

BE or HAVE in Contemporary Standard French – residua of a semantic motivation

Rolf Kailuweit

Chapter - Version of Record



Suggested Citation:

Kailuweit, Rolf (2015): BE or HAVE in Contemporary Standard French - residua of semantic motivation. In Rolf Kailuweit, Malte Rosemeyer (Eds.): Auxiliary Selection Revisited: De Gruyter (linguae & litterae, 44), pp. 249-276. DOI: 10.1515/9783110348866-009.

Wissen, wo das Wissen ist.



UNIVERSITÄTS- UND
LANDESBIBLIOTHEK
DÜSSELDORF

This version is available at:

URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:061-20230124-163942-8

Terms of Use:

This work is protected by copyright and/or related rights.

For more information see: <https://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/>

BE or HAVE in Contemporary Standard French – residua of semantic motivation

1 Introduction

Split-intransitivity – i.e. the distinction between unaccusative and unergative verbs¹ – has been an intensively discussed topic in general linguistics during the last decades. As far as Romance languages are concerned, the most obvious marking of split-intransitivity is the use of two different auxiliaries in compound tenses. In contemporary French for example, most intransitive verbs take HAVE in compound tenses, but some verbs take BE.

- (1) a. *Le roi a rit*
the king have-PRS.3SG laugh-PCPT
'The king has laughed.'
- b. *Le train est arrivé*
the train be-PRS.3SG arrive-PCPT
'The train has arrived.'

Nevertheless, Romance intransitive verbs do not split naturally into two auxiliary selection classes. As already pointed out by Rosen (1984), there is considerable intralinguistic and interlinguistic variation. On the one hand, there are for instance several intransitive verbs that allow for BE and HAVE in French:

- (2) a. *Ce texte est paru le 5 août*
this text be-PRS.3SG appear-PCPT the 5 august
'This text came out on August 5th.'
(FRANTEXT, JOCARD)

¹ The term *split-intransitivity* was coined by Merlan (1985) and spread by Van Valin (1990). In comparison with the terms *inaccusativity/inerativity* introduced by Perlmutter (1978) in the Relational Grammar framework, it is more neutral from a typological point of view. Due to the fact that inaccusativity/inerativity are well established terms in the literature, I will continue to use them in this paper.

- b. *Il y a quelques mois, un livre a paru*
 Ago some months a book have-PRS.3SG appear-PCPT
 ‘Some months ago, a book came out.’
 (FRANTEXT, FEBVRE)

On the other hand, several intransitive verbs allowing for BE in one language are exclusively used with HAVE in another. There are, for example, obvious mismatches between French and German:

- (3) a. *Christ est ressuscité*
 Christ be-PRS.3SG revive-PCPT
 (FRANTEXT: DÉON)
- b. *Christ a ressuscité*
 Christ have-PRS.3SG revive-PCPT
 (FRANTEXT: BONNEFOY)
- c. *Christus ist / *hat auferstanden*
 Christ be/have-PRS.3SG revive-PCPT
 ‘Christ is resurrected.’
- (4) a. *Elle a couru tout droit à la police*
 She have-PRS.3SG run-PCPT directly to the police
 (FRANTEXT: GARY)
- b. *Sie ist direkt zur Polizei gelaufen*
 She be-PRS.3SG directly to the police run-PCPT
 ‘She ran directly to the police.’

On the basis of this kind of data, Rosen (1984) denied that the unaccusative-unergative distinction could be motivated semantically. In addition, from a diachronic point of view many Romance languages and varieties show a tendency to substitute BE-selection with HAVE-selection: in Spanish, Portuguese and Catalan,² BE-selection is no longer an option in contemporary use (Vincent 1982; Posner 1996). In French the number of BE-selecting verbs has diminished considerably since the 18th century (Fournier 2002). This seems to be clear counter-evidence to a semantic motivation of split-intransitivity.

However, several authors have tried to reformulate semantic criteria for the overall distinction of two classes of intransitive verbs. Dowty (1991),

² With the exception of a few northern dialects.

Schwarze (1996, 1998) and Aranovich (2003) pointed out that the subject of unaccusative verbs is never a prototypical agent. Centineo ([1986] 1996), Van Valin (1990) and Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) highlighted the differences at the level of *Aktionsart* (activities vs. other *Aktionsart* classes). As far as the variation of auxiliary choice in Romance languages is concerned, Labelle (1992) claimed that BE-selection is a sufficient but unnecessary condition for inaccusativity in French, while Centineo ([1986] 1996), Van Valin (1990) and Bentley (2006: 44) declared that HAVE-selection is only limited to the *Aktionsart* class of activities in Italian. In recent years, Sorace (Sorace 2000; Legendre and Sorace 2003)³ has worked out an integrative approach to auxiliary selection that claims to explain interlinguistic and intralinguistic variation as well as the direction of diachronic change.

In the present paper I shall deal with the motivation of BE-selection in Contemporary Standard French. In section 2 an overview of the number of BE-selecting verbs in Contemporary Standard French is given in comparison to Italian and Old Spanish. Section 3 will account for the fact that in earlier stages of French the BE-construction and the HAVE-construction had different functions: it will be shown that the BE-construction was used as a resultative, the HAVE-construction as an anterior. This distinction has been lost in Contemporary Standard French while the number of BE-selecting verbs has diminished considerably. Section 4 will revisit Sorace's Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (ASH). Following Kailuweit (2011), I shall prove that the different features that determine the affinity for the unaccusative or unergative pole have to be weighed to describe the seven semantic classes of the hierarchy and their order in a coherent way. Finally, in section 5 the spread of Contemporary Standard French's BE-residua over the ASH-classes will be analysed. I shall prove that ASH is a useful tool to describe the distribution of BE-residua, although ASH's semantic explanation does not apply for a certain number of outliers. It will be shown that change of location is a necessary but insufficient condition for BE-selection in Contemporary Standard French since a change of location component can be detected in the semantics of all BE-selecting verbs.

2 BE in contemporary standard French

The construction BE + participle has several functions in Contemporary Standard French. BE is the only auxiliary used in French passive constructions which

³ For over 10 years, Sorace has tested her approach in synchrony and diachrony, taking several languages and varieties into consideration. See Sorace (this volume) for further references.

can be formed with transitive verbs only.⁴ All reflexive constructions take BE in the compound tenses. A small number of intransitive verbs constructs compound tenses with BE.

Burzio claims that Italian passives and reflexives behave syntactically as BE-intransitives (unaccusatives): “All and only the verbs that can assign a θ -role to the subject can assign (accusative) case to an object” (Burzio 1986: 178). Nonetheless, in French there are extraction dissimilarities between passives and reflexives (Abeillé and Godard 2002):

- (5) a. **C'est parti soudain à Rome que Jean est*
 It be-PRS.3SG leave-PCPT suddenly to Rome that John be-PRS.3SG
- b. *C'est complètement détruite que sa maison*
 It be-PRS.3SG completely destroy-PCPT that his house
a par les bombes
 have-PRS.3SG by the bombs

Reflexives always take BE in contemporary standard French, independent of the semantic class of the predicate or its transitive or intransitive status. Hence there is no variation at all that can be explained on semantic grounds. Following Legendre and Sorace (2003), I shall only account for intransitives in this paper. The similarities and dissimilarities of different BE-constructions will not be dealt with.

