

WPFG

working papers in functional grammar

wpfg no. 44
February 1992

The history of Spanish *haber* plus participle
Hella Olbertz
University of Amsterdam

THE HISTORY OF SPANISH HABER PLUS PARTICIPLE

Hella Olbertz

University of Amsterdam
Department of Spanish
Spuistraat 134
1012 VB AMSTERDAM

0. Introduction*

It is generally acknowledged among Hispanists that the so-called compound forms of the verb, haber plus participle,¹ in Spanish and similar constructions in other Romance languages stem from constructions with a possessive meaning in classical Latin such as the following:

- (1) in ea provincia pecunias magnas
in that province capital.pl.acc large.pl.acc
collocatas habent
invested.pl.acc they-have
"in that province they have a large capital invested"
(Cicero (106 - 43 B.C.) quoted from Vincent 1982:82)

The Spanish construction differs from its Latin base in that the former expresses a grammatical notion, viz. Perfect Aspect or (recent) Past Tense, while the latter has no function whatsoever beyond its lexical meaning.

It is the aim of this paper to answer the following questions:

(i) Which were the functional and formal changes that led from constructions exemplified in (1) to the haber plus participle construction in modern Spanish?

(ii) When did each of these changes occur?

(iii) How are they related to each other?

The answers will be given within the framework of Functional Grammar.²

* I would like to thank Martine Cuvalay, Simon Dik, Inge Genee, Henk Haverkate, Kees Hengeveld, Harm Pinkster and Jacqueline Veerman as well as the editors of this series for their valuable comments on earlier versions of this paper.

¹ Since in present-day Spanish the present participle is no longer productive, the only grammatically relevant participle is the descendant of the Latin passive past participle. Therefore I will use the abbreviation p.p.p. to refer to the passive past participle in Latin, whereas for Spanish the term participle will suffice.

² Throughout this paper the following abbreviations will be used: General: FG - Functional Grammar, SoA - State of Affairs, A - Addressee, S - Speaker; pred - predicate, t_i - reference time; masc - masculine, fem - feminine; nom - nomi-

The paper is divided into two main sections, which deal with Latin and Spanish respectively. The first section contains a brief analysis of the development of habere plus p.p.p. in classical Latin, which is necessary for a full understanding of the structural changes that took place in Spanish. The second section, on the participle construction in Spanish, will give a more detailed account of the changes the construction has undergone.

1. Latin

In this section two types of constructions will be dealt with. The first is represented by participle constructions such as (1), which show no sign of grammaticalization, whereas the second is partly grammaticalized.

1.1. Possession

Constructions such as (1) go back as far as archaic Latin, the first occurrences being found in Plautus (254 - 184 B.C.) (Thielmann 1885). In this construction, habere functions as a two-place predicate expressing a relationship of possession between the entity referred to by its first argument (with the semantic function Positioner) and the referent of its second argument (with the semantic function Goal), in this case pecunias magnas. The p.p.p. is a predicational adjunct: it denotes the result of an action or process in which the pos-

native, gen - genitive, dat - dative, acc - accusative; sg - singular, pl - plural; subj - subjunctive. Wordclasses: B - any wordclass, N - noun, A - adjective, V - verb. Variables: α - any variable, x - individual, e - state of affairs. Semantic functions: Ag - Agent, Pos - Positioner, Go - Goal, Circ - Circumstance. Syntactic functions: Subj - Subject. Predicate/Predication operators: Pres - Present, Perf - Perfect, Ant - Anteriority. Representations and glosses will be simplified in such a way that they only contain the relevant information.

sessed item has been involved before the time indicated by the main predicate, here, the action of investing (collocare) (cf. Pinkster 1987: 196f). This means that it expresses a resultative SoA rather than a property. The information given in the p.p.p. in sentences like (1) is additional information about the entity to which the second argument refers. Consequently, the p.p.p. can be left out without affecting the grammaticality of the rest of the sentence.

An FG representation of (1) which captures both of the above features of the predicational adjunct could be as follows:

- (2) [PRES e_1 : [habe-_v (mx₁: [-S, -A] (x₁))_{PosSubj} (mx₂: pecunia_n (x₂): magn-_a (x₂))_{Go}] (e₁)]
 (ANT e_j : [colloca-_v (x₁)_{Ag} (x₂)_{GoSubj}] (e_j)_{Circ}]

In (2), the predicational adjunct is represented as a predication satellite, a satellite that gives some additional information about what is the case at the time the main SoA occurs, thus helping to situate the main predication in time.³ The operator ANT indicates anteriority with respect to the time expressed by the tense operator on the main predication. Due to the combined effect of the operator ANT on the embedded predication and of the Subject assignment to the second argument of the embedded predicate, the verb will take the form of the passive past participle. The identity of indexation (x₂) indicates that the second argument of collocare refers to pecunias magnas. Conversely, the first argument variables of habere and collocare are not coindexed, because they need not have the same referents.

³ This analysis has mainly been prompted by the way predicational adjuncts are dealt with in Dik/Hengeveld (1990).

1.2. Possessive metaphor

The first step towards grammaticalization of the structure is reflected in constructions where there is no longer a candidate for the second argument position of habere. Consider the following example from Cicero (Pinkster 1987:204):

- (3) cum cognitum habeas quod sit
 when known.acc you-have.subj what is.subj
 summi rectoris ... numen
 highest.gen lord.gen will.nom
 "when you realize what is the will of the supreme lord"

As we have seen above, the predicate frame of habere requires a nominal second argument. In (3), however, the only constituent that can be considered to be a possible candidate for the second argument position is the subordinate question quod sit summi rectoris ... numen. This embedded clause must be the second argument of cognitum, since the predicate frame of cognoscere requires a propositional content in its second argument position. Therefore we may conclude that in (3) the only argument of habere is the implicit second person singular Subject.

