1 Introduction

The status of structures with have and be has long been a topic of considerable discussion. Since Benveniste 1966 and Bach 1967, it is assumed that the verb have is, in some way or another, the result of combining be with another element. According to Freeze (1992), the verb of possession have results from incorporation of a preposition into the copula be. This view is adopted by Kayne 1993, who proposes to derive several syntactic uses of be and have from the structure in example (1):

   DP
   DP         VP

The gist of Kayne's analysis is the idea that be selects a DP whose head is an oblique Determiner or an abstract Preposition that can conflate with the copula be forming have. His goal is to derive from one single structure the use of have in the perfect tenses, the highly modular system of Romance auxiliary selection, and its agreement effects. Several movement operations (akin to those argued for by Szabolcis's (1981, 1983) for Hungarian possessive constructions) conspire to yield the two French sentences expressing possession in (2):

---

*I gratefully acknowledge help from M. Llinàs-Grau and M. Vilanova for Catalan data, from M. Figueira and M. Terra for Portuguese data, from I. Bosque for historical source materials and discussion."
(2) **French**

a. Marie a le livre.
   “Mary has the book.”

b. Le livre est à Marie.
   the book is to Mary
   “This book is Mary’s.”

In (2a), P incorporates into the copula *be*, and the newly formed complex *be+a*, is spelled out as *have* (plus raising of the possessor throughout the specifier of D/P first). No P incorporation occurs in (2b), and the possessor in situ picks up dative Case, with the possessum raising above *be*. What matters to my purposes here is the prepositional component of *have*.

Arguably, the element that combines with *be* and yields *have* can be an invaluable source of information to understand different uses of *have*, and, more generally, cross-linguistic differences in this domain. This is exactly the approach I take in this article. I argue that the locus of cross-linguistic variation in the domain of *have* and *be* lies in the particulars of the head that combines with the copula *be*. Interestingly, many of the arguments that support this view extent to other "light" verbs. The logic of the approach suggests that "light" verbs other than *be* can select for Heads other than V, giving rising to syntactic and semantic effects of various types. The present study is an overview of such arguments.

2 **The dative P and Romance have and be**

As is well known, there is great diversity among languages concerning *have* and *be* (See Chvany (1975)). Within Romance, the following two properties (almost) go together:

A) The verb *have* can express possession. As noted in Bosque and Torrego (1994), this holds in French (with *avoir*), in Italian (with *avere*), and in Medieval Spanish (with *auer*):

(3) French  a. Marie a le livre.
           Italian b. Marie ha il libro.
   “Mary has the book.”
Old Spanish c. Tanto vales quanto *has*. 
such (you) are worth as you have
“You are worth what you have.”

B) A stative reading of the dative preposition is available. This holds true in French and Italian (in addition to Medieval Spanish), and also in Catalan. Catalan has an extremely limited use of possessive have, which I will discuss later. In (4) below I give examples illustrating the stative use of the dative preposition in French, Italian and Catalan:

(4) French a. Marie est à Paris/Il fait froid à Boston.
   Mary is to Paris/ It is cold to Boston
   Italian b. Ho passato venerdí a Parigi.
   (I) spent Friday to Paris
   Catalan c. La Maria é a París! Fa fred a Boston.
   Mary is to Paris/ It is cold to Boston

Both Portuguese and present-day Spanish lack A and B. That is, they lack a possessive use of the verb have, and a stative reading of the dative preposition. As illustrated in (5), in these two languages, have does not express possession, and the dative preposition cannot be used in the same way that it can in French, Italian and Catalan.

To express possession Portuguese and present-day Spanish use a different verb: Portuguese ter, and Spanish tener. Catalan also employs a verb other than have for general uses of possession, namely tenir. Example (5) illustrates possessive have, and (6) illustrates the absence of the stative use of the dative preposition:

(5) Catalan a. En Pere te/^ha una barca.
   the Pere has a boat
   Portuguese b."As coisas não têm significaçao:
   têm existência” (F. Pessoa).
   Things do not have a meaning:
   they have existence
   Spanish c. Pedro tiene/^ha una barca.
   Pedro has a boat

(6) Portuguese a. Faz frio en/^a Boston
   It is cold in/to Boston
   Spanish a. He pasado el viernes en/^a París.
   (I) spent Friday in/to Paris
When Catalan uses *have* as a verb of possession, we get an inchoative reading, as noted in Longa, Lorenzo and Rigau 1994. This is illustrated in (7):

(7) Catalan  A veure qui l'haurà, aquesta plaça.
    -let's see who cl(Accusative) will-get this position
    'Let's see who will get this position.'
    (Longa, Lorenzo and Rigau 1994)

Since the verb *get* is probably the inchoative of *have*, a point made by Jackendoff (1990: 4.1), it is highly plausible that *have* in Catalan, in its possessive use, does not have the same origin as in French and Italian.