From a synchronic point of view, French and Italian are the only national Romance languages that use BE for the formation of compound tenses of a subgroup of intransitive verbs. BE-selecting intransitives are also found in Occitan, Corsican, Sardinian, Rhaeto-Romanic and in some Catalan and Romani-an dialects. It has been suggested in the literature that the differences concerning the spread of BE-selecting verbs in contemporary standard French and Italian are not significant. Following Salvi (1988), Schwarze (1996) only counts 92 BE-selecting verbs in Italian, indicating that this number may be slightly greater if one also considers derivatives. However, it is easy to prove that the number of BE-selecting verbs in Italian is much higher. According to the CD-ROM edition of the *Dizionario Italiano Sabatini Colletti* (DISC), 1,175 out of 3,293 intransitive verbs allow for BE in compound tenses. Of course, this number has

⁴ Some verbs that take an indirect or oblique allow for passive constructions with an expletive *il* ('it') as a dummy subject. This construction is mainly used in formal speech: i. ...*ces noms de famille donnèrent naissance à une foule de dérivés dont il sera parlé ci-après* (FRANTEXT) ('these family names gave birth to masses of derivatives which will be talked about below').

to be revisited. Several verbs are antiquated or restricted to dialectal or highly formal use. Nonetheless, Italian native speakers whom I confronted with this list marked more than 500 current Italian intransitives as BE-selecting (Kailuweit 2011).

It is obvious that there are considerably fewer BE-selecting verbs in contemporary standard French. Arrivé (2006) lists about 100 verbs that allow for the selection of BE. The largest part is marked as also allowing for the selection of HAVE. Grevisse and Goosse (2008: 1032)⁵ refer to this list, indicating that many of these verbs are doubtful candidates for BE-selection, since their BE-constructions seem to consist of a copula and an adjectivised participle. In a rather laconic way they comment that these verbs take HAVE if they are “really” conjugated (Grevisse and Goosse 2008: 1033).

Sankoff and Thibault (1977: 85–94) proposed a number of criteria to distinguish between Canadian French BE + participle as an auxiliary for compound tenses – anteriors in Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca’s (1994) terminology – and as an adjectival construction with a copula. Adverbials referring to the manner in which an event is realised are evidence against the copula + adjectivised participle interpretation. In addition, adverbials expressing the motivation of a subject referent for an action favour an eventive interpretation. Other criteria refer to the fact that the copula construction necessarily denotes a resultant state that persists at reference time. If this is clearly not the appropriate interpretation, BE functions as an anterior:

- (6) *J’avais ça même quand on est arrivé*
 I-have-PST.IPFV.1SG that same when one be-PRS.3SG arrive-PTCP.M.SG
ici à Pointe Saint-Charles
 here at Pointe Saint-Charles
 ‘The same thing happened to me when we arrived here at Pointe Saint-Charles.’
 (Sankoff and Thibault 1977: 88)

Quand must be translated as ‘in the instant in which’. This is due to the difference in the temporal and aspectual morphology in the subordinate clause, and the main verb. The situation expressed by the BE + participle construction is conceptualised as bounded. A resultative interpretation would have required

⁵ In 1936, Maurice Grevisse published the first edition of the French reference grammar *Le bon usage*. After his death in 1980, his colleague André Goose updated the work and published the 12th and 13th editions. The 14th edition (2007) was completely revised. I shall refer to the 14th reprinted edition from 2008.

an imperfective BE (*était arrivé*) (also see the discussion of this example in Rosemeyer 2014).

Note that there is a metonymic link between anteriors and resultatives (Rosemeyer 2012, 2014): a resultant state has been brought about by a previous event and a previous event may lead to a resultant state that persists at reference time. While the HAVE-construction in Contemporary Standard French always focuses on the previous event, the BE-construction is ambiguous. The degree of adjectivisation of the participle on the one hand and on the other the possibility of using the BE-construction when a resultative reading is ruled out by the context has to be determined for each verb.

In Kailuweit (2011), I discussed the lists of Arrivé (2006) and Grevisse and Goosse (2008) in detail. The results are the following: the selection of BE is obligatory for about 20 verbs in contemporary standard French. About 20 verbs allow for variation between the BE-construction and the HAVE-construction in an anterior reading. The BE-construction of about 60 verbs marked as varying in Arrivé (2006) seems to be a copula + adjectivised participle construction.

As far as previous stages of Spanish are concerned, Benzing (1931) compiled a list of 38 verbs that allowed for the BE-construction in Old Spanish. For most verbs there was variation until the 16th or 17th century. After that period, only HAVE is used as an auxiliary in compound tenses. Later studies have added only four verbs to this list (Elvira González 2001). In his PhD dissertation, Rosemeyer (2014) shows that Old Spanish BE-constructions should be interpreted as resultatives. However, due to the metonymic relation of anteriors and resultatives, the BE-construction underwent a functional change and was reanalysed as an anterior in Early Modern Spanish. The BE-anterior was completely substituted by the HAVE-construction during the 17th century and also disappeared from the resultative construction, in which a different copula (*estar*) prevailed. In contemporary Spanish, BE-constructions are restricted to passives of transitive verbs.

Therefore, Early Modern Spanish seems to show a quite similar picture to Contemporary Standard French as far as the distribution of HAVE and BE as auxiliaries in compound tenses are concerned. In the next section, I shall raise the question of whether there is evidence for a process of reanalysis in earlier stages of French that parallels Rosemeyer's findings for Spanish.

3 Functional split in earlier stages of French

For a subgroup of the BE-selecting verbs, Grevisse and Goosse (2008: 1033) indicate a rule that may explain the variation of BE and HAVE-constructions: “*Certains verbes intransitifs [...] se conjuguent avec avoir quand ils expriment l’action – et avec être quand ils expriment l’état résultant de l’action [...] Dans beaucoup de cas, cette règle est plus théorique que pratique.* [‘Certain intransitive verbs [...] are conjugated with *avoir* (‘to have’) when they express action – and with *être* (‘to be’) when they express the state resulting from the action [...]] In many cases, this rule is more theoretical than practical.’] (Grevisse and Goosse 2008: 1033, translation, RK).

When speaking of individual verbs, they generally highlight that the use of one auxiliary is antiquated, dialectal or vulgar. The reference dictionary of Contemporary Standard French, *Le Grand Robert de la langue française* (2007), also comments on the following verbs as candidates for a resultative-anterior opposition:

- (7) *accoucher* (‘give birth’), *accourir* (‘run together’), *descendre* (‘descend, decrease’), *éclore* (‘emerge’), *monter* (‘ascend, increase’), *partir* (‘leave’), *passer* (‘pass’), *rester* (‘stay’), *ressusciter* (‘revive’), *résulter* (‘result’), *sortir* (‘go out’), *tomber* (‘fall’)

and the derivatives with *re-* (‘again’)

- (8) *redescendre* (‘descend again, decrease again’), *remonter* (‘ascend again, increase again’), *repartir* (‘leave again’, ‘go back’), *repasser* (‘pass again’), *ressortir* (‘go out again’), *retomber* (‘fall back’, ‘fall down again’)

Grevisse and Goosse (2008: 1032) illustrate their “theoretical rule” with the following example in which the adverbial indicates a bound situation:

- (9) *Il a reparti ce matin à six heures*
 He have-PRS.3SG go back-PTCP.M.SG this morning at six o’clock
 ‘He has gone back this morning at six o’clock.’

Le Grand Robert (2007) states apodictically that *repartir* take BE in the sense of ‘to go back’. The use of HAVE with *repartir* in the sense of ‘to reply’ is marked as antiquated and formal. In the FRANTEXT corpus an almost identical example is found with *partir* (‘leave’) that proves clearly that this verb can be use as an anterior in a bound situation:

- (10) *Lui et Bucky étaient partis le matin six heures*
 He and Bucky be-IPFV.3SG leave-PTCP.M.PL the morning six o'clock
 'He and Bucky had left this morning at six o'clock.'
 (FRANTEXT: CAMUS)

Le Grand Robert (2007) considers the use of *partir* ('leave') with HAVE in contemporary French vulgar.

