I am writing’). The transition from the morphologically-oriented structures of Latin to the increasingly syntactically-oriented structures of Romance (Ledgeway 2012:11) involves the grammaticalization of verbs such as HAVE, BE, WANT, OWE, COME, GO, MAKE, HOLD, STAND, FOLLOW, and the transfer of many inflexional categories from the lexical verb to the auxiliary / first component of the monoclausal CPred.

Taking stock of the set of syntactic diagnostics used to classify a given structure as a CPred, we turn to the analysis of the Romance facts, which are extremely well documented both in diachrony and in synchrony, and which can be used as a series of fruitful case studies to throw light on the diachronic and synchronic relationship between inflexion and periphrasis from a wider cross-linguistic perspective.

21.2 Delimitations and diagnostics

21.2.1 What is a complex predicate?

A large set of constructions with distinct properties has been considered to constitute CPreds, this notion often being applied in a vague and underspecified manner. In a very broad sense, any predicate structure that ‘consists of more than one piece is complex’ (Svenonius 2008:47). Under this broad understanding, even auxiliary-verb constructions have been included in the class of CPreds (Müller 2006; Abeillé and Godard 2002; 2003; ‘verbal complex’ in Monachesi 2005), a fact which, in a certain respect, captures the intuition that Romance auxiliaries represent a heterogeneous set of elements, which share fewer morphosyntactic properties than do English or other Germanic auxiliaries (Green 1987:257; Ledgeway 2012:119).

A coarser definition restricts the notion of CPred to constructions based on restructuring (Rizzi 1978) – defined as an operation by which ‘the scope of operations associated with a lower predicate [cliticization, auxiliary selection] is extended to the domain of a higher predicate’ in Cardinaletti and Shlonsky (2004:524) – and other related constructions such as: periphrastic causatives, verb-particle constructions, resultatives, *consider* + predicate combinations (in Amberber, Baker, and Harvey 2010), along with serial verb constructions and light verb constructions (in Svenonius 2008), and constructions with motion verbs, copula verbs, and perception verbs (in Abeillé and Godard 2002:404; 2003:125-27).

The common intuition, to which we return below, is that CPreds are monoclausal, this property variously being obtained either via clause union (Aissen and Perlmutter 1976) or restructuring (Rizzi 1978; 1982), i.e., as an operation by which an underlying biclausal

structure becomes a simple sentence (cf. also Pesetsky 2019 in this respect), or via direct selection of a complement of a smaller size than a CP (Wurmbrand 2001).

Other authors stress the fact that, monoclausality notwithstanding, there are subtler differences between different types of CPreds. In Baker and Harvey (2010), there are two types of CPreds, distinguished on the basis of the relation established between the component units: CPreds based on *merger* (the units share conceptual structure), the result being a predicate structure ‘whose range classes with the range of predicate structures found in monomorphemic predicates’ (Baker and Harvey 2010:13; cf. also Sheehan 2016:981 on Romance causatives) and CPreds based on *coindexation*, an operation which extends the conceptual structure of the predicate (e.g., perception verbs and *faire*-infinitive verbs, which do not obey the condition of the unique argument structure, Labelle 2017).

This chapter adopts a broad notion of CPreds and focuses on monoclausal periphrases whose component units are verbal in nature. Examples of particular interest include auxiliary-verb constructions (passive periphrases, resultative perfects, periphrastic futures and conditionals) and monoclausal constructions with aspectual, modal, causative, and perception verbs, typically complemented by a non-finite form.

21.2.2 Diagnosing monoclausality

From a formal perspective, the monoclausal nature of the CPred ensures that its components share one single extended projection, a property which derives the syntactic diagnostics variously proposed in the literature. The complex nature of these formations, in conjunction with monoclausality, explains why in some aspects CPreds pattern with prototypical words, but in others, with prototypical phrases (Amberber, Baker, and Harvey 2010:3); however, from a narrow syntactic perspective, only one of the component verbs (the bearer of TAM¹ (and phi-feature) information) serves as a syntactic head of the CPred (Svenonius 2008:55).

The following linguistic phenomena have been generally used to diagnose monoclausality:

(i) negation expressed exclusively on the higher head and disallowed in the embedded domain, illustrated with an Ibero-Romance aspectual periphrasis (Ledgeway 2012:127):

- 1 *o seu país non está (*non) buscando construir*
 the his country not is not seeking build.INF
 unha bomba nuclear (Glc.)
 a bomb nuclear
 ‘his country is not trying to build a nuclear bomb’

(ii) clitic climbing, illustrated with a Fr. *faire*-infinitive construction (Abeillé, Godard, and Sag 1998:2):

- 2 *Paul le fera lire aux élèves*
 Paul 3MSG.ACC= make.FUT.3SG read.INF to.the students
 de terminale (Fr.)
 of sixth.form
 ‘Paul will make the sixth-form students read it.’

¹ With certain periphrastic formations, TAM marking is shared between the two components; for example, in active *have/be* + participle constructions, aspect is formally marked on the participle; however, the auxiliary, which is the head of the formation from a narrow syntactic perspective, bears most of the grammatical information, marking, among other things, mood, tense, and phi-feature values.

(iii) *se/si*-passive adjoined to the higher head (Burzio 1986), illustrated with a Romanian ‘semi-auxiliary’ modal configuration (Guțu Romalo 2005):

- 3 *Romanele* *nu* *se* *pot* *scrie*
 novels.DEF not PASS= can.IND.PRS.3PL write.INF
peste noapte. (Ro.)
 over night
 ‘Novels cannot be written overnight.’

(iv) in certain languages the choice of perfective auxiliary of the lower verb is determined by the argument structure of the higher verb; e.g., in Italian, both in a prototypical restructuring configuration (4a), and in a compound passive (4b), the selection of auxiliary BE is determined by the unaccusative nature of *andare* ‘go’ and *stata* ‘been’ (Frank 1996):

- 4 a *Mario ci sarebbe proprio voluto andare.* (It.)
 Mario it be.COND.3SG really want.PTCP go.INF
 ‘Mario would have really wanted to go there.’
 b *Maria è stata accusata.* (It.)
 Maria be.AUX.PASS be.PTCP.F.SG accuse.PTCP.F.SG
 ‘Maria has been accused.’

Other phenomena taken to be sensitive to CPred formation (e.g., past participle agreement, reflexivization) are tied to more particular language-specific rules and cannot be taken as general tests of CPred formation (this is also the case of auxiliary selection, discussed above). It is also important to highlight that there are numerous structures which, despite showing a certain degree of cohesion, do not make up CPreds, but rather admit a biclausal analysis: Romanian causatives, modals, and perception verbs followed by the subjunctive, certain Spanish verbal periphrases, and future periphrases of the Fr. *aller*-type or Ro. *o* + subjunctive are all constructions in which clitic climbing, one of the characteristic signatures of monoclausality (but cf. Cinque 2004), does not apply (Abeillé and Godard 2003:125-27). The question of which combination permits or requires clitic climbing is also subject to variation in Romance, with particular language-specific and construction-specific options (e.g., clitic climbing occurs in French with causatives and perception verbs, but not with other classes of verbs) (Legendre 2007:294). Furthermore, Cinque (2004) stresses the fact that a given verb may be associated with two distinct syntactic configurations in the very same language: witness (5) below, where It. *volere* ‘want’ may occur both in a restructuring (5a) and a non-restructuring (5b) configuration, as testified by the presence (5a) or absence (5b) of clitic climbing.

- 5 a *Lo volevo [vedere subito]* (It.)
 3MSG.ACC= want.IPF.1SG see.INF immediately
 ‘(I) him wanted to see immediately.’
 b *Maria vorrebbe già averlo*
 Maria want.COND.3SG already have.INF=3MSG.ACC
 già lasciato (It.)
 already left.
 ‘Mary would already want to have already left him.’
 b' **Maria lo vorrebbe già aver*
 Maria 3MSG.ACC= want.COND.3SG already have.INF
 già lasciato (It.)

already left.

When restructuring/CPred formation does not apply, the properties of the lower verb do not extend to the higher verb; e.g., only when clitic climbing applies does the higher verb reflect the auxiliary selection properties of the lower verb (compare 6a and 6b) (Burzio 1986; Frank 1996). There are, of course, notable and important exceptions, e.g., *andare/venire* ‘go’/‘come’ always take auxiliary ‘be’, while *finire/cominciare* ‘finish’/‘start’ always take the auxiliary ‘have’ irrespective of clitic climbing (Adam Ledgeway, p.c.).

6	a	<i>I</i> the	<i>ragazzi</i> children	<i>si</i> REFL=	<i>sarebbero</i> be.COND.3PL	<i>voluti</i> want.PTCP.PL	<i>vedere</i> see.INF	(It.)
		<i>più spesso.</i> more often						
	b	<i>I</i> the	<i>ragazzi</i> children	<i>avrebbero</i> have.COND.3PL	<i>voluti</i> want.PTCP	<i>vedersi</i> see.INF=REFL		(It.)
		<i>più spesso.</i> more often						
		‘The children would have wanted to see each other more often.’						

Last but not least, while auxiliary-verb constructions and other monoclausal constructions have in common two of the core features which identify a CPred (clitic climbing and negation on the first verb), they exhibit major differences with respect to other important features; the review in Ledgeway (2012:119-50) is summarized in Table 21.1:

auxiliary-verb constructions

morphophonological reduction
adjacency (exc. Fr)
clitic forms
no VP-ellipsis
no stress

other monoclausal constructions

—
no obligatory adjacency
the same form as the lexical verb
VP ellipsis
stress (in answers)

Table 21.1 *Auxiliary-verb constructions vs other monoclausal constructions*

21.3. Auxiliaries

21.3.1 Introduction

In auxiliary-verb constructions, also labelled ‘verbal complexes’ (Ramat 1987; Monachesi 2005), the auxiliary is the bearer of TAM information, and the argument structure of the entire complex is that of the lexical verb. In contrast to Latin, where only the perfect passive and (semi-)deponent auxiliary ESSE ‘be’ is systematically used (see Ledgeway 2012:34fn9 on the apparent auxiliary usage of other verbs, e.g., UELLE ‘want’, POSSE ‘can’, DEBERE ‘must’), the Romance languages are characterized by a profusion of analytic, auxiliary-based constructions which replace or often add to and complement the existing synthetic structures (Green 1987:263; Ledgeway 2012:11,33), an empirical development reflecting the emergence of, (a), dedicated structural position(s) hosting auxiliaries to the left of the VP (Ledgeway 2012:33; 2017). A significant number of originally lexical verbs develop into a wide range of auxiliaries, following the parameters generally underlying such processes of grammaticalization: phonetic attrition, morphological specialization, morphosyntactic decategorialization, and semantic bleaching. The emergence of auxiliaries also triggers a redistribution in the marking of grammatical values (Vincent 1987; Danckaert 2016:132), i.e.,

- here too it.has.AUX.PST do.PTCP cold
 ‘here too it continues to be cold’
- 10 *siempre la he escuchado con atención,*
 always 3FSG.ACC= have.AUX.PST.1SG listen.to.PTCP with attention
pero nunca más (EuSp., in Penny 2000:159)
 but never more
 ‘I have always listened to her attentively, but never again.’
- 11 *la France a déclaré la guerre*
 the France has.AUX.PST.3SG declare.PTCP the war
en 1939 (spoken Fr.)
 in 1939
 ‘France declared war in 1939.’

