Late Attestations of Participle Agreement in Spanish Perfective Constructions

Jason P. Doroga
University of Wisconsin-Madison

1. Introduction: Verbal and Adjectival Participles in Spanish

In modern Spanish, the present perfect is formed by the present tense of *haber* + an invariable past participle (henceforth [-Ag]), as shown in (1), while a resultative construction is formed by *tener* (or *estar*) + a variable past participle [+Ag], as in (2):

(1) He perdido la cartera. (Perfective)
   'I have lost my wallet'[1]

(2) Tengo perdida la cartera. (Resultative)
   'The wallet is lost'
   (from Harre 1991:75)

Though the basic message in both sentences is essentially the same, the event is conceptualized in two different ways. In (1) the focus is on the completed action of an agent who has lost a wallet while in (2) the focus shifts to the resultant state of the wallet being lost. Though the participles in (1) and (2) look similar, they actually are quite different. Following Bosque (1989, 1999), I consider the perfective participle in (1) to be a verbal participle and the resultative participle in (2) to be an adjectival participle. The most obvious difference between verbal and adjectival participles is the feature of agreement, but recent contributions by Varela (1992, 2003, 2005), Demonte (1983) and Di Tullio (2008) have highlighted some important syntactic differences. For example, only verbal participles accept adverbs of manner, as shown in (3), and only adjectival participles accept the degree modifier 'muy', as in (4):

(3) He (*Tengo) cerrado la puerta violentemente. (Verbal)
   'I have closed the door violently'

(4) Me tiene (*ha) muy preocupado este niño. (Adjectival)
   'This boy has me very worried'

Along with these syntactic properties, there are morphological differences as well between verbal and adjectival participles. In some cases, the morphology of the verbal and adjectival participle is the same, as shown in (5); however, in instances of participle doublets (e.g., *fijo/fijado*; *suelto/soltado*) we see an important distinction. In modern Spanish the morphology of the participle indicates to which grammatical category it belongs. For example, participle forms that have the /do/ morpheme (referred to in this paper as 'regular participles') function as verbal (perfective) participles whereas participles

[1] Throughout this article, English glosses are paraphrases, not full translations, of the relevant Spanish passages.

that lack the /do/ morpheme (referred to here as 'truncated participles') are restricted to adjectival (resultative) uses. This is shown in (6)-(7):

(5) He barrido el piso. 'I have swept the floor' (Verbal)
    Tengo barrido el piso. 'I have the floor swept' (Adjectival)

(6) He fijado (*fijo) el papel en la pared. (Verbal)
    'I have attached the paper on the wall'

(7) La toalla está seca (*secada). (Adjectival)
    'The towel is dry'

Truncated participles derive from Classical Latin verbs of the second and third conjugations. These verbs had rhizotonic perfect participles (e.g., TRACTUM, COCTUM, PRENSUM 'pulled,' 'cooked,' 'seized'), which stood in opposition to the arrhizotonic participles of the first and fourth conjugation (e.g. AMATUM, ERUDITUM 'loved,' 'educated'). From these patrimonial forms, many of the truncated participles of Spanish are derived: TORQUEO, TORTU>*tuerto* 'to twist'; FIGO, FIXUS>*fijo* 'to attach'; PRE(HE)NDO, PRENSUM>*preso* 'to seize'. Although truncated participles only function as adjectives in the modern language (8), throughout the medieval period of Spanish, truncated participles were used in both perfective and resultative constructions, as shown in (9) and (10) respectively:

(8) Verbal: Ha **matado** al hombre 'He has killed the man'
    Adjectival: El hombre está **muerto** 'The man is dead'

(9) et mando [thamaris] adozir un odre lleno de sangre de omnes e por que auie este rey ciro fechas muchas batallas & **muertas** tantas yentes que eran sin cuenta & gozaba siempre de matar omnes (*Estoria de España*, c. 1270)
    'because the king had killed so many people'

(10) pusieron le nombre xamat que es tanto como **muerto**
     (*Libro de ajedrez, dados y tablas*, c. 1251)
     'they gave it the name checkmate which means the same as dead'