The fact that there is no "possessed item" in this sentence implies that the lexical meaning of habere has been seriously reduced. Habere is not an expression of possession, but rather an indicator of the present availability of the knowledge that is specified by the second argument of the p.p.p.

Another crucial difference between this construction and the type of construction exemplified in (1) is that the first argument of habere must refer to the same person as the first argument of cognoscere, because, obviously, an individual can only avail himself of knowledge he himself has acquired. This means that the character of the p.p.p. has undergone some alteration, too: although it still has a passive form, its first argument is actually expressed in active morphology (in the second person singular form of habere). So the participle

in (3) has become an integral part of the active main predicate at the expense of the integrity⁴ of habere.

Nevertheless, habere has not been fully auxiliari- zed in this construction. There are two major arguments to support this view. In the first place habere still does impose some residue of its lexical meaning on the construction. It combines exclusively with two-place verbs, where it expresses a relationship of "metaphorical possession" between the first and the second argument. In (3), for example, it denotes "intellectual possession" of some specific piece of knowledge. Consequently habere does not combine with verbs whose meaning contradicts the notion of possession, such as perdere ("to lose") and dare ("to give"). Secondly habere does not -yet- form the only possible expression of Perfect Aspect, which can also be expressed by means of the synthetic Perfect form. This does not mean, of course, that the synthetic Perfect form conveys precisely the same meaning as the participle construction. On the contrary, it is the lexical impact of habere that makes the meaning of this construction different from the fully grammaticalized synthetic Perfect.

For the representation of this structure in terms of Functional Grammar this means that the construction cannot be seen as the output of an operator rule, because this would presuppose a high degree of grammaticalization (cf. Goossens 1987, Olbertz 1989); rather, it should be regarded as a derived predicate, which is formed by means of the following rule:

- (4) Input: $\text{pred}_v (x_1) (\alpha_2)$
 Output: $\text{habe-}_v \text{pred}_v \text{ p.p.p. } (x_1) (\alpha_2)$
 Condition: (x_1) must be assigned Subject function
 Meaning: (x_1) avails him/herself of the results
 of pred_v at t_1 ,
 (x_1) pred_v -ed (α_2) before t_1

⁴ This term has been taken from Lehmann (1982), who defines grammaticalization as a combination of decrease of weight (phonological and semantic integrity, scope), increase in cohesion (paradigmaticity, bondedness) and decrease of paradigmatic and syntagmatic variability.

In this structure, t_1 is the time indicated by the Tense-operator of the predication, which I will call reference time. As the structure is restricted to two-place verbs, only two-place verbs are allowed as input to the rule. The introduction of the variable (α) in the second argument position accounts for the fact that not only first-order entities, such as persons and things, but also second-order entities (events) as well as third-order entities (propositions) and fourth-order entities (speech-acts)⁵ can be referred to in this position. The meaning definition reflects what has been said above about the function of habere in constructions of this type: it indicates that the referent of the first argument has something at his disposal that is the result of some SoA he has been involved in before.

This structure also accounts for participle constructions that do have a nominal second argument, such as the one exemplified in the following quotation from Ulpianus (A.D. 170 - 228).

- (5) si miles qui habebat iam factum
 if soldier who he-had already made.acc
 testamentum aliud fecisset
 will.acc another he-had-made.subj
 "if a soldier who had already made a will would have
 made another" (quoted from Pinkster 1987:203).

Theoretically (5) could be interpreted according to structure (2). Under such an interpretation the conditional clause would encode the information that a soldier had a will, which, moreover, had been made. This interpretation is clearly nonsensical, since the additional information is entirely superfluous: the existence of a will presupposes that the will has been made. Hence the only acceptable interpretation is the one given in the English translation, i.e. habebat ... factum is a Perfect Aspect periphrasis.

⁵ The first to discuss a -then tripartite- hierarchy of entities was Lyons (1977:442 ff). A subcategorization of entities at four different levels, as presented above, was introduced into Functional Grammar by Hengeveld (1989).

In classical Latin the grammaticalization of the construction does not proceed beyond this stage.

1.3. Summary

In the above section on Latin we saw the beginning of the fusion of two independent lexical items: the possessive verb habere and a passive past participle of some transitive verb, the former being the core of the predication and the latter fulfilling a predicative function at the periphery of the predication. In this process the predicative function of the originally marginal element, the p.p.p., becomes more prominent in the predication, and to the same extent that its importance increases, the importance of the other, originally dominant, element decreases. At the end of the development in classical Latin the first stage of their fusion has been reached, in that they jointly form a periphrastic expression, i.e. a partially grammaticalized expression with a specific function.

The following section will deal with the further tightening of the bonds between the two elements and the change of meaning the construction undergoes once it forms one inseparable unit.

2. Haber plus participle in Spanish

In the description of the grammaticalization of Latin habere I have concentrated on the loss of selection restrictions and the loss of lexical meaning, which are the most important features of auxiliarization, because they concern the underlying structure of the predicate. In Spanish these structural changes also find expression in the form of the constituents of the periphrasis, which was not yet the case in the Latin constructions dealt with above. From a functional view on language it is not at all surprising that functional and

formal changes in language do not necessarily occur simultaneously, since the form of a linguistic sign is considered to be subservient to its function. This means that changes as regards the form of a construction are the ultimate reflection of changes that have already taken place in the underlying structure. The component of Functional Grammar to which the description of the formal changes pertains is constituted by the expression rules.

