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In this paper, I will examine the historical development of perfect constructions in English and propose a licensing condition on perfect participles: Perfect participles are licensed either through the Spec-Head relation with a subject, or by adjunction to HAVE. In earlier English, asymmetrical auxiliary selection was observed, since the two options were available to license the participles. In present-day English, by contrast, only the latter option is permitted, and then have is used in perfect constructions (which I call 'symmetrical' auxiliary selection). I will further claim that the shift from asymmetrical to 'symmetrical' auxiliary selection was caused by the 'complete' loss of overt verb raising.*
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1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the historical development of perfect constructions in English. In Old English (henceforth, OE) through Modern English (henceforth, ModE), two auxiliaries were used in perfect constructions: habban 'have' and beon/wesan/weorpan 'be/become.' The latter auxiliaries were used with unaccusative or mutative verbs (go, come, arrive, etc.), whereas the former with other verbs. Modern Germanic and Romance languages (such as German, Italian, French and so on) exhibit similar corresponding behaviors. In these

* I am indebted to Hirozo Nakano, Masachiyo Amano, Masayuki Ohkado, Yoshinobu Niwa, Kazuhsa Ishikawa, and Justin Alexander Figgett for their helpful comments and encouragement. Thanks also go to two anonymous EL reviewers for suggesting improvements on an earlier version of this paper. Needless to say, all remaining inadequacies are my own.

© 1999 by the English Linguistic Society of Japan
languages as well, unaccusative verbs form perfects with BE, and other
intransitive and transitive verbs with HAVE. Such auxiliary selection
is called asymmetrical auxiliary selection in this paper. Two types of
auxiliaries in each language are listed in (1).

(1)    HAVE    BE
OE      habban    beon/wesan/weorþan
German  haben      sein
Italian  avere      essere
French  avoir      être

After late ModE, however, even unaccusative verbs came to be used
with HAVE more frequently. Furthermore, in present-day English
(henceforth, PE), verbs form perfects only with HAVE (though there
are some exceptions). This type of auxiliary selection, as opposed to
the one mentioned above, is called ‘symmetrical’ auxiliary selection in
this paper.

A large amount of effort has been devoted to synchronic or cross-
linguistic research. For example, see Burzio (1986) for Italian;
Grewendorf (1989) for German; Hoekstra (1984) for German and
Dutch; Kakietek (1987) for Shakespearean English; Vikner and
Sprouse (1987) for Germanic and Romance languages, and so on.
These synchronic approaches can explain asymmetrical auxiliary selec-
tion observed in OE through ModE. They, however, cannot account
for ‘symmetrical’ auxiliary selection in PE, because almost all verbs of
PE select only HAVE in perfect constructions. We will return to this
matter in section 2.2.

To my knowledge, only few theoretical studies have been made re-
garding the diachronic change of auxiliary selection. This paper thus
provides a new account of the historical development of perfect con-
structions in English. In particular, I propose a licensing condition on

---

1 Throughout this paper, HAVE and BE are used to refer to their inflected forms
and cognates in each stage of English and each language (cf. (1)).
2 Such examples as in (i) are not dealt with in this paper, because they are
idiomatic expressions or are archaic forms (cf. Curme (1931: 358–361), Jespersen
(1931: §3.1), Quirk et al. (1985: 170n) and so on).

(i) a. He is gone
b. They are come.
perfect participles (section 3). It is further claimed that the shift from asymmetrical to ‘symmetrical’ auxiliary selection was caused by a change in the way of licensing the participles. It is also shown that this change is correlated with the ‘complete’ loss of overt verb movement (sections 4). In section 5, we try to show the viability of the present analysis by applying it to auxiliary selection in passé composé constructions of French. Section 6 is the conclusion of this paper.

2. Basic Facts

This section provides basic data concerning perfect constructions in the history of English. Examples of asymmetrical auxiliary selection and ‘symmetrical’ auxiliary selection are given in subsection 2.1 and 2.2, respectively.

2.1. Asymmetrical Auxiliary Selection

2.1.1. Old English

In OE, both HAVE and BE were used in perfect constructions. We first provide examples of perfect constructions combined with HAVE. When an accusative object is accompanied, a perfect participle agrees with the object. This is illustrated in (2).

(2) Ic hæbbe ðe nu todæg gesetne ofer rice ...
   I have you.Acc.Sg now today set.Acc.Sg over kingdoms
   ‘Today I have set you over kingdoms …’

   (CP 441.30/Denison (1993: 346))

In this example, the participle gesetne ‘set’ agrees with its objects ðe ‘you’ in number and case. The agreement ending -ne is expressed overtly on the participle. Such agreement endings are expressed on participles whether the participles precede or follow their object. Example (3) is a case where a participle precedes its object.

(3) & heo hæfdon utamaerede þa
   and they had expelled.Masc.Acc.Pl the
   bigengan þisses ealondes
   inhabitants.Masc.Acc.Pl this island.Gen.Sg
   ‘and they had expelled the inhabitants of this island’

   (Bede 1 12.54.7/ibid.)

In (3), the participle utamaerede ‘expelled’ precedes and agrees with its object þa bigengan ‘the inhabitants’ in gender, number and case. The ending -e appears on the participle.
In many cases, however, no overt endings were realized on perfect participles. Examples without inflections are given below. In (4), the participles befangen 'seized' and tonumen 'divided' are uninflected, and if inflected, they might have had the agreement endings -ne and -e, respectively.