I propose that the absence of a possessive value for *have* has to do with its oblique component. In broader terms, I take the particulars of the head that combines with the copula *be* to be the locus of cross-linguistic variation.

A central tenet of my approach is that, not just *be* selects a D or a P, but that as a parametric option of grammar, "light" verbs as well may select for a Determiner or a Prepositional head. I will develop this hypothesis throughout this article on the basis of comparative evidence within the Romance languages. The heads selected by *be* and "light" verbs manipulate the aspectral structure of predicates, and, for this reason, they can be considered to be Aspect heads. My strategy will be to show that superficially unrelated phenomena of various kinds can receive a unified treatment along the lines of this proposal.

The idea that Aspect enters into the formation of *have* is not entirely novel. Van Valin 1990 for Dutch, Den Dikken 1993 for Romance and others as well, have proposed that Aspect is crucially involved in auxiliary selection. Watanabe 1996 goes further, and identifies the element that incorporates into *be* for the perfect with an Aspect head, proposing (8) as a (partial) structure of the perfect:

(8) *be*+Aspect [t(Aspect) [ Agr [ John eaten the cake]]]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AspP</th>
<th>AgrP</th>
<th>VP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to suggest, instead, that the head that we call Aspect is the element that incorporates into *be*, a Preposition or a Determiner. Labelling this as Aspect does nothing but obscure the issue.¹

Before proceeding to the prepositional content of *have*, let us briefly consider some of the current theoretical assumptions within the Minimalist Program that bear on these topics.

2.1 *Romance Participles: the theoretical issue*

Romance participles do or do not agree overtly with their objects, depending on various factors, with great variation among the Romance languages; see Kayne 1985, 1989, 1993, Hoekstra and Mulder 1991, and den Dikken 1993, 1995 for details. One important empirical factor to consider is that, for the most part, **participial agreement takes place when the object precedes the participle**, as happens with clitics or *wh*-phrases, which is commonly taken as a sign that the object has raised. On the other hand, when the object follows the participle, a sign that the object has not raised, the participle does not agree overtly with the object. Examples from French and Italian that illustrate this are given in (9):

(9) **French**

a. *Combien de tables as-tu repeintes?*  
   How-many of tables (fem. pl.) have-you repainted (fem. pl.)?  
   'How many tables did you repaint?'

b. Jean *les a repeintes*  
   Jean them-(fem.pl.) has repainted (fem.pl.)

c. *Ils ont repeinte (fem. sing.) la table*

¹ To be fair, Watanabe comments that he is borrowing terminology from the literature on Celtic languages, but that the so-called aspectual particles "have a strong similarity to prepositions in these languages (Watanabe (1996: 3.2.2.3, p. 84). See his discussion for details."
They have repainted the table

**Italian**

a. *Li ho visti.*

(I) them-(masc. pl.) have seen (masc. pl.)

'I have seen them'

b.*Ho visti i ragazzi.*

(I) have seen (masc. pl.) the boys

(masc. pl.)

In Kayne's and most later analyses of participial agreement, the range of variation is derived from the assumption that overt past participle agreement satisfies a Case relation with the participle. This is implemented by one, the presence of agreement phrases in the structure, and two, a Specifier-Head agreement relation between the object and the participle.

Kayne made the licensing of accusative Case undistinguishable from that of nominative, by proposing that the object that raises enters into the specifier of the AgrP, and establishes agreement with the participle, which, in turn, has raised to the Agreement head, roughly as illustrated with a French sentence in (10):

(10) ![combien de tables] as-tu

[ t(combien de…) AGR repeintes t (combien de …)]

AGRP

This analysis nicely captures the contrasts in participial agreement of the sentences in (9), however it is not available to us for the following reasons.

First, agreement phrases pose problems: they consist solely of [-interpretable] features. Within the Minimalist Program, features are divided into [+interpretable] and [-interpretable], and [-interpretable] features must be eliminated for a Logical Form representation to converge. Since agreement phrases only have [-interpretable] features, once their features are checked (by, for instance, the agreeing DP of a past participle) nothing remains. Since the agreement phrase vanishes, the remaining structure is no longer a licit linguistic object.
Second, under current assumptions, only lexical heads have Case, Case being a [-Interpretable] feature. Functional heads can have [-Interpretable] features other than Case, such as gender, number and person. Therefore, several questions remain about participial agreement in general.