Throughout this section I will first deal with the changes in the underlying structure of haber plus participle and then turn to the formal aspects of its grammaticalization. How these changes are to be accounted for in the expression component of FG is of minor importance to my argument, and will not be gone into in detail; instead, I will dwell on formal changes only insofar as this can contribute to the functional description of the history of the haber-construction.

As regards the data, I strongly depend on the results of corpus-based studies by Pountain (1985) and Macpherson (1967). But as I wanted to gain a deeper insight into the matter and find an answer to a few more specific questions, I examined fragments of the corpora on which Pountain based his study.⁶

⁶ The fragments were taken from the following texts: CID [1140-1180]: Poema de Mio Cid, ed. Ian Michael (1973), Madrid: Castalia, lines: 21-412. MIL [1252?]: Gonzalo de Berceo, Milagros de Nuestra Señora, ed. A.G. Solalinde (1952), Madrid: Espasa Calpe, stanzas 142-340. LBA [1343]: Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita, Libro de buen amor, ed. M. Criado de Val & E.W. Taylor (1965), Madrid: C.S.I.C., stanzas 63-579. RIM [1386]: Pero López de Ayala, Rimado de Palacio, ed. Germán Orduña (1987), Madrid: Castalia, stanzas 193-476. TAL [1438]: Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, Arcipreste de Talavera o Corbacho, ed. J. González Muela (1970), Madrid: Castalia, pp. 121-166. CAR [1492]: Diego de San Pedro, Cárcel de Amor, ed. Keith Whinnon (1971), Madrid: Castalia, pp. 80-106. CEL [1499]: Fernando de Rojas, La Celestina. Tragicomedia de Calisto y Melibea, ed. Dorothy S. Severin (1969), Madrid: Alianza, pp. 213-236. LOZ [1528]: Francisco Delicado, La Lozana andaluza, ed. Bruno M. Damiani & Giovanni Allegra (1975), Madrid: Porrúa, pp. 69-105. TER [1562]: Santa Teresa de Jesús, "Epistolario", in: Obras completas, Madrid: Plenitud, pp. 985-989.

Note that I did not always use the editions on which Pountain based his investigation. Furthermore, I did not consider El Conde Lucanor, which, as a didactic prose work, differs mark-

The lengths of the fragments are such that they each yield 22 occurrences of the haber-construction. In addition to these, I examined fragments from nine literary texts which cover the period from the beginning of the 17th century to modern times⁷ in order to find out about more recent functional changes.

2.1. CID

The earliest document of Spanish literature we know of, El poema de Mío Cid, is thought to have been written between 1140 and 1180.⁸ So there is a gap of approximately one thousand years between the last stage of the development of the p.p.p. construction in classical Latin I considered and the first accessible occurrences of its descendant in Spanish litera-

edly from the other medieval works of the corpus.

⁷ EJE [1613]: Miguel de Cervantes, Novelas ejemplares I, ed. Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce (1982), Madrid: Castalia, pp. 219-221. DES [1654]: Agustín Moreto y Cavana: "El desdén con el desdén" in: Teatro, ed. Narciso Alonso Cortés (1937), Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 149-181. FIL [1690?]: Francisco Bances Candamo, La piedra filosofal, ed. Mariateresa Cattaneo (1974), Milano: Cisalpino-Goliardica, pp. 1-31. SAI [1764]: Ramón de la Cruz, Doce Sainetes, ed. José-Francisco Gatti (1972), Barcelona: Labor, pp. 35-65. NIÑ [1805]: El sí de las niñas, ed. Federico Ruiz Morcuende (1968), Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 90-104. DRA [1867]: Manuel Tamayo y Baus, Un drama nuevo (1965), Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 151-171. NIE [1914]: Miguel de Unamuno, Niebla, ed. Mario J. Valdés (1982), Madrid: Cátedra, pp. 138-147. NOV [1967]: Antonio Gala, Noviembre y un poco de yerba, ed. Phyllis Zatlin Boring (1983), Madrid: Cátedra, pp. 113-127. BIC [1982]: Fernando Fernán-Gómez, Las bicicletas son para el verano, ed. Eduardo Haro Tecglen (1984), Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 51-63.

⁸ The oldest existing manuscript of El poema de Mío Cid dates from 1307. This manuscript is more recent than Milagros de Nuestra Señora, which must have been written around 1252. As we will see, the language in MIL is slightly more conservative than the language of CID, at least as far as haber plus participle is concerned. However, since it is problematic to assess the extent to which copyists altered the original manuscript, I will stick to the periodization of the original text.

ture. As is to be expected, quite a few changes took place in this period.

2.1.1. Function

In most of the 22 examples of haber plus participle in my sample, haber can hardly be interpreted as a possessive predicate. Consider the following examples:

- (6) El rrey lo ha vedado (CID, 42)
 the king it has forbidden
 "The King has forbidden it."
Context: He had forbidden the people to sell
 goods to Cid and his followers.
- (7) dexado ha heredades e (CID, 115)
 left he-has patrimony.(fem).pl and
 casas
 houses.(fem)
 "He has left his patrimony and his houses."
- (8) lo que vos he servido (CID, 73)
 that what you I-have served
 "what I have served you"
- (9) por el agua á passado (CID, 150)
 through the water he-has crossed
 "he crossed (the river) through the water"

In (6), the context indicates that ha vedado is an expression of Perfect Aspect. (7)-(9) are incompatible with a possessive interpretation of haber. The meaning of the predicate dexar ("to leave") in (7) is almost the opposite of "to possess". In (8) the lexical predicate is a three-place verb, whose third argument has the semantic function Recipient; on logical grounds the presence of a Recipient in the predication is incompatible with a possessive interpretation of haber, as one cannot possess and keep a thing and at the same time have someone else receive it. In (9), finally, there is no entity

to be possessed: passar ("to go through") is used here as an intransitive predicate.