(4) a. *Hraæe heo æþelinga anne hæfde | fæste
  \hspace{1cm} \text{quickly she nobles.Gen.Pl one.Acc.Sg had fast}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{befangen}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{seized}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Quickly she grasped firmly one of the nobles.’}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{(Beo 1294/Denison (1993: 347))}

  b. *hæfde se cyning his fierd on tu tonumen
  \hspace{1cm} \text{had the king his army.Fem.Acc.Sg in two divided}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{‘The king had divided his army into two.’}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{(ChronA 84.31 (894)/ibid.)}

As noted by Mitchell (1985: §709), when uninflected and inflected forms are identical (e.g. (5)), it is difficult to see whether the participles are inflected or not. By contrast, in some examples, we can safely say that they are uninflected, as in (6). This is because in (6) the agreement ending -ne does not appear on the participle gefæstnod 'confirmed,' though it might have appeared on the participle if the participle had been inflected in masculine, singular and accusative.

(5) *Hwæt hæfstan þu gedon?
  \hspace{1cm} \text{what hast thou done}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{‘What hast thou done?’}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{(ÆCHom II 184.8/Mitchell (1985: §709))}

(6) *Dāða hi ealle hæfdon þysne rad
  \hspace{1cm} \text{when they all had this resolve.Masc.Acc.Sg}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{betwux him gefæstnod}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{among them confirmed}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{‘when they all had confirmed this resolve among themselves’}
  \hspace{1cm} \text{(ÆCHom I 10.28/ibid.)}

Thus, we introduce a third category, i.e. the ‘zero’-inflection, with regard to examples like (5), in which the participle gedon ‘done’ may

---

3 The present-day English translations of examples (5)-(6) and (i) below are borrowed from Thorpe's (1844-1846) edition.
have the ‘zero’ ending if inflected. We also assume that there is agreement between a participle and an accusative object NP, whether the participle is inflected or uninflected (cf. Mitchell (1985: §709) and Denison (1993: 347), among others). We will return to this below.

Let us next consider examples involving objects with inherent Case in (7).5

(7) a. gyf hwa hæf髇 his hlaforde sare abolgen
   if one has his Lord.Dat heavily made-angry
   ‘if one has heavily made his Lord angry.’
   (WHom 15.59/Mitchell (1985: §716))

b. he þæt sona onfand, || ðæt hæfde gumena
   he that immediately discovered that had men.Gen
   sum goldes gefandod
   some gold.Gen disturbed
   ‘he immediately discovered that someone had disturbed
   his gold’
   (Beo 2300-1/ibid.)

In these examples, no overt agreement endings appear on the participles abolgen ‘made-angry’ and gefandod ‘disturbed.’ Incidentally, in a perfect construction where a participle takes a clausal or prepositional complement, no overt agreement ending is expressed. Examples of these types are given in (8) and (9), respectively.

(8) Nu ge habbað gehered hu se hælend be
   now you have heard how the Savior concerning
   him sylfum spræc
   Himself spoke
   ‘Now have ye heard how Jesus spake of Himself …’
   (ÆLS I 1.11-2)

(9) Scortlice ic hæbbe nu gesæd ymb þa þrie daelas ealles
    briefly I have now spoken about the three parts all
    þises middangeardes
    this middle-earth
    ‘I have now briefly described the three parts of the earth’
    (Or 9.18/Denison (1993: 350))

---

4 Denison (1993: 347) states that adjectival inflections in general had an increased tendency to appear as zero on polysyllables. Perfect participles almost invariably have two (or more) syllables, and they are endingless in most cases. See note 6.

5 The PE translations of examples (7) are my own.
The clausal and prepositional complements follow the participles in these examples, unlike the nominal complements in (2) and (7).

Finally we provide examples of perfect constructions with BE, where unaccusative verbs are used.

(10) a. Swæ clæne hio waes
    so completely it.Fem.Nom.Sg was
    oðfeallenu on Angelcynne
decayed.Fem.Nom.Sg in England
    ‘so completely it had decayed in England’
    (CP 3.13/Ono and Nakao (1980: 375))

b. forðan þe his gebedda gefaren waes of life
    because his consort departed was from life
    ‘because his consort had departed from this life’
    (ÆLS I 6.132)

Here BE is selected to form perfects. In some cases, agreement endings are expressed overtly on participles, as in (10a). In (10a), the participle oðfeallenu ‘decayed’ agrees with the subject hio ‘it’ in gender, number and case, and the agreement ending -u appears on the participle. In other cases, no overt endings are realized on participles, as in (10b). Whether an overt agreement ending is expressed or not, we assume that participles in BE-perfects agree with a nominative NP, just as in HAVE perfects.6 This is critically important in the following discussion.

2.1.2. Middle English and Early Modern English

This subsection provides examples of Middle English (henceforth, ME) and then early ModE. In these periods, as in OE, asymmetrical auxiliary selection was observed, that is, two types of auxiliaries,

6 The ending of strongly-inflected adjectives appears as zero in masculine and neuter nominative singular. An example is given below.

(i) An þæs cynges cnihta waes ær afaren to Hierusalem
    one the king’s of-servants was before journeyed to Jerusalem
    ‘One of the king’s servants (,who) had before journeyed to Jerusalem’
    (ÆCHom II 472.18/Mitchell (1985: §737))

In (i), an ‘one’ agrees with the participle afaren ‘journeyed,’ and the ‘zero’ agreement ending appears on the participle since an is a masculine nominative singular form. In addition, polysyllable participles had a tendency to have no overt agreement ending when used as predicatives. See Denison (1993: 359), Mitchell (1985: §737-738) and Mustanoja (1960: 275-277), among others, and also note 4.
HAVE and BE, were used in perfects. Examples from ME are given in (11) (see also Fischer (1992), Fridén (1948), Mustanoja (1960), and so on).\(^7\)

\[
(11) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{that he had slayne hym} \\
\text{b. } & \text{for ich habbe iherd hu drihtines deore muð haueð wið þe imotet with you spoken}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MALORY, 51.237} \\
\text{MARGA, 91.610}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(12) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Sone se ha icume wes he cleopede to hire þus} \\
\text{b. } & \text{and whanne þe mayde was i-entred into þe citee the gates closed}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MARGA, 58.59} \\
\text{POLYCH, VI, 229.137}
\end{align*}
\]