There are two main factors which favoured the grammaticalization of HABERE as a perfective auxiliary: semantic bleaching of HABERE, from expressing an action with a durative value (initially a near synonym of TENERE ‘keep’) to expressing a relation, i.e., possession (Salvi 1987:229); subject coreference between the locative subject of HABERE and the agentive/experiencer subject of the participle, causing the subject of transitive and unergative participles to be reanalysed as the subject of the entire structure (Ledgeway 2012:131f.) (unaccusatives and passives occur with ESSE ‘be’, see §§21.3.3, 5). With HABERE losing the ability to host its own thematic subject, the argument structure of the participle is extended to the entire construction (the *Heir-Apparent Principle* of Harris and Campbell 1995); the participle becomes the lexical head of the extended projection of the simplified structure, and thematically empty HABERE becomes a placeholder for the mood and tense values of the entire construction. From a strictly syntactic point of view, one of the crucial steps in the development of the compound past is structural simplification (Roberts 2013), i.e., the removal of the thematic subject of HABERE.

Furthermore, in late Latin and in Romance there emerges an entirely new system for the future and the conditional, based on Latin periphrases involving the infinitive and the present indicative of HABERE (CANTARE HABEO ‘sing.INF have.PRS.1SG’, which gave rise to the Romance inflexional future Fr. *chanterai*, It. *canterò*, Sp. *cantaré* ‘I will sing’) and the infinitive and the imperfect of HABERE (CANTARE HABEBAM ‘sing.INF have.IPFV.1SG’, which is the origin of the Romance conditional: Fr. *chanterais*, It. *canterìa*, Sp. *cantarìa*) and, more rarely, the perfect of HABERE (CANTARE HABUI ‘sing.INF have.PFV.1SG’ yielding the Tuscan/modern Italian conditional *canterei* ‘I would sing’) (Vincent 1987:245f.; Pinkster 1987:25f.). The grammaticalization process involving futures and conditionals is radically different from that leading to compound past forms in two respects: first it emerged much earlier² from structures where HABERE is placed after the lexical verb (as it reflects a head-final ordering, this was taken as evidence for the claim that future and conditional auxiliaries grammaticalized earlier than compound past auxiliaries, see Adams 1991, Ledgeway 2012:33fn7)³, and, secondly, the final result is a novel synthetic form (in contrast to the compound past, which remained an analytic form all over Romance). The ‘new’ synthetic

² Cf. also the controversial example involving DARAS ‘you will give’ (juxtaposed to NON DABO ‘I will not give’) in seventh century Fredegarius, identified by Krusch (1888:85) (see Alkire and Rosen 2010:165).

³ Cf. early examples such as (i) given in Adams (1991:148–54), ambiguous between possibility and futurity:

(i) *si enim sustuleris istam tertiam, remanere habent duae* (Pompeius 129.26)
 ‘For if you take away the third [last syllable], two [syllables] will have to remain’

future emerged in all the Romance varieties, except Sardinian, Romanian, and Dalmatian (Ledgeway 2012:134f.).

Moreover, periphrastic future forms, which already existed in Latin from the classical period (Pinkster 1987:211) are attested in all the Romance languages. Sometimes, they are based on the auxiliary ‘have’, as in Abruzzese (*ajja cantà, hî da cantà, a da cantà, avem a cantà, avet a cantà, anno da cantà* – Ledgeway 2012:135) and in Romanian (*am să cânt, ai să cânți, are să cânte, avem să cântăm, aveți să cântați, au să cânte* ‘have.IND.PRS.1SG-3PL COMP.SBJV sing.SBJV.1SG-3PL’). However, these periphrastic formations do not show the same degree of morphosyntactic cohesion as analytic formations of the compound past type; for example, the Romanian ‘have’-future behaves incongruously with respect to the monoclausality diagnostics in that the clausal negator surfaces on the higher verb, ‘have’ (12a), while clitic climbing is impossible with the clitic surfacing in the domain of the lower verb (12b); furthermore, periphrastic formations based on the imperfect of ‘have’ with a future in the past interpretation are also possible (13) (Zafiu 2013:40f.).

- | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|
| 12 | a | <i>nu</i>
not | <i>am</i>
have.IND.PRS.1SG | <i>să</i>
COMP.SBJV | (* <i>nu</i>)
not | <i>cânt</i>
sing.SBJV.1SG | (Ro.) |
| | | ‘I’m not going to sing’ | | | | | |
| | b | (* <i>l-</i>) <i>am</i>
it=have.IND.PRS.1SG | <i>să-l</i>
COMP.SBJV=3MSG.ACC | | <i>cânt</i>
sing.SBJV.1SG | (Ro.) | |
| | | ‘I’m going to sing it’ | | | | | |
| 13 | | <i>aveam</i>
have.IND.IPFV.1SG | <i>să</i>
COMP.SBJV | <i>cânt</i>
sing.SBJV.1SG | (Ro.) | | |
| | | ‘I was going to sing’ | | | | | |

21.3.3 Auxiliary-verb constructions based on ESSE ‘be’

Although the grammaticalization of ESSE had been under way since Latin (when it was used as a perfective passive and as a periphrastic future auxiliary, Green 1987:259f.), the paths taken by ESSE in Romance are less numerous than those involving HABERE (for the Romance analytic passive, see §21.4). On the one hand, verbs semantically incompatible with HABERE, i.e., unaccusatives, were absorbed into the ESSE perfective periphrasis for (semi-)deponents and passives (Aranovich 2009:21), with which they have in common their co-occurrence of an Undergoer subject (Ledgeway 2012:133), a construction such as LAPSUS SUM (lit. slipped I.am, ‘I have slipped’) being constructed on the model of the passive AMATUS SUM (lit. loved I.am, ‘I have been loved’) (Burton 2016:165). These facts gave way to the well-known phenomenon of auxiliary selection in Romance varieties such as Italian (Burzio 1981; Centineo 1986; Van Valin 1987), French (Sorace 2000, 2004), old Spanish (Lamiroy 1999; Mackenzie 2006; Stolova 2006), old Romanian (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2013); this includes mixed systems which appear to illustrate the gradual phasing out of the proto-Romance active/inactive alignment and the return to the nominative/accusative alignment (Loporcaro 2007:173-85). On the other hand, in a language such as Romanian, the auxiliary ‘be’ grammaticalized as an irrealis marker (Avram and Hill 2007), which occurs in the structure of the perfect subjunctive (*să fi citit* COMP.SBJV be.IRREALIS read.PTCP ‘should have read’), the perfect conditional (*aș fi citit* AUX.COND.3SG/PL be.IRREALIS read.PTCP ‘I would have read’), the future perfect (*voi fi citit* AUX.FUT.1SG be.IRREALIS read.PTCP ‘I will have read’), the perfect infinitive (*înainte de a fi vorbit* before of to.INF be.IRREALIS talk.PTCP ‘before I/you etc. would have talked’), and the presumptive (*voi fi citind* AUX.FUT.1SG be.IRREALIS read.GER ‘I would be reading’).

21.3.4 Auxiliary-verb constructions based on other verbs

Except for the analytic forms with HABERE (§21.3.2), other future periphrases are based on proto-Romance **vo'lere* ‘want’ (Ro. *voi cânta, vei cânta, va cânta, vom cânta, veți cânta, vor cânta*; Friulian, southern Italian dialects), UENIRE (AD) ‘come to’ (Srs. *vegnel a cantar, vegns a cantar, vegn a cantar, vegin a cantar, veginis a cantar, vegen a cantar*), DEBERE ‘owe; must’ (in Sardinian), IRE/AMBULARE/VADERE ‘go’ (Sp. *voy a cantar, vas a cantar, va a cantar, vamos a cantar, vais a cantar, van a cantar*; and in French, Occitan, and (Brazilian) Portuguese) (Ledgeway 2012:122-24,134f.).

Other verbs enter periphrases expressing different temporal and aspectual values (Green 1987:259f.; Ledgeway 2012:122-24, 134f.; 2017:847): UENIRE ‘come’ expresses different values, from iterative aspect (14a) to past tense (14b), while TENERE ‘hold, keep’ expresses iterative aspect (14c) or the present perfect (14d); STARE ‘stand’ and SEDERE ‘sit’, along with ESSE may occur in passive, progressive, and present perfect periphrases (see §21.4.5).

- 14 a *l' ai* *tornat*
 3MSG=have.AUX.PST.1SG returned
 a veire (Lgd., in Ledgeway 2012:122)
 to see.INF
 'I saw him again'
- b *vaig* *anar* *al* *mercat*
 go.AUX.PST.1SG go.INF to.the market
 ahir (Cat., in Ledgeway 2012:123)
 yesterday
 'I went to the market yesterday'
- c *lo tenh* *de velhat* (Occ., in Ledgeway 2012:123)
 3MSGACC=hold.AUX.PRS.3SG of watched
 'she keeps watching him'
- d *el* *ga* *invecià*
 he have.AUX.PST.3SG aged
 tanto (Ven., in Ledgeway 2012:123)
 a.lot
 'he has aged considerably'

Many of the periphrastic structures occurring in Romance (e.g., the **vo'lere*, *TENERE*, and *STARE* periphrases) do not have forerunners in Latin texts (Pinkster 1987:195, 211).

21.3.5 TAM make-up of auxiliaries

Cross-Romance comparative considerations indicate that the division of labour in the marking of TAM categories in the analytic cluster varies across the Romance languages, and that the degree of the morphological richness of a given auxiliary differs from one Romance variety to another (Giacalone Ramat 2000:125; Nicolae 2015:82-84; 2019:31f., cf. also Fleischman 1983:183). Consider, for example, the contrast between the analytic paradigms with the grammaticalized descendants of HABERE in (standard) French (15) and (standard) Romanian (16).

