

Perfect doubling and the grammaticalization of auxiliaries

Ellen Brandner (Konstanz) & Ida Larsson (Stockholm)

i. The possibility of so-called perfect doubling (1) is widespread in varieties of German, Italian and French, and it occurs to a more limited extent also in Dutch and Danish (Koeneman et al., Barbiers et al.).

(1) *Ich habe das ganz vergessen gehabt*
I have.PRES that completely forget.PTC have.PTC

(1) can have several interpretations: (i) a *temporal* one in which it has the same reading as a pluperfect and (ii) what Barbiers et al. call a *superperfect* which roughly expresses that the target state no longer holds at the speech time.

Perfect doubling is not attested in English and the Scandinavian languages apart from Danish. These languages also disallow positional past adverbials in the present perfect but have the so-called present perfect puzzle (Klein). Furthermore, they lack auxiliary selection, but have HAVE as the only temporal auxiliary. We argue that this clustering of properties is not a coincidence, but should be given a unified treatment. Focusing on Germanic, we suggest that the cross-linguistic patterns are a consequence of the different stages of grammaticalization of the perfect auxiliary. We tie the varying semantics of perfects to variations in the structure of the auxiliaries, while assuming that perfect participle morphology always spells out T+past (Julien, Larsson).

ii. Starting from a Kaynean analysis of HAVE as BE + P, we argue that temporal HAVE in languages like English spells out a temporal preposition ('in') that restricts the interpretation of the perfect and establishes a perfect time span (PTS) which necessarily includes the time set by the matrix tense (Iatridou et al.). This excludes past adverbials from the present perfect in English (cf. Pancheva & von Stechow). We assume that P always makes a semantic contribution, and that it is never spelled out by BE. In a system that uses BE in the perfect, P therefore cannot be present in the internal structure of the auxiliary. As a result, the internal structure of HAVE is also lost. In a German-type perfect, the auxiliary (HAVE/BE) thus spells out merely verbal inflectional features, and it does not restrict the interpretation of the embedded T+past. Past adverbials are therefore possible in the present perfect. Note that the analysis can account for the differences in the present perfect between English, on the one hand, and German, on the other, without relying on a notion of a parameterized semantics of tense.

iii. The superperfect (2), i.e. the non-pluperfect reading of double perfects, is analyzed by Koenemann et al. and Barbiers et al. as a stative construction with an adjectival participle. However, the participle is active, and it has the properties of a perfect participle also with respect to adverbial modification and (absence of) lexical restrictions. The superperfect is possible with telic, atelic and stative verbs, and regardless of transitivity.

(2a) *Ich habe meine Brille verloren gehabt*
I have.PRES my glasses lose.PTC have.PTC
(TS(lose) \supset RB of PTS, PTS < R, R = S)

(2b) *ich habe sie geliebt gehabt*
I have.PRES her love.PTC have.PTC
(S(love) \subseteq PTS, PTS < R, R = S)

Instead, we propose that the superperfect involves the combination of a German-type perfect auxiliary with an English-type perfect: the matrix perfect places the embedded perfect time span in the past. We suggest that the [T ASP AUX] complex can be iterated without leading to vacuous embedding and thus give rise to the possibility of double perfects iff a language has an impoverished HAVE in addition to the less

grammaticalized HAVE (which spells out P). Given that the German perfect can have the same interpretation as the English perfect, we independently need to assume that the less grammaticalized form is retained.

iv. We predict that the three phenomena (auxiliary selection, double perfects and the loss of the present perfect puzzle) are diachronically related in a non-trivial way. This seems to be borne out. The German BE-perfect is established later than the HAVE-perfect, in Middle German (cf. McFadden & Alexiadou). We see this as a precondition for the further development of HAVE. Subsequently, past adverbials start appearing in the present perfect in the 15th century; this is when the so-called *Präteritumsschwund* began in Southern German varieties. At this point, these varieties have two perfect auxiliaries: one older with internal argument structure, and one new, which only spells out inflectional features. This in turn opens for the possibility of a double perfect (with a superperfect interpretation). As predicted, the first attestations of the double perfect are from the same period (Litvinov & Radcenko 1998). Early examples are given in (3).

- (3a) *we...gedachten die zyt er sich mir vnd ich mich yme han ergeben gehabt*
 we...thought the time he himself me and I myself him have.PRES devote.PTC have.PTC
 'We thought about the time (when) he was devoted to me and I to him.'
 (Pontus and Sidonia, 15th c.; from Buchwald-Wargenau, 2012:255)
- (3b) *haut sich der turkist kaisser enthschlossen gehept, ... statt zu stuermend*
 have.PRES RFX the turkish emperor decide.PTC have.PTC town to attack
 (16th c.; from Ebert 1993:390)

In earlier work, it was often assumed that the emergence of double perfects was a consequence of the loss of the preterite (e.g. Behaghel): a double perfect was 'necessary' to express a pluperfect (reading (i) of ex. (1) above). However, it has since been established that this cannot be the right causal chain, for several reasons (cf. Rödel, Buchwald-Wargenau). Firstly, the first attestations of the double perfect occur before the loss of the preterite has prevailed. Secondly, the superperfect occurs also in varieties that have retained the simple past, and the matrix auxiliary can even be in the past tense (i.e. an English-type perfect embedded under a German pluperfect). So, the possibility of the double perfect (due to the loss of the internal structure of HAVE) has paved the way for the loss of the preterite.

v. To summarize, we argue that the (im-)possibility of double perfects boils down to the inventory of different grammaticalized auxiliaries, allowing iteration or not. We trace the development in the historical records of German. We can account for the different readings of simple and double perfects as a consequence of the combination of auxiliaries (with varying properties) with the invariant meaning of the participle (past). This is a welcome result as it places the variation (and diachronic development) in the functional makeup of lexical items (auxiliaries), rather than in the syntactic or semantic component.

References. Barbiers S. et al. *subm. Mesocomparative Syntax of Perfect Doubling*; Behaghel. O. 1924. *Deutsche Syntax III*. Carl Winter; Buchwald-Wargenau, I. 2012. *Die doppelten Perfektbildungen im Deutschen: Eine diachrone Untersuchung*. De Gruyter; Ebert, P. et al. 1993. *Frühneuhochdeutsche Grammatik*. Niemeyer; Iatridou S. et al. 2001. *Observations about the form and meaning of the Perfect*. In Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. MIT Press; Julien M. 2001. *The syntax of complex tenses*. *The Linguistic Review* 18:125–167; Kayne, R. 1993. *Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection*. *Studia Linguistica* 47:3-31; Koenenman O. et al. 2001. *Perfect doubling*. *Linguistic Variation* 11:35–37; Klein W. 1992. *The present perfect puzzle*. *Language* 68:525–552; Larsson I. 2009. *Participles in Time*. Diss. Gothenburg; Litvino, V. & Radcenko, V. *Doppelte Perfektbildungen in der deutschen Literatursprache*. Stauffenburg; McFadden T. & A. Alexiadou, *Auxiliary selection and counterfactuality in the history of English and Germanic*. In J. Hartmann et al. (eds.), *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax*. Benjamins; Pancheva R & A von Stechow, 2004. *On the Present Perfect Puzzle*. In Moulton & Wolf (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 34*. Stony Brock. Rödel, M. 2007. *Doppelte Perfektbildungen und die Organisation von Tempus im Deutschen*. Stauffenburg-Verlag.