In examples (11), HAVE is used as a perfect auxiliary, while in (12), BE is used. Basically unaccusative verbs formed perfects with BE, as in (12), but they selected HAVE as well. This is exemplified in (13)–(14).

\[
(13) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{3ef ani god mon is of feorren icomen} \\
\text{b. } & \text{As many as han come, weren nyst theues and dai theues}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ANCRIW, II. 57.556} \\
\text{NTEST, X, 1.916}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(14) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{anone as his broþer was gone to Norway} \\
\text{b. } & \text{and whanne thei hadden gon awei fro the tentis}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{BRUT3, 24.209} \\
\text{OTEST, XVI, 20N.663}
\end{align*}
\]

In the (a) examples of (13)–(14), the verbs select BE. In contrast, the

\(^7\) Examples (11)–(14) are cited from the Penn Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Middle English (the PHPCME). In citing examples from the PHPCME, the reference system used there is adopted. See Taylor and Kroch (1994).
same verbs select HAVE in the (b) examples of (13)–(14).

We next present examples from early ModE. In this period, as mentioned above, the two types of auxiliaries were used in perfects. Examples are given in (15)–(16).

(15)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{He hath brought many captives home to Rome.} \\
& (\text{Caes. 3.2.93/Araki and Ukaji (1984: 435)}) \\
\text{b. } & \text{When I have spoke of you dispraisingely} (\text{Oth 3.3.72/ibid.})
\end{align*}
\]

(16)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{And didst thou not, when she was gone downstairs, ...} \\
& (\text{Henry IV 2.1.96/Traugott (1972: 144)}) \\
\text{b. } & \text{What is become of my rare Jewels?} \\
& (\text{Th. of Reading 279.28/ibid.})
\end{align*}
\]

The examples of (15) involve HAVE, while those of (16) involve unaccusative verbs and BE.

In ModE, as in ME, unaccusative verbs formed the perfect tense both with BE and with HAVE. Examples indicating such behaviors are given in (17)–(18).

(17)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Winter is come, that blowes the bitter blaste} \\
& (\text{Stepheardes D 143}) \\
\text{b. } & \text{... From euery coast that heauen walks about, | Haue thither come the noble Martiall crew} \\
& (\text{Faerie Queene 1.7.45.4})
\end{align*}
\]

(18)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{He is not yet arriued.} \\
& (\text{Othello 2.1.88}) \\
\text{b. } & \text{on a moderate pace, I haue since ariu’d but hither} \\
& (\text{Twelfe 2.2.2–3})
\end{align*}
\]

(Examples (17)–(18) are cited from Friden (1948))

In OE, auxiliary selection between HAVE and BE was relatively clear-cut, whereas in ME and ModE it came to be more obscure.

2.1.3. After the Eighteenth Century

Over the centuries, the verbs selecting BE in perfect constructions have gradually changed to form the perfect tense with HAVE. Denison (1993: 359) states that such a process was in effect completed by the nineteenth century. This is supported by the observation of Rydén and Brorström (1987). They investigated the BE/HAVE variation in late ModE, and compiled data on intransitive verbs (not only unaccusatives but also unergatives) used in perfect constructions.\(^8\)

---

\(^8\) For a summary of their research, see also Rydén (1991).
Some examples of perfect constructions involving unaccusative verbs are given in (19)–(22), which are cited from Rydén and Brorström (1987).

(19) perfects with BE in the 18th century
   a. I am once more arriv’d within sight of my own doors.  
   (Fielding 153, 1733)
   b. Sir, my young masters are both come.  
   (Cibber BBT VII 11, 1700)
   c. The curse is accomplished, and hope is fled  
   (Holcroft 320, 1787)
   d. what, are they gone away without me?  
   (Cibber BBT VII 72, 1700)
   e. Surely they are all run away or drowned, or hanged  
   (Reynolds MT I 4, 1797)

(20) perfects with HAVE in the 18th century
   a. Well, sir, I hope the hour of reason has arrived.  
   (Reynolds MT II 92, 1805)
   b. I have just come away from my place.  
   (Reynolds MT II 310, 1801)
   c. The damsel hath fled from one Mary Diamond  
   (Inchbald 165, 1799)
   d. Stocks have gone just as I imagined  
   (Fielding 154, 1733)
   e. Such a gentleman has run away with me!  
   (Reynolds MT I 260, 1793)

(21) perfects with BE in the 19th century
   a. The hour of conviction is arrived  
   (Boucicault NCBD 248, 1841)
   b. Mrs. Jones is come, and Mrs. Willoughby  
   (Taylor 305, 1863)
   c. I congratulate Nero that his ghastly rival is fled  
   (Th. Carlyle 298, 1852)
   d. I’ve seen better days, but they are gone — most like for ever  
   (Robertson 350, 1867)
   e. All my cable is run out  
   (Jerrold 37, 1829)

(22) perfects with HAVE in the 19th century
   a. Then, Mr. Clandon has not yet arrived?  
   (Shaw 301, 1898)
   b. You have come back!  
   (Grundy 564, 1890)
c. he has fled away from everybody to me  
   (J. W. Carlyle II 393, 1858)
d. He has gone to London just now, this minute  
   (Jones LVP 120, 1897)
e. I have run away for a week's change  
   (Carroll I 434, 1881)

They showed that in perfect constructions with unaccusatives, the paradigm changed from a heavily BE-dominated system to an almost totally HAVE-dominated one during the eighteenth and nineteenth century.