According to Gevisse and Goosse (2008: 1033) and *Le Grand Robert* (2007), *rester* ('stay') is another example that illustrates a rule that was in force until the 19th century, but is obsolete today. Voltaire still used HAVE with *rester* to denote a previous state that did not persist at reference time:

- (11) *J'ai resté huit jours à la maison*
 I-have-PRS.1SG stay-PTCP.M.SG eight days at the house
 'I stayed eight days at home.'
 (ROBERT: VOLTAIRE)

For most of the varying verbs listed in (7) and (8) the use of HAVE is banished from the contemporary standard. However, *disparaître* ('disappear') and *accoucher* ('give birth') generally take HAVE in all contexts, while *ressusciter* ('revive') and *résulter* ('result') show a variation of the two auxiliaries that seems to be free and does not confirm the anterior-resultative opposition (Kailuweit 2011). To sum up, the anterior-resultative opposition can be considered obsolete in Contemporary Standard French.⁶ For a small group of verbs, BE has become the only acceptable auxiliary in every context, while other verbs show variation that is no longer driven by the anterior-resultative opposition.

From a diachronic point of view, it is obvious that several verbs underwent a change as far as the use of the BE-construction is concerned. However, the development of auxiliary use in French has not yet been studied in a systematic way. The most detailed reliable studies date back to late 19th and early 20th century.⁷ Foerster (1908), when working with the findings of Hofmann (1890), declared: "Im Altfrz. war das vorherrschende Hilfsverb bei intransitiven Verben *être*, heute ist es sein Rivale *avoir*" [In Old French the predominant auxiliary for intransitive verbs was *be*, nowadays it is its rival *have*] (Foerster 1908: 103, translation, RK).

⁶ However, the opposition seems to be still in force in substandard varieties (Blanche-Benveniste 1997)

⁷ Later studies, such as Gamillscheg (1957) or Togeby (1974) do not go into details.

A look at his data shows that the hypothesis is true for verbs of change of state and change of location. Purely stative verbs vary: *durer* ('last'), *reposer* ('repose'), *séjourner* ('linger') and *vivre* ('live') predominantly take HAVE, but sometimes BE, while *gésir* ('lie') only appears with HAVE in Foerster's corpus. Verbs that do not have a state predicate in their semantic structure, such as *pleurer* ('cry'), *songer* ('dream') or *pécher* ('sin'), always take HAVE. As far as Classical French is concerned, Oudin's grammar (1640: 214–232) lists 95 verbs with BE and 15 showing BE-HAVE variation. Some of them are change of location verbs, but most are anticausative variants of change of state verbs. Fournier (2002: 255–262) gives evidence for 33 varying change of state and change of location verbs. In addition, she gives an example of how the manner-of-motion verb *courir* ('run') takes BE in a telic construction. By adding an adverbial that denotes a goal to an atelic manner-of-motion verb, the construction becomes telic.⁸

- (12) *Monsieur le Chevalier était de retour. Je suis*
 Monsieur le Chavalier be-IPFV.3SG back. I be-PRS.1SG
courue ici
 RUN-PTCP.F.SG here
 'Monsieur le Chavalier was back. I have run over here.'
 (SÉVIGNÉ, Fournier 2002: 256)

Van Valin (1990) refers to Italian *correre* to illustrate that BE-selection in Italian requires a state predicate in the semantic structure of the construction. The diachronic data confirm that this rule also holds for French.

Rosemeyer (2012: 139) points out with regard to Old Spanish, that "resultatives can only appear with predicates expressing complex situations that involve a transition to a resultant state". This is obviously the case for change of location and change of state verbs as well as for manner-of-motion verbs allowing for template augmentation. Nonetheless, there are also purely stative verbs that appear in BE-constructions. Rosemeyer (2014) shows that stative verbs in Old Spanish receive a change of state interpretation when they appear in a BE-construction. As far as Contemporary Standard French is concerned, the most obvious example of a BE-selecting verb that seems to have no change component in its meaning is *rester* ('stay'). However, verbs denoting the continuation of a pre-existing state show a complex event structure. According to the formal-

⁸ This is an instance of template augmentation in the sense of Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005).

ism of Role and Reference Grammar, the semantic structure of *rester* ('stay') is quite similar to the semantic structure of *partir* ('leave').

- (13) a. *partir* ('leave'): BECOME (NOT **be.at'**[x, y])
 b. *rester* ('stay'): NOT BECOME (NOT **be.at'**[x, y])

Verbs of continuation of a pre-existing state denote that at a point of reference a possible change of state or location has not occurred. According to Sokol (1999), they are bounded to the left and open to the right and can be described as telic in a border sense. Hence, *rester* ('stay') is not a counterexample to the hypothesis that the BE-construction had a resultative meaning in earlier stages of French. As we have seen, *rester* ('stay') as well as several verbs of change of location have generalized the use of BE in contexts in which no resultative interpretation is available. Other verbs, especially verbs of change of state, have generalised HAVE. A small group allows for variation that is no longer driven by the resultative-anterior opposition. Since the number of BE-selecting verbs has considerably decreased in Contemporary Standard French and the functional opposition between the BE-construction and HAVE-construction has disappeared, I consider the remaining BE-selecting verbs as BE-residua.

According to Sankoff and Thibault (1977), the existence of BE-residua is only due to the prescriptive norm of Contemporary Standard French that tries to block the typologically-driven spread of HAVE as the only auxiliary in compound tenses:

Nous croyons que l'utilisation de l'auxiliaire *avoir* [...] correspond à une tendance vers la régularisation des conjugaisons. La petite classe de verbes pour lesquels les grammairiens prescrivent l'usage exclusif de *être* ne nous semble ni assez homogène, ni suffisamment distincte des autres verbes pour expliquer une résistance à cette régularisation. [We believe that the use of the auxiliary *avoir* ('have') [...] corresponds to a tendency toward the regularization of conjugations. The small class of verbs for which the grammarians prescribe the exclusive use of *être* ('be') seems to us neither sufficiently homogeneous nor distinct from other verbs to explain a resistance to this regularization.] (Sankoff and Thibault 1977: 106, translation, RK).

However, the question arises whether BE-residua form an arbitrary group or whether there is a systematic explanation of BE-selection in contemporary standard French that is not based on the resultative-anterior opposition. Legendre and Sorace (2003) apply the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (ASH) to contemporary standard French, although they only examine a subgroup of documented BE-residua (Kailuweit 2011). The next section will revisit the ASH approach from a theoretical point of view. In the last section of this paper I shall

discuss to which extent a revisited ASH is helpful to explain the distribution of BE-residua in Contemporary Standard French.

4 Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy revisited

According to Legendre, Miyata, and Smolensky (1991), split intransitivity is both syntactically encoded and semantically determined. As far as auxiliary selection at the syntactical level is concerned, there is no gradience. A verb appears either in a HAVE-construction or in a BE-construction. Gradient could be the statistical distribution of the two-constructions of varying verbs or at a semantic level the distance of a specific verb or verb class to an unaccusative or unergative prototype.