On the other hand, there are a few examples in which a possessive interpretation of haber is not only possible but fits quite nicely in the context:

- (10) yo treinta he ganados (CID, 207)
 I thirty I-have won.masc.pl
 "I have won thirty"

However, examples like (10) do not by themselves prove the continuing relevance of possessive meaning within the periphrastic construction, since the possessive interpretation is strongly suggested by the meaning of the lexical predicate.

Thus we may conclude that, already in CID, haber plus participle generally functions as a periphrastic expression of the Perfect.

Rule (4), according to which habere was introduced into the predicate in Latin is no longer applicable at this stage however: as we have seen in (8) and (9) the predicate formation with haber is no longer restricted to two-place predicates. Three-place predicates combine with haber and, incidentally, it also occurs with one-place verbs although, as a rule, the Perfect of one-place verbs is formed by means of a participle plus ser.⁹ Haber is thus more generally applicable than habere was in Latin. If at this stage haber could be combined with any verb, i.e. with all kinds of lexical verbs and even with auxiliaries, this would mean that it had entered the paradigm of auxiliaries and that, in terms of FG, it should be regarded as the expression of an operator. However, this is not yet the case because, firstly, haber does not appear in combination with auxiliaries and, secondly, the set of lexical verbs with which it does combine is still restricted: haber does not occur with zero-place predicates, such as llover ("to rain"),

⁹ In CID nearly all intransitive verbs take ser as a Perfect auxiliary. Only at the end of the 15th century does haber definitely exceed ser in this function (Pountain 1985: 342).

and there is still a restriction as to the nature of the first argument of the lexical verb, which must be a first-order entity. Thirdly, the first argument must be the Subject of the clause and finally haber does not combine with haber or any other possessive predicate.¹⁰ Consequently, haber cannot yet be regarded as an auxiliary proper, so it still has to be accounted for by means of a predicate formation rule.

The argument structure of the input predicate can be represented as follows:

$$(11) \text{ pred}_v (x_1) (\alpha_n) \quad n \geq 0$$

This means, firstly, that the predicate must have at least one argument, which must be a first order entity, and, secondly, that there are no further restrictions on the number or type of its arguments.

Simultaneously with the restrictions on the input predicate, the meaning of the construction has changed too. When we consider the examples from CID given so far, we observe that the meaning postulate¹¹ in (4), "(x₁) avails him/herself of the results of pred_v at t₁", can only be attached without awkwardness to (10), whereas in (6)-(9) a less specific meaning definition is needed.

As is apparent from the meaning definition in (4), Perfect Aspect resembles Past Tense insofar as it locates a SoA on the time axis. But, unlike Past Tense, Perfect Aspect has a two-fold function: in addition to locating the SoA in time, it establishes a relationship between the past SoA and a moment posterior to its occurrence. At that moment t₁, there are some traces which the past SoA has left and which lead to the con-

¹⁰ Note that these restrictions on the applicability of the haber constructions are in fact restrictions on Perfect Aspect, because in Old Spanish there is no longer an alternative way of expressing Perfect Aspect: the Latin synthetic Perfect form has developed into a Past Tense.

¹¹ For further discussion of this concept cf. Dik 1989:81f.

clusion that the SoA has occurred. For example, when I meet some friend of mine with a new hair-style, I can conclude that she has been to the hairdresser's, which may result in a question such as:

(12) Have you been to the hairdresser's?

Dik (1989:190) puts it as follows: "The Perfect will (...) be used to describe past SoA's the occurrence of which is evident from the information we have at t_1 ".

On the basis of this definition the predicate formation rule for Perfect Aspect as it is expressed in CID should be as follows:

(13) input: $\text{pred}_v(x_1)(\alpha_n)$ $n \geq 0$
 output: $\text{habe-}_v \text{pred}_v(x_1)(\alpha_n)$
 conditions: pred_v does not express possessive meaning
 (x_1) must be assigned Subject function
 meaning: there is some indication at t_1 that:
 (x_1) pred_v -ed (α_n) before t_1

When we compare the meaning of haber in this structure with that of the possessive lexical verb haber, we find that the meaning of haber in the periphrasis cannot even be said to be loosely related to its lexical meaning; in other words, at this stage the periphrastic auxiliary¹² haber has entirely lost its lexical meaning. The traces of the lexical verb that are left in this structure are the restrictions on the first argument of the combining lexical verb and the impossibility of combining haber with "itself" or with its synonym tener; the latter may indicate that the speakers of Old Spanish still felt that the lexeme haber and the periphrastic auxiliary haber had something in common semantically.

After having considered the developments that concerned the underlying structure of the haber-construction, i.e. the loss

¹² I use the term periphrastic auxiliary to refer to the finite verb in the periphrastic predicate, independently of the extent to which this finite verb has been auxiliarized.

of the lexical meaning of haber as a periphrastic auxiliary, the decreasing specificity of its aspectual meaning and the ongoing loss of its selection restrictions, due to which its impact on the structure of the periphrasis decreased, let us now turn to the way in which the grammaticalization of the construction is expressed in its form.