2.2. 'Symmetrical' Auxiliary Selection

In PE perfects, unlike those of OE, ME, and ModE, all verbs select HAVE, with a limited number of exceptions (see note 2). Whereas unaccusative verbs of earlier English formed perfects with BE, as we showed in the preceding subsections, HAVE, instead of BE, is employed in PE perfects with unaccusatives. It is very interesting that such syntactic change (i.e. the shift from asymmetrical to 'asymmetrical' auxiliary selection) took place, though there are phenomena indicating unaccusativity even in PE, as illustrated in (23)–(24).

(23) a. There exist three men in the room.
   b. There appeared a ship on the horizon.

(24) a. *Phyllis existed a peaceful existence.
   b. *Karen appeared a striking appearance at the department party.

(23) involve there-constructions, which are in general compatible only with unaccusative verbs.9 Unaccusatives are also said to take no cognate objects, as shown in (24). In spite of the facts in (23) and (24), unaccusative verbs of PE select HAVE in perfects. Some examples are given in (25).

(25) a. The ship has appeared on the horizon.
   b. He has gone to America.
   c. Chris has just arrived at the station.

If BE is selected, the sentence will be ungrammatical, as in (26).

(26) *The ship is appeared on the horizon.

9 It is controversial whether there-constructions can be used to diagnose the unaccusativity of a given verb. This paper adopts Burzio's (1986) theory without any argument. For arguments against this approach, see Levin (1993) and Levin and Rappaport (1995), among others.
3. Theoretical Assumptions

This section provides some theoretical assumptions adopted here. First, we assume the following structure for perfect constructions of HAVE in OE through ModE, with AGRs and its projections omitted.\textsuperscript{10,11}

\[(27) \quad [CP \ C \ [TP \ T \ [VP \ HAVE \ [AGRP \ AGR \ [VP \ Subj \ PtP \ Obj]]]]] \quad (PtP=\text{perfect participle})\]

The structure in which HAVE takes AGRP as its complement is motivated by the fact that perfect constructions have developed from possessive constructions with HAVE, as in (28) (cf. Carey (1994), Denison (1993) and Mitchell (1985)).

\[(28) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ðonne hæbbe we begen fet gescode swīðe untællice} \\
& \quad \text{then have we both feet shod very blamelessly} \\
& \quad \text{'then we have both feet shod very blamelessly'} \\
& \quad \text{(CP 45.12/Denison (1993: 349))} \\
\text{b. } & \text{hwæðer he ... þa stafas mid him awritene hæfdæ} \\
& \quad \text{whether he ... the letters with him written-out had} \\
& \quad \text{'whether he had the letters with him written out.'} \\
& \quad \text{(Bede 4 23.328.6/ibid.)}
\end{align*}\]

In the examples above, the participles gescode 'shod' and awritene 'written-out' agree with the DPs begen fet 'both feet' and þa stafas 'the letters,' respectively, and these DPs are objects of HAVE, not of the participles. From the minimalist point of view, $\phi$-features of the DPs are checked through the Spec-Head relation with the participles, whereas the Case feature of the DPs is checked through the Spec-Head relation with HAVE. Thus, two AGRPs are assumed as in (29a). Sentences like (28) are derived as schematically illustrated in (29), with AGRs and its projections omitted again.

\textsuperscript{10} In Chomsky (1995, 1998), AGRsP and AGRoP, which are assumed in Chomsky (1993), are abandoned on conceptual ground. The viability of such functional categories should be examined at length, but this is left open for future work. See Tanaka (1998) for discussion against Chomsky's (1995, 1998).

\textsuperscript{11} As for the head parameter, we suppose that it is specified as head-initial for all stages of English, just for simplicity of illustration. For analyses based on this position, consult Kayne (1994), Roberts (1997) and Van der Wurff (1997). See also Van Kemenade (1987) and Pintzuk (1993) for clause structure of OE.
(29) a. \[[\text{CP} \text{ C} \text{ [TP T} \text{ [AGR_{RoP} AGRo} \text{ [VP Subj HAVE} \text{ [AGRP AGR} \text{ [VP PtP Obj]]}]]]]

b. \[[\text{CP} \text{ C} \text{ [TP T} \text{ [AGR_{RoP} AGRo} \text{ [VP Subj HAVE} \text{ [AGRP Obj}} \text{ PtPi [VP ti tj]}]]]]

c. \[[\text{CP} \text{ C} \text{ [TP T} \text{ [AGR_{RoP} Obj} \text{ HAVEk} \text{ [VP Subj tk} \text{ [AGRP tj PtPi} \text{ [VP ti tj]}]]]]

d. \[[\text{CP} \text{ Top HAVEk} \text{ [TP Subj tk [AGR_{RoP} Objk tk [VP tk [AGRP tj PtPi [VP ti tj]]]]]]

To begin with, the participle and object are raised to AGR and the specifier of AGRP, respectively, in order to check agreement features. As the next step, HAVE moves up to AGRo, and the object is raised into the specifier of AGRoP, so that the Case feature of the object is checked. HAVE moves up to C via T, and a topic element is raised to the specifier of CP, forming (29d). It should be noted here that the Case feature of the object is checked within AGRoP, and that the agreement features between the participle and object are checked within AGRP.

As opposed to possessive constructions like (28), in perfect constructions, the object has no direct relation with HAVE, but with the participle. Given the general minimalist assumption, both the Case and \(\phi\)-features of the object are checked simultaneously through the Spec-Head relation within AGRP in the structure of (27). Therefore, it is not necessary to assume AGRoP above VP headed by HAVE in perfect constructions, but AGRP should be projected above VP headed by a perfect participle.\(^{12}\)

As for BE perfects, we posit the following structure, which is similar to the structure proposed in Chomsky (1991), Den Dikken (1994), Kayne (1989) and so on.