Legendre and Sorace (2003)⁹ use the Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (Sorace 2000) to account for the BE-selection asymmetries between Italian and French. The hierarchy distinguishes seven classes of monadic (one-place) intransitive verbs that show decreasing affinity for BE-selection and increasing affinity for HAVE-selection. The class of change of location is located at the top of the hierarchy showing the highest affinity for BE-selection. Change of location is followed by change of state. In the middle of the hierarchy we find verbs of continuation of a pre-existing state and of existence of state. The classes of uncontrolled processes and of motional controlled processes are located in the lower part of the hierarchy. At the bottom, the class of non-motional controlled processes shows the lowest affinity for BE-selection and the highest to HAVE-selection. The hierarchy allows us to determine the cut-off point for BE-selection in a specific language. If BE-selection is excluded for a specific class, classes located lower in the hierarchy will not allow for BE-selection. Table 1 illustrates the different cut-off points for French and Italian. According to Legendre and Sorace (2003), the cut-off point for French is between the classes of change of state and continuation of a pre-existing state; for Italian it is between the classes of existence of state and uncontrolled processes. Note that the notation “A*” which appears in the Italian classes of uncontrolled processes and motional controlled processes indicates that there is still variation (occasional BE-selection) in these classes.

As far as French is concerned, Legendre and Sorace (2003) admit that two verbs of continuation of a pre-existing state – *rester* (‘stay’) and *demeurer* (‘stay’) – select BE. Nonetheless, they do not indicate the existence of these

⁹ See Legendre (2007) for a slightly modified approach.

Tab. 1: Auxiliary selection in French and Italian (adapted from Legendre and Sorace 2003: 227).

Auxiliary selected		Verb classes
French	Italian	
E	E	Change of location: <i>arrivare/arriver, venire/venire</i> , etc.
		Change of state
E	E	a. Change of condition: <i>morire/mourir</i> , etc.
E*	E	b. Appearance: <i>apparire/apparaître</i> , etc.
		c. Indefinite change in a particular direction:
E*	E	<i>salire/monter, scendere/descendere</i>
A	E*	<i>appassire/faner, peggiorare/empirer</i> , etc.
A	E*	Continuation of pre-existing state: <i>durare/durer</i> , etc.
		Existence of state:
A	E	a. <i>essere/être</i>
A	E*	b. <i>esistere/exister, bastare/suffire</i> à
		Uncontrolled processes
A	A*	a. Emission: <i>risuonare/résonner</i> , etc.
A	A	b. Bodily functions: <i>sudare/suer</i> , etc.
A	A*	c. Involuntary actions: <i>tremare, trembler</i> , etc.
A	A*	Motional controlled processes: <i>nuotare/nager</i> , etc.
A	A	Non-motional controlled processes: <i>lavorare/travailler</i> , etc.

verbs in Table 1. Hence, the cut-off point cannot be considered a strict logical concept. Rather, it refers to a subjective evaluation of the data that depends on two aspects that are not made explicit. On the one hand, a class is declared E or A because of the statistical relation of BE-selecting and HAVE-selecting verbs. On the other hand, the statistical relation of BE-constructions and HAVE-constructions of the varying verbs in a specific class seems to be a decisive criterion. For an E*, varying verbs should prefer BE over HAVE, for an A* it should be the other way round.

Another problem of the ASH consists in an independent semantic motivation of the classes and their order. In the original form (Sorace 2000), the hierarchy seems to be the result of a semasiological approach that starts from the meaning of prototypically BE-selecting and HAVE-selecting verbs. Legendre and Sorace (2003) present a semantic decomposition of the seven classes based on features that have been discussed as being relevant for split-intransitivity: +/–telic [TE], +/–motion [MO], +/–directed change [DIR], +/–protagonist control (or agentivity) [CON], +/–state [ST]. However, the five binary features are

Tab. 2: Featural composition of monadic intransitive verbs in French and Italian (adapted from Legendre and Sorace 2003: 227).

Aux	Aux	Semantic/aspectual features →	TE	MO	DIR	CON	ST
Fr	Ital	emergent verb classes ↓					
		Change of location:					
E	E	<i>arriver/arrivare</i>	+	+	+	+/-	-
E	E	<i>aller/andare</i>	+	+	+	+/-	-
E	E	<i>venir/venire</i>	+	+	+	+/-	-
		Change of state					
		a) change of condition					
E	E	<i>mourir/morire</i>	+	-	+	-	-
		b) appearance:					
E	E	<i>apparaître/apparire</i>	+	-	+	-	-
		c) indefinite change in a particular direction:					
E	E	<i>monter/salire, descendre/scendere</i>	-	+/-	+	+/-	-
A	E	<i>faner/appassire, empirer/peggiore</i>	-	-	+	-	-
		Continuation of a pre-existing state:					
A	E	<i>durer/durare</i>	-	-	-	-	+
		Existence of state:					
A	E	<i>être/essere</i>	-	-	-	-	+
A	E	<i>exister/esistere, suffire/bastare</i>	-	-	-	-	+
		Uncontrolled processes:					
A	A	a) bodily functions: <i>suer/sudare</i>	-	-	-	-	-
A	A	b) involuntary actions: <i>trembler/tremare</i>	-	-	-	-	-
A	A	c) emission: <i>résonner/risuonare</i>	-	-	-	-	-
A	A	Controlled processes (motional): <i>nager/nuotare</i>	-	+	-	+	-
A	A	Controlled processes (non-motional): <i>travailler/lavorare</i>	-	-	-	+	-

not sufficient to describe all classes and subclasses and their order in a coherent way.

Table 2 shows Legendre and Sorace's feature-value pairings for the classes and subclasses in Table 1. Verbs of continuation of a pre-existing state and existence of state cannot be distinguished, since the same values are assigned to the five features in both classes. The subclass *faner/appassire* ('wilt') and *empirer/peggiore* ('worsen') as a non-controlled variant of indefinite changes in a particular direction show only one +/-value [DIR]. Since the classes of continuation of a pre-existing state and of existence of state receive also one +/-value for the feature [ST], *faner/appassire* ('wilt') and *empirer/peggiore*

Tab. 3: Revisited ASH (adapted from Kailuweit 2011: 417).

	TE = telic	MO = Move- ment	DIR = Directed change	CON = control	ST = static	
	1	1	4	-2	1	
Change of location	+	+	+	+/-	-	4-6
Change of state						
a) change of condition	+	-	+	-	-	5
b) appearance	+	-	+	-	-	5
c) indefinite change in a particular direction:	-	+/-	+	+/-	-	2-5
Continuation of a pre-existing state:	+	-	-	-	+	2
Existence of state	-	-	-	-	+	1
Uncontrolled processes						
a) bodily functions	-	-	-	-	-	0
b) involuntary actions	-	-	-	-	-	0
c) emission	-	-	-	-	-	0
Controlled processes (motional)	-	+	-	+	-	-1
Controlled processes (non-motional)	-	-	-	+	-	-2

(‘worsen’) show the same degree of semantic unaccusativity as the stative classes. In addition, since motion is a feature of unaccusativity and control a feature of unergativity, the two +/-values for controlled motional processes cancel each other out. Therefore, the controlled motional processes do not differ in semantic unergativity from uncontrolled processes.

Nonetheless, as for proto-agent and proto-patient features in Dowty (1991), it is quite obvious that the five features do not have the same significance. Telicity has been considered the central feature for unaccusativity (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995), control or agentivity for unergativity (Schwarze 1998). However, it would be too simple to reduce ASH to a continuum between a telic and an agentive pole. Giancarli (this volume) rightly states that these features do not apply in the same way to all classes and subclasses of the hierarchy.

In Kailuweit (2011), I proposed a modified version of the ASH. The basic idea consists in weighing the features. I consider directed change a very strong feature of semantic unaccusativity and control a strong feature of semantic unergativity. Telicity, movement and stativity are weak features of unaccusativity. If the very strong unaccusativity feature is given for class or subclass, the

feature-value-pairing gets 4 points. If the strong unergativity-feature is given the pairing gets -2 points. For a given weak unaccusativity-feature a pairing gets 1 point. The sum of the points for the five feature-value-pairings indicates the degree of semantic unaccusativity of a verbclass.