There is a substantial body of research on the historical development of the Spanish present perfect construction (Rodríguez Molina 2004, Givón 2001, García Martín 2001), yet scholarship to date has not addressed the reasons why the truncated participle gradually became excluded from the perfective construction. Previous studies tend to focus on the historical development of the verb *haber* as it evolves from being a verb of possession in Latin to auxiliary verb in Spanish (Salvi 1987). In (11) the verb HABERE ('to have') is a full lexical verb of possession, and this oft-cited example simply describes the state of possessing a letter, with no indication that the person who has the letter actually wrote it. Furthermore, the participle SCRIPTAM ('written') functions as an adjectival complement modifying the direct object. It is accepted that this construction gave rise to the Spanish perfective construction through the process of grammaticalization (e.g., Traugott & Heine 1991; Lehmann 1995). This term as understood in this paper means essentially the evolution of linguistic structures whereby they lose syntactic freedom and autonomy by becoming more subject to constraints in the linguistic system. In the development of the Romance perfective, the semantic value of *haber* gradually is lost. There are several important syntactic consequences to note as a result of this semantic change. As *haber* loses its status as main verb, it no longer assigns thematic roles of agent and patient in the subject and object positions, and must rely on the participle to do so. Since the participle now assigns the theta roles, it changes grammatical categories and moves from ADJECTIVE to VERB. The participle no longer functions as an adjectival complement, thus it no longer agrees with the direct object. These changes are seen in (12), where the grammatical subject of the sentence is necessarily the same as the agent who has written a letter. To convey the meaning of the original, resultative meaning of the Latin construction, modern Spanish chooses a different auxiliary, illustrated in (13):

(11) HABEO EPISTULAM SCRIPTAM   (Resultative)
    'I have the written letter'

(12) He escrito la carta.   (Perfective)
    'I have written the letter'

(13) Tengo escrita la carta.   (Resultative)
    'I have the written letter'
    (cited in Salvi 1987:225-226)

The main goal of this paper is to show that the morphosyntactic representation of the Spanish participle (regular or truncated) contributes to the interpretation of an event. In this study I present evidence that *haber* + regular participle [-Ag] became associated with a perfective meaning before *haber* + truncated participles [-Ag]. Furthermore, I consider late attestations of *haber* + truncated participle [+Ag] (from the 16th through the 18th centuries) and argue that they favor a resultative reading, rather than a perfective one, even though they select the perfective auxiliary *haber*. The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I provide a brief overview of the historical development of the perfective construction in Spanish, and I define key concepts such as 'perfective' and 'resultative'. In section 3, I present a description of the corpus and analyze examples of late attestations of agreement. In section 4, I explain my proposal to account for the gradual association of the regular participle with perfective readings and the truncated participle with resultative readings. Concluding remarks and a summary of the main findings of this study appear in section 5.

2. Theoretical considerations
2.1. Defining the concepts of 'perfective' and 'resultant state'

All of the Romance languages display a perfect construction with the auxiliary 'have' (or 'have'/'be' in French and Italian) + past participle.[2] The study of this innovation in the Romance verb paradigm offers numerous avenues of research, for example the interpretation of the event and the relationship between tense and aspect.[3] Following the terminology of Iatridou (2002), example (14) may be interpreted in two different ways. It may be read as an *experiential perfect,* which highlights an agent who has lost something, and the entire event is conceptualized as the completion of a telic event that has some relevance to the present temporal reference point. In this reading, it is unclear if the glasses are still lost at the time of speech. However, (14) may also be interpreted as a *perfect of result*. In this reading, an agent has lost a pair of glasses, and they continue to be lost at the time of the utterance. Thus, removed from any context, there is an inherent ambiguity in Spanish perfects with respect to the duration of the predicate. The use of adverbs and the addition of other clauses, such as in (15), are necessary to clarify the intended message.

(14)   He perdido los lentes.
        'I have lost my glasses'

(15)   Esta mañana he perdido los lentes y ahora no puedo leer la carta.
        'I lost my glasses this morning, and now I cannot read the letter'

---

[2] However, not all languages have a present perfect that is distinct from the simple past. For example Latin has SCRIPSIT which depending on context, can be interpreted as either a simple past or as a perfective. The conflation of the perfect and the simple past form is seen in the modern languages as well. For example, in modern German *Ich habe gedacht* and the simple past form *Ich dachte* may both be glossed as 'I thought'.