- | | | | | |
|----|---|---|--------------------------|-------|
| 15 | a | <i>j'ai</i>
I.have.IND.PRS.1SG
'I have eaten/I eat' | <i>mangé</i>
eat.PTCP | (Fr.) |
| | b | <i>j'avais</i>
I.have.IND.IPF.1SG
'I had eaten' | <i>mangé</i>
eat.PTCP | (Fr.) |

c	<i>j'aurai</i> I.have.IND.FUT.1SG 'I will have eaten'	<i>mangé</i> eat.PTCP	(Fr.)
d	(<i>que</i>) <i>j'aie</i> that I.have.SBJV.PRS.1SG '(that) I have eaten'	<i>mangé</i> eat.PTCP	(Fr.)
e	<i>j'aurais</i> I.have.COND.1SG 'I would have eaten'	<i>mangé</i> eat.PTCP	(Fr.)
16	<i>eu am</i> I have.IND.PRS.1SG 'I have eaten/I ate'	<i>mâncat</i> eat.PTCP	(Ro.)

The contrast in (15)-(16) reveals that Romanian HAVE is unable to undergo tense variation (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; Avram and Hill 2007; Giurgea 2011; Nicolae 2015), but does however possess an unambiguous mood specification (indicative), while its French counterpart undergoes tense variation, mood and aspect variation. Thus, Romanian auxiliaries are mood-oriented, while French auxiliaries are tense-oriented (also marking mood and aspect values), a microparametric distinction which also accounts for the distinct nature of the multiple-auxiliary paradigms in these two languages: Romanian possesses multiple auxiliary structures in which auxiliaries encode mood-oriented information (17) (indicative/conditional and irrealis), while in French doubly compound structures auxiliaries have tense-oriented values (18).

17	<i>voi / aș</i> will.AUX.IND.FUT.1SG have.AUX.COND.1SG 'I will / would have sent'	<i>fi</i> be.IRREALIS=INF	<i>trimis</i> (Ro.) send.PTCP
18	<i>j'avais eu / j'ai</i> I=have.AUX.IPFV.1SG have.PTCP I=have.AUX.IND.PRS.1SG <i>eu envoyé</i> have.PTCP send.PTCP 'I had sent'		(Fr.)

21.4 The periphrastic passive

21.4.1 Synthetic vs analytic

The history of the passive represents another illustration of one of the most significant typological changes in the transition from Latin to Romance, namely the passage from Latin predominantly synthetic structures (AMATUR '(s)he is loved') to Romance chiefly periphrastic structures (Fr. *Il est aimé*, Ro. *El este iubit*, It. *Lui è amato*, Sp. *Él es amado* 'He is loved') (Danckaert 2017:217). The Romance periphrases are descendants of Latin constructions used for perfective paradigms (Danckaert 2017:216; Ledgeway 2021a:§1). The synthetic passive, restricted in Latin to imperfective paradigms (Danckaert 2017:216; Ledgeway 2021a:§1), was fully replaced in Romance by analytic formations made up of a descendant of ESSE or another auxiliary + a passive past participle, this representing a 'functional extension of an already existing periphrasis of the classical language' (Ledgeway 2012:16).

21.4.2 Frequency and distribution

There is a common place in the Romance reference literature concerning ‘unpopularity’ of the passive, especially in informal registers. While it is true that in some non-standard varieties of Italy the canonical passive is inexistent or very rarely used (see Ledgeway 2021a:§§2.1, 2.2 and references), it is equally true that in some contexts and under certain pragmatic conditions, especially in the standard languages, the passive has a wide distribution and a significant frequency. Overall, the usage of the passive is much more nuanced.

The considerable differences in usage depend on different factors: (i) type of register (formal vs informal register; written vs oral register – the formal and written registers resort to the passive much more often, see also Cennamo 2016:975); (ii) pragmatic conditions (the choice of the passive is tied to a given pragmatic context; for example, a particular way of formulating a question might influence the selection of the passive); (iii) semantic and syntactic-semantic type of verb (i.e., weak transitive verbs are rarely or never used in the passive; the ungrammaticality of the passive with stative, modal, measure verbs or unergative verbs with an internal object is well-documented); (iv) lexical restrictions of the Agent and of the Patient/Theme (the [+human] vs [-animate] feature bears upon the selection of the passive); for details on the frequency and distribution of the passive, see Ledgeway (2021a:§2.1, 2.2).

21.4.3 Participle agreement

Irrespective of other variables (auxiliary selection, participle agreement in the compound past, overt realization of the Agent, etc.), there is a constant feature of analytic passives across Romance: the passive past participle undergoes number and/or gender agreement with the clausal subject (19a-d). Brazilian Portuguese is exceptional in this respect: as a general tendency of agreement weakening, for some speakers, the participle does not undergo number agreement with preverbal subjects, and gender and number agreement with postverbal subjects (Ledgeway 2021a:§7.1).

- | | | | |
|----|---|--|-------|
| 19 | a | <i>Deputații</i> _{MPL} <i>sunt aleși</i> _{MPL} <i>de popor.</i> | (Ro.) |
| | b | <i>Les députés</i> _{MPL} <i>sont élus</i> _{MPL} <i>par le peuple.</i> | (Fr.) |
| | c | <i>I deputati</i> _{MPL} <i>sono eletti</i> _{MPL} <i>dal popolo.</i> | (It.) |
| | d | <i>Los diputados</i> _{MPL} <i>son elegidos</i> _{MPL} <i>por el pueblo.</i> | (Sp.) |
- ‘Deputies are elected by the people.’

21.4.4 The reflexive passive

Alongside the periphrastic passive, the Romance languages also make use of the reflexive passive; this construction is particularly productive in Romanian and Italian (D’Alessandro 2007; Maiden and Robustelli 2007:285f.; Adams 2013:711;), but also occurs in the other Romance varieties.

Without being equivalent in all occurrences, the auxiliary-based passive and the reflexive passive are used in parallel, with distinct features depending on the syntactic construction and stylistic register. The reflexive passive is specialized for the third person, singular and plural, with non-animate passive subjects and constructions with an unexpressed Agent (20); as for the linguistic register, it is preferred in popular and colloquial varieties.

- | | | | |
|----|---|--|-------|
| 20 | a | <i>Cărțile</i> <i>se</i> <i>citesc.</i> | (Ro.) |
| | | book.PL.DEF REFL.PASS.3PL read.PRS.3PL | |
| | | ‘Books are read.’ | |
| | b | <i>Si</i> <i>distrusse</i> <i>Dresda.</i> | (It.) |
| | | REFL.PASS.3SG destroy.3SG Dresden | |
| | | ‘Dresden was destroyed’ (Maiden and Robustelli 2000:285) | |

21.4.5 Inventory of passive (semi-)auxiliary verbs

In most Romance varieties, the passive periphrasis is based on *ESSE*, irrespective of the auxiliary/auxiliaries employed for the perfect.

Exceptionally, in southern Italian dialects spoken in the Pugliese province of Bari and in southeastern Lucania, *HABERE* is used as a passive auxiliary, in free variation with *ESSERE* and *UENIRE* (Loporcaro 1988; Cennamo 2016:975; Ledgeway 2021a:§3.4); this represents an extension of the free variation of *ESSERE* and *HABERE* from active constructions. A different situation is found with a southern Calabrian dialect from Polia, where, in the absence of this free variation with active forms, *avire* ‘have’ generalized, being used also in the passive (Marchese 2016, in Ledgeway 2021a:§3.4).

Besides the exceptional selection of *HABERE*, the Romance languages show considerable variation in the choice of the passive auxiliary. In French, Italian and Romanian (Abeillé and Godard 2003), prototypical *ESSERE* occurs with a full paradigm and with identical forms in the passive (21a) and in the copulative (21b) usage; note that Romanian also has a third usage of *be* – i.e., a perfective/irrealis auxiliary usage (cf. Avram and Hill 2007) –, with *be* being invariable⁴ (21c).

21	a	<i>Profesorul</i>	<i>trebuie</i>	<i>să</i>	(Ro.)
		teacher.SG.DEF	must.PRS.3SG	COMP.SBJV	
		<i>fie</i>	<i>plătit.</i>		
		be.SBJV.3SG	pay.PTCP		
	'The teacher must be paid'				
	b	<i>Profesorul</i>	<i>trebuie</i>	<i>să</i>	(Ro.)
		teacher.SG.DEF	must.PRS.3SG	COMP.SBJV	
		<i>fie</i>	<i>bătrân.</i>		
		be.SBJV.3SG	old		
	'The teacher must be old'				
c	<i>Profesorul</i>	<i>trebuie</i>	<i>să</i>	(MRo.)	
	teacher.SG.DEF	must.PRS.3SG	COMP.SBJV		
	<i>fî</i>	<i>plătit</i>	<i>pentru serviciile</i>		<i>cerute.</i>
	be.INV	pay.PTCP	for		services.DEF
'The teacher must have paid for the required services'					

Alongside prototypical *essere* ‘be’ (22a), Italian also employs *venire* ‘come’ (22b) and *andare* ‘go’ (22c), the former for the dynamic passive, the latter for a deontic passive (Ledgeway 2016:226). Their occurrence in compound tenses (hence their combination with another auxiliary) is disallowed. *Venire* incorporates a dynamic value (i.e., in contrast to *La porta è aperta* ‘The door is open(ed)’, which is ambiguous between a stative and a dynamic reading, *La porta viene aperta* ‘The door gets opened’ is unambiguously dynamic) (Maiden and Robustelli 2007:284); the *andare* passive is characterized by more complex restrictions (see Maiden and Robustelli 2007:282f.).

22	a	<i>Il topo</i>	<i>è mangiato</i>	<i>dal gatto.</i>	(It.)
		the mouse(MSG)	is eat.PTCP.MSG	by cat	

⁴ In old Romanian, perfective/irrealis *be* also occurred with variable forms, and had identical forms with copulative and passive *be* (Nicolae 2015:120, n5):

(i)	<i>să</i>	<i>fi</i>	<i>noi</i>	<i>iubit</i>	<i>pre</i>	<i>Dumnezeu</i>	(ORo.)
	COMP.SBJV	be.SBJV.1PL	we	love.PTCP	DOM	God	
	‘for us to have loved God’						

[illegible]

24 a *Los terroristas* *fueron* *arrestados*
 the terrorists.MPL be.PRT.3MPL arrest.PTCP.PL
 por la policía. (Sp.)
 by the police
 ‘The terrorists were arrested by the police.’

 b *Los terroristas* *están* *arrestados.*
 the terrorists.MPL be.IND.PRS.3PL arrest.PTCP.MPL
 ‘The terrorists are under arrest.’