Furthermore, the privileged status of the Spec-head agreement relation has been weakened in more recent versions of the program. [-interpretable] features make functional heads and DPs "active" for the operations Agree, and Move (which consists of Agree plus Merge). Inflectional heads with [-interpretable] features are allowed to establish a long distance checking relation with their agreeing DP by the operation that is called Agree. Checking amounts to deletion under matching of the [-interpretable] features. Given that Agree can check [-interpretable] features, it is important to emphasize that it is not clear at all why overt agreement obtains with objects raised above VP and not with objects that are postverbal.

Finally, technical tools such as the chain condition, which prevented "illicit" movement (movement from a so-called A(rgument) position to a non-Argument position and back to an A(rgument) position) are not available to us either, their effects being derived as in the analysis of Epstein and Seely (1999).

Now, why should the locus of participial agreement be an Agreement head rather than the past participle affix itself or some other head? Evidence that I will discuss shortly suggests that the head that moves to the copula be forming have can select another head. This approach suggests the structure shown in (11):

\[(11) \text{ be} \ [P \ [D \ [...[V...]]]]\]

\[\text{VP has}\]

The idea is simply to have double selection: the P that conflates with be selects D. Since I am arguing that P has an aspectual content, we may expect that the head that P in turn selects may also be an Aspect head. More concretely, the selected head can be the locus
of the perfectivity of the participle, a position taken by Anagnostopoulou, Iatridou, and Izvorski (1997).

I will show that this type of approach allows us to assimilate the phenomenon of Romance past participle agreement to that of other phenomena attested in Romance involving "aspectual" heads, such as the phenomenon of accusative objects preceded by the dative preposition of Spanish (and other languages), clitic doubling of accusatives, and participial absolute clauses attested in Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, and in a limited form in French.

I will next turn to discussing the prepositional content of the verb *have*.

2.2 *The relevance of the prepositional content of have*

In what follows, it is important to keep in mind that the Romance dative preposition (equivalent to English *to*) is of locative origin (in Latin, it is *ad*) and can be stative or directional. We have already seen the stative reading of the dative preposition in the French sentence in example (4): *Il fait froid à Boston* (`It is cold in Boston’). A directional reading of the dative preposition can be seen in sentences such as French *Marie est allée à Boston* (`Mary went to Boston’).

Assuming that *have* is formed by incorporation of a dative preposition, we can ask ourselves whether the preposition that yields possessive *have* is stative or directional, or whether this question is meaningless.

The verb of possession *have* is a stative verb, and most copular sentences are stative sentences. It is therefore plausible that the dative preposition that can render *have* a verb of possession has a stative value. As mentioned earlier, the Romance languages appear split: some allow the dative preposition in more contexts than others. The range of contexts where the Romance languages can or cannot use the dative preposition is more extensive than what we have considered so far. For example, some dialects of French
allow the dative preposition with possessors in the nominal system, as noted by Kayne (1975) (French: *Un livre à Pierre*). However, for the purposes of this article I will ignore these other contexts, acknowledging their importance for a more detailed comparative analysis.

Since French and Italian have a purely stative use of the dative preposition, and French and Italian also have the possessive meaning with the verb *have*, my conjecture is that the dative preposition that conflates with *be* is stative. The intrinsic semantic value of the preposition will then be reflected in the constellation *be+a*.

We can now begin to understand why some Romance languages have possessive *have* and others do not. Catalan, Portuguese and Spanish may lack the main verb of possession *have* because the preposition they employ with *be* is not stative. This may also help explain Catalan uses of the verb *have* with possession, which as we saw earlier has an inchoative meaning. Plausibly, the preposition that yields this use of *have* in Catalan is the dative preposition that is directional. Then, perhaps the fact that some languages have different inflectional paradigms for the perfect auxiliary and the possessive verb *have* is rooted in the internal composition of *have*. In (12) I give the Romanian paradigms with *avea*:

(12) a. the perfect b. the possessive

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>am</em></td>
<td><em>am</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ai</em></td>
<td><em>ai</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>a</em></td>
<td><em>are</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>am</em></td>
<td><em>avem</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ati</em></td>
<td><em>aveti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>au</em></td>
<td><em>au</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Dobrovie-Sorin 1993: 3)

The present approach can also be helpful in regard to Portuguese, which lacks compound tenses with *have*, although it has an existential use of this verb: "haver" (*há diferença 'There is a difference’*), and uses *have* for modals (*haver de: Tenho escrito bastantes poemas. Hei-de escrever muitos mai, ..." F. Pessoa, Poemas Inconjuntos).
Interestingly, in Portuguese, *a* appears in infinitives with a progressive value, as noted by Raposo (1989) in his example here numbered (13):

(13)  [Os meninos a fumarem]! Isso é um horror.
      the children to smoke-Agr! That is a horror
      The children smoking! That's awful.
      (Raposo 1989)

The situation in Spanish is more revealing. I will not concentrate here on the Tense aspects of Romance *have* (which is a different research topic). Instead, I would like to briefly illustrate with the Spanish future the directional value of the dative preposition that forms Spanish *haber*.

Historically, the future in Romance developed out of the combination of the present indicative of *have* and the infinitive form of the verb. For example, Spanish *he*+*hablar* yields the first person form of the future *hablaré*.

Yet, in Spanish the future is not permitted in *when*-clauses, in contrast to Catalan, French and Italian. In this context, Spanish requires the subjunctive, as pointed out in Bosque and Torrego 1994:

(14) Spanish   a. *Cuando vendrás/ Cuando vengas*
      * (future) / (subjunctive)
      Catalan b. Quan vindrás (future)
      French   c. Quand tu viendras (future)
      Italian  d. Quando verrai (future)
      (Bosque and Torrego 1994)

This difference can be attributed to the preposition that forms Spanish *haber*, if it is directional or motional, as I am arguing here. Intuitively, there is conflict between the intrinsic value of the morphological future in Spanish and the modal value of the future of these *when*-clauses.

In other words, due to the lexical composition of Spanish *haber*, the future, in Spanish, is limited to contexts of "real" future. Many other differences between Spanish
Haber and its Romance counterparts described in Bosque and Torrego (1994) can be made to follow in a similar manner (among others, the fact that Spanish has compound forms with epistemic modals precluded in Catalan, and in Italian), but I will not pursue this task here.

An important argument for thinking of the dative preposition that forms Spanish haber as an Aspect head comes from its role in transitive accusative predicates. I turn to discuss this topic next.

3 Spanish: the dative preposition with accusative objects

In Spanish, direct objects of certain aspectual classes of verbs can or must be preceded by the dative preposition. In separate work I have discussed this phenomenon in great detail (Torrego (1998)). For the purposes of the present discussion, the two factors conditioning the presence of the preposition with the object that matter are, one, that only accusative verbs allow the preposition, and two, that the object that carries the preposition is interpreted as specific in some intuitive sense, and is of a certain lexical type, basically "animate". Some examples are given in (15):

(15) Spanish
   a. La policía detuvo *(a) Pinochet.
      the police detained (to) Pinochet
      "The police detained Pinochet."
   b. La lluvia empapó *(a) muchos turistas.
      The rain soaked (to) many tourists
      "The rain soaked many tourists"
   c. Conoce bien (a) un vecino suyo/*(a) su vecino
      (they) know well (to) a neighbor of them well/
      (to) their neighbor

Within this phenomenon, a particularly revealing group of verbs is that of degree and scalar predicates. Degree and scalar predicates, as their name implies, order or grade along certain dimensions. The object of these verbs obligatorily appears preceded by the dative preposition, as shown in examples (16):
(16) a. Xmanda-c *(a) Y.
    X c-commands (to) Y
b. El invierno precede *(a) la primavera.
    the winter precedes (to) the spring
    'Winter precedes Spring.'
c. Esto se parece *(a) aquello.
    this resembles (to) that

No dative preposition appears in similar sentences in French and Italian. Catalan, again, falls in the middle with some residue of this, since Catalan uses the dative preposition for the direct object that is a "point target," as in example (17b):

(17) Catalan
    a. X c-comanda Y.
        `X c-commands Y'
b. Això s'assembla *(a) allò.
        This resembles that
c. L'hivern precedeix la primavera.
        Winter precedes Spring

The Spanish sentences in example (16) are informative because the dative preposition's function in these predicates is to link the event participants, while leaving their exact relationship open. Intuitively, what the dative preposition does in sentences with objects is to relate two event participants by making the object the "target" participant of the event. For example, the two event participants of sentence (15a) with the verb *detain* are the police and Pinochet, with Pinochet as the target.

I want to concentrate here on what I consider to be the core of the phenomenon of the dative preposition with direct objects, although, because for reasons of space, I am forced to leave undiscussed syntactic and semantic issues of relevance.

I would like to propose that light verbs in some languages can select for a phonologically null dative preposition, arguing that this is what we commonly refer to as an Aspect head. Evidence from Spanish suggests that different light verbs select for prepositional and determiner heads with slightly different features, that come to be reflected in the syntactic structure of these predicates, as illustrated in (18a) and (18b):
(18) a. [SUBJ v [ P […] V OBJ ]]]
   vP     PP     VP

   b. [SUBJ v [ P […] V P-D-NP] ]]
   vP     PP     VP
   ^________|_________|__|

The structures in (18) are similar to the structure of possessive sentences with *be* and *have* proposed by Kayne (1993), with the following differences. First, not *be* but a light verb such as 'cause', 'make', and others selects for a preposition or an oblique Determiner. As a consequence of this fact, the range of thematic subjects allowed in sentences with prepositional accusatives is limited; the subject of sentences with accusative objects preceded by the dative must be a volitional agent or a cause. This, I previously thought was due to the preposition of the direct object itself, but it is not. Second, because the null preposition in structure (18) is sandwiched between small 'v', the light verb, and the lower VP, it is the main verb V that moves into the null P first, and the resulting cluster moves to small ‘v’. Lastly, in the structures in (18), unlike in the structure with possessive sentences involving *be* plus preposition, the only possible syntax is Head-incorporation (leaving aside additional morphological choices).

It follows, then, that we do not find accusative objects with the dative preposition in passive sentences or with unaccusative verbs because passives and unaccusatives lack small v. At the same time, we find in Spanish certain other syntactic contexts, which contain a light verb, where the dative preposition is obligatory, a fact that follows from this approach.

As far as the direct object is concerned, as I mentioned, certain restrictions apply, relating to specificity, and animacy. I want to propose that these constraints be looked at in terms of selection. The null P sandwiched between the light verb, represented in the structure by small v, and the VP, selects for a preposition, which in turn selects for a
determiner, thus bringing us into the realm of double selection, as depicted in (18b).

Furthermore, in close similarity to the variation we have encountered within the Romance languages in regard to the P/D selected by *be*, I claim that there is variation with respect to the element selected by the light verb, both cross-linguistically, and within a single language. I suggest that in some languages light verbs select a definite determiner rather than a Preposition, which is realized as an accusative clitic, as illustrated in (19a):

(19) Variant A:

a. [SUBJ v  [ D(Clitic) […] V D-NP ] ]
   vP    DP    VP

   La felicitamos a la pianista.
   (we) her-congratulated to the pianist
   `We congratulated the pianist’

   (Attested in the Spanish spoken in the South Cone of America.

   Variant B:

b. [SUBJ v  [ P […] V P D-NP ] ]
   vP    PP    VP

   *(La) felicitamos a la pianista.
   (we) (her)-congratulated to the pianist

   (Attested in Peninsular Spanish and other dialects)

So we have two variants, A and B. In Variant A 'v' selects for a D, the accusative clitic, and in Variant B 'v' selects for the preposition instead.

There are significant syntactic and semantic differences between these two choices, which I can only briefly touch on here.\(^2\) Let us briefly consider one here.

\(^2\) Some of these differences are discussed in detail in Torrego (1998).
Certain variants of Spanish allow one more option in causatives of the faire-à type than do French and Italian. Namely, the one given in example (20):

(20) **Spanish**

Ese guardia hizo al/el chico guardar la botella.

that policeman made the guy to put away the bottle

`The policeman made the guy put away the bottle`

The preverbal causee in (20), namely *al chico*, requires the dative preposition. The underlying structure of (20) corresponds to those variants of Spanish in which light verbs select a Preposition rather than a definite determiner, that is, (19b). It is important to point out that languages, and Spanish variants, that conform to variant A, and not to variant B, lack this causative.

What is surprising is that this type of causative is found not only in the variants of Spanish that display (19b) (which correspond to prepositional accusatives with no accusative doubling clitic), but also in many dialects in Catalan that otherwise lack prepositional accusatives, as illustrated in example (21):

(21) **Catalan**

Aquest guàrdia va fer al noi guardar la botella.

this policeman is going to make to the guy put away the bottle

`The policeman will make the guy put away the bottle`

However, Catalan, unlike French and Italian, lacks the verb of possession *have* (except the one that yields an inchoative reading). The logical thing to do is to look for a solution parallel to the one proposed above for Spanish accusatives, and to consider the Catalan dative preposition itself to be central in this phenomenon. Catalan (21) simply corresponds to structure (22):

(22) … V(causeative) [ P [SUBJ v [ V OBJ] ] ]

PP vP VP
Here, the causative verb selects for the directional P, which indirectly makes the preinfinitival causee appear in the dative.

This shows that the grammatical property that matters is selection by light verbs (here, the causative verb), since Catalan has a stative use of the dative preposition with the copula *be*, as already discussed; yet, the preinfinitival causative is attested. This also adds support for Freeze's analysis of possessive *have* as the result of incorporation of an abstract P to *be*, which I argue has aspectual value.

One significant piece of circumstantial evidence in support of this proposal comes from the facts of historical grammar. Recall that *have* had a possessive value in medieval Spanish. According to historical sources, Spanish "*Haber* retained its value as a verb of unmarked possession until the fifteenth century." It is also during the fifteenth century that in Spanish *auer a* plus infinitive ceases to exist (Strausbaugh, J. A 1933: p.17). It is precisely during the fifteenth century that all investigators agree that a dative preposition must appear before accusative objects with predicates of certain aspectual classes. It is therefore plausible that the copula *be* in Spanish came to be assimilated in its behavior with a light verb around this time, and could no longer select a stative preposition, as the grammar of French and Italian do.

Within my current proposal, the loss of partitive and locative clitics, clitics available in Spanish up until the fifteenth century, and absent from present-day Spanish, can be understood along the following lines. Roughly put, the selectional property of Spanish light verbs (that is, a double selection involving a light verb, a preposition and the type of determiners associated with specificity) came to preserve only clitics that delimit; partitive clitics, of course, do not delimit since they are not "definite", and locative clitics, plausibly, have the aspectual properties of stative prepositions.

With this as background, I now turn to discuss some ramifications of this parameter.
4 have, be and Participles

So far I have ignored the question of the location of have and be with respect to small v, the light verb. This question is important for constructions involving participles. As is well-known, there is a wide variety of patterns in regard to have and be as auxiliaries in Romance. Italian requires be for unaccusatives, and have for transitives and unergatives. In contrast, Spanish, like English, only uses auxiliary have. No matter what the verb is, the auxiliary that is selected in Spanish is have, except for passives, as shown in (23):

(23) Spanish
   a. El tren ha/es llegado con retraso.
      the train has arrived late
   b. Juan ha comprado (masc. sing.) las cervezas (fem. pl.)
      Juan has bought the beers
   c. Juan las (fem. pl.) ha comprado (masc. sing.)
      Juan them-has bought
      ‘Juan has bought them’

Yet Spanish patterns with be languages rather than with have languages in two closely related domains: one is absolute clauses (illustrated in (24a):

(24) Spanish
   a. Leída (fem. sing) la sentencia (fem. sing.),
      el juez se retiró.
      (Hernanz (1991, 1993)); de Miguel (1990))
      ‘The sentence (having been) read, the judge left’

   Italian
   b. Regalato il disco a Maria, Gianni vuole subito ascoltarlo. (Belletti 1990)
      ‘The record (having been) given to Maria, Gianni wanted to listen to it immediately’

   Continental Portuguese
   c. Dito isto, o juiz retirou-se. (Barbosa 1994)
      ‘This said, the judge left’

The other is Reduced Relatives; some examples of Reduced Relatives are given in (25):

(25) Spanish a. una hoja caída del árbol.
     Italian b. una foglia caduta dall'albero.
This puzzling syntactic behavior of Spanish will follow if we assume, as I here propose, that light verbs ('v') in Spanish are structurally above the copula be (and therefore above have), whereas I assume they are below be in Italian, as shown in (26):

(26) a. Spanish [ v [ be [ D [ V OBJ ] ] ]]
   vP     VP
   b. Italian [ be [ D [ v [ V OBJ ] ] ]]
      vP     VP

This proposal bears on the position of the subject in the structure: the subject in Spanish must merge in a higher position than in Italian, as illustrated in (27):

(27) Spanish
   a. [SUBJ v [ be [ P/D [ Participle OBJ ] ] ]]
      vP     VP
      ^_____/
      have
   Italian
   b. [be [ P/D [SUBJ v [ Participle OBJ ] ] ]]
      vP     VP
      ^_____/
      have

The fact that Spanish lacks have/be auxiliary alternations can be approached as follows: Unaccusatives in Spanish are simply indistinguishable from accusatives as far as the lower VP is concerned. Therefore, we do not expect sensitivity to the external argument, except in passives and in complex predicates such as periphrastic causatives, which I briefly commented on earlier.

Consider some other predictions of this proposal. The particular position of the
small 'v' in configuration (27a), higher than be and the Aspect head, makes the following prediction. In participial absolute clauses, accusative Case cannot be licensed in Spanish, contrary to the case in Italian. This prediction is borne out, as illustrated in (28):

(28) **Italian** a. Conosciuta me (Accusative)/*io (Nominative)  
    hai cominciato ad apprenzzare il mare.  
    known me/l, (you) have started to  
    appreciate the sea  
    ‘Having met me, you have started to  
    appreciate the sea’

**Spanish** b. Conocida *me (Accusative)/ yo (Nominative)  
    Juan dió un suspiro de alivio.  
    Known me/l, Juan gave a sigh of relief  
    ‘Having met me, Juan gave a sigh of relief’

**Italian** c. Arrivata *me (Accusative)/io (Nominative),  
    Gianni tirò un sospiro di sollievo.  
    Arrived me/l, Gianni gave a sigh of relief  
    ‘When I arrived, Gianni gave a sigh of relief’

In previous accounts, participial absolute constructions have been analyzed as clauses headed by an Aspect head. I take the Aspect head to be a Determiner head with a full set of agreement features. Following current assumptions within the Minimalist Program, I take small 'v' to be the locus of accusative Case checking. Since small 'v' in Italian is structurally below the copula be, but in Spanish small 'v' is above the copula be, the structure of participial absolute clauses lacks small 'v' in Spanish, and contains small 'v' in Italian. As a result, accusative Case is not licensed in Spanish participial absolute clauses, but can be licensed in Italian.

Let us now return to Reduced Relatives. According to Anagnostopoulou et al, in a Reduced Relative the Participle can be separated from the auxiliary when the missing auxiliary is be, but not when the missing auxiliary is have. This is why in Italian, (25b) is possible and (25d) is not possible. The puzzling fact is that Reduced Relatives in Spanish

can be formed with unaccusative verbs, as shown in example (25a), just as they can be formed in Italian, but unlike in Italian unaccusatives in Spanish select *have* and not *be.*

This particular behavior of Spanish grammar follows from the configuration proposed in (27a). Since small 'v' is above the copula *be* and the head D as well, the structure that obtains in Spanish in the absence of *be* is identical to the structure that obtains in Italian with unaccusatives, which lack a small 'v'.

From the perspective of this analysis, we can think of the absence of overt agreement between participles and objects in the Spanish perfect as related to the particulars of the structure proposed in (27a), repeated below):

```
(27) a. [SUBJ v [ be [ P/D [ Participle OBJ] ]] ]
  vP                VP
  \\
  ______/  
  have
```

The copula *be* is closer to the participle than small v. Using the "phase" concept of the minimalist program, I suggest that the [-interpretable] features of the participle stay around and do not delete until the completion of the phase. The VP formed by a small v is a phase. Derivations are generated phase-by-phase, with each phase having its own separate numeration. Thus once that a small vP is built, there is no choice: all [-interpretable] features of the structure have to be checked. Since under my present proposal, light verbs are structurally higher than the copula *be* in Spanish, it is possible for *have* to check the [-Interpretable] features of the participle, without the object ever entering into the equation.4

This brings us to the interesting case of accusative clitic doubling, which I

4 The present approach is similar to a proposal made by den Dikken (1993), in which the past participle can adjoin to *have* and check its Case-feature in this manner. I am assuming, though, that the features that are checked are agreement features of the Aspect head, rather than a Case feature.
introduced in structure (19a), and to which I return now.

5 Participial Agreement versus Clitic Doubling

Schmitt 1993 notes that NPs introduced by a definite determiner are the only NPs allowed in the three constructions shown in examples (29), (30) and (31). Furthermore, Schmitt observes that these three constructions are aspectually identical, and they all lack iterative readings.  

(29) **Brazilian Portuguese**
   a. Compradas todas as passagens.
      Bought all the tickets
   b. *Comprada toda passagem.
      Bought every ticket

      João had solved (masc.pl.) the/all the/many of the problems (masc. pl.)
   b. * O João tinha resolvidos problemas.
      João had solved problems.

(31) **Spanish**
   a. Los vi a todos los hombres/libros.
      (I) them-saw all of the men/books
   b. *Lo vi a todo hombre/libro.
      (I) him/it-saw every man/book

She also shows that in Brazilian Portuguese constructions with the verb *ter* can appear with agreeing and non-agreeing participles (as illustrated in (32)), making the interesting observation that it is only the agreeing participle that bars the multiple event reading:

(32) a. O João tinha tocado a sonata por uma hora, quando
      Maria chegou.
      João had played the sonata for an hour when Maria arrived
   b. O João tinha toca**da** (fem, sing.)a sonata(fem. sing.)