2.1.2. Form

The most obvious change as regards the form of the construction is the loss of agreement between the participle and the noun or pronoun in the second argument position. According to Macpherson (1967:244), in 19 out of the total of 77 occurrences of haber plus participle, i.e. 25%, the participle does not agree with the second argument of the lexical verb. Let us consider a few examples of non-agreement:

(14) D' aquesta rriqueza que
 of that.fem richness.(fem) which
 el Criador nos á dado (CID, 811)
 the Lord us he-has given
 "Of that wealth which the Lord has given to us"

(15) Vençido á esta.fem batalla.(fem) (CID, 1008)
 won he-has this battle
 "He has won this battle"

(14) exemplifies an important semantic factor that favours non-agreement, the use of dar ("to give") or dexar ("to leave (behind)") as a lexical predicate, which blocks the possessive interpretation of haber. In such cases it is obvious to the language user that agreement would be a matter of form without any function whatsoever. Consequently, haber periphrases with verbs of this kind are the first candidates for agreement to be dropped. Of the 19 cases of non-agreement that Macpherson finds, 8 are constructions with such verbs (Macpherson 1967:

246).¹³ In addition to this very obvious discrepancy between the original possessive meaning of haber and the meaning of the lexical verb there are many cases, such as (6), (8) and (9) above, in which a possessive interpretation of haber would be extremely far-fetched. Although at this stage there is still often agreement in such constructions, gradually their semantics contribute to the further loss of agreement, because it does not really make any sense. Another factor to stimulate non-agreement is the fact that often there is nothing to agree with. This is not only the case with one-place predicates, but also when haber is combined with verbs with a sentential second argument.¹⁴ According to my data, the number of such cases steadily increases in the course of the Middle Ages.

In (14) and (15) the participle is immediately adjacent to haber, which favours the interpretation of the two words as one compound verbal form. Apparently the participle of the compound form is no longer seen as an adjectival element that relates to the Goal argument; rather, it is felt to be a verbal morpheme that indicates anteriority and that is bound to haber, whose function it is to "tie" whatever is expressed in the participle to the present or to another reference time. Indeed, in 18 out of the 19 cases of non-agreement the finite haber and the participle are placed side by side. This brings us to our next point concerning the form of the construction, the tendency towards fusion (Lehmann 1982:148).

Whereas in Latin it was quite common to place at least the Goal argument in between the participle and habere (or vice versa), from the beginning of Spanish onward this has been a

¹³ Macpherson gives still another argument for the loss of agreement in (14), viz. the distance between the participle and the noun or pronoun it ought to agree with. In my opinion this can only be regarded as a secondary factor, which in itself has no explanatory value, since in Latin, when the construction was less -or not at all- grammaticalized, there was always agreement, no matter how large the distance between the two elements was.

¹⁴ The ending -o which the participle takes in these cases should be considered to be an unmarked -or default- ending rather than an expression of gender.

very uncommon practice. In CID, in only 4 of the 22 haber-constructions I examined, has a word been inserted between the two constituents of the construction. In all of these 4 cases the inserted word is a clitic, i.e. a word of very little prosodic force. This increase in bondedness, "the intimacy with which (a sign) is connected with other signs to which it bears a syntagmatic relation" (Lehmann 1982:147) is the formal reflection of how strongly haber semantically "leans" on the lexical verb, which it specifies grammatically without having any lexical function of its own.

Another aspect of the tendency towards fusion is the increasing regularity as regards the order of the constituents within the periphrasis, since fusion presupposes not only adjacency, but also fixed positions of the constituents (cf. Lehmann 1982:157ff). In Latin habere could freely precede or follow the p.p.p., but already in CID we find that in 18 out of 22 periphrases, i.e. in 82% of all cases, the finite verb precedes the participle.

Table I gives an overview of the formal characteristics of the haber-construction in CID. The figures presented here are based on my sample of 22 occurrences of haber plus participle.

TABLE I: FORMAL AND FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF HABER PLUS PARTICIPLE IN CID

	yes	no	total
Agreement	6 (86%)	1 (14%)	7 ¹⁵
words inserted between <u>haber</u> and participle	4 (18%)	18 (82%)	22
deviation from preferred mutual word order	4 (18%)	18 (82%)	22
semantic compatibility of <u>haber</u> with participle	16 (73%)	6 (27%)	22

¹⁵ This number is based only on those cases in which agreement would require a marked ending, i.e. any ending but -o.

(17) no has podido conocerme (CAR, 88)
 not you-have could recognize-me
 "you have not been able to recognize me"

(18) tan contraria me ha sido la ventura (CAR, 104)
 so adverse to-me it-has been the fortune
 "so unfortunate have I been"

(19) no he havido menos placer de oírte (CAR, 92)
 not I-have had less pleasure of hear-you
 "I have not had less pleasure in hearing you"

In example (17) haber combines with a modal verb which, as such, fulfils an auxiliary function. In (18) it expresses the Perfect morphology of a copulative verb, which, itself, has the purely grammatical function of "supporting" an adjectival predicate. In (19) haber functions as a periphrastic auxiliary to the lexical verb haber, a combination which, until then, had not been possible. The examples show that, at this stage, haber has become a true auxiliary: nearly all of the restrictions on the predicates haber could possibly combine with, which were given in structure (13), have disappeared: possessive predicates are no longer excluded and - as the combinations with the semi-auxiliary poder in (17) and the copula in (18) show - the combining word need not even be a lexical predicate. It is obvious that, under these conditions, the haber periphrasis can no longer be explained by means of a predicate formation rule, since derived predicates can only be formed from lexical predicates.