Table 3 shows that the order of the seven classes can be justified by this approach. Note that the higher degree of unaccusativity of continuation of a pre-existing state in comparison with existence of state stems from the fact that the continuation class is telic in a broader sense (Sokol 1999).

The first two classes – change of location and change of state – overlap as far as the degrees of unaccusativity are concerned. If verbs of change of location are controlled, e.g. *sortir* ('go out') with a human subject, the degree of unaccusativity is 4; if they are uncontrolled, e.g. *arriver* ('arrive'), they reach a 6, which is the maximum degree of unaccusativity. The unaccusativity degree of change of state verbs is 5 with the exception of the subclass of indefinite change in a particular direction.

- (14) *Je suis peut-être descendu encore vachement plus bas*
 I be-PRS.1SG perhaps descend-PCPT still bloody more deep
 'Perhaps, I still have gone bloody deeper down.'
 (FRANTEXT: DEGAUDENZI)

In (14), the subject-argument controls her or his own directed movement as an unbounded process. Hence the feature-value cluster is [TE-], [MO+], [DIR+], [CON+], [ST-] corresponding to a degree of unaccusativity of 3. For *monter* and *descendre* [CON+] implies [MO+]. With the reading 'increase' and 'decrease' the two verbs exclude a controlling subject. Therefore, 3 is the minimum degree of unaccusativity of these verbs. Even this subclass of change of state verbs thus differs in unaccusativity from the next lower class of continuation of a pre-existing state. Telic verbs of directed change reach a considerably higher degree of unaccusativity than stative verbs in the middle of the hierarchy. This is in line with Mateu's (2009) model which allows for five different classes on the basis of three features [T], [r] and [R]. Roughly speaking, [T] corresponds to the existence of a transition, the "coincidence relation" [r] marks the completion of an action (comparable to the notion of telicity), and [R] marks agentivity of the verb's subject referent (Mateu 2009: 189–190). With the help of these features, Mateu (2009) distinguishes telic and atelic change of location or state ([T+, r±], continuation of a pre-existing state/existence of state [T-, r-], non-volitional verbs of internal causation [R-] and volitional verbs of internal causation [R+].

If motion is not a decisive factor to distinguish the degree of unaccusativity of the first two classes of the ASH, why is it the case that most verbs that

only allow for the BE-construction are verbs of change of location in Standard Contemporary French? We will come back to this question in the last section of this paper. Note that motion is used in Legrendre and Sorace (2003) to distinguish two kinds of controlled processes. While non-motional processes do not allow for BE-constructions in Romance languages which feature BE-HAVE-alternation,¹⁰ motional processes can be constructed with BE under certain conditions. We have already seen that like Italian *correre* ('run'), *courrir* ('run') forms compound tenses with BE in older stages of French if the construction is telic. Hence, it seems to be telicity and not motion that licences the use of BE. Nonetheless, motion is a prerequisite for this type of construction and can therefore be considered a factor that decreases unergativity and enables BE-selection.

However, the class of controlled motional processes does not fit perfectly into a hierarchy of decreasing semantic unaccusativity. In Italian, several verbs of uncontrolled processes show free variation (Sorace 2000: 877–878). Generally, for these verbs HAVE-constructions are more frequent than BE-constructions. In the CODIS corpus for instance, only 5 of 17 occurrences of *squillare* ('ring') in compound tenses take BE. The variation does not seem to be semantically motivated:

- (15) a. *alle sette e un quarto, è squillato* (CODIS)
 at seven and a quarter be-PRS.3SG ring-PCPT
 il telefono
 the telephone
 'At a quarter past seven, the telephone rang.'
- b. *In quel momento aveva squillato il telefono* (CODIS)
 in that moment have-IPFV.3SG ring-PCPT the telephone
 'In that moment the telephone rang.'

In contrast, variation of Italian *correre* is semantically motivated and categorical. However, *nuotare* ('swim') does not allow for BE even in telic constructions (Sorace 2000: 875). German verbs of controlled motion categorically take BE (Keller and Sorace 2003). Hence, at least for German the order of the classes has to be modified (see Gillmann this volume).

From a diachronic point of view, the ASH predicts that the spread of HAVE occurs from the bottom to the top. The loss of BE-selection in Spanish as well as the development towards Contemporary Standard French seem to confirm

¹⁰ According to Tuttle (1986), BE is the only auxiliary of several central Italian dialects.

the hypothesis that the higher a class in the hierarchy the longer it withstands the substitution process. Aranovich (2003) shows on the basis of Benzing's (1931) data that the two highest classes – “change of location” and “change of state” – still allowed for BE-selection in the 17th century. Rosemeyer (2014) proves in a conscientious corpus study that from 1425, the chance of survival of BE-selection is higher for change of location verbs than for change of state verbs. Interestingly, this was not the case before 1425. In Old Spanish the classes of change of location and change of state show an identical affinity for BE-selection. Motion is not a significant factor in split-intransitivity until Early Modern Spanish. Then the situation started to change.

According to Rosemeyer (2014), the conservation of BE-selection with verbs of change of location is a frequency effect. In the first half of the 17th century, *ir* (‘go’) and *venir* (‘come’) are the most frequent verbs in his corpus, *volver* (‘return’) appears in position 8 and *partir* (‘leave’) in position 12. Since high frequency leads to entrenchment, highly frequent verbs resist the ongoing morphological change longer. In addition, the data suggest putting forward the hypothesis that speakers started to associate the BE-construction with a change of location, thus applying a new rule to BE-selection: when confronted with the choice between BE + past participle and HAVE + past participle, use BE + past participle if you wish to express a past change of location event (Rosemeyer 2014). Note that this rule also applies to less frequent verbs of change of location. Hence, the interplay of semantic parameters of unaccusativity is not universal. Their presence and weight depend on language-specific developments, as Rosemeyer (2014) shows for Spanish and Gillmann (this volume) for Dutch and German.

Against the background of these insights, the last section of this paper will cast some light on the distribution of BE-selecting verbs in Contemporary Standard French. Is motion a decisive factor in the conservation of BE-selection in French and does frequency plays a role in establishing an analogous rule to the rule Rosemeyer proposes for Early Modern Spanish? We will see that French data confirm Rosemeyer's findings for Spanish. In addition, the existence of several BE-selecting outliers which have not been accounted for in the literature can be explained by taking into consideration the change of location rule.

5 BE-residua in Contemporary Standard French

Based on the FRANTEXT corpus (1951–2000) and standard-setting grammars and dictionaries (Arrivé 2006; Grevisse and Goosse 2008; *Le Grand Robert* 2007), Kailuweit (2011) compiled an exhaustive list of French BE-residua (see Table 4).