[3] It is not possible to provide a full account of the interpretation of the present perfect in this paper. See Cartagena (1999) and Carrasco Gutiérrez (2008) for a thorough overview.

(16)   Tengo perdidos los lentes.
        'I have lost my glasses' / 'My glasses are lost'

On the other hand, a resultative construction (16) focuses on a current state that is the result of a previous action. Nedjalkov (1988) notices some important differences between the two constructions. He posits that while there are few aspectual restrictions on perfective constructions, resultatives generally only allow telic verbs. Additionally, he points out there is no ambiguity in resultatives because they imply that the state not only is relevant, but is also maintained at the time of the utterance. For example, the difference between the resultative in (17) and the perfective in (18) is that the perfective does not necessarily imply that the dinner is ready now (i.e., it may have already been consumed):

(17)   Tengo hecha la cena
        'I have dinner ready'

(18)   He hecho la cena
        'I have made dinner'

The thematic role of AGENT is another important difference between perfectives and resultatives. In the syntactic representation of the argument structure, participles in transitive perfective constructions (19) incorporate into their semantic base the undeniable existence of an external argument (an AGENT), while participles in transitive resultative constructions suppress the agent (20). Note that in a stative construction (21) the agent is deleted completely.

(19)   He perdido la cartera.
        'I have lost the wallet'

(20)   Tengo perdida la cartera.
        'I have a lost wallet'

(21)   Está perdida la cartera.
        'The wallet is lost'

Although at times the semantic distinction between perfectives and resultatives may seem inconsequential, syntactically the conceptualization of the event is different.

2.2. 'Haber' with resultatives and perfectives

During the 12th and 13th centuries, Spanish resultatives with transitive verbs[4] were expressed with either *haber* or *tener* + participle [+Ag] construction.[5] In fact, the *haber* construction allowed for at least two different readings. The construction could be interpreted as a resultative (22) or as a perfective (23):

(22)   E la faiçón de los gavilanes que son de tierra de Caçria semejan a los sagres, sinon que son
        muy pintados e **an** las palmas luengas e bien **fechas** e las alas muy luengas (*Libro de los
        animales que cazan,* 1250)
        'they are colorful and have long, well-formed feathers'
        (Resultative)

---

[4] Intransitive verbs selected a different auxiliary, usually either *ser* or *estar* (Lapesa 2000:783-784).
[5] This study focuses only on resultatives with *haber*, but for a full discussion of the history of the development of *tener* in resultative constructions, see Harre (1991).

(23)   Despues ovo esse Tobias por mugier la fija de Raguel, que **avie avidos** .vii. maridos
         (*Fazienda,* c.1295)
         'who had previously had seven husbands'
         (Perfective)

In (22) the adjectival participle describes the resultant state of an object as logic dictates that the grammatical subject (the birds) does not function as the external agent of the participle (*fechas*) that has caused the feathers to be in this condition. Note as well that the participle is coordinated with another adjective (*luengas*), which is further indication that it describes a resultant state and not a perfective. Conversely, in (23) the verbal participle describes a past action, and the grammatical subject of *haber* is necessarily the same as the explicit agent of the action described. This is interpreted as a perfective because the agent of the participle (*avidos*) is the same as the grammatical subject of the sentence, and it does not refer to the resultant state of one having seven husbands at the same time. Having identical surface structures, a certain amount of ambiguity was naturally found in the interpretation of the sentences. Of course in many cases context clarified the appropriate reading, yet, at times, the context alone was not sufficient to clearly favor one interpretation over the other, such as when the lack of co-referentiality between grammatical subject and implied agent was not explicit, as shown in (24) and (25):

(24)   Todos son adobados quando mio Çid esto ovo fablado; **las armas avien presas** e sedien
         sobre los cavallos (*Cantar de Mio Cid,* 1100?-1210?, copied c.1307)
         'their weapons were/had been taken'
         (Resultative/Present Perfect reading ambiguous)

(25)   A Minaya Albar Fañez mataron le el cavallo, bien lo acorren mesnadas de christianos
         la lança a quebrada, al espada metio mano mager de pie buenos colpes va dando
         (*Cantar de Mio Cid,* 1100?-1210?, copied c.1307)
         'he has a broken lance/his lance has broken'
         (Resultative/Present Perfect reading ambiguous)

   Timberlake (1977), Romani (2008) and others have argued that a principal, motivating factor for the loss of participle agreement in perfective constructions is precisely because the surface forms for perfective/resultative (during this time period) were the same. It is when there is no agreement of past participle and direct object that one can be most certain of how the combination *haber* + participle is to be interpreted.

