

Have-participial constructions in West Germanic

Joanna Wall (j.h.wall@uu.nl)

Utrecht University & Meertens Institute

1. Introduction. West Germanic languages feature a range of *have*-participial constructions, in which one or more forms of *have* combine with a morphologically past participle. These include the various English singular *have*-participials illustrated in (1): present perfects like (1a) express past events with current relevance, eventive *have*-participials like (1b) express events in the present, and resultative *have*-participials like (1c) express states in the present.

- (1) a. *I have locked up John.*
b. *I often have John locked up by Mary.*
c. *I still have John locked up.*

In addition, West Germanic languages contain various *have*-doubling constructions, like (2).

- (2) *I have often had John locked up by Mary.*

A *have*-doubling construction like (2) is a straightforward combination of a present perfect (i.e. (1a)) and an eventive *have*-participial (i.e. (1b)). However, a more analytically puzzling type of *have*-doubling construction are perfect doubling constructions like (3).

- (3) *Ik heb vandaag nog niet gerookt gehad.*

I have today still not smoked._{PTCP} had._{PTCP}

‘I have not yet smoked today.’ (South-eastern Dutch; Koenen et al. 2011: 37)

Constructions like (3) are attested in modern German (e.g. Rödel 2011) and south-eastern Dutch dialects (Koenen et al. 2011). They have strong syntactic and semantic parallels to present perfect constructions. Firstly, like present perfects, perfect doubling constructions can contain an embedded unergative predicate like *gerookt* ‘smoked’ in (3). This contrasts with eventive and resultative *have*-participials (e.g. (1b), (1c) and (2)) which require an embedded DP object. Secondly, the semantic interpretation of perfect doubling constructions is very close to that of present perfects, as illustrated by the English translation of (3).

In this talk, I begin by filling an important gap in our knowledge of the distribution of *have*participials in West Germanic, by presenting the first large-scale corpus study of *havedoubling* constructions in historical varieties of Dutch. This leads me to propose an analysis for both doubling and singular *have*-participials across West Germanic in which variation in these constructions is reduced to merge and spell-out parameter settings.

2. *Have-doubling in historical varieties of Dutch.* 512 *have*-doubling constructions were found in an approx. 83,000,000 word collection of texts from authors born between 1050 and 1649. An analysis of these constructions was conducted, addressing the questions in (4).

- (4) a. In which historical varieties of Dutch are *have*-doubling constructions attested?

b. What types of *have*-doubling constructions are found in historical varieties of Dutch? In addition to yielding important diachronic frequency and text genre information, the crucial finding of the analysis in relation to (4a) is that the majority of *have*-doubling constructions (330/512; 64%) are attested in Hollandic varieties. Not only are *have*-doubling constructions absent from modern Hollandic varieties, but, significantly, historical Hollandic varieties also formed the basis for modern Standard Dutch. In relation to (4b), at least a subset of the *havedoubling* constructions in the corpus are shown to be perfect doubling constructions. This is based on the presence of embedded unergative participles which are blocked in other types of *have*-doubling constructions (*see* Section 1). Importantly, these *have*-doubling constructions with unergative participles include instances from Hollandic authors. Thus, this corpus study shows the attestation of perfect doubling in a historical variety whose closest descendant lacks it. From a comparative perspective, this provides fresh impetus to capture the variation in *have*-participials in West Germanic with the minimalist possible analytic means.

3. Proposed analysis. My departure point is Brandner and Larsson's (2014) proposal that perfect doubling constructions are a combination of two semantically distinct present perfects. According to the standard typological classifications, I assume that one of these present perfects functions as a true perfect requiring current relevance whilst the other functions as a temporal past, lacking current relevance. I show that the true perfect use of the present perfect is found in English, German, Dutch dialects and modern Standard Dutch, whilst the temporal past use is found in all varieties but English. The net consequence of this is that perfect doubling constructions can be derived from two singular *have*-participials just like the straightforward English *have*-doubling case in (2).

Next, I argue that part of the variation in the attestation of *have*-participials in West Germanic can be reduced to a parametrization of the clausal positions in which *have* can merge. More specifically, I adopt Wurmbrand (2001), according to which there are different types of restructuring (functional, semi-functional, lexical) configurations dependent on the clausal position the matrix verb merges into. I assume Wurmbrand's (2001: 144) clause structure for German shown in (5) can be adopted for all West Germanic varieties.

(5) AgrSP > TP > AuxP > ModP > vP/AspP > VP

I further assume that *have* is a transitive predicate which must probe for an active DP goal when it merges or moves into a case assignment position (i.e. vP/AspP). The various *have* singular constructions are accounted for as follows. Firstly, resultative *have*-participials like (1c) are argued to be lexical restructuring configurations in which *have* merges in VP and selects a bare VP complement. Secondly, eventive *have*-participials like (1b) are argued to be semi-functional restructuring configurations in which *have* merges in vP/AspP. These first two proposed configurations account for the inability of resultative and eventive *have*'s to embed unergative predicates: *have* moves or merges into vP/AspP, meaning that there must be an active DP goal for it to probe for. Thirdly, Wurmbrand already proposes that present perfect *have* can merge in two distinct functional projections (ModP and AuxP) but without any resulting semantic distinction. In contrast, I argue that *have* merging in the lower ModP results in a true perfect, whilst *have* merging in the higher AuxP results in a past. This proposal is satisfying from a theory-internal perspective: Wurmbrand already posits that distinct merger positions for modals correspond to distinct interpretations (i.e. epistemic, deontic, dynamic), the current account extends this to present perfect *have*'s, thereby implying a systematic one-to-one mapping between merger site and interpretation.

Whilst the analysis thus far correctly rules out perfect doubling constructions in English, it does predict that perfect doubling should be possible in all varieties proposed to have both types of present perfect. This includes modern Standard Dutch, where the construction is not attested. However, I make the novel claim that the lack of perfect doubling constructions in that variety is only apparent and results from a parameter which blocks the spell out of the embedded participial form of *have*. This proposal is favourable from a Minimalist perspective by localizing variation away from the computational system and LF. Moreover, I show that, far from being stipulative, it is empirically supported by several parallel verbal constructions in modern Standard Dutch where a covert, structurally second head has also been posited, like perfect passives (e.g. *het boek is verkocht* (**geworden*); van Bart et al. 1998) which feature only one overt auxiliary. Indeed, further empirical support for this proposal is that varieties which attest perfect doubling show a strong tendency for perfect passives with two overt auxiliaries.

In sum, the entire analysis shows that variation in West Germanic *have*-participial constructions can be reduced to parameters governing merger and spell-out.

4. References. 1. Van Bart, P., J. Kerstens & A. Sturm. 1998. *Grammatica van het Nederlands. Een inleiding*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. 2. Brandner, E. & I. Larsson. 2014. *Perfect doubling and the grammaticalization of auxiliaries*. Abstract. DiGS16, 3–5 July 2014 Budapest. 3. Koenenman, O. N. C. J., M. Lekakou & S. Barbiers. 2011. "Perfect doubling." *Linguistic Variation* 11 (1): 35-75. 4. Rödel, M. 2011. "New perspectives on double perfect constructions in German." *Tense across languages*, ed. by M. Rathert & R. Musan, 127-146. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 5. Wurmbrand, S. 2001. *Infinitives: restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.