25 *Sa màchina keret acconzada*
 the car.FSG want.IND.PRS.3SG repair.PTCP.FSG
 dae mechanic (Srd.)
 by mechanic
 ‘This car needs to be repaired by a mechanic.’

Dragomirescu, Adina & Nicolae, Alexandru & Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2022. Complex Predicates. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Romance Linguistics*, 571–603. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108580410.023>

- 26 *La propoſta* *vign* *acceptada.* (Rms.)
 the proposal.FSG come.IND.PRS.3SG accept.PTCP.FSG
 ‘The proposal is accepted.’

Besides the grammaticalized BE construction in (27), in non-standard registers Romanian also employs *veni* ‘come’ (28) in constructions with a modal necessity value (Iordan 1950; Pană Dindelegan 2003:133-39; Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2014). Like Sardinian and southern dialects of Italy, Romanian features a construction based on a deontic modal, *a trebui* ‘must’ (29), used with a full paradigm (see also Cabredo Hofherr 2017:244).

- 27 *Copiii* *sunt* *lăudați* *de părinți.* (Ro.)
 children.DEF.Mbe.IND.PRS.3PL praise.PTCP.MPL by parents
 ‘The children are praised by their parents.’
- 28 a *Cratița* *în care* *se* *coace cozonacul* *vine*
 pan.DEF.F in which CL.REFL.PASS bakes cake.DEF comes
 unsă *cu* *unt.* (Ro.)
 smear.PTCP.FSG with butter
 ‘The pan in which the pound cake is baked has to / must / ought to be / is smeared with butter.’
- b *Celălalt* *bec* *vine* *slăbit.* (Ro.)
 the.other bulb.MSG comes loose.PTCP.MSG
 ‘The other bulb must be loosened.’
- 29 *Cartea /* *cărțile* *trebuia /* *vor* *trebui*
 book.F.DEF books.FPL.DEF must.IPFV will.AUX.FUT.3PL must.INF
 citită / *citite* *de elevi* (Ro.)
 read.PTCP.FSG read.PTCP.FPL by students
 ‘The book(s) were to be read / will have to be read by the students.’

Among the sub-Danubian varieties, the *veni* ‘come’ and *rămâne* ‘remain’ passives occur occasionally in Istro-Romanian (30) (Sârbu and Frățiță 1998:66). Given the circulation of these passives in areas of contact with Venetan, it is presumed that Venetan might have played a role in the existence of these constructions, yet it is hard to decide whether language contact is the sole source for these constructions (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2014:79).

- 30 a *ie* *vire* *ucis*
 he comes kill.PTCP
 ‘he is killed’
- b *ie ramas-a* *ucis*
 he remain=have.AUX.PST.3SG kill.PTCP
 ‘he was killed’

In several Romance languages (Fr., Ptg., Sp., It., Cat., and Ro.), especially in the journalistic and literary styles, the verb ‘see’ accompanied by the reflexive pronoun is used in passive structures, followed by a participle or an infinitive (31) (Giacalone Ramat 2017:170-3; Ledgeway 2021a:§3.5).

- 31 a *Il* *se* *voyait* *envahir /* *envahi*

- he REFL see.IMPF.3SG overrun.INF overrun.PTCP
par un sentiment d'échec. (Fr.)
 by a feeling of-failure
 'He was being / was taken over (lit. saw himself to invade / invaded) by a sense of failure'
- b *El s-a văzut abandonat și*
 he REFL=have.AUX.PST.3SG abandon.PTCP and
uitat de Dumnezeu. (Ro.)
 forget.PTCP by God
 'He saw himself abandoned and forgotten by God'

21.4.6 The double passive

A special construction attested across non-formal varieties of modern Spanish, but deemed absent from the other Romance languages, is the 'double passive' (32a-b) (Bosque and Gallego 2011). The construction consists of a cluster made up of two verbal complexes: a passive periphrasis with the lexical verb and the auxiliary *ser* 'be' and a doubling periphrasis, made up of a tensed form of *ser* and an aspectual verb. Bosque and Gallego (2011) analyse this construction as a type of syntactic doubling, and stress the expletive nature of some of the components (the low auxiliary and the high, aspectual, participle). A similar phenomenon is found in colloquial French with the aspectual verbs *finir* 'finish' / *commencer* 'begin' (32c); here, the passive reading of the infinitival complement is formally marked on the aspectual verb (Ledgeway 2021a:§2.3).

- 32 a *La ermita fue empezada a ser*
 the hermitage be.IND.PRT.3SG start.PTCP.FSG to be
construida en el siglo XIV (Sp.)
 build.PTCP.F.SG in the century 14
 'The hermitage was started to be built in the fourteenth century'
- b *El misil fue acabado de ser armado ayer.* (Sp.)
 the missile be.IND.PRT.3SG finish.PTCP of be arm.PTCP yesterday
 'The missile was finished being armed yesterday'
- c *La maison est finie de construire.* (Fr.)
 the house be.PRS.3SG finish.PTCP.FSG of build.INF
 'The house has finished being built.'

21.4.7 The position of constituents in the passive periphrasis

The preferred word order in Latin passive ESSE-constructions places the auxiliary in postposition (participle > ESSE), but the reverse word order is also possible (ESSE > participle) (Ledgeway 2012:223). In a statistical analysis, Bauer (2006:294) convincingly demonstrates that the ESSE > participle word order gradually extends in the history of Latin. In accordance with the passage from a head-final to a head-initial grammar, the word order ESSE > participle continues to gradually surpass the reverse word order in the diachrony of the Romance languages (for the word order preferences of late Latin, see the percentages in Danckaert 2017:226). For example, the patterns with pre-auxiliary participles (33) were much more frequent in old Romanian than in modern Romanian, where the auxiliary + participle word order, productive since old Romanian (34), has generalized.

- 33 *Deaci dzise se aducă Pavelu.*
 do say.PST COMP.SBJV bring.SBJV.PRS.3SG Paul
Adusu fu el de ceia... (ORo.)

bring.PTCP be.PST.3SG he by those
 ‘So he meant to bring Paul. He was brought by those...’

- 34 *nu sunt* *dumnedzei* *ceia* *ce-su*
 not be.IND.PRS.PL gods those who=be.IND.PRS.3PL
 cu mârule *fapți* (ORo.)
 with hands.DEF make.PTCP.MPL
 ‘They are not gods who are made with the hands.’

On the basis of word order evidence, the recent literature documents an attempt towards reconsidering the emergence of the Romance analytic passive (e.g., It. *sono amato* ‘I am loved’). Thus, according to this hypothesis, based on the word order difference between the Latin pattern (AMATUS EST ‘he has been loved’) and its Romance counterparts, which feature the word order auxiliary > participle, the analytic passive does not descend from a Classical Latin structure, but rather represents a new formation, not older than the fourth century AD (Danckaert 2017).

21.4.8 Monoclausal properties

In contrast to tense and mood auxiliaries, which present many syntactic and morphophonological signs of decategorialization (grammaticalization), the periphrastic passive formation has greater autonomy, ensuring, among other features, the possibility of employing multiple (semi)auxiliaries in the passive (this represents one of the reasons why the term ‘semi-auxiliary’ is more appropriate than ‘auxiliary’ with reference to the analytic passive). This also accounts for the fact that, in the absence of a broader linguistic or extralinguistic context, these periphrases are systematically ambiguous: constructions like (35a) may be read either as passives (35b), or as [copula + predicative] constructions (35c).

- 35 a *Pâinea* *este* *coaptă* (Ro.)
 bread.DEF.FSG is bake.PTCP.FSG
 ‘The bread is baked.’
 b *Pâinea* *este* *coaptă* *cu grijă.* (Ro.)
 bread.DEF.FSG is bake.PTCP.FSG with care
 ‘The bread is carefully baked.’
 c *Pâinea* *este* *foarte coaptă,* *aproape* *arsă.* (Ro.)
 bread.DEF.FSG is very bake.PTCP.FSG almost burn.PTCP.FSG
 ‘The bread is well baked, almost burned.’

Also, there are significant differences in the behaviour of the passive auxiliaries: the BE-auxiliary behaves in all aspects like a copula verb, while auxiliaries based on motion verbs exhibit clear signs of grammaticalization, the most important of which is the loss of the motion semantics. Using for illustration material from Romanian, the diagnostics below synthesize the monoclausality vs autonomy properties for the analytic BE-passives. Diagnostics for monoclausality:

(i) negation expressed exclusively on the auxiliary:

- 36 *Nu mi-au* *fost* *date* *cărțile.*
 not 1SG.DAT=have.AUX.PST.3PL be.PTCP give.PTCP.FPL books.DEF.FPL
 ‘The books were not given to me.’

(ii) (dative) clitic climbing (accusative clitics are excluded by default in the passive):

- 37 *Mi-au* *fost* *date* *cinci cărți.*
 1SG.DAT=have.AUX.PST.3PL be.PTCP give.PTCP.FPL five books.F
 ‘Five books were given to me.’

(iii) occurrence of the passive in restructured modal configurations (see §21.6):

- 38 a *Cartea* *poate fi citită* *de elev.*
 book.DEF.FSG can be.INF read.PTCP.FSG by student
 ‘The book can be read by the student.’
- b *Cartea* *îmi* *poate fi furată* *oricând.*
 book.DEF.FSG 1SG.DAT= can be.INF steal.PTCP.FSG anytime
 ‘My book can be stolen from me at any time’

Diagnostics for autonomy:

- (i) semantically, passive BE behaves like any other copula;
(ii) passive BE has a full paradigm (like existential BE): it shows no sign of morphophonological erosion and may co-occur with other (TAM-expressing) auxiliaries (39);

- 39 (*Aș fi dorit*) *să fi fost*
have.AUX.COND.1SG be.INF want.PTCP COMP.SBJV be.INF be.PTCP
ajutat de prieteni. (Ro.)
help.PTCP by friends
‘I would have wanted to have been helped by friends.’

(iii) full constituents may be interposed between passive BE and the participle (40a), and the participle may be even topicalized (40b), giving rise to the word order participle > passive auxiliary;

- 40 a *A* *fost* *și* *astăzi* *lăudată*.
 have.AUX.PST.3SG be.PTCP also today praise.PTCP.FSG
 ‘She was praised today as well.’
- b *Știut* *este* *că...*
 know.PTCP is that
 ‘It is known that...’