2.3. Participle agreement in perfectives with 'haber'

     In this section, I briefly summarize participle agreement patterns in the 12th through 15th centuries in order to demonstrate that the participle [-Ag] gradually became the sole form available for perfective constructions. As I demonstrated in section 2.2, the first non-ambiguous examples of perfectives begin to appear in Castilian with [-Ag], but the change from [+Ag] to [-Ag] was gradual and did not affect all participles at the same rate. Macpherson (1964) and Company Company (1983) find that participle agreement in 12th and 14th century texts was more frequent than the participle lacking agreement[6], although the feature of agreement was never considered obligatory. As García Martín (2001) notes, there are several factors that explain the preference for [+Ag] during this time period. Participle agreement imitated the original Latin syntax and contributed an archaic flavor to the language that some authors consciously employed (e.g., Berceo). Additionally, the participle [+Ag] was common as it was useful for fulfilling the demands of the rhyme scheme in verse (Macpherson 1964). Lastly, because the word order of the perfective construction was not as fixed during this time

---

[6] Macpherson reports that 80% of participles show agreement with direct objects in the *Cid*, while Company Company finds an agreement rate of 76% in her corpus of 12th-14th century texts.

as it is in modern Spanish, the location of the direct object in relationship to the participle is another factor for agreement. Throughout this time period, agreement was more common when the direct object appeared before the participle, and less common when the direct object appeared after the participle, as shown in examples (26) and (27) respectively:

(26)   Su oracion ovo acabada (Direct object precedes participle)
         (*La vida de María Egipciaca,* c.1200-1215)
         'His prayer had finished'

(27)   Este rey ha muerto nuestros saçerdotes (Direct object follows participle)
         (*Calila e Dimna*, c.1251)
         'This king has killed our priests'

However, by the fifteenth century, there is a significant change in agreement patterns, and the participle [-Ag] increasingly becomes the only form documented in perfective constructions. Harre (1991) finds examples of agreement up to the first third of the fifteenth century, suggesting that the latest attestations of agreement in perfectives roughly coincide with the composition date of the *Corbacho* (approximately 1438). Similarly, data from Macpherson (1964) and Company Company (1983) corroborate these findings and suggest that the grammaticalization process is complete by the end of the fifteenth century, finding no examples of participle agreement by the time of the production of the *Celestina* (1499). Additionally, during this time period the participle gradually becomes restricted to post-auxiliary position, providing further evidence that by 1500 there was "una lexicalización total, formando morfema y lexema un todo coherente e indivisible" (Company Company 1983:51). For this reason, in this paper I consider examples of *haber* + participle [+Ag] documented after 1500 to be late-attestations of participle agreement.

3. The present study

In the existing literature on the development of perfect tenses in Spanish, very little has been said about which type of participle was first to lose agreement and form a grammaticalized unit with the auxiliary verb. In fact most studies treat the entire category PARTICIPLE as a homogenous whole. There is no study of which I am aware that has examined the type of participle to determine if there is any difference in agreement patterns between truncated and regular participles. It is for this reason that I conducted the present investigation.

3.1. Data collection

I searched the on-line *Corpus del español* (Davies 2002) and the *Corpus Diacrónico del Español* (Real Academia Española)[7] for examples of verbal allomorphy in perfective constructions, that is, a verbal function that was realized by two unique forms of the participle (e.g., one truncated, one regular). I limited my search to the *haber* + participle + Direct Object construction, therefore only transitive verbs were included in the analysis. This eliminated some common intransitive participle doublets such as *nado/nacido* 'born' from the analysis. Also excluded from analysis were the numerous truncated participles that functioned adjectivally, without a corresponding perfective use (e.g. *tinto, tuerto* 'dyed', 'twisted').[8] All tenses of *haber* in the indicative and subjunctive moods were included as collocates in the search.

