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1. Habeo epistulas scriptas.
   I-have letters-ACC.pl written-ACC.pl
   “I’ve got the letters written.”

b. Ho scritto le lettere.
   I-have written the letters.
   “I’ve written the letters.”

2. Smuggling, (A-)Movement and Locality

   a. Direct derivation: DP moves to SpecHP (to value H’s [uφ] features,
      triggered by ^), YP doesn’t.

   b. Indirect derivation: YP moves to SpecHP, DP doesn’t (but enters into
      an Agree relation with H).

3. Passives (adopting and adapting insights from Collins (2005))

   a. ... T[up, ^] .. [VoiceP Voice [vP EA v ([PrtP Prt) VP ()]]]

   b. The book [+past] written by John

---
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(6) a. It was believed by everybody that Mary was a thief.
b. Danger was sensed by John.
c. A black smoke was emitted by the radiator.
d. That professor is feared by all his students.
e. Mary was respected by John.
f. A copy of the book has been received by everyone.
g. Ted was bitten by the lovebug.
h. *A train was arrived by there.

(7) The book was pro written [ to make money ].

(8) a. Written in only three days, this book sold millions of copies.
b. *Written her dissertation in only three days, Sue took a break.
c. Having written her dissertation in only three days, Sue took a break.

3. Causatives

(9) a. She will [ let John eat the cake ].
b. Elle [ laissera Jean manger le gâteau ]. (Kayne (1975:270))

(10) LET [VoiceP Voice [vP EA v [InfP Inf VP ]]]

(11) Elle [ laissera manger le gâteau par Jean].

b. Elle fera/laissera manger le gâteau à/par Jean.

(13) a. Je la fais/laisse laver à/par Marie.
I it make wash to/by Marie
“I make Marie wash it.”
b. Elle laissera Jean le manger.
She will-let John it to-eat
“She will let John eat it.”
c. *Elle le laissera Jean manger.
She it will-let John to-eat.

(14) a. I had Mary wash the car.
b. I had the car washed (by Mary).

(15) .. have [VoiceP Voice [vP EA v ([PrtP Prt) VP ()]]]
(16)  
   a.  *I had Mary to wash the car.²  
   b.  I had the car (*to) (?be) washed by Mary.  
   c.  *Mary was had wash the car.  
   d.  *The car was had (be) washed  

(17)  
   a.  I made Mary (*to) wash the car.  
   b.  I made the car (*to) *(be) washed (by Mary).  
   c.  The car was made *(to be) washed (by Mary).  
   d.  Mary was made *(to) wash the car.  

(18)  
   a.  I let Mary wash the car.  
   b.  I let the car (*to) be washed by Mary.  
   c.  *The car was let (be) washed by Mary.  
   d.  ??Mary was let (*to) wash the car.  

(19)  
   a.  I got Mary *(to) wash the car.  
   b.  I got the car (to be) washed by Mary.  
   c.  *The car was got (to be) washed by Mary.  
   d.  ??Mary was got *(to) wash the car.  

(20)  
   a.  Did John have/*Had John Mary wash the car/the car washed?  
   b.  John didn’t have/*hadn’t Mary wash the car/the car washed.  

4.  The Origin of the Perfect  

4.1  Perfect vs causative HAVE  

(21)  
   John has seen Mary,  

(22)  
   ..  
     r  u  
     has  VoiceP  
           r  u  
             Voice  vP  
               r  u  
                 v  PrtP  
                   r  u  
                     Prt  VP  
                       r  u  
                         seen  r  u  
                          V  DP  
                             (see)  Mary  

² (16a) is grammatical on the purpose-clause reading. But on this reading the construction isn’t restricted to have; any main verb will do:  
(i)  I brought/hired Mary to wash the car.  
Here the infinitive is clearly an adjunct (see Roberts 1987, Ch 3).
(23) a. That box has contained plutonium.
   b. Hermione has always known the answers.
   c. I have always hated spinach.

(24) a. ??We had the box contain plutonium.
   b. ??We had her know the answers.
   c. ??They had me hate spinach.

(25) *Mary has seen by John.

(26) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{has} \quad \text{vP} \\
\quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{v'} \\
\quad \text{John} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{v} \quad \text{PrtP} \\
\quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{seen} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{V} \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad (\text{see}) \quad \text{Mary}
\end{array}
\]

(27) Mary has been seen by John.

(28) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{has} \quad \text{vP} \\
\quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\text{DP} \quad \text{v'} \\
\quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{v} \quad \text{PrtP} \\
\quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{vP} \\
\quad \text{been} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{v} \quad \text{VoiceP} \\
\quad (\text{be}) \quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{PrtP} \quad \text{Voice'} \\
\quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{Prt} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{Voice} \quad \text{vP} \\
\quad \text{seen} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{by} \quad \text{r} \quad \text{u} \\
\quad \text{V} \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{EA} \quad \text{v'} \\
\quad (\text{see}) \quad \text{Mary} \quad \text{John} \quad \text{t} \quad \text{y} \\
\quad \text{v} \quad (\text{PrtP})
\end{array}
\]

(29) causative have perfective have
    Assigns 0-roles no 0-roles
    Has intrinsic φ no intrinsic φ
    Main-verb syntax auxiliary syntax
    Takes VoiceP takes vP
(30)  a. Causative have is a V with VoiceP complement
     b. Perfect have is active Voice (with a vP complement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[ __ TP ]</th>
<th>[ __ VoiceP ]</th>
<th>[+φ]</th>
<th>[ __ indirect derivation ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE ONE**

4.2  *The Latin Construction*

(1a)  Habeo epistulas scriptas.
       I-have letters-ACC.pl written-ACC.pl
       “I’ve got the letters written.”