(iv) passive BE may be replaced by other auxiliaries (41a) or be elided (41b).

- 41 a *Cratița* *este / rămâne / trebuie / vine* *unsă*
 pan.DEF.FSG is remains must be comes smear.PTCP.FSG
 cu unt.
 with butter
 ‘The pan is/remains/must be/comes smeared with butter.’
- b *Obligată* *de părinți, a* *renunțat*
 force.PTCP.FSG by patents have.AUX.PST.3SG give.up.PTCP
 la facultate.
 at faculty
 ‘Forced by her parents, she gave up university.’

21.5. Aspectual periphrases

In Romance, aspectual values are often (but not always) syncretic with temporal values (Bertinetto and Squartini 2016:939; Maiden 2016:501f.) but there also exist numerous verbs which lexically encode aspect, and aspectual periphrases with verbs having different meanings, which show a CPred behaviour. These aspectual periphrases are made up of a verb (such as CONTINUE, BE, STAND, GO, HOLD, etc.) bearing the inflexional information and a lexical verb in the infinitive or the gerundive.

Verbs lexically encoding aspect in Romance have a different behaviour. Similarly to other classes of verbs, in standard Italian, clitic climbing is not obligatory with aspectuals⁵ (Rizzi 1982:4), hence their CPred status is contextual (42); in Romanian negation and clitic climbing are obligatorily hosted by the aspectual verb when it is followed by a supine (43a) (Dragomirescu 2013:196f.), but when the second verb is in the infinitive (43b) or the subjunctive (43c-d) the construction receives a biclausal analysis, as negation may occur either on the higher verb (43c) or on the lower verb (43d) (with scope differences), and clitic climbing is disallowed (43b).

- 42 a *Gianni continua a / sta per raccontargli*
 Gianni continue.PRS.3SG to stay.PRS.3SG for tell.INF=3DAT
 stupide storie. (It., in Rizzi 1982:4)
 stupid things
- b *Gianni gli continua a/sta per raccontare*
 Gianni DAT.3= continue.PRS.3SG to stay.PRS.3SG for tell.INF
 stupide storie. (It., in Rizzi 1982:4)
 stupid things
 ‘Gianni is continuing / going to tell him stupid stories’
- 43 a *Cărțile nu le termină de*
 books.DEF.F not 3FPL.ACC= finish.PRS.3SG of.SUP
 citit. (Ro.)
 read.SUP
- b *Cărțile (*le) nu termină*
 books.DEF.F 3FPL= not finish.PRS.3SG
 a le citi. (Ro.)
 to.INF F.3PL= read.INF
 ‘He doesn’t finish reading the books.’
- c *Nu continuă să vină*
 not continue.PRS.3SG COMP.SBJV come.SBJV.3SG
 la ore. (Ro.)
 to hours
 ‘(S)he doesn’t keep on attending classes’
- d *Continuă să nu vină*
 continue.PRS.3SG COMP.SBJV not come.SBJV.3SG
 la ore. (Ro.)
 to hours
 ‘(S)he keeps on not attending classes’

⁵ In actual usage, clitic climbing is always obligatory in the regional Italian of southern speakers, but usually absent in the speech of northern speakers, this distribution reflecting the options found in the dialects spoken in each area in turn (Adam Ledgeway, p.c.)

Aspectual (progressive) BE-periphrases are specific to Gallo-Romance, Italian, and Sardinian (44a) (Bertinetto and Squartini 2016:947-50; Andriani 2017:197). Romanian also possesses an imminent periphrasis made up of *fi* ‘be’ and the subjunctive (44b), which disallows clitic climbing (and allows for negation both on the higher, and on the lower predicate, with scope differences), therefore not qualifying as a CPred. Squartini (1998:27-29) indicates that the aspectual BE-periphrases with a gerund/present participle are also attested in Catalan (*estar*), French (*être*), Galician (*estar*), Portuguese (*estar*), and Spanish (*estar*). Imminent and proximate periphrases may be also found in Catalan, French, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish (Bertinetto and Squartini 2016:951).

- | | | | | |
|----|---|---------------------|-----------|--|
| 44 | a | <i>so</i> | | <i>travallande</i> (Srd., Jones 1993:83) |
| | | be.IND.PRS.1SG | | work.GER |
| | | '(I) am working.' | | |
| | b | <i>era</i> | <i>să</i> | <i>te</i> <i>lovesc</i> (Ro.) |
| | | be.IPFV | COMP.SBJV | 2SG.ACC= hit.SBJV.1SG |
| | | 'I almost hit you.' | | |

Aspectual (progressive) STAND-periphrases are specific to Italo-Romance and Ibero-Romance, where they represent a widespread option for expressing progressive aspect (45a,b); diachronically, in many Romance varieties (but not in all of them; cf. standard European Portuguese and Romanesco) the infinitive was replaced by the gerund in these constructions (Andriani 2017:198f.). The infinitive is still an option in certain varieties, being introduced by the non-finite subordinator *a* ‘to’ (46a,b). The infinitival STAND-periphrasis (alternating with the gerundial one) is also attested in Neapolitan, western Abruzzese, Laziale, and Tuscan varieties (see Andriani 2017:ch.5 for an overview).

- 45 a *ma non vedi* *che* *sto*
 but not see.IND.PRS.2SG that stand.IND.PRS.1 SG
 guidando? (It., Andriani 2017:199)
 drive.GER
 ‘can’t you see I’m driving (right now)?’
 b *istan* *fakende* *su mándicu* (Srd., Jones 1993:84)
 stand.IND.PRS.PL make.GER the food
 ‘they are preparing the meal’

46 a *tu* *duorme* *e* *Ninno tuo* *stacə*
 you sleep.IND.PRS.2SG and Ninno your stands
 a penarə (Nap., Rohlfs 1969:133)
 to suffer.INF
 ‘you’re sleeping and your Ninno is suffering’
 b *estou* *a falar* *com*
 stand.IND.PRS.1 SG to speak.INF with
 você (EuPt., Mendes Mothé 2006:1554)
 you
 ‘I’m speaking to you’

The GO-andative periphrasis with infinitives is specific to certain Italian varieties, where it is found in an early grammaticalization stage, without (yet) encoding temporal and aspectual information (Andriani 2017:205) (47); this type of structure underwent further grammaticalization as an intentional future in Ibero-Romance (48). GO is also attested in

- Other verbs which may be part of aspectual (progressive) gerundial periphrases have been recorded by Squartini (1998:27-29): COME (Cat. *venir*, Gal./Pt. *vir*, It. *venire*, Sp. *venir*), WALK (Glc., Pt., Sp. *andar*), and CARRY (Glc. *levar*, Sp. *llevar*).

Unlike auxiliaries (§21.3), but similarly to aspectuals (§21.5), modal verbs (reflexes of proto-Romance *po'tere 'be able', Lat. DEBERE/HABERE DE-AB 'must', proto-Romance *vo'lere 'want', Lat. QUAERERE 'seek, require') selecting an infinitive or a non-finite complement do not generally show signs of morphophonological erosion, yet they pass to variable degrees the generally accepted CPred diagnostics (§21.2).

49	a	<i>nous pouvons</i>	<i>les</i>	<i>aider</i>	(Fr.)
		we can.IND.PRS.1PL	3.MPL=	help.INF	
		'we can help them.'			
	b	<i>los anam</i>	<i>(los) ajudar</i>	(Lgd.)	
		3MPL= go.IND.PRS.1PL	3MPL= help.INF		
	c	<i>los vamos a</i>	<i>ayudar</i>	<i>(los)</i>	(Sp.)
		3MPL= go.PRS.1PL to	help.INF	=3MPL	
		'we are going to help them.'			
	d	<i>El Pere ho</i>	<i>deu</i>	<i>explicar</i>	(-ho) (Cat.)
		the Pere 3NSG.ACC=	must.PRS.3SG	explain.INF=	3NSG.ACC
		'Pere must explain it.'			
	e	<i>Mario lo</i>	<i>vuole / sa</i>	<i>risolver(lo)</i>	<i>da solo</i>

- Mario 3MSG.ACC= wants knows solve(=3MSG) by himself
(*questo problema*). (It.)
this problem
'Mario wants to / can solve it by himself (this problem).'
- f 'e gghjammo a aiutà (Nap.)
3MPL.ACC go.IND.PRS.1PL to help.INF
'we are going to help them.'
- 50 a *îi pot* (**îi) *ajuta* (Ro.)
3MPL.ACC= can.IND.PRS.1SG 3MPL.ACC= help.INF
'I can help them'
- b *le trebuie* (**le) *date cărți fetelor* (Ro.)
3PL.DAT= must 3PL.DAT= give.PTCP.FPL books girls.DEF.DAT
'Books must be given to the girls'
- c *îl are de* (**le) *citit.* (Ro.)
3MSG.ACC= has K.SUP 3MSG.ACC= read.SUP
'(S)he has to read it'

Romanian modals present a more complex picture, as they may take a wider range of complements: they can select either a non-finite complement – a bare short infinitive (50a) (the modal *putea* 'can, be able', in a diachronically stable construction, Hill 2012), a participle or a prepositionless supine (50b) (the modal *trebui* 'must, have to') or a supine (50c) (*avea* 'have', in its modal usage) –, or a subjunctive clausal complement (51) (a Balkan Sprachbund property, cf. Sandfeld 1930:173-80). The subjunctive configuration is unambiguously biclausal (Nicolae 2013:ch.4), as shown by impossibility of clitic climbing and by the availability of negation in the embedded domain. Reflexes of *vo'lere / QUAERERE may also take a finite clausal complement and, in Spanish and Neapolitan, a participial complement (52) (Ledgeway 2012:121).