In CEL, which was written in 1499, i.e. seven years later than CAR, the last restriction on the input predicate, which has not been overtly dropped in CAR, viz. the condition that the first argument of the input predicate must be a first-order entity, is neglected as well, as can be seen in the following example:

(20) te contaré [...] lo que con Areúsa
 to-you I-will-tell the what with Areúsa
 me ha pasado hoy (CEL, 218)
 to-me it-has happened today
 "I will tell you what happened to me with Areúsa today"

But even if sentences like (20) had not been written in this period, the decisive turning point has been reached when haber combines with auxiliaries. At this point haber must be regarded as the expression of an operator. This operator could be represented as follows:

(21) Perf pred_s (α_n) --> habe-v pred_s (α_n)

This structure expresses, firstly, that haber can be used together with verbal as well as with non-verbal predicates, the latter requiring copula support, and, secondly, that the expression of the Perfect with haber is no longer restricted to active predications. Although generally the passive Perfect is still formed with ser plus participle, which is also used to express the passive form of the Present Tense, there are occurrences of passive Perfect forms with haber in CEL such as:

(22) ¡O quan burlado has sido de tus sirvientes!
 oh how-much deceived you-have been by your servants
 "Oh how much have you been deceived by your servants"
 (quoted from Bouzet 1953:57)

According to Yllera (1979:227f) the incidental use of the passive construction with haber begins even earlier, viz. in the first half of the fourteenth century. This construction, however, never really occurs frequently; a reflexive construction is preferred instead. The first occurrences of the so-called "reflexive passive" with the haber-construction are to be found in TER [1571]:

(23) Los dineros [...] se han dado (TER, 987)
 the.pl money.pl themselves they-have given
 "the money has been given away"

(24) no se ha enviado [a usted] (TER, 988)
 not itself it-has sent to you
 "it has not been sent to you"

With the application to passive sentences, Perfect Aspect as expressed by means of the haber-construction has reached the stage of complete integration into the verbal system, in other words, Perfect Aspect has now become completely grammaticalized.¹⁷

2.2.2. Form

By the time Sta. Teresa de Jesús wrote her letters [1570], the haber-construction had already taken the form it still has in modern Spanish.

Agreement, which, as far as it made sense (cf. 2.1.2.), helped to indicate the relationship between the past SoA and its consequences at reference time, completely disappeared from TAL [1438] onward, simultaneously with the introduction of haber as an auxiliary to reflexive verbs. The participle thus definitively lost its adjectival status and became a dependent form which could only occur in combination with haber. The order of the constituents of the construction was definitively fixed in LOZ [1528]. Bondedness is the only factor that lags behind, and it is not even complete in present-day Spanish, although from CEL [1499] onward there were no insertions between haber and the participle in about 95% of all occurrences of the construction. But even in modern Spanish it is still possible -although often rejected in prescriptive grammars- to insert a personal pronoun, a particle or even an adverbial phrase between the finite form of haber and

¹⁷ This does not mean, however, that haber plus participle has lost its periphrastic character. In my definition a construction is a periphrasis as long as the situation of functional split (Heine & Reh 1982:48) persists, i.e. as long as the periphrastic auxiliary is capable of fulfilling a lexical function outside the periphrasis. Only when the auxiliary has lost its original lexical meaning, in other words when a functional shift (Heine & Reh 1982:51) from the lexicon to grammar has taken place, can an analytic construction no longer be considered to be a periphrasis (cf. 2.3.).

the participle (Lorenzo 1966:153ff).¹⁸ The insertion of clitics is even unavoidable when haber appears in the infinitive or as a gerund. So the stage of fusion has not been reached and -as Fleischman (1982) convincingly argues¹⁹- probably never will be. Nevertheless, the form has reached a stage where neither constituent can occur independently. This, in addition to the regularity of the paradigm, shows that the construction is now a firmly established grammatical paradigm.

Table II summarizes the development of the periphrasis from CID to TER. Again, the formal parameters are presented next to a functional parameter, compatibility. What I mean by this parameter is the compatibility of the auxiliary use of haber with its possessive interpretation, which, at this stage, is still possible. The increasing incompatibility represents the increasing desemanticization of the auxiliary. Note, however, that this percentage, unlike the percentages of the formal parameters, does not tend towards 100%, because this would mean that verbs whose meaning and structure happen to be compatible with the notion of possession were excluded from the combination with haber, which is, of course, not the case. In

¹⁸ Lorenzo quotes examples from 20th century Spanish prose and from the contemporary press. The favourite candidates for interpolation between haber and the participle are the second and first person singular pronouns usted and yo and the particle ya ("already"). Particularly interesting is the use of más que ("more than") and menos que ("less than") as verbal modifiers. These phrases must immediately precede the verb they modify. Thus, the word order in a sentence such as El volumen de crédito se ha más que duplicado ("The credit volume has more than doubled") is not only correct, but there is not even any alternative (cf. Lorenzo 1966:157).

¹⁹ Fleischman compares the development of the Spanish Perfect with that of the Future, which is formed by the infinitive form of the lexical verb followed by a finite form of haber; in the latter tense expression the constituents have fused. Fleischman explains that the position of haber in front of the lexical verb impedes fusion in the Perfect, because such fusion would necessarily involve the loss of prosodic prominence for the inflected haber forms. In other words, whereas postposed haber could fuse with the non-finite lexical verb "without sacrificing any necessary grammatical information", preposed haber could not (Fleischman 1982:115).

addition to this, table II shows that the lexical verb haber is gradually being ousted by its rival tener, simultaneously with the ongoing auxiliarization of haber in the participle construction.²⁰ The relevance of the fate of lexical haber for the development of the participle construction will be dealt with in section 2.3.

2.3. From the Golden Age to modern Spanish

The first and most important change to occur in this period is the extinction of haber as a lexical predicate. In the second part of my corpus, from EJE [1613] to BIC [1982], haber occurs in a non-auxiliary function only in four restricted contexts: Firstly, it is used in the idiom haber menester ("to need"):

- (25) Lo que yo había menester para mi
 the what I had need for my
 divertimiento tengo en vos. (DES, 171)
 entertainment I-have in you
 "You fill my need for entertainment."