(30) \[[\text{CP} \text{ C} \text{ [TP T} \text{ [VP BE} \text{ [AGR_{RoP} AGR} \text{ [VP PtP Subj]]}]]]]

Assuming this, I make the following assumptions with respect to verb movement.

(31) a. In a language where finite verbs can move overtly, non-finite verbs as well can move overtly.

\(^{12}\) Broekhuis and Dijk (1995) propose a different structure with two AGRPs for perfect constructions.
b. In a language where finite verbs cannot move overtly, nonfinite verbs as well cannot move overtly.

Here finite verb movement is used to refer to independent verb movement, which is proposed by Vikner (1995). German and French have independent finite verb movement, and PE and Swedish have no such verb movement (cf. Vikner (1995: chapter 5) and Jonas (1996)). Under the assumptions of (31), thus, in German and French nonfinite verbs can move overtly whereas in PE and Swedish nonfinite verbs cannot move overtly. This is borne out by the following fact.13

(32) a. *Anders lovade [att PROi dricka_i [VP inte [VP t_i t_j
Anders promised to drink not
mjölken]]]
The milk

b. Anders lovade [att PRO_i [inte [VP t_i dricka
Anders promised to not drink
mjölken]]]
The milk

(Swedish; Jonas (1996: 182))

As just mentioned above, Swedish has neither independent finite verb movement nor overt nonfinite verb movement. Given this, the contrast in (32) can be straightforwardly explained. The sentence of (32a) is ruled out as ungrammatical because the nonfinite verb *dricka ‘drink’ moves overtly. On the other hand, the sentence is grammatical when the nonfinite verb remains in situ, as in (32b).

Finally, we adopt the minimalist program advocated by Chomsky (1995), not a newer version (Chomsky (1998)), mainly because the Spec-Head relation plays a crucial role in the analysis presented below.

4. How to License Perfect Participles

4.1. The Licensing Condition on Perfect Participles

This section examines how perfect participles of OE, ME, and ModE are licensed. Just as DPs are licensed by having the Case feature checked, so we assume that perfect participles (or more generally, nonfinite verbs) must be licensed by having some feature checked. One

---

13 The assumption is also supported by the word order variation observed in OE. See Koopman (1992).
question raised here is what checks this feature.

There are two options for checking this feature (which I call the [+P(articiple)] feature for convenience): One is that the [+P] feature is checked by HAVE. This can be motivated by the fact that HAVE takes a perfect participle as its complement. If a perfect participle was used as complement of a modal auxiliary, for example, the sentence would be ungrammatical.

(33)  a. *The ice will melted if the sun comes out.
     b. The ice will melt if the sun comes out.
     c. The ice has just melted.

The other option is that the [+P] feature of perfect participles is checked through the Spec-Head relation with a subject. If the [+P] feature is checked through the Spec-Head relation with a subject, a perfect participle is licensed and it is not necessary for HAVE to be used in the construction. As a result, BE is instead selected.

To sum up, the licensing condition on perfect participles is stated as follows:

(34)  The licensing condition on perfect participles:14
       A perfect participle is licensed either
       a. through the Spec-Head relation with a subject, or
       b. by adjunction to HAVE.15

If a perfect participle is licensed by (34a), BE is selected. Otherwise, HAVE is used in perfect constructions, and it licenses a perfect participle. This condition is partly supported by the agreement phenomena (see also section 5). In OE, agreement endings, sometimes 'zero'-inflection, appear on a participle, as we saw in section 2. Relevant examples are repeated here.

---

14 This condition is more formally stated as follows:
   (i) A perfect participle is licensed only if the [+P] feature is checked either
       a. through the Spec-Head relation with a subject, or
       b. through the Head-Head relation with HAVE.

I will use the informal version in (34) for ease of illustration.

15 Chomsky (1995) proposes covert feature movement for checking. However, I will continue to assume Chomsky's (1993) version of covert category movement for the sake of clarity. If covert feature movement is adopted, the essence of the present analysis will remain unchanged.
In (35), the participles agree with the objects, not with the subjects, and select HAVE as a perfect auxiliary. In (36), by contrast, the participles select BE and agree with the subjects. This mechanism is illustrated in (37). In (37b), the VP-internal subject position is not projected, since the PtP is unaccusative.

(37) a. HAVE AGRP Obj PtP VP Subj t t

b. BE AGRP Subj PtP VP t t

In the structure of (37a), the Case feature of the object is checked at the same time. If the subject moves into the specifier of AGRP, instead of the object, the derivation will be cancelled because of the feature mismatch (cf. Chomsky (1995: 309)). By contrast, in the structure of (37b), the Case feature of the subject is not checked, just because unaccusatives have no corresponding Case feature. The subject further moves up to the specifier of TP in order to have its Case feature checked.