- 51 (*Îl) *pot* *să* *nu* (îl)
3MSG.ACC= can.IND.PRS.1SG COMP.SBJV not 3.MSG.ACC=
citesc. (Ro.)
read.SBJV.1SG
'I can not read it'
- 52 a *quería que preparasen todo /* *preparado*
b *vuleva ca preparassero tutta cosa /* *preparata*
want.PST.3SG that prepare.PST.3PL everything prepare.PTCP
todo (Sp.)
tutta cosa (Nap.)
everything
'He wanted for them to prepare everything / everything prepared'

The availability of negation in the embedded domain is also subject to variation: while in languages such as French (53a) and Spanish (53b) (Zagona 2002:195) the clausal negator may freely occur in the embedded domain, in Romanian non-finite configurations (53c) (Nicolae 2013:ch.4) and in Neapolitan (53d) (Ledgeway 2000:168) negation exclusively occurs in the domain of the modal verb:

- 53 a *il peut ne pas dire toute la vérité* (Fr.)

	he	may.PRS.IND.3SG	not	not	say.INF	all	the	truth	
	'He may not say all the truth'								
b	<i>La cámara no puede</i>		<i>leer</i>		<i>el nivel de la carga</i>			(Sp.)	
	the camera	not can.IND.PRS.3SG	read.INF		the level of the charge				
	'The camera cannot read the level of the charge'								
c	<i>nu poate</i>		(**nu) <i>spune</i>		<i>tot adevărul</i>			(Ro.)	
	not	can.PRS.IND.3SG	not	say.INF	all truth.DEF				
	'He cannot say all the truth'								
d	<i>dubbeto</i>		<i>'e num puté</i>		<i>veni</i>			(Nap.)	
	doubt.IND.PRS.1SG	of	not	be.able.INF	come.INF				
	'I doubt that I won't be able to come'								

Therefore, there appears to be a strong correlation between clitic climbing and the availability of negation in the embedded non-finite domain: languages/configurations with obligatory clitic climbing (Romanian, Neapolitan) disallow negation in the embedded domain, while languages/configurations in which clitic climbing is blocked (French) or optional (Spanish, Italian) freely allow the negator to occur in the embedded domain. This shows that in the former type of languages, the modal verb and its non-finite complement make up a monoclausal configuration, ensuring that CPred formation is obligatory.

Of the Romance languages which show auxiliary selection, only in Italian (54a) and Occitan (54b) (but not in French and Neapolitan), is the auxiliary which surfaces on the modal verb sensitive to the transitive / unaccusative nature of the embedded infinitive (Ledgeway 2012:121).

54	a	<i>non mi sono potuto</i>		<i>addormentare</i>	(It.)
	b	<i>me soi pogut</i>	<i>pas</i>	<i>dormir</i>	(Lgd.)
		not myself=am been.able	not	fall.asleep.INF	
	'I couldn't fall asleep.'				

To sum up, modal verbs show variable degrees of concatenation with their non-finite complement across Romance; while the tight monoclausal nature of the [modal verb + infinitive/non-finite complement] complement is evident in Romanian and Neapolitan, the same is not true of the other Romance languages, in which optional or impossible clitic climbing and the availability of negation in the embedded domain testify to a looser concatenation of the modal verb and the infinitive.

21.7. Causative complex predicates

21.7.1 Introduction

Most of the Romance languages, except for modern Daco-Romance (Benucci 1993:53), feature causative constructions with the Romance reflexes of Lat. FACERE 'make, do' (55a), LAXARE 'let' (55b) and MANDARE 'command' (55c) followed by an infinitive (examples from Sheehan 2016:981).

55	a	<i>La ragazza fece cadere la caraffa.</i>		(It.)
		the girl made fall.INF the carafe		
	'The girl made the carafe fall.'			
	b	<i>Elle a laissé entrer le petit garçon.</i>		(Fr.)
		she have.AUX.PST.3SG let enter.INF the little boy		
	'She let the little boy enter.'			
	c	<i>O Presidente da Assembleia mandou votar a lei</i>		

the president of.the assembly ordered vote.INF the law
 aos deputados.
 to.the MPs
 ‘The President of the Assembly made the MPs vote through the law.’

CPred formation is diagnosed using the same tests as those used for auxiliaries; however, in contrast to auxiliary-verb constructions, causative constructions (and constructions with perception verbs, see §21.8) contribute to the argument structure of the new overall construction/periphrasis with an external argument, and may also add an adjunct (Labelle 2017:309).

The constructions in (55) are characterized by E(xceptional) C(ase) M(arking) on the subject of the infinitive (which surfaces with the accusative – or with the dative, see §21.7.2.1 –, instead of the nominative). When the subject is cliticized, it raises to the first verb, leading to restructuring (55b becomes 56a); negation is also hosted by the first verb (56b). Therefore, constructions such as (55) do not match the CPred diagnostics (§21.2.2), whereas those in (56) do.

- 56 a *Elle l’a* *laissé* *entrer.* (Fr.)
 she 3MSG.ACC=have.AUX.PST.3SG let.PTCP enter.INF
 ‘She let him enter’
- b *Elle ne l’a* *pas laissé* *entrer.* (Fr.)
 she not 3MSG.ACC= have.AUX.PST.3SG NEG let.PTCP enter.INF
 ‘She does not let him enter.’

21.7.2 FACERE causatives

The causative structure with FACERE had been attested since classical and postclassical times, and it proliferated in early Romance. There is, however, a significant difference between the Latin biclausal construction and the Romance monoclausal one (Vincent 2016).

There is major diachronic variation across the Romance languages. In Portuguese and Spanish it appears that clitic climbing, which was previously obligatory, has become optional quite recently, so that Spanish and Portuguese causative constructions have gradually undergone a change from monoclausality to biclausality (Davies 1995; Sheehan 2016:993). By contrast, while modern Romanian disallows the FACERE causative as a CPred (because the verb *face* ‘make’ selects a subjunctive clausal complement), old Romanian attests the Romance monoclausal infinitival construction (Nedelcu 2016:244) (57).

- 57 *Și va fi ceriul nou și pământul*
 and will.AUX.FUT.3SG be.INF sky.DEF.NOM new and land.DEF.NOM
nou, cari eu le-am făcut a
 new which I 3FPL.ACC=have.AUX.PERF.1SG make.PTCP to.INF
trăi naintea mea (ORo.)
 live.INF in.front.of my
 ‘And the sky and the land that I made come to life in front of me will be new.’

Since the pioneering work on French by Kayne (1975), the literature on causatives has distinguished two types of monoclausal FACERE constructions: *faire-infinitif* and *faire-par* (see also Guasti 2006; Ciutescu 2013). Both these types are also attested in Italian, in some varieties of Spanish, and, to a lesser extent, in European Portuguese and Catalan (Sheehan 2016:985), with subtle semantic differences: in French, Italian, and Spanish, the *faire-infinitif*, unlike the *faire-par*, involves a sense of obligation exerted on the subject of the second verb

(Folli and Harley 2007:212), whereas in the *faire-par* construction the subject of the first verb has to be an agent (not a cause), and therefore it is obligatorily animate.

21.7.2.1 The *faire-infinitif* construction

In this structure, illustrated in (58), the subject of the embedded verb surfaces in the dative when the verb is transitive; clitics and negation attach to the first verb (Labelle 2017:306).

- 58 a *Il fera boire un peu de vin*
 he will.make drink.INF a bit of wine
 à son enfant. (Fr., Sheehan 2016:987)
 to his child
 ‘He’ll make his child drink a bit of wine.’
 b *On la lui laissa réparer.* (Fr., Labelle 2017:307)
 we 3FSG.ACC= 3SG.DAT= let.PST.3SG repair.INF
 ‘We let him repair it.’
 c *La hizo funcionar.* (Sp., Labelle 2017:307)
 3FSG.ACC= make.PST.3SG function.INF
 ‘He made it work.’

The Romance languages show variation with respect to clitics; for example, the reflexive clitics (Zubizarreta 1985:274): *se/si* may attach to the embedded verb in French and Spanish (59a,b), but not in Italian (59c):

- 59 a *On a fait se raser*
 we have.AUX.PST.SG make.PTCP 3REFL= shave.INF
 Pierre. (Fr., Zubizarreta 1985:274)
 Pierre
 ‘We made Pierre shave himself.’
 b *Le hicimos lavarse las manos*
 3MSG.ACC= made.PST.1PL wash.INF=3REFL the hands
 a Pedro. (Sp.)
 to Pedro
 ‘We made Pedro wash his hands.’
 c ***Mario ha fatto accusarsi Piero.* (It.)
 Mario have.AUX.PST.SG make accuse=3REFL Piero
 ‘Mario made Piero accuse himself.’

21.7.2.2 The *faire-par* construction

In the *faire-par* construction, the subject of the embedded verb is realized as an adjunct PP introduced by the same preposition as the *by*-phrase in the passive construction (60) (Labelle 2017:319). In Brazilian Portuguese and Catalan, this construction seems to be possible when the prepositional phrase is suppressed (Sheehan 2016:985)

- 60 a *Elle fera manger cette pomme par Jean.* (Fr., Kayne 1975:235)
 she make.FUT.3SG eat.INF that apple by Jean
 ‘She’ll have that apple eaten by Jean.’
 b *Gli fecero sparare addosso*
 CL.DAT.3SG make.PST.PL fire.INF upon
 da un agente.
 by an agent
 (It., Burzio 1986:270f.)

‘They had him fired upon by an agent.’

It is a monoclausal construction allowing clitic climbing of the embedded objects, including datives (60b); the reflexive/passive clitic *se* cannot be hosted by the embedded infinitive (61) (Labelle 2017:326).

- 61 ***On fait /* *laisse* *se* *laver*
 IMPERS make.IND.PRS.3SG let.IND.PRS.3SG 3REFL= wash.INF
avant de *s'asseoir* *à table.* (Fr., Zubizarreta 1985:264)
 before of 3REFL=sit.INF at table
 (intended) ‘We make / let wash oneself before sitting down at table.’

21.7.3 LAXARE causatives

LAXARE causatives with ECM complements are permitted in French, European Portuguese, Spanish, and (marginally) in Italian. In these structures, clitic climbing is permitted, the subject of the infinitive surfaces to its right, and when the embedded infinitive is transitive its subject appears in the dative (Sheehan 2016:984):

- 62 a *J' ai* *laissé* *lire* *le livre*
 I have.AUX.PST.1SG let.PTCP read.INF the book
 à Jean. (Fr., Sheehan 2016:984)
 to Jean
 ‘I have let Jean read the book.’
 b *Je le* *lui* *ai*
 I 3MSG.ACC= 3SG.DAT= have.AUX.PST.1SG
 laissé *lire.* (Fr.)
 let.PTCP read.INF
 ‘I have let him read it.’

21.7.4 MANDARE causatives

MANDARE is the canonical causative verb in European Portuguese, where it allows both restructuring/CPred formation (63a) and ECM constructions (63b).

- 63 a *O João* *mandou* *à Ana* *procurar*
 the João ordered.PST.3sg the Ana fetch.INF
 o livro. (EuPt., Sheehan 2016:984)
 the book
 b *O João mandou procurar o livro* *à* *Ana.* (EuPt.)
 the João ordered find.INF the book to.the Ana
 ‘João made Ana find the book.’