---

[7] I consulted *BETA*, an on-line bio-bibliographical resource, to verify the date for the production of the texts given in these electronic corpora.
[8] Though some truncated participles are used in other verbal contexts apart from perfective constructions (e.g. synthetic passives).

3.2. Presentation of data

The verbs included in the analysis are listed in (28):[9]

(28) conquerir   conquisto/conquistado   'to conquer'
       matar   muerto[10]/matado   'to kill'
       prender   preso/prendido   'to capture', 'to seize'
       soltar   suelto/soltado   'to free'

A characteristic found in 13th-century documentation is evidence of competing participial forms. Thus in addition to the etymological, truncated forms *conquisto, muerto, preso* and *suelto*, throughout the corpus we also see attestations of the analogical participles *conquistado, matado,*[11] *prendido, soltado*. These new participles are a testament to the strong influence that the regular morpheme /do/, found in the arrhizotonic participles (*amado, vivido*) exerted on the truncated forms. Examples (29) and (30) demonstrate that the two participle forms were used in co-variation:

(29) por esta mesma via fizo matar los otros que **auian prendido** enforcando los a todos que mas se puede dezir (*Historia troyana*, 1380)
      'he ordered the others to be killed, whom he had captured'

(30) El Rey don ferrando despues que **ouo presos** todos estos castillos (*Crónica de veinte reyes*, c.1295)
      'after the King had captured all of these castles'

However, comparing the frequency of the regular participles that showed agreement to the frequency of the truncated participles that showed agreement, an interesting pattern was revealed. The data presented in Tables 1-4 demonstrate that truncated participles show agreement with their objects more frequently and for a longer period of time than the regular participles with /do/.

Table 1 Number of tokens of perfective *haber + conquistado/conquisto* showing agreement

	1200s	1300s	1400s	1500s	TOTALS
regular [+Ag]	7	3	3	0	13
truncated [+Ag]	13	3	4	0	20

Table 2 Number of tokens of perfective *haber + matado/muerto* showing agreement

	1200s	1300s	1400s	1500s	TOTALS
regular [+Ag]	2	1	0	0	3
truncated [+Ag]	37	23	14	3	77

---

[9] It should be noted that these are not the only truncated participles documented in perfective constructions during the time period under investigation. This study highlights a limited number of verbs that demonstrate a pattern that is consistent with the other truncated participles used in this construction (e.g., *cocho* 'cooked').

[10] Corominas & Pascual identify *muerto* as an early suppletive participle of *matar* (1980-91: s.v. *matar*); this is from the earliest documentation, continuing through the medieval period.

[11] *MATTARE is the etymon of *matar*, as suggested by Corominas and Pascual (s.v. *matar*), so *matado* may be considered etymological rather than analogical.

Table 3 Number of tokens of perfective *haber* + *prendido/preso* showing agreement

	1200s	1300s	1400s	1500s	TOTALS
regular [+Ag]	0	0	1	0	1
truncated [+Ag]	4	3	5	5	17

Table 4 Number of tokens of perfective *haber* + *soltado/suelto* showing agreement

	1200s	1300s	1400s	1500s	TOTALS
regular [+Ag]	0	0	1	0	1
truncated [+Ag]	4	3	5	2	14

Tables 1-4 illustrate that in the corpora the truncated participles maintain agreement with their direct objects longer than the regular participle in perfective constructions. For example, in the fifteenth century the participle *muerto* [+Ag] is documented fourteen times, one example is shown in (31), yet by this time *matado* [-Ag] had already formed a grammaticalized unit with *haber* and there are no attestations in the corpus of *matado* showing agreement in the fifteenth century (or later).

(31)   Capitulo.xxxj. que muestra commo auariçia **ha muertos** & condepnados grandes omnes
        (*Libro de las donas*, 1448)
        'Chapter 31 shows how avarice has killed and condemned great men'

Only examples where agreement can clearly be determined have been included in these raw frequency numbers. Examples with a masculine singular direct object, such as (32), are not included in the analysis because it is not possible to distinguish whether it is an example of participle agreement with a direct object, or whether it is an example of a fully grammaticalized participle [-Ag].