4.2. Licensing of Perfect Participles in OE

This subsection first considers OE perfects with HAVE and then turn to BE perfects. HAVE perfects can be syntactically classified as follows:

(38) a. HAVE perfects involving an accusative object (cf. (2))
    b. HAVE perfects involving an object with inherent Case (cf. (7))
    c. HAVE perfects involving a clausal complement (cf. (8))
    d. HAVE perfects involving a prepositional complement (cf. (9))

In type (38a), the participle agrees with its accusative DP, and checks
the Case and \( \phi \)-features of it within AGRP. As proposed in (34), the participle cannot be licensed in this case, just because the DP is not a subject. Thus, it must be adjoined to HAVE to be licensed. In OE, perfect participles are adjoined to HAVE covertly to be licensed. However, if the so-called verb raising takes place (cf. Koopman (1992) and the references cited there), perfect participles are adjoined to HAVE overtly and the \([+P]\) feature is checked as a free rider. In this case, a perfect participle precedes HAVE, as shown in (39).\(^{16}\) The adjunction structure is schematically illustrated in (40).\(^{17}\)

(39) a. pe he gehogad hæfde wið þam cyninge
    which he contemplated had against the king
    'which he had contemplated against the king'
    (COBEDE, 124)

b. eac se cyng him wel gegifod hæfde on hamon, þ
    also the king him wel enriched had in home and
    on golde þ seolfre
    in gold and silver
    (COCHROA3, 132 1001.11)
    'the king had also made great gifts to him, in estates and
gold and silver'

(40)

In (40), the \([+P]\) feature is checked through the Head-Head relation with HAVE and then the participle is licensed by (34b). If checking of the \([+P]\) feature is covert, we have almost the same structure of (40)

\(^{16}\) Examples (39) are cited from the Diachronic Part of the Helsinki Corpus, whose reference system is adopted here.

\(^{17}\) For more details of this structure, see Kayne (1994).
at LF. In type (38b), AGRP should be projected, though there is no agreement between the perfect participle and its inherent DP. This is because the inherent Case feature of the object also must be checked through the Spec-Head relation within AGRP. The perfect participle and its dative or genitive object move to AGR and the specifier of AGRP, respectively, for checking the Case feature, not the [+P] feature. As in the case of type (38a), the participle of type (38b) cannot be licensed by condition (34a) because no Spec-Head relation is established between the participle and subject, and then must be adjoined to HAVE under the present analysis.

In types (38c, d), no agreement features are checked within AGRP, because agreement only takes place between the participle and accusative object, as mentioned above. As for the Case feature, since clausal and prepositional complements have no Case features to be checked (cf. Stowell (1981)), they do not raise into the specifier of AGRP. Therefore, the clausal and prepositional complements remain in situ. In these cases, the perfect participles move to AGR overtly (cf. (31)). The structure is illustrated approximately as this:

```
(41) CP
    \     \      \       \     \    \       
 HAVE TP VP AGRP PtP VP CP/PP
    \     \       \      \    \   \      
      t       t       t
```

The perfect participles of types (38c, d), like those of types (38a, b), cannot be licensed within AGRP, because they are not in the Spec-Head relation with a subject. Thus it must be adjoined to HAVE, in order to have the [+P] feature checked and thereby be licensed.

Let us next turn to perfects with BE, where unaccusative verbs are used. The skeletal structure of BE-perfects in OE may look like (42).

```
(42) [CP C [TP T [VP BE [AGRP AGR [VP PtP Subj]]]]]
```

Agreement features are checked within AGRP, regardless of whether
overt agreement endings are realized. Thus, the participle and subject move to AGR and the specifier of AGRP, respectively, in order to establish the Spec-Head relation there. Example (9), repeated as (43), contains the partial structure of (44).

(43) Swæ clæne hio wæs oðfeallenu on Angelcynne

(44) AGRP

 hio
  /\  
 oðfeallenu VP
    /\    /\ 
t VP PP 
   /\  /\  on Angelcynne
  t  t

In (44), the subject *hio* ‘it’ and the participle *oðfeallenu* ‘decayed’ are in the Spec-Head relation within AGRP. The perfect participles in this case is licensed by condition (34a), and HAVE need not be selected in perfects with unaccusatives.

4.3. Licensing of Perfect Participles in ME and ModE

This section shows that in ME and ModE, as in OE, perfect participles are licensed by condition (34a) or (34b). This means that both HAVE and BE were used in these periods. Although, unlike OE perfects, no overt agreement endings were realized in ME and ModE, I will maintain that the ‘zero’-inflection survived in these periods (cf. section 2.1.2 and Mustanoja (1960: 275–277)).

As for verb movement in ME through ModE, finite verbs can move overtly. There are two pieces of evidence for this: Object Shift and the V-*not* order. They are exemplified in (45)–(47).

(45) a. ʒif þei þise degrees knowyn
   if they these degrees know
   (Jacob’s Well 21.17/Van der Wurff (1997: 486))

   b. I may no sorwe haue
      I may no sorrow have    (Jacob’s Well 22.8/ibid.)

(46) a. Wepyng and teres counforteth not dissolute laghers
    weeping and tears comfort not dissolute laughers
    (Lyf of Jesu Christ/Roberts (1993: 250))
Given that the basic word order in these periods was SVO, the OV order, as in (45), is derived by overt raising of the verbs and objects. Similarly, the V-not order, as in (46)–(47), is derived by overt verb movement across not.

Based on these facts, along with assumptions (31), repeated here as (48), it might be claimed that nonfinite verbs can move overtly in these periods, too. As in OE, then, perfect participles in these periods move to AGR, which should also be assumed in order to check the Case feature.

(48) a. In a language where finite verbs can move overtly, nonfinite verbs as well can move overtly.
   b. In a language where finite verbs cannot move overtly, nonfinite verbs as well cannot move overtly.

By combining these assumptions, we now have the following structure of HAVE perfects:

(49)

In (49), no Spec-Head relation is established between the perfect participle and subject. This is just because the subject does not move into the specifier of AGRP. If it moves there, the derivation is cancelled for the reason of feature mismatch. As a result, the perfect participle
is not licensed by (34a). Therefore, it is adjoined to HAVE (in covert syntax), in order to be licensed by condition (34b).

In perfect constructions with unaccusatives, by contrast, the subject moves to the specifier of TP through the specifier of AGRP. Since unaccusatives have no Case feature, no Case mismatch yields if the subject moves to the specifier of AGRP. This is illustrated in (50).