21.8. Complex predicates with perception verbs

Most of the Romance languages (except for modern Daco-Romance) feature monoclausal constructions with ‘see’ and other perception verbs which select an infinitival complement with a preverbal subject. Perception verb constructions have many features in common with causative constructions. The subject of the embedded verb is exceptionally case marked (with the accusative) (64a) and may surface as an accusative clitic hosted by the main verb (Labelle 2017:300) (64b). Just as in the case of modal verb configurations in certain languages (§21.6), there is variation: clitics and negation may also surface on the embedded verb (64c) (Labelle 1996:91).

- 64 a *Jean a vu Marie réparer la voiture.* (Fr.)
 Jean have.AUX.PST.3SG seen Marie.ACC repair.INF the car
 ‘Jean saw Marie repair the car.’
- b *Jean l’a vue réparer la voiture.* (Fr.)
 Jean 3FSG.ACC=have.AUX.PST.3SG seen.FSG repair.INF
 the car
 ‘Jean saw her repair the car.’
- c *J’ai cru voir Pierre ne pas s’arrêter au feu rouge.* (Fr.)
 I have.AUX.PST.1SG believe.PTCP see.INF Pierre not NEG
 3REFL=stop.INF at.the light red
 ‘I think I have seen Pierre not stop at the red light.’

In Romanian, perception verbs are followed by a gerund (Nicula 2012), in constructions with subject-to-object raising (and negation on the first verb) (65a); evidence for subject-to-object raising comes from the availability of the passive voice (65b), a context in which the raised subject bears nominative and acts as the subject of the passive verb. Note that there is no clitic climbing in this construction (cliticization of the embedded subject on the perception verb in (65a) is the effect of subject-to-object raising).

- 65 a *Nu îl văd pe Ion lovind-o.* (Ro.)
 not 3MSG.ACC= see.IND.PRS.1SG DOM Ion hit.GER=3FSG.ACC
 ‘I do not see Ion hitting her.’
- b *El nu a fost văzut lovind-o.* (Ro.)
 he(NOM) not have.AUX.PST.3SG be.PTCP see.PTCP
 hit.GER=3FSG.ACC
 ‘He has not been seen hitting her.’

Across Romance, these constructions behave differently (Sheehan 2016:982f.). In Spanish, Italian, French, Catalan, Galician, and European Portuguese (to a lesser extent) the perception verb and its complement make up a CPred. French, Spanish, European Portuguese, Catalan, and Romanian display ECM complements where the lexical verb is a gerund(ive); these constructions involve Exceptional Case Marking; ECM complements do not generally display restructuring phenomena such as clitic climbing, though the subject of the embedded verb behaves like an argument of the matrix perception verb and must be expressed on the matrix verb when it is realized as a clitic.

21.9. Conclusions: what Romance languages tell us about complex predicates

The concept of CPred is, to a certain degree, fuzzy, yet it brings under the same umbrella a variety of syntactically and semantically distinct constructions, which have in common monoclausality (mainly diagnosed by clitic climbing and the exclusive realization of negation on the high verb).

The examination of the empirical data has shown that the distinction between CPreds based on merger and CPreds based on coindexation (Baker and Harvey 2010; see §21.2.1) holds with respect to the Romance languages too: on the one hand, in CPreds with auxiliaries, modals, and aspectuals, the argument structure of the formation reflects the argument structure of lexical verbs, hence auxiliary/modal/aspectual verbs are ‘athematic’ predicates

(which ‘do not assign either an external or internal argument but, rather, inherit their argument structure directly from their non-finite verbal complement’, Ledgeway 2007:121), but rather mere placeholders for TAM values; on the other hand, CPred formations with causatives and perception verbs are characterized by an argument/conceptual structure distinct from that of the component verbs.

Morphophonological erosion affects only a subclass of CPred constructions, those with (non-passive) auxiliaries. By contrast, modals and aspectuals (as well as passive auxiliaries) do not generally undergo morphophonological erosion / weakening, yet they share with auxiliaries the fact that they are devoid of thematic properties; the term ‘semi-auxiliary’ appears to be an appropriate label for this class of fully inflecting, yet athematic, verbs.

Furthermore, modal and aspectual semi-auxiliaries may also occur in biclausal configurations and preserve their athematic nature; identity of subject between the higher and embedded predicates (technically obtained via subject raising or obligatory control) gives the appearance of a more cohesive structure, yet a CPred formation is not at play, given biclausality.

The diachronic paths taken by the various types of Romance CPreds are also diverse. Some of the formations undergo grammaticalization, the most extreme case being that of the western Romance futures and conditionals; in this case, a new synthetic system was created on the basis of analytic formations with postverbal auxiliaries. Other CPreds are extremely stable from a diachronic point of view: the Romanian modal CPred made up of the verb *putea* ‘can, be able’ plus a bare infinitive did not undergo any significant change in the five centuries of the attested history of Romanian (Hill 2012). Opposite diachronic developments are also attested. For example, rather than undergoing further structural simplification, the Spanish and Portuguese causative constructions appear gradually to revert to a biclausal structure, as shown by the fact that previously obligatory clitic climbing has quite recently become optional. Global changes affecting the syntax of a given language may have local effects on the grammar of CPreds: the replacement of the infinitive by the subjunctive in Romanian (a more general Balkan Sprachbund phenomenon) has led to the replacement of the infinitival monoclausal causatives attested in old Romanian with subjunctive biclausal causatives, the only option in modern Romanian.

To sum up, the phenomena investigated point to the fact that ‘complex predicate’ is a heteroclite concept in any accepted sense, as every construction in its turn features different properties and has non-converging diachronic developments.

References

- Abeillé, A. and Godard, D. (2002). ‘The syntactic structure of French auxiliaries’, *Language* 78:404-52.
- Abeillé, A. and Godard, D. (2003). ‘Les prédicats complexes dans les langues romanes’. In Godard, D. (ed.), *Les Langues romanes. Problèmes de la phrase simple*. Paris: CNRS Éditions, 125-84.
- Abeillé, A., Godard, D., and Sag, I. A. (1998). ‘Two kinds of composition in French complex predicates’. In Hinrichs, E., Kathol, A., and Nakazawa, T. (eds), *Complex Predicates in Nonderivational Syntax*. San Diego: Academic Press, 1-41.
- Adams, J. (1991). ‘Some neglected evidence for Latin HABEO with infinitive: the order of the constituents’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 89:131-96.
- Adams, J. N. (2013). *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Adriani, L. (2017). *The Syntax of the Dialect of Bari*. University of Cambridge: unpublished doctoral thesis.

- Aissen, J. and Perlmutter, D. (1976). 'Clause reduction in Spanish'. In Thompson, H. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistic Society, 1-30.
- Alfonzetti, G. (1998). 'Passato prossimo e passato remote: dimensioni di variazione'. In Ruffino, G. (ed.), *Atti del XXI congresso internazionale di linguistica e filologia romanz. Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, Università di Palermo 18-24 settembre 1995*, II, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 346-60.
- Alkire, T. and Rosen, C. (2010). *Romance Languages. A Historical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alsina, A. (2016). 'Catalan'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 363-81.
- Amberber, M., Baker, B. and Harvey, M. (2010). 'Introduction'. In Amberber, M., Baker, B., and Harvey, M. (eds), *Complex Predicates. Cross-linguistic Perspectives on Event Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-12.
- Anderson, S. (2016). 'Romansh (Rumantsch)'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 169-84.
- Aranovich, R. (2009). 'From *esse* to *ser*: diachronic mismatches in the selection of perfect auxiliaries'. In Reinheimer Rîpeanu, S. (ed.), *Studia linguistica in honorem Mariae Manoliu*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 21-35.
- Avram, L. and Hill, V. (2007). 'An irrealis BE auxiliary in Romanian'. In Aranovich, R. (ed.), *Split Auxiliary Systems: a crosslinguistic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 47-64.
- Baker, B. and Harvey, M. (2010). 'Complex predicate formation'. In Amberber, M., Baker, B., and Harvey, M. (eds), *Complex Predicates. Cross-linguistic Perspectives on Event Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 13-47.
- Bauer, B. (2006). "'Synthetic" vs "analytic" in Romance: the importance of varieties'. In Gess, R. and Arteaga, D. (eds), *Historical Romance Linguistics: Retrospective and Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 287-304.
- Benucci, F. (1993). 'Temporal periphrasis and clitics in central Romance languages', *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:51-83.
- Benveniste, É. (1962). *Hittite et indo-européen. Études comparatives*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Bertinetto, P. M. and Squartini, M. (2016). 'Tense and aspect'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 939-53.
- Bosque, I. and Gallego, Á. J. (2011). 'Spanish double passives and related structures', *Revista de estudos linguísticos da Universidade do Porto* 6:9-50.
- Buridant, C. (2000). *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français*. Paris: SEDES.
- Burton, P. (2009). 'Analytic passives and deponents in classical and later Latin'. In Adams, J. and Vincent, N. (eds), *Early and Late Latin. Continuity or Change?*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163-79.
- Burzio, L. (1981). *Intransitive Verbs and Italian Auxiliaries*. MIT: unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Burzio, L. (1986). *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Cabredo Hofherr, P. (2017). 'Voice and voice alternations'. In Dufter, A. and Stark, E. (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 230-71.
- Cardinaletti, A. and Shlonsky, U. (2004). 'Clitic positions and restructuring in Italian', *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:519-57.
- Cennamo, M. (2016). 'Voice'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 967-80.