(31)  a. .. habeo [VoiceP Voice [vP EA v ([PrtP Prt) VP ]]]
     b.  r   u
         habeo  VoiceP
         r   u
         PrtP   Voice’
         r   y   r   u
         DP   Prt’ Voice   vP
         epistulam t   y   r   u
         Prt   (VP)   EA   v’
         scriptam t   y   pro   r   u
         (V)   (DP)   v   (PrtP)
4.3 Changes from Latin to Romance

(32) ru
    vP
    ru
    DP v'
    pro ru
    v PrtP
    ru
    Prt VP
    scriptam u
    (V) DP
    epistolam

(33) ru
    vP Voice'
    ru ru
    EA v' Voice (vP)
    pro ru ru
    habeo
    PrtP v'
    ru tu ty
    VP Prt' v (PrtP)
    ru tu
    DP V' Prt (VP)
    epistolam ru ty scriptam (V) (DP)

(34) ru
    VoiceP V'
    ru tu
    PrtP Voice' habeo (VoiceP)
    ry ru
    DP Prt' vP Voice'
    epistolam ty tu
    VP Prt' EA v'
    ty ty ty ty
    (DP) V' Prt (VP) v (PrtP)
    ty scriptam (V) (DP)

5. Have/Be Alternations

(35) a. John has spoken.
    b. [VoiceP [Voice has] [vP John v [PrtP [Prt spoken] [vP (speak)]]]]
(36) a. \( \nu_1^* \text{Perfect} = \text{have}; \nu_2 \text{Perfect} = \text{be} \) (Standard Italian, German, etc.)
b. \( \nu_1 \text{Perfect} = \text{have}; \nu_2 \text{Passive} = \text{be} \) (Spanish, English, Sicilian dialects, etc.)
c. \( \nu_1 \text{Perfect[3pers]} = \text{have}; \nu_2 \text{Perfect[1,2pers]} = \text{be} \) (Central-Southern Italo-Romance)

6. Ergativity

(37) \( T_{\text{uφ'}} \left[ \text{VoiceP} \text{Voice}_{\text{uφ'}} \left[ \nu_3 \text{EA}_{\text{uφ'}} \nu \left[ \nu_2 \text{V OBJ}_{\text{uφ'}} \right] \right] \right] \)

(38) \( \text{OBJ}_{\text{uφ'}} \nu \left[ \text{VoiceP} \nu \left[ \nu_2 \text{V (OBJ}_{\text{uφ'}} \right] \text{Voice}_{\text{uφ'}} \nu \left[ \nu_2 \text{EA}_{\text{uφ'}} \nu \left[ \nu_2 \text{V OBJ}_{\text{uφ'}} \right] \right] \right] \)

(39) ahi-\( \text{r} \) indr-\( \text{eŋa} \) ha-ta-\( \text{h} \)
a. Serpent-NOM.SG Indra-INST.SG kill-PTCPL-NOM.SG
   « the serpent has been killed by Indra »
b. Serpent-ABS.SG Indra-ERG.SG kill-FF-NOM.SG
   « Indra has killed the serpent »

(40) indr-\( \text{o} \) ga-ta-\( \text{h} \)
a. Indra-NOM.SG go-PTCPL-NOM.SG
   « Indra has gone »
b. Indra-ABS.SG go-PF-NOM.SG
   « Indra has gone »
   (Garrett 1990 :263)

(41) \( T_{\text{uφ'}} \left[ \text{VoiceP} \nu \left[ \nu_2 \text{V OBJ}_{\text{uφ'}} \right] \right] \)

(42) ram*(ne) ga-ya
Ram*(ERG) go-perf-msg
« Ram went »

(43) a. Passive (PrtP smuggling) > perfect (loss of smuggling, reanalysis of causative HAVE as auxiliary)
b. Passive (PrtP smuggling) > ergative perfectives (reanalysis of PrtP smuggling as VP-smuggling)

7. Conclusion

- development of the Romance periphrastic perfect from the Latin causative-resultative construction seen in (1), using the derivational mechanism of smuggling.
- an analysis of certain English causative constructions, notably the have-causative.
- a general formal characterisation of HAVE-auxiliaries, as arising from v-to-Voice incorporation.
- contrast the development of Romance perfects with the development of ergative perfectives in Indo-Iranian
- changes consistent with the general characterisation of change as involving structural simplification, given in Roberts (2007).
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