(50)

```
TP
  /\          /
 /  \        /  \      
Subj BE VP AGRP
    /\     /\    /
   t   t PtP VP
```

As stated above, nonfinite verbs can move overtly in these periods. Thus, if a perfect participle is raised to AGR and a subject moves to/through the specifier of AGRP, the Spec-Head relation is established between the participle and subject, and then the participle is licensed by condition (34a).

It should be noted here that in these periods unaccusatives could be used in perfect constructions with HAVE. How can this be explained under the present analysis? For illustration, some relevant examples are repeated here.

(51)  a. sef ani god mon is of feorren icomen
     b. As many as han come, weren nyzt theues and dai heues

(52)  a. anone as his broBer was gone to Norway
     b. and whanne thei hadden gon awei fro the tentis of hem bi the cumpas

(53)  a. He is not yet arriued.
     b. on a moderate pace, I haue since ariu'd but hither

These sentences have the same order ‘auxiliary (AUX) and PtP’ on the surface, but they can be analyzed as having the ‘underlying’ structure in (54) or (55).

(54)  \[TP Subj AUX_k [VP t_k [AGRP t_i PtP_j [VP t_i t_j]]]]

(55)  \[TP Subj AUX_k [VP t_k [AGRP AGR [VP PtP t_i]]]]
In (54), the perfect participle moves up to AGR, while in (55) it remains in situ. If the participle is considered to be raised, it can enter into the Spec-Head relation with the subject, thereby it is licensed. If it does not move, no Spec-Head relation is established between the participle and subject, even if the subject moves up through the specifier of AGRP, as shown in (56).18

![Diagram showing Spec-Head relation](image)

Even in perfect constructions with unaccusatives, therefore, HAVE must be employed for licensing a perfect participle under condition (34b). Such coexistence of BE and HAVE perfects with unaccusatives had continued for some centuries (see the examples given in sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3), partly because the constructions under discussion could be analyzed as (54) or (55).

4.4. Licensing of Perfect Participles in PE

This subsection will consider how perfect participles are licensed in PE. As the following examples show, it seems that in PE finite main

---

18 An anonymous reviewer pointed out that in OE, too, the two options (54) and (55) were available. Agreement in OE, however, was obligatory rather than optional (cf. section 2.1.1) and participles must always raise to AGR in perfect constructions. Therefore, an unaccusative verb necessarily enters in the Spec-Head relation with a subject. In ME and ModE, by contrast, no overt agreement ending appeared on a participle (cf. sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3), and it is difficult to see whether agreement virtually took place. Thus, the same construction could be analyzed in the two distinct ways. Even in OE, some unaccusative verbs could already be used with HAVE, though. There is an example of this:

(i) pa Scipia hæfde gefaren to ðære niwan byriģ Cartainathen
    then Scipio had travelled to the new city Carthage

(Or 104.29/Denison (1993: 350))
verbs do not move overtly. In fact, this has been assumed in many studies (cf. Chomsky (1993), Roberts (1993), Rohrbacher (1994), and the references cited there).

(57)  
  a. John often kisses Mary.
  b. *John kisses often Mary.

(58)  
  a. My children do not go out on Sundays.
  b. *My children go not out on Sundays.

In the (a) examples of (57)–(58), the main verbs follow the adverb *often or not. If they precede such elements as *often or not, as in the (b) examples of (57)–(58), then the sentences result in ungrammatical ones. Given the assumptions of (48), nonfinite verbs of PE as well cannot move overtly, unlike those of OE, ME and ModE. In perfect constructions with non-unaccusatives, whether a participle moves overtly or not, no Spec-Head relation is established between a participle and subject, for the reason stated above. Thus, HAVE is employed for licensing the participle in perfects.

As for perfect constructions with unaccusatives, if a perfect participle of PE moves to AGR overtly, the Spec-Head relation can be established within AGRP and the participle may be licensed by (34a). Since in PE a perfect participle does not move to AGR overtly, however, no Spec-Head relation is established between the participle and subject, as we illustrated in (56). Thus, HAVE is employed for licensing unaccusative participles as well.

4.5. On the Demise of Asymmetrical Auxiliary Selection in English

This section explores why asymmetrical auxiliary selection has disappeared in the history of English. Specifically, we claim that the demise of asymmetrical auxiliary selection is attributed to the 'complete' loss of overt verb raising.

In section 3, I made the following assumptions: In a language where finite verbs move overtly, nonfinite verbs as well move overtly; in a language where finite verbs cannot move overtly, nonfinite verbs also cannot move overtly. As discussed in the previous subsections, in OE through early ModE, finite verbs can overtly move, and then nonfinite verbs as well can move overtly to AGR under the present analysis. In
perfect constructions of these periods, the finite auxiliaries, HAVE and BE, overtly move up to T (or C), whereas perfect participles overtly move to AGR. This is illustrated in (59). Some irrelevant part is omitted for the sake of exposition.

(59)

\[
\text{CP} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{HAVE/BE} \quad \text{TP} \\
\uparrow \quad \uparrow \\
\text{VP} \quad \text{AGR} \\
\text{PtP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

In perfects with unaccusative verbs, the participle is licensed by condition (34a), if it overtly moves to AGR and thereby enters into the Spec-Head relation with a subject (cf. (50)). In other perfect constructions, by contrast, no Spec-Head relation is established between a participle and subject and then condition (34a) is not satisfied. Therefore, HAVE is selected in order to satisfy condition (34b).

As shown in section 2.1.2, however, in ME through early ModE, HAVE was already used in perfects with unaccusatives, though the number was small. One reason is that the surface order can be analyzed as involving or not involving overt movement of a participle, as argued in section 4.3. If a participle is not raised, it is not licensed by (34a), and then in such situation HAVE began to be used even in perfects with unaccusatives.