- Centineo, G. (1986). 'A lexical theory of auxiliary selection in Italian', *Davis Working Papers in Linguistics* 1:1-35.
- Cinque, G. (2004). 'Restructuring and functional structure'. In Belletti, A. (ed.), *Structures and Beyond: the cartography of syntactic structures*, III. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 132-91.
- Ciutescu, E. (2013). 'Micro-parametric variation in Romance causative constructions', *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 15:45-60.
- D'Alessandro, R. (2007). *Impersonal si constructions*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Danckaert, L. (2016). 'Variation and change in Latin BE-periphrases: empirical and methodological considerations'. In Adams, J. and Vincent, N. (eds), *Early and Late Latin. Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 132-62.
- Danckaert, L. (2017). 'The origins of Romance analytic passive: evidence from word order'. In Mathieu, E. and Truswell, R. (eds), *Macro-change & Micro-change in Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 216-34.
- Davies, M. (1995). 'The evolution of causative constructions in Spanish and Portuguese'. In Amastae, J., Goodall, G., Montalbetti, M., and Phinney, M. (eds), *Contemporary Research in Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 105-22.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1994). *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dragomirescu, A. (2013). 'Complex predicates'. In Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 191-203.
- Dragomirescu, A. and Nicolae, A. (2013). 'Urme ale selecției auxiliarului de perfect compus în română'. In Cepraga, D. O., Lupu, C., and Renzi, L. (eds), *Hommages offerts à Florica Dimitrescu et Alexandru Niculescu*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 338-52.
- Dragomirescu, A. and Nicolae, A. (2014). 'The multiple grammaticalization of Romanian *veni* 'come': focusing on the passive construction'. In Devos, M. and van der Wal, J. (eds), *COME and GO Off the Beaten Grammaticalization Path*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 69-100.
- Fleischman, S. (1983). 'From pragmatics to grammar. Diachronic reflections on complex pasts and futures in Romance', *Lingua* 60:183-214.
- Folli, R. and Harley, H. (2013). 'The syntax of argument structure: evidence from Italian complex predicates', *Journal of Linguistics* 49:93-125.
- Frank, A. (1996). 'A note on complex predicate formation: evidence from auxiliary selection, reflexivization, and past participle agreement in French and Italian'. In Butt, M. and Holloway King, T. (eds), *The Proceedings of the LFG96 Conference*. CSLI On-line Publications.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. (2000). 'On some grammaticalization patterns for auxiliaries'. In Smith, J. C. and Bentley, D. (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1995: selected papers from the 12th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Manchester, August 1995. V.1. General Issues and Non-Germanic Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 125-54.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. (2017). 'Passives and constructions that resemble passives'. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 38:149-176.
- Giurgea, I. (2011). 'The Romanian verbal cluster and the theory of head movement'. In Herschensohn, J. (ed.), *Romance linguistics 2010. Selected Papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Linguistics (LSRL), Seattle, Washington, March 2010*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 271-86.
- Green, J. N. (1987). 'The evolution of Romance auxiliaries: criteria and chronology'. In Harris, M. and Ramat, P. (eds), *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 257-77.

- Green, J. N. (1991). 'The collapse and replacement of verbal inflection in late Latin/early Romance: how would one know?'. In Wright, R. (ed.), *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages*. London: Routledge, 83-99.
- Guasti, M.-T. (2006). 'Analytic causatives'. In Everaert, M. van Riemsdijk, H. (eds), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, I. Oxford: Blackwell, 142-72.
- Guțu Romalo, V. 2005. 'Semiauxiliarele de mod'. In Guțu Romalo, V., *Aspecte ale evoluției limbii române*. Bucharest: Humanitas, 156-84.
- Harris, A. and Campbell, L. (1995). *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, M. (1982). 'The 'past simple' and the 'present perfect' in Romance'. In Harris, M. and Vincent, N. (eds), *Studies in the Romance Verb*. London: Croon Helm, 42-70.
- Haverling, G. (2016). 'On the use of *habeo* and the perfect participle in earlier and later Latin'. In Adams, J. and Vincent, N. (eds), *Early and Late Latin. Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 180-201.
- Hill, V. (2012). 'Romanian 'can': changes in parametric settings. In Galves, C., Cyrino, S., Lopes, R., Sandalo, F., and Avelar, J. (eds), *Parameter Theory & Linguistic Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 265-80.
- Iordan, I. (1950). 'Note sintactice'. *Studii si cercetări lingvistice* 1:269-79.
- Jones, M. A. (1993). *Sardinian Syntax*. London: Routledge.
- Kayne, R. (1975). *French Syntax: the transformational cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Krusch, B. (1888). *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum*, II. Hanover.
- Labelle, M. (1996). 'Remarques sur les verbes de perception et la sous-catégorisation', *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes* 25:83-106.
- Labelle, M. (2017). 'Causative and perception verbs'. In Dufter, A. and Stark, E. (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 299-331.
- Lamiroy, B. (1999). 'Auxiliaires, langues romanes et grammaticalisation', *Langages* 135:33-45.
- Leal Cruz, P. (2003). *El español tradicional de La Palma*. La Laguna: Centro de la Cultura Popular Canaria.
- Ledgeway, A. (2000). *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: a minimalist approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ledgeway, A. (2007). 'Old Neapolitan word order: some initial observations'. In Lepschy, A. L. and Tosi, A. (eds). *Languages of Italy. Histories and Dictionaries*. Ravenna: Longo Editore Ravenna, 119-46.
- Ledgeway, A. (2009). *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Ledgeway, A. (2012). *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, A. (2016). 'Italian, Tuscan, and Corsican'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 206-27.
- Ledgeway, A. (2017). 'Syntheticity and analyticity'. In Dufter, A. and Stark, E. (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 839-86.
- Ledgeway, A. (2021a). 'Passive periphrases in the Romance Languages'. In Gardani, F. and Loporcaro, M. (eds), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Romance Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.639>.
- Ledgeway, A. (2021b). 'Indirect object WANT-passives in southern Italy'. In Grohmann, K., Matsuya, A., and Remberger, E.-M. (eds), *Passives Cross-linguistically: theoretical and experimental approaches (empirical approaches to linguistic theory)*. Leiden: Brill, 138-170.

- Legendre, G. (2017). 'Auxiliaries'. In Dufter, A. and Stark, E. (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 272-98.
- Loporcaro, M. (1988). *Grammatica storica del dialetto di Altamura*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Loporcaro, M. (2007). 'On triple auxiliiation in Romance', *Linguistics* 45:173-222.
- Mackenzie, I. (2006). *Unaccusative verbs in Romance languages*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maiden, M. (2016). 'Inflectional morphology'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 497-512.
- Maiden, M. and Robustelli, C. (2007). *A Reference Grammar of Modern Italian*. London: Routledge.
- Marchese, F. (2016). *Il lessico del dialetto di Olia (VV)*. University of Florence: unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Mendes Mothé, N. G. (2006). 'Gerúndio versus Infinitivo Gerundivo: Brasil e Portugal em contraste nos séculos XIX e XX'. *Estudos lingüísticos* 35:1554-63.
- Mensching, G. and Remberger, E.-M. (2016). 'Sardinian'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 270-91.
- Monachesi, P. (2005). *The Verbal Complex in Romance: a case study in grammatical interfaces*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Motapanyane, V. and Avram, L. (2000). 'The syntax of *putea* and its mixed typology', *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 14:149-65.
- Müller, S. (2006). 'Complex predicates'. In Brown, K. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier, 697-704.
- Nedelcu, I. (2016). 'The infinitive and the infinitival construction'. In Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 232-49.
- Nicolae, A. (2013). *Types of Ellipsis in Romanian*. University of Bucharest and University of Cambridge: unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Nicolae, A. (2015). *Ordinea constituenților în limba română: o perspectivă diacronică*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Nicolae, A. (2019). *Word Order and Parameter Change in Romanian. A Comparative Romance Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nicula, I. (2012). *Modalități de exprimare a percepțiilor fizice. Verbele de percepție în limba română*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Pană Dindelegan, G. (2003). *Elemente de gramatică. Dificultăți, controverse, noi interpretări*. București: Humanitas Educațional.
- Penny, R. (2000). *Variation and Change in Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pérez Bouza, J. A. (1996). *El Gallego*. Munich / Newcastle: Lincom Europa.
- Pesetsky, D. (2019). *Exfoliation: towards a derivational theory of clause size*. MIT, unpublished MS.
- Picallo, C. M. (1990). 'Modal verbs in Catalan'. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 8:285-312.
- Pinkster, H. (1987). 'The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tense auxiliaries in Latin'. In Harris, M. and Ramat, P. (eds), *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 193-223.
- Ramat, P. (1987). 'Introduction'. In Harris, M. and Ramat, P. (eds), *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 3-19.
- Rizzi, L. (1978). 'A restructuring rule in Italian syntax'. In Keyser, S. J. (ed.), *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 113-58.
- Rizzi, L. (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht / Cinnaminson: Foris.

- Roberts, I. (2013). 'Some speculations on the development of the Romance periphrastic perfect'. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 58:3-30.
- Rohlfs, G. (1969). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti: sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Salvi, G. (1987). 'Syntactic restructuring in the evolution of Romance auxiliaries'. In Harris, M. and Ramat, P. (eds), *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 225-36.
- Sandfeld, K. (1930). *Linguistique balkanique: problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Champion.
- Sârbu, R. and Frăţilă, V. (1998). *Dialectul istroromân*. Timişoara: Amarcord.
- Sheehan, M. (2016). 'Complex predicates'. In Ledgeway, A. and Maiden, M. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 981-93.
- Sorace, A. (2000). 'Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs', *Language* 76:859-90.
- Sorace, A. (2004). 'Gradience at the lexicon–syntax interface: evidence from auxiliary selection for unaccusativity'. In Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou, E., and Everaert, M. (eds), *The Unaccusativity Puzzle. Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 243-68.
- Squartini, M. (1998). *Verbal Periphrases in Romance. Aspect, Actionality, and Grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Squartini, M. and Bertinetto, P. M. (2000). 'The simple and compound past in Romance languages'. In Dahl, Ö. (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 403-39.
- Stolova, N. I. (2006). 'Split intransitivity in Old Spanish: irrealis and negation factors', *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 51:301-20.
- Svenonius, P. (2008). 'Complex predicates and the functional sequence', *Tromsø Working Papers on Language & Linguistics: Nordlyd* 35:47-88.
- Thielmann, P. (1885). 'Habere mit dem Part. Perf. Pass.', *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie* 2:372-423; 509-49.
- Van Valin, R. D. (1987). 'The unaccusative hypothesis vs. lexical semantics'. In McDonough, J. and Plunkett, B. (eds), *Proceedings of NELS 17*, 641-61.
- Vincent, N. (1987). 'The interaction of periphrasis and inflection: some Romance examples'. In Harris, M. and Ramat, P. (eds), *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 237-56.
- Vincent, N. (2016). 'Causatives in Latin and Romance'. In Adams, J. and Vincent, N. (eds), *Early and Late Latin. Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 294-312.
- Wheeler, M., Yates, A., and Dols, N. (1999). *Catalan. A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Wurmbrand, S. (2001). *Infinitives: restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Zafiu, R. (2013). 'Mood, tense, and aspect'. In Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 24-64.
- Zagona, K. (2002). *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zubizarreta, M. L. (1985). 'The relation between morphophonology and morphosyntax: the case of Romance causatives', *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:247-89.