Schmitt (1993) discusses the aspectual import of these constructions within the theory of Verkuyl, H. J. (1972).
Schmitt's basic proposal for these data is to treat the three constructions as identificational small clauses headed by a definite determiner, allowing the definite determiner to be either a clitic or an affix.

Although I do not attribute a predicational content to the Preposition selected by light verbs or by be, I do share Schmitt's intuitions both about the semantics and about the syntax of the accusative clitic doubling construction, as well as the other two constructions. In agreement with her analysis, I will argue that these structures are headed by a definite determiner, which I regard as the Aspect head selected by certain light verbs in variants of Spanish which I have illustrated in (19a).

There is one more property that these three constructions share, in my view, and that is their "thematic independence". This is straightforward for participial absolute clauses, but it is controversial for the other two constructions (accusative clitic doubling, and ter-agreeing participial constructions). I will however take thematic independence here to mean their independence with respect to the subject of the clause, a true external argument, in the sense of Williams (1983). This fact bears on the notion of phase that we encountered earlier.

In addition to small vP, Complementizer Phrases are also considered to be phases, but Tense Phrases, for example, are not. The idea behind this is that both vP and CPs are (I quote from Chomsky) "relatively independent in terms of interface properties. On the 'meaning side' perhaps the simplest and most principled choice is to take a syntactic object to be the closest syntactic counterpart to a proposition: either a verb phrase in which all theta roles are assigned or a full clause including Tense and force." (MI, p. 20)

Now, let us recall the structure I have proposed for accusative clitic doubling, which I repeat as number (33):
I have proposed that the intervening Determiner that is morphologically realized as an accusative clitic in certain Spanish variants is selected by a light verb, small ‘v’, just as the dative Preposition is selected in other variants and in other languages, but each gives rise to a different semantics. Informally, when the dative preposition is selected, the dative preposition relates two arguments in the clause, the subject and the object, as participants of a single event. When a definite determiner is selected by the light verb instead, the determiner links a sub-event involving a subject to the sub-event involving the object, whatever the formal analysis of this intuition may be.

In conformity with Schmitt’s analysis, we can derive the properties of the three structures above (Portuguese ter agreeing participle constructions, participial absolute clauses and accusative clitic doubling constructions) from the particulars of the proposed configuration, as illustrated in (34):

(34) accusative clitic doubling structures

a. \[ \text{[SUBJ v [ D(Clitic) \ldots V D-NP ]]} \]
\[ vP \quad DP \quad VP \]

participial absolute clauses

b. \[ [ D \ldots V D-NP ] \]
\[ DP \quad VP \]

ter agreeing participle constructions

c. \[ ter [ D \ldots V D-NP ] \]
\[ DP \quad VP \]

The three constructions in (34) are headed by a Determiner with [-interpretable] agreement features. Syntactically, the crucial difference between accusative clitic doubling constructions and the other two lies in the structure above D, the Aspect head: there is a small ‘v’ above D with accusative verbs, but there is none in Spanish absolute clauses, and, presumably, there is one only above the main verb of possession ter in
Portuguese (or in Spanish *tener* agreeing clauses). For absolute clauses, which lack a small v, I assume that the functional head that checks the [-Interpretable] Case feature of the object is the Aspect head. Since this is the functional head that behaves as having "strong" phi-features, a minimal conclusion is that a functional Head with "strong" agreement features such as D can, at least sometimes, check Case, a conclusion reached by others with respect to Aspect heads.

It is possible that functional heads with a full set of phi-features such as these aspectual clauses are phases. This may explain why the object of these clauses appears to have raised over the past participle, perhaps a property of the phase, as suggested in Chomsky's Minimalist Inquiries article. Of course, the movement of the participle obscures the raising of the object.

Finally, the pattern of participial agreement we have encountered in these data suggests that the internal composition of Aspect, like that of Tense, depends on its selector. In the proposal of Chomsky 1998 *MI*, Tense can be selected by the Complementizer, or by verbs and other lexical heads. When Tense is selected by the Complementizer, Tense has a full set of [-Interpretable] phi-features; otherwise Tense has "deficient" agreement features, as in the case of the Tense of infinitival clauses which are complements of raising-to-subject verbs. The more thematic independence the clause has, the stronger its Aspect head is in its agreement features. In analogy with Tense, the element responsible for the internal feature composition of the Aspect head seems to be its selector, either Tense or the light verb.

6 Conclusion

In this article I have provided strong arguments that the absence of the possessive verb *have*, the lack of *be/have* alternations, accusative clitic doubling, and the phenomenon of accusative objects preceded by the dative preposition are just different facets of the same parameter.
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