In late ModE, furthermore, overt verb raising actually became obsolete. Rohrbacher (1994: 153-156), based on the data of Ellegård (1953)

---

19 In OE, perfect participles optionally move to HAVE before Spell-Out (cf. section 4.2).

20 The derivation will be cancelled for feature mismatch (cf. section 4.1).
and Kroch (1990), assumes that the loss of overt verb raising took place between late fifteenth and late sixteenth centuries. As he points out, however, the frequency of overt verb raising decreases somewhat in negative declaratives. In fact, some verbs, such as know, doubt, or go, precede the negative marker not during the nineteenth century (cf. Traugott (1972: 176)). This suggests that the 'complete' loss of overt verb raising took place in the course of the nineteenth century. Because of the 'complete' loss of overt verb movement, the licensing of participles by condition (34a) became unavailable. This is because if a participle does not raise to AGR, it cannot enter into the Spec-Head relation with a subject (cf. section 4.4). Consequently, it must be adjoined to HAVE in order to be licensed. The paradigm of perfects with unaccusatives, as mentioned above, changed to an almost totally HAVE-dominated system during the nineteenth century, which is almost identical to the period in which the 'complete' loss of overt verb raising took place. Also in PE, finite verbs raise covertly under the general assumption. Participles also move covertly under assumptions (48 (=31)). As a result, the Spec-Head relation is never established between a participle and subject. Therefore, the participles must be adjoined to HAVE to be licensed. Eventually, HAVE has become the only auxiliary in perfects.

5. Auxiliary Selection in French

In the previous sections, we have argued that the demise of asymmetrical auxiliary selection of English perfect constructions was caused by the 'complete' loss of overt verb movement. In this section, the analysis presented here is applied to auxiliary selection in French to show its validity. In French passé composé constructions, like perfect constructions of OE, ME, and ModE, two auxiliaries are used. Here are examples of auxiliary selection in French.

(60) a. Marie a vu Jean  
Marie has seen Jean

b. Marie est venue  
Marie is come

‘Marie has seen Jean.’  
‘Marie has come.’

(Vikner and Sprouse (1987: 524))

This syntactic behavior can be properly explained under the present analysis. French has overt finite verb movement, as shown in (61) (cf. Pollock (1989)). Given assumptions (48), nonfinite verbs, especially participles, can move overtly as well.
(61) a. Jean embrasse souvent Marie.
   Jean kisses often Marie.
   'Jean often kisses Marie.'

b. *Jean souvent embrasse Marie

If a non-unaccusative verb moves to AGR, it does not enter into the Spec-Head relation with a subject, as discussed above. If it moves there and the Spec-Head relation is established between the verb and subject, the derivation is cancelled for Case mismatch. So, non-unaccusative participles cannot be licensed by condition (34a). The participles are licensed only by adjunction to HAVE under the condition of (34). Therefore, HAVE is selected in passé composé constructions with non-unaccusatives.

As opposed to non-unaccusatives, unaccusative participles can enter into the Spec-Head relation with a subject. In this case, they are licensed by condition (34a), and then it is unnecessary for HAVE to be selected in the constructions.

French exhibits an interesting syntactic behavior: If a reflexive pronoun is used in passé composé constructions, BE is selected, instead of HAVE. Under the present analysis, such auxiliary alternation can be correctly predicted. An example is given in (62).

(62) Marie s’est photographiée.
   Marie Cl-is photographed
   'Marie has photographed herself.'

(Vikner and Sprouse (1987: 524))

This example has the following structure.

(63) \[ TP \text{Marie}_i \text{s’est}_k [VP \text{ti} [AGR \text{ti} \text{photographiée}_j [VP \text{tj} \text{ti}]]] \]
The reflexive pronoun se 'herself,' which itself is not a subject of the sentence, and the participle photographiée 'photographed' are in the Spec-Head relation within AGRP, and the agreement ending appears on the participle. What is more important is that the reflexive pronoun is coindexed with the subject Marie. Through this coindexation, the participle is in the Spec-Head relation with the subject. As a result, the participle is licensed by condition (34a), and HAVE is not selected.

Note that a participle is not licensed only through the Spec-Head relation with some NP. The NP must be coindexed with the subject of sentences. For example, in a passé composé construction where an object is a clitic, a participle agrees with the clitic, but HAVE is used, as shown in (64).
(64) a. Paul les a repeintes
    Paul them-has repainted.Pl
    ‘Paul has repainted them.’

b. Paul a repeint les chaises.
    Paul has repainted the chairs
    ‘Paul has repainted the chairs.’ (Kayne (1989: 85))

In (64), the participle agrees with the object clitic, i.e., it is in the Spec-Head relation with the object clitic, not with the subject. According to the condition of (34a), however, a participle is licensed through the Spec-Head relation with a subject, and so in this case, the participle is not licensed by condition (34a). Therefore, HAVE must be employed so that the participle is licensed.

6. Conclusion

We have examined the historical development of perfect constructions in English. In particular, I proposed the condition under which perfect participles are licensed either (a) through the Spec-Head relation with a subject, or (b) by adjunction to HAVE. It was also shown that in the case where a participle is licensed by condition (a), BE is selected in perfects; otherwise, HAVE is selected. We further claimed that the demise of asymmetrical auxiliary selection in English was caused by the ‘complete’ loss of overt verb raising. To be more precise, in earlier English, where asymmetrical auxiliary selection was observed, perfect participles were licensed by condition (a) or condition (b). In the course of the nineteenth century, in contrast, overt verb raising was completely lost, thereby the licensing of participles by condition (a) became unavailable. This is because a participle never enters into the Spec-Head relation with a subject. In PE, consequently, even in perfects with unaccusatives, HAVE is used so that participles are licensed by condition (b).
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