According to my findings, this idiom does not occur later than approximately 1690 (FIL) and has been replaced by the impersonal expression ser menester ("to be necessary") from SAI [1762] onward. Secondly, haber is used with expressions of time, where it indicates the notion of "(a certain time) ago" such as in:

- (26) Zoilo Maza, que ha tres días que
 Zoilo Maza who it-has three days that
 llegó de París. (SAI, 62)
 he-arrived from Paris
 "Zoilo Maza, who arrived from Paris three days ago."

²⁰ The one and only variant of possessive meaning which has always been expressed by tener, i.e. the notion of "have and hold", has been excluded in my calculation.

TABLE II: FORMAL AND FUNCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF PERIPHRASTIC AND LEXICAL HABER FROM CID TO TER
 (the given numbers are percentages, numbers between brackets are absolute numbers;
h is haber; P is the participle)

	Agreement*		Wordorder		Insertions		Compatibility		Possession	
	total	yes no	Ph	hP	yes	no	yes	no	haber	tener
CID [1180?]	(7)	86 14	23	77	23	77	73	27	80	20
MIL [1252?]	(8)	87 13	5	95	41	59	77	23	81	19
LBA [1343]	(7)	71 29	27	73	27	73	86	14	56	44
RIM [1386]	(7)	71 29	5	95	9	91	73	27	53	47
TAL [1438]	(8)	12 88	10	90	9	91	73	27	22	78
CAR [1492]	(6)	0 100	0	100	9	91	59	41	5	95
CEL [1499]	(8)	0 100	5	95	9	91	45	55	12	88
LOZ [1528]	(5)	0 100	0	100	5	95	45	55	3	97
TER [1570]	(7)	0 100	0	100	5	95	41	59	11	89

*The percentages of agreement are based on the numbers of cases which, in case of agreement, would require a marked ending, i.e. any ending but -o. These are the numbers given between brackets.

In this function haber survives until the beginning of the 20th century, when it is eventually replaced by hacer (cf. Rasmussen 1981:12ff). In its two remaining functions outside the participle construction, viz. as a deontic modal verb in combination with the preposition de and as an impersonal existential verb, haber is still used in modern Spanish, although as a deontic modal it may possibly be ousted by tener que, which -in this function- is much younger than haber de and now occurs much more frequently.

Anyway, only the first of these four functions is closely related to the lexical meaning of possession. But, being an idiom, even this expression cannot be regarded as an instance of haber as a lexical verb with possessive meaning. Throughout the second part of my corpus, possessive meaning is exclusively expressed by means of tener. Therefore we may conclude from the above findings that at the beginning of the 17th century haber definitively vanished as a possessive predicate (cf. also Urrutia & Alvarez 1983:290).

From this moment onward haber plus participle can no longer be regarded as a periphrasis. It is one of the characteristics of a periphrastic construction that the auxiliary has a lexical function outside the periphrasis, which is metaphorically related to the meaning it expresses within the periphrasis. It was precisely the association with the lexical meaning of haber that helped to establish the "bridge" between the past SoA and its present relevance. In order to clarify what I mean by this bridging through association, I will slightly reformulate the definition of Perfect Aspect given in (13):

- (27) some entity has a property at t_1 , which indicates that:
 this entity was involved in a SoA which occurred before
 t_1

When the word that indicates the possession (of the property in question) is different from the auxiliary this association bridge has been broken. In other words: at this stage the shape of the construction no longer suggests that there must be some sort of relationship between the past event on the one

hand and what is the case at the moment of speaking on the other. From this moment haber plus participle is nothing but an analytic verbal construction, in which haber transports Person, Number and Tense, while the participle expresses the lexical meaning as well as the grammatical notion of anteriority.

The fact that the haber-construction is thus poorly geared to the expression of Perfect Aspect is probably one of the main causes for the tendency towards a reinterpretation of the Perfect as a Past Tense, which is to be observed from the beginning of the 19th century onward. Consider the following example:

- (28) Ha padecido mucho este invierno. (NIÑ, 100)
 she-has suffered much this winter
 "She suffered a lot this winter."
context: This sentence is uttered in small talk about
 the speaker's sister's delicate health.

(28) could be interpreted aspectually if it were not uttered on a summer evening; "this winter" in (28) apparently is the winter of "this year". What (28) exemplifies is the minimal condition to which the use of the haber plus participle construction is tied in modern peninsular Spanish: the SoA must have occurred within a span of time to which the moment of speaking belongs too. More concretely: the possibility of using the pronoun este ("this") or temporal adverbs such as hoy ("today") when referring to the time when the past SoA occurred is a sufficient precondition for the use of haber plus participle. This means that there must be some connection between the past SoA and the moment of speaking, but that this connection no longer necessarily concerns the content of the SoA. It suffices when the relationship concerns the time of occurrence of the SoA. Note, however, that, at least in my corpus, unequivocally temporal uses of the construction are still very infrequent.

There are some cases, though, which at first sight appear to be instances of Past Tense. Moreover, in the following examples, even the above restriction is neglected:

- (29) Y hasta pocos días ha no lo he
and until few days it-has not it I-have
sabido. (NIÑ, 100)
known

"And I did not know until a few days ago."

context: The speaker complains about his son's lack of confidence in him.

- (30) ayer, cuando salía de su casa, han
yesterday when he-left from his house they-have
asasinado a tiros a un guardia (BIC, 61)
murdered by shots to a policeman
"yesterday they shot a policeman who was leaving his house."

context: The speaker reports about the situation in the streets of Madrid shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War. He is very upset.

A closer look at the meaning of the sentences within their contexts shows that they do in fact express aspectuality. By using the Present Perfect in situations where he is supposed to use the Past Tense, the speaker expresses how much he is personally affected by the past SoA. Although, at reference time, there are probably no indications whatsoever that the past SoA occurred, the SoA is evaluated by the speaker as if this were the case. In other words, although the SoA may not have left generally perceivable traces at reference time, the use of the Perfect shows that such traces are in fact present in the speaker's mind.

Besides these marginal instances of Perfect Aspect, there are quite a few examples in the more recent works of my corpus where the speaker's choice between Perfect Aspect and Past Tense is a matter of subjective evaluation. Example (31) shows how the use of the Perfect can be part of a complex strategy of the speaker to focalize a past event.

- (31) ¿Sabes, Eugenia, quién ha estado aquí?
you-know Eugenia who has been here
Don Augusto Pérez. (NIE, 138)
don Augusto Pérez
"Do you know, Eugenia, who was here? Don Augusto Pérez."

Context: This sentence is uttered by Eugenia's aunt and ward, immediately on Eugenia's return home. Out of Eugenia's suitors, Augusto Pérez is the aunt's absolute favourite.

The haber-construction is very frequent in stage directions, such as the following:

- (32) Se ha acercado al fregadero,
 herself she-has approach to-the sink
 se ha entristecido. (NOV, 119)
 herself she-has saddened
 "She has approached the sink, she has become sad."

This is another piece of evidence for its aspectual function, since, in stage directions of this type, it is not the occurrence of the SoA that is of importance but its result.

So we may conclude that, although the extinction of haber as a possessive predicate has facilitated the reinterpretation of the construction as some sort of Past Tense, haber plus participle may still be said to fulfil its aspectual function without any restriction whatsoever. In addition to its aspectual function, haber plus participle is incidentally used for the expression of (recent) Past Tense.

3. Conclusion

I have argued in this paper that Spanish haber plus participle developed out of a construction containing two independent predicates in classical Latin. The construction began to be grammaticalized in Latin, when habere lost part of its meaning and qualitative valency and the participle lost its passive meaning. The two items began to depend on each other, forming a unified construction, a verbal periphrasis expressing Perfect Aspect.

At the beginning of Old Spanish, haber is entirely demantimized within the periphrasis, but the applicability of the construction is still restricted to specific contexts,

these restrictions being due to the residues of the original meaning and argument structure of haber.

The development from Old Spanish to sixteenth-century Spanish is characterized by the widening of the domain of haber and ends up with the entire loss of all the restrictions to which the application of the periphrasis was bound. As regards the form of the construction, the loss of independence of both, haber and the participle, becomes increasingly evident when the mutual order of the constituents has been fixed, agreement has been lost, and the two items have become virtually inseparable.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the auxiliari-
zation of haber is completed, when its lexical function is definitively taken over by tener. However, this does not put an end to the grammaticalization of the construction as a whole. Approximately a hundred years later slight tendencies towards a further grammaticalization of the meaning of the construction from Aspect to Tense arise.

References

- Bouzet, Jean
(1953) Orígenes del empleo de "estar", in: Estudios dedicados a Menéndez Pidal IV. Madrid: CSIC. 37-58.
- Dik, Simon C.
(1989) The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dik, Simon C. and Kees Hengeveld
(1990) The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of perception verb complements. Working Papers in Functional Grammar 37.
- Fleischman, Suzanne
(1982) The future in thought and language. Diachronic evidence from Romance. Cambridge: University Press.
- Goossens, Louis
(1987) The Auxiliarization of English Modals: a Functional Grammar View, in: Harris, Martin & Paolo Ramat (eds.), Historical Development of Auxiliaries. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton De Gruyter. 111-143.
- Heine, Bernd and Mechthild Reh
(1982) Patterns of grammaticalization in African Languages. Arbeitspapiere des Kölner Universalienprojekts 47.
- Hengeveld, Kees
(1989) Layers and operators in Functional Grammar. Journal of Linguistics 25, 127-157.
- Lehmann, Christian
(1982) Thoughts on grammaticalization: A programmatic sketch. Arbeitspapiere des Kölner Universalienprojekts 48.
- Lorenzo, Emilio
(1966) El español de hoy. Lengua en ebullición. Madrid: Gredos.
- Lyons, John
(1977) Semantics, 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press.
- Macpherson, Ian
(1967) Past Participle Agreement in Old Spanish: Transitive Verbs. Bulletin of Hispanic Studies 1967. 241-254.
- Olbertz, Hella
(1989) Periphrastic aspect in Spanish. Working Papers in Functional Grammar 32.

- Pinkster, Harm
(1987) The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tense auxiliaries in Latin, in: Harris, Martin and Paolo Ramat (eds.), Historical development of auxiliaries. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 193-223
- Pountain, Christopher
(1985) Copulas, verbs of possession and auxiliaries in Old Spanish. Bulletin of Hispanic Studies 1985. 337-355.
- Rasmussen, Poul
(1981) El verbo hacer en expresiones temporales. Revue Romane número spécial 22.1981.
- Thielmann, Philipp
(1885) Habere mit dem Part.Perf.Pass. Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik. 2. 372-423 and 509-549.
- Urrutia Cárdenas, Hernán and Manuela Alvarez Alvarez
(1983) Esquema de morfosintáxis histórica del español. Bilbao: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Deusto.
- Vincent, Nigel
(1982) The development of the auxiliaries habere and esse in Romance, in: Vincent, Nigel and Martin Harris (eds.), Studies in the Romance verb. London: Croom Helm. 71-96.
- Yllera, Alicia
(1979) Sintaxis histórica del verbo español: Las perífrasis medievales. Zaragoza: Departamento de Filología, Universidad de Zaragoza.