(32)   E despues quelo **ouo muerto** quese fue para el palaçio & que lo dixo a doña sancha su esposa
        (*Castigos y documentos de Sancho IV*, 1293)
        'And after he had killed him he went to the palace'

Interestingly, when I extended the search to beyond the fifteenth century, some important differences in agreement patterns were revealed. No attestations of agreement in the regular participles (*conquistado, matado, prendido, soltado*) were found in perfective constructions after 1500, results which are not unexpected in light of the conclusions by Company Company (1983), Macpherson (1964) and Harre (1991); however the data do not demonstrate, as some studies conclude (cf. Harre 1991:115), that there are no attestations of agreement in all types of participles. In fact there are late attestations of *haber* + truncated participle [+Ag] in the corpus which deserve mention and are highlighted in (33)-(35).[12]

(33)   De San Miguel anduvieron hasta el valle de Chimo, parándose primero en el valle de
        Chicama a castigar los indios porque diz que **habían muertos** ciertos cristianos
        (*Crónica del Perú*, 1553)
        'They came to punish the Indians because they said they had killed certain Christians'

(34)   En dejándole en la cárcel, se le llegaron tres o cuatro pícaros que allí **habían presos**, con
        ciertos cañutillos de piojos en las manos
        (*Don Quijote de la Mancha*, Alonso Fernández de Avellanada, 1614)
        'three of four rogues arrived that were captured there'

---

[12] There are no attestations of late participle agreement for the verb *conquistar* in the corpus.

(35)   e pusiesen en libertad todas las personas que **auían presas**, menos aquellos procesados por
        delitos grabes en perjuicio de S. M. ó tercero
        (*Relación verídica de lo acaecido en la isla de Puerto Rico*, 1747)
        'they freed all of the people that were held captive'

The corpus suggests that participle agreement was indeed rare by the end of the fifteenth century, but a small group of truncated participles do show agreement beyond the sixteenth century and do not seem to be the first group affected by grammaticalization.

4. Discussion
4.1. The grammaticalization of [-Ag] in perfective constructions

The general pattern that I find in the data is that starting in the thirteenth century regular participles show agreement less frequently than truncated participles. The development of the perfect tenses reveals a prototypical characteristic of grammaticalization. As the morpheme /do/ [-Ag] becomes associated with a transitive argument structure for a perfective action with an agent that is co-referential with the grammatical subject, the participle loses morphological freedom (i.e., the ability to show agreement) and loses autonomy. The role of frequency effects has been studied by a number of researchers, most notably Bybee (1985, 2002), who believe that the cognitive representation of language is affected by the frequency with which a particular structure is used. The usage-based model of language change helps explain the variation that we see in participle agreement. The fact that the morpheme /do/ [+Ag] does not appear in *haber* perfective constructions after the fifteenth century may be partially explained by the role of repetition and its effect on morphological change. Bybee has demonstrated that morphemes may become grammaticalized through a process of ritualization as speakers connect a particular morpheme to a particular grammatical structure. Hence as agreement became less frequent in regular participles, speakers began to make connections between a participle's morphological structure /do/ [-Ag] and a specific syntactic and semantic structure. Thus beginning in the second half of the 15th century, the *haber* + regular participle [-Ag] communicates a previous action whose grammatical subject is the implied agent of the action affecting the direct object.

4.2. Event conceptualization and participle agreement

In this section I explore the role of lexical aspect and its implications on the patterns of agreement that the data reveal. Vendler (1967) proposes that verbs may be divided into four different classes, of which two ('accomplishments' and 'achievements') share the common feature of telicity, while the remaining two ('states' and 'activities') are atelic. More recent studies have highlighted that aspectual properties may have implications not only on how the verb itself is interpreted, but also on how verbal complements and the entire event may be conceptualized (Brinton 1988; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2005). The four verbs that I consider in this investigation may all be classified as 'accomplishments', and therefore are telic as they have a natural endpoint (Kearns 2003). The primary semantic feature of the transitive infinitives *conquistar*, *matar, prender,* and *soltar* is that they require two arguments, an agent and an patient. Following Dowty (1991), prototypical agents are animate with a volitional involvement in causing an event, while prototypical patients undergo a change of state and are causally affected by an agent. As indicated in Section 1.2, in the diachronic development of the perfect tenses in Spanish, the participle assigns the theta-role of agent. As a consequence of the grammaticalization process, the participle /do/ [-Ag] becomes associated with this agentive role. Truncated participles, lacking the morpheme /do/, do not have this cognitive representation and allow for an alternate interpretation, one that deemphasizes the agent and focuses on the resultant state of the object.

4.3. Interpretation of the late attestations of participle agreement

The truncated participle does not assign the theta-role of agent (Salvi 1987), thus I propose that in late attestations of participle agreement in constructions with *haber,* the event is conceptualized as a

resultant state that focuses on the patient, rather than an agent-focused perfective action. Consider example (34), repeated here for convenience as (36):

(36)   En dejándole en la cárcel, se le llegaron tres o cuatro pícaros que allí **habían presos**, con ciertos cañutillos de piojos en las manos (*Don Quijote de la Mancha*, manuscript of Alonso Fernández de Avellenada, 1614)
'three of four rogues arrived that had been held there'

In (36), the agent who has acted on the patient (the prisoners) remains unexpressed (and in fact is unknown), and the focus is on the resultant state of the prisoners. We know that the rogues were being held at the prison, but the entire 'capturing' event is not the focus, rather the focus is on the resultant state that is the result of a previous action. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) report that in the vast majority of cases, states are characterized by not allowing any agentive involvement by the subject, such as the English example 'I am tall', which is inherently non-agentive. Since the truncated participles do not license an agent, it follows that they are used to describe a resultant state, as shown in (35), repeated here as (37):

(37)   e pusiesen en libertad todas las personas que **auían presas**, menos aquellos procesados por delitos grabes en perjuicio de S. M. ó tercero (*Relación verídica de lo acaecido en la isla de Puerto Rico*, 1747)
'they freed all of the people that were held captive'

In this example from the 18th century, the agent has been eliminated from the sentence and the focus is on the patient (the prisoners). States do not allow any involvement by an agent, and this is indeed what is illustrated in this example. The sentence is best interpreted as a description of a resultant state, and the idea could be expressed in modern Spanish as '*estaban presos*' ('were held as prisoners') rather than '*habían prendido*' ('they had captured').

4.4. Resultatives with 'haber'

Recall that *haber* for transitive, resultant clauses was always an option in Old Spanish (Inclán 1991, Pountain 1985), though its use gradually became associated with perfective constructions, and the *tener* or *estar* + participle became associated with resultant states. Traditionally, linguists have maintained that the distinction between *perfective/resultative* lies in the choice of the auxiliary. Alonso & Henríquez Ureña (1945:115) point out that "*haber* con participio indica la acción pasada; es pues un pretérito ocurrido con anterioridad al tiempo del auxiliar *haber...tener* con participio es un presente en el que se acumula una acción pasada; indica el resultado actual de la acción pasada." Similar views are expressed by Gili Gaya (1955) and, more recently, Lapesa (2000). But these examples considered in the present paper demonstrate that a resultant state may be indicated by participle choice (e.g. a truncated participle [+Ag]) rather than by auxiliary choice. In other words, the use of *tener* to indicate a resultant state may be considered as a secondary index, encoding information that is already present in the primary indicator, the participle. Thus the avoidance of repetition seems to justify the choice of the auxiliary *haber* for these resultative constructions.

5. Conclusions

The findings of this study demonstrate that late attestations of agreement in *haber* + truncated participle [+Ag], lacking the /do/ morpheme, emphasize the resultant state of the object rather than an anterior, perfective action performed by an agent. To justify this reading, I have considered the syntactic restructuring of the truncated participle in the evolution of the Spanish perfect tenses. Data analysis reveals that regular participles, when used in perfective constructions with telic verbs, incorporate into their semantic base the undeniable existence of an external argument (an AGENT). However, the truncated participle, when studied in its diachrony, loses the ability to license an agent, and the conceptualization of the whole event moves away from agent-centeredness to patient-

centeredness. Whereas in the thirteenth century the truncated participles *conquisto, muerto, preso,* and *suelto* functioned both as a verb (perfective) and an adjective (resultative) without a corresponding change in morphology, the truncated participle gradually became excluded from perfective constructions because of this change in argument structure.

References

Alonso, Amado & Pedro Henríquez Ureña. 1945. *Gramática española: segundo curso*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada.