As in Table 1, A and E indicate the use of HAVE or BE as an auxiliary in compound tenses. If a small “a” in combination with a capital E is used, this

Tab. 4: French BE-residua in ASH (adapted from Kailuweit 2011: 410).

change of location		accourir ‘run together’ (E/a), aller ‘go’ (E), arriver ‘arrive’ (E), convenir de ‘agree to’ (E/A), (dis)convenir de ‘deny’ (E/A), échapper qc à q ‘slip out’ (E/A), échoir à ‘hatch’ (E/a), entrer ‘enter’ (E), intervenir ‘intervene’ (E), (re)partir ‘leave’ (E), parvenir à ‘reach somewhere’(E), (re)passer ‘pass’ (E/a), provenir de ‘accrue’ (E), (re)sortir ‘go out’ (E), survenir ‘turn up’ (E), rentrer ‘come back’ (E), retourner ‘come back’ (E), (re)venir ‘come’ (E)
change of state	Change of condition	accoucher de ‘give birth’ (A/e), décéder ‘die’ (E/a), (re)devenir ‘become’ (E), échoir ‘decay’ (E), expirer ‘decay’ (E), mourir ‘die’ (E), naître ‘be born’ (E), ressusciter ‘revive’ (E/A), trépasser ‘fade away’ (A/e)
	Happening	advenir ‘happen’ (E)
	Appearance	apparaître ‘appear’ (E/a), disparaître ‘disappear’ (A/e), éclore ‘emerge’ (E/a), paraître ‘appear’ (E/A), résulter de ‘result from’(E)
	Indefinite change in a particular direction	(re)descendre ‘descend’ (E), (re)monter ‘arise’ (E/a), (re)tomber ‘fall’(E)
Continuation of pre-existing state		demeurer ‘stay’ (E/a), rester ‘stay’ (E)
Existence of state		
Uncontrolled processes	emission	émaner ‘emanate’ (E/A)
Controlled processes (motional)		sauter ‘jump’ (A/e)
Controlled processes (non-motional)		

means that the BE-construction is clearly more frequent than the HAVE-construction. For (A/e) it is the other way around. More or less equal use of the two constructions is coded by (E/A). Not all of the verbs in Table 4 are monadic in the sense of Legendre and Sorace (2003), but at least in French the inclusion of dyadic BE-selecting verbs does not impede the applicability of the ASH. Note that the French prototypical BE-selecting verb *aller* is not monadic. It requires the presence of an obligatory locative argument:

- (16) *Il vous a parlé de votre pays [...] il y*
 He you have-PRS.3SG talk-PCPT of your country he there
est allé souvent
 be-PRS.3SG go-PCPT often
 ‘He has talked to you about your country [...] he has often gone there.’
 (FRANTEXT: BASTIDE)

Dyadic (two-place) verbs are printed in bold. These verbs denote a change of location not literally, but metaphorically. Most of them are derivatives of change of location verbs. *Parvenir* (‘reach somewhere, come through’) is a derivative of *venir* (‘come’) and denotes a metaphorical arrival. The two derivatives of *venir* (‘come’) *convenir de* (‘agree to’) and *disconvenir de*, generally used in the expression *ne pas disconvenir de qch* (‘not to deny sth’), are more problematic. Although the eventuality of “agreeing” could be described as a controlled non-motional process, the change of location component of “coming together” is still detectable. Only this component explains why these verbs allow for BE-selection.

Échapper qch à q takes BE in the sense of ‘slip out with, mention unintentionally’. It is a genuine metaphorical change of location verb, as *échoir* is in the sense of ‘fall to’. Note that *choir* (‘fall’), antiquated or very formal in Contemporary Standard French, takes HAVE (*Le Grand Robert* 2007).

There are two outliers that are not dealt with in Legendre and Sorace (2003). We have seen that in the 18th century, the verb *courir* as an instance of the class of controlled motional processes still took BE in telic contexts. According to Grevisse and Goosse (2008: 1036), BE-selection with *courir* is not acceptable in Contemporary Standard French, but can still be heard from time to time in spoken discourse. Nonetheless, there is another verb of the class that is occasionally used with BE in telic contexts: *sauter* (‘jump’) (Grevisse and Goosse 2008: 1037).¹¹ Hence, *sauter* (‘jump’) has to be included in the list of BE-selecting verbs in Contemporary Standard French:

11 Legendre and Sorace (2003) mention *sauter* (‘jump’) as a HAVE-selecting verb.

- (17) *George est sauté au bas du cabriolet*
 George be-PRS.3SG jump-PCPT on the backseat of the cabriolet
 'George has jumped on the backseat of the convertible.'
 (FRANTEXT, MAURIAC)

The other outlier appears in the class of uncontrolled processes. According to Grevisse and Goosse (2008: 1037) *émaner* ('emanate') shows free variation between BE-selection and HAVE-selection.

- (18) *Elle étincelait comme si la lumière fût émanée*
 She shine-IPFV.3SG as if the light be-PRS.3S emanate-PCPT
d'elle
 from her
 'She was shining as if the light emanated from her.'
 (ROBERT, GAUTIER)

Are we dealing with arbitrary exceptions or is there a general organising principle? My claim is that such an organising principle exists as a necessary, but insufficient condition for BE-selection. In the narrower or wider sense, all BE-selecting verbs in Contemporary Standard French can be considered verbs of change of location. Verbs of manner of motion turned into change of location verbs with a goal argument-adjunct added by template augmentation. This explains the occurrence of *sauter* ('jump') with BE in telic contexts, but it seems arbitrary that only this verb is accepted in the BE-construction in Contemporary Standard French, while other verbs of the same class are not. As far as the class of uncontrolled processes is concerned, it is curious that only the verb that gives name to the subclass of emission, *émaner* ('emanate'), allows for BE-selection. Nonetheless, emission could be reinterpreted as a change of location, in which case *émaner* ('emanate') would be a special case of *sortir* ('go out') and can be used as a hyperonym in the same contexts:

- (19) ... *les électrons expulsés par l'action de la lumière*
 the electrons expel-PCPT by the action of the light
 – *photoélectrons – sortent de la matière*
 photoelectrons go out-IPFV.3PL from the materia
 'The electrons emanate from the materia as photoelectrons expelled by the action of the light.'
 (FRANTEXT: BROGLIE)

The BE-selecting verbs in the class of continuation of a pre-existing state – *rester* ('stay') and *demeurer* ('remain') – denote the negation of a change of

location in their literal, locative meaning. Moreover, the different types of BE-selecting verbs of change of state in Contemporary Standard French are metaphorically related to change of location. BE-selecting verbs of indefinite change in a particular direction – *descendre* ('descend, decrease'), *monter* ('ascend, increase') and *tomber* ('fall') – denote a directed movement in their literal meaning. Verbs of appearance as well as verbs denoting birth and death can be reinterpreted as verbs of coming and going from a localist viewpoint. In addition, several BE-selecting verbs in Contemporary Standard French are derivatives of prototypical verbs of change of location, mostly of *venir* ('come').

Note that BE-selection was not restricted to change of location in earlier stages of French. Oudin ([1640] 1972) compiled a large number of anticausative BE-selecting or varying verbs of change of state which do not suggest a localist reinterpretation:

(20) Anticausatives in Oudin ([1640] 1972: 214–226)¹²

blondir 'become fairer', *durcir* 'harden', *embellir* 'grow more attractive', *empirer* 'worsen', *engoudir* 'numb', *enlaidir* 'become ugly', *espaisser* 'thicken', *faner* 'wilt', *guérir* 'heal', *hausser* 'raise', *jaunir* 'yellow', *moisir* 'rot, stagnate', *mollir* 'soften', *noircir* 'blacken', *rougir* 'go red', *veillir* 'grow old', etc.

If change of location was not a prerequisite for BE-selection in Classical French, it seems reasonable to suppose that Contemporary Standard French developed as Early Modern Spanish did more than three centuries before.¹³ In line with Rosemeyer (2014), I put forward the hypothesis that the creation of a new rule for BE-selection was a frequency effect that occurred at the same time as a general typologically-driven trend to HAVE-selection. It is beyond the scope of this paper to prove this process in detail. I do not provide statistical evidence for the use of verbs of change of location in the 19th century. Nonetheless, contemporary frequency dictionaries suggest that Rosemeyer's observation for Early Modern Spanish also holds for Contemporary Standard French. According to Julliand, Brodin, and Davidovitch (1970), *venir* ('come') is the

¹² Oudin (1972: 215) defines causative/anti-causative pairs in the following way: "ceux qui sont actifs transitifs, & neutres tout ensemble" [those [verbs] that are active transitive and neutral at the same time].

¹³ The change may explain the "surprising" result of Heidinger's study (this volume) that not only [TEL+] and [MO+], but also [CON+] increase the probability of a BE-construction with *monter* ('ascend, increase'). If it is true that [MO–] correlates with [CON–], then the observed impact of [CON+] may be a side effect of the impact of [MO+].

fourth most frequent verb after the transitive verbs *avoir* ('have'),¹⁴ *dire* ('say') and *savoir* ('know'). *Aller* ('go') is the tenth, *rester* the 14th, *passer* the 16th and *arriver* the 21st most frequent. *Revenir* ('come again') is the 25th, *partir* ('leave') the 35th, *entrer* ('enter') the 36th and *sortir* ('go out') the 40th most frequent. The only HAVE-selecting intransitive verb in this field is *parler* ('speak') in 12th place.

The data in Quasthoff, Fiedler, and Hallsteinsdóttir (2013) confirm these findings, although the dictionary is not easy to work with, since it is a full form dictionary which does not indicate lemma frequencies of verbs. However, a look at the infinitives shows that *aller* ('go'), *passer* ('pass'), *partir* ('leave'), *sortir* ('go out') and *venir* ('come') are among the most frequent 1,000 words, *partir* being the most frequent form followed by *aller* and *passer*. HAVE-selecting *parler* ('speak') appears in 740th place after the five verbs of change of location.

Therefore, BE-selecting verbs of change of location are among the most frequent verbs in Contemporary Standard French. It seems reasonable to assume that the BE-constructions of these verbs are entrenched in a subject-external, objective way, guiding conventionalised language use.¹⁵ However, not only BE-selection has become the only acceptable way of expressing compound tenses in Standard Contemporary French for these particular verbs. It is also associated with change of location as a general rule that also applies to some former BE-selecting verbs that have a change of location component in their semantics, but do not feature among the most frequent verbs. It has to be pointed out that this is of high theoretical importance. A usage-based approach that takes frequency into account does not necessarily exclude the assumption of general rules that apply for high frequent and low frequent forms at the same time. Frequency can play a role in cases of system instability. It does not only lead to conservation, but also helps to reorganise the system. As far as French is concerned, the instability is caused by the grammatical change that causes a BE-construction to develop from a resultative to a fully grammaticalised anterior construction. As we have seen in section 2 of this paper, this process that occurred in Early Modern Spanish (Rosemeyer 2014) is a rather recent development in French: the "theoretical" distinction between resultative BE-constructions and anterior HAVE-constructions for "some verbs" which show variation (Grevisse and Goose 2008: 1033) turns out to be the last laconic

¹⁴ The auxiliary use of *avoir* ('have') is not counted.

¹⁵ My own approach to entrenchment does not focus on the speaker's mind, but on conventionalized interchange in form of language games that is based on intertextuality (see Kailuweit, 2013 and Rosemeyer, this volume).

reminiscence of prescriptive grammar applied to an antiquated stage of Standard French. The new rule, “select BE with a verb of change of location”, has not yet made its way into the reference works. As a necessary but insufficient condition – the rule “select BE only if there is a change of location component in the semantics of the verb” is reality from a descriptive point of view. However, apart from the prototypical (and highly frequent) verbs of change of location, which all select BE exclusively, the question remains unanswered whether there are replenishing rules that could explain why certain former BE-selecting verbs of lower ASH-classes have become BE-residua and other verbs of the same semantic classes have not.

6 Conclusion and outlook

In the present paper I have shown that the distribution of BE-selecting verbs in Contemporary Standard French is not arbitrary. In earlier stages of French the opposition between BE-selection and HAVE-selection depended on resultativity. BE was used in a resultative construction while HAVE was used to express (pure) anteriority. Note that there is contiguity of resultative and anterior constructions. All resultatives imply an anterior event that brought about a change, but only some anterior events lead to a resultant state that holds at reference time.

Between the 18th and the early 20th century the system changed. For one thing, BE-constructions were reinterpreted as anteriors that did not necessarily imply a result state holding at reference time. For another, HAVE-constructions were generalised with verbs that have a resultative meaning, such as change of state verbs. All verbs allowing for BE in anterior constructions in Contemporary Standard French formerly used BE in resultative constructions. Therefore, they can be considered BE-residua. The BE-construction is not “productive”. In Contemporary Standard French, there are no recent loan verbs or verbs resulting from word formation processes that allow for BE in compound tenses.

Sorace’s ASH in the feature-based version of Legendre and Sorace (2003) helps to compare the distribution of BE-residua in Contemporary Standard French to the distribution of BE-selection in other Romance and Germanic languages that encode split-intransitivity by means of auxiliary selection. However, the features have to be considered to allow for a coherent distinction of ASH’s seven semantic classes. An examination of the features (Kailuweit 2011) confirms the insight of Mateu (2009) that the semantic feature “motion” does not universally increase the affinity of a verb for unaccusativity. Rosemeyer (2014) has shown that the establishment of a new rule in Early Modern Span-

ish – “select BE with a verb of change of location” – is a frequency effect. The same new rule applies to Contemporary Standard French. Evidence was provided to back the claim that frequency also plays a decisive role in Contemporary Standard French in establishing “change of location” as the organising principle of BE-selection. All BE-residua in Contemporary Standard French can be interpreted as change of location verbs in a nearer or broader sense. The rule applies not only to the most frequent verbs, but also to less frequent verbs that have a change of location component in their semantic structure. However, the rule is a necessary but insufficient condition for BE-selection. It explains why there are some outliers in lower ASH classes that allow for BE-selection, but the question remains unanswered why other verbs of these classes with a change of location component in their semantic structure do not allow for BE-selection.

Some questions remain open for further research. From a diachronic point of view it is puzzling why a considerable number of verbs taking BE in resultative contexts did not allow for HAVE when no resultative interpretation was available. In line with Rosemeyer’s findings for Old Spanish (Rosemeyer 2012, 2014), I put forward the hypothesis that the spread of the HAVE-construction in French was a long-lasting process. With regard to verbs that were not affine to the original contexts of HAVE (controlled, non-resultative processes), anteriority was probably encoded with the past tense, especially with the imperfective. From a synchronic point of view, the question is raised as to how resultativity can be expressed when the resultative use of BE no longer exists. Unlike Spanish, French has not developed a new resultative construction with a specific auxiliary. First of all, the contiguity relation of resultativity and anteriority comes into play. Nowadays, the HAVE-construction may refer to a former event without excluding that the result of this event still holds at reference time. As we have seen, Arrivé (2006) and Grevisse and Goosse (2008) list about 50 verbs of Contemporary Standard French that allow for a BE-construction which is clearly not an anterior. Is this construction (still) a resultative construction and if so, why is this construction limited to a relatively small number of verbs? In my opinion, we should distinguish the copula + adjectivised participle construction of Contemporary Standard French from the former resultative construction. The resultative construction refers to a result state which is contiguous to a former event that led to a change. The copula + adjective construction denotes a state without referring to its coming about. A verb like *croître* (‘grow’) allowed for a resultative construction in Classical French:

- (21) *Le Marquis est un peu crû, mais ce n’est*
 the markees be-PRS.3SG a little grow-PCPT but this not be-PRS.3SG

pas assez pour se récrier ; sa taille ne sera point
 NEG enough for REFL shout for joy his size not be-PRS.3SG NEG
comme celle de son père
 as that of his father
 ‘The maquees has grown in stature, but not as much as to shout for joy.
 He will never have the stature of his father.’
 (Sevigné, Fournier 2002: 257)

However, in Contemporary Standard French, the participle of *croître* (‘grow’) can no longer be combined with a BE-construction.

(22) *Il *est / a crû*
 He has grown

(23) *Il est (plus) grand*
 He is tall(er)

The participle of *croître* (‘grow’) has not developed into an adjective, unlike the participles of other verbs of change of state that appear in the lists of Arrivé (2006) and Grevisse and Goosse (2008). In Contemporary Standard French, the result state of “being grown” can be referred to with the HAVE-construction or with an adjective such as *grand* (‘tall’). Further research will have to focus on French change of state verbs and their development in the 18th and 19th centuries. This will help us to understand the reorganisation of split-intransitivity that led to the contemporary system.

References

- Abeillé, Anne and Danielle Godard. 2002 The syntactic structure of French Auxiliaries. *Language* 78(3): 404–452.
- Aranovich, Raúl. 2003 The semantics of auxiliary selection in Old Spanish. *Studies in Language* 27(1): 1–37.
- Arrivé, Michel. 2006 *Bescherelle – La conjugaison pour tous*. Édition entièrement revue sous la responsabilité scientifique de Michel Arrivé. Paris: Hatier.
- Bentley, Delia. 2006 *Split-Intransitivity in Italian*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Benzing, Joseph. 1931 Zur Geschichte von *ser* als Hilfszeitwort im Spanischen. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 51: 385–460.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. 1997 La notion de variation syntaxique dans la langue parlée. *Langue française* 115(1): 19–29.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986 *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

- Bybee, Joan L., Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca. 1994 *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Centineo, Giulia. [1986]1996 A lexical theory of auxiliary selection in Italian. *Probus* 8: 223–271. (Originally in Davis [California] Working Papers in Linguistics 1 1986).
- Dowty, David. 1991 Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67(3): 547–619.
- Foerster, August. 1908 *Avoir und Être als Hilfsverba beim intransitiven Zeitwort in ihrer Entwicklung vom Alt- zum Neufranzösischen*. Darmstadt: Otto.
- Fournier, Nathalie. 2002 *Grammaire du français classique*. Paris: Belin.
- Gamillscheg, Ernst. 1957 *Historische französische Syntax*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Grevisse, Maurice and André Goosse. ¹⁴2008 *Le bon usage: grammaire française*. Bruxelles: De Boeck/Duculot.
- Hofmann, Fritz. 1890 *Avoir und estre in den umschreibenden Zeiten des altfranzösischen intransitiven Zeitworts*. Berlin: Mayer & Müller.
- Juilland, Alphonse, Dorothy Brodin and Catherine Davidovitch. 1970 *Frequency Dictionary of French Words*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton.
- Kailuweit, Rolf. 2005 *Linking: Syntax und Semantik französischer und italienischer Gefühlsverben*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kailuweit, Rolf. 2011 Le choix de l'auxiliaire: Être ou avoir en français standard contemporain. In: Renata Enghels, Machteld Meullemann and Clara Vanderschueren (eds.), *Peregrinatio in Romania: Artículos en homenaje a Eugene Roegiest con motivo de su 65 cumpleaños*, 397–420. Gent: Academia Press.
- Kailuweit, Rolf. 2013 Radical Role and Reference Grammar (RRRG) A sketch for remodelling the Syntax-Semantics-Interface. In: Elke Diedrichsen and Brian Nolan (eds.), *Linking Constructions into Functional Linguistics – The Role of Constructions in Grammars*, 103–141. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Keller, Frank and Antonella Sorace. 2003 Gradient auxiliary selection and impersonal passivization in German: an experimental investigation. *Journal of Linguistics* 39: 57–108.
- Labelle, Marie. 1992 Change of state and valency. *Linguistics* 28: 375–414.
- Le Grand Robert de la langue française*. CD-ROM. 2007 Paris: Le Robert/Sejer.
- Legendre, Géraldine, Yoshiro Miyata and Paul Smolensky. 1991 Unifying syntactic and semantic approaches to unaccusativity: a connectionist approach. In: *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society. General Session & Parasession on the Grammar of Event Structure*, 156–167. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistic Society.
- Legendre, Géraldine and Antonella Sorace. 2003 Auxiliaires et intransitivité en français et dans les langues romanes. In: Danièle Godard (ed.), *Les langues romanes. Problèmes de la phrase simple*, 185–234. Paris: Editions du CNRS.
- Legendre, Géraldine. 2007 Optimizing auxiliary selection in Romance. In: Raúl Aranovich (ed.), *Split Auxiliary Systems. A Cross-linguistic Perspective*, 145–180. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995 *Unaccusativity: at the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mateu, Jaume. 2009 Gradience and auxiliary selection in Old Catalan and Old Spanish. In: Paola Crisma and Giuseppe Longobardi (eds.), *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory*, 176–193. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Merlan, Francesca. 1985 Split intransitivity: functional oppositions in intransitive inflection. In: Johanna Nichols and Anthony Woodbury (eds.), *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause: Some Approaches to Theory from the Field*, 324–362. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oudin, Antoine. 1972 [2/1640] *Grammaire française rapportée au langage du temps*. Genève: Slatkine.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1978 Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4: 157–189.
- Posner, Rebecca. 1996 *The Romance Languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Quasthoff, Uwe, Sabine Fiedler and Erla Hallsteinsdóttir (eds.). 2013 *Frequency Dictionary French*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag.
- Roegiest, Eugene. 2001 La grammaire relationnelle. In: Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin und Christian Schmidt (eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, Bd. I/1, 393–407. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rosemeyer, Malte. 2012 How to measure replacement: Auxiliary selection in Old Spanish bibles. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 33(1): 135–174.
- Rosemeyer, Malte. 2014 *Auxiliary Selection in Spanish. Gradience, Gradualness, and Conservation*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rosen, Carol. 1984 The interface between semantic roles and initial grammatical relations. In: David Perlmutter and Carol Rosen (eds.), *Studies in Relational Grammar* 2, 38–77. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sabatini, Francesco and Vittorio Colletti. 1999 *Dizionario Italiano. Edizione in CD-Rom*. Firenze: Giunti.
- Salvi, Giampaolo. 1982 La frase semplice. In: Lorenzo Renzi (ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione* Vol.1, 29–113. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Sankoff, Gillian and Pierette Thibault. 1977 L'alternance entre les auxiliaires avoir et être en français parlé à Montréal. *Langue française* 34: 81–108.
- Schwarze, Christoph. 1996 The syntax of Romance auxiliaries. In: Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway (eds.), *LFG-Workshop. Proceedings of the First LFG Conference*, 418–433. Grenoble: Rank Xerox Research Centre.
- Schwarze, Christoph. 1998 A lexical-functional analysis of Romance auxiliaries. *Theoretical Linguistics* 24: 83–105.
- Sokol, Monika. 1999 *Das Zusammenspiel der Verbalkategorien und der französischen Futura*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Sorace, Antonella. 2000 Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76: 859–890.
- Togeby, Knud. 1974 *Précis Historique de Grammaire Française*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Tuttle, Edward F. 1986 The spread of ESSE as universal auxiliary in Central Italo-Romance. *Medieval Romanzo* 11: 229–287.
- Van Valin, Robert D. 1990 Semantic parameters of split intransitivity. *Language* 66: 221–260.
- Vincent, Nigel. 1982 The development of the auxiliaries HABERE and ESSE in Romance. In: Nigel Vincent and Martin Harris (eds.), *Studies in the Romance Verb*, 71–97. London: Biddles Ltd., Guildford and Kings Lynn Croom Helm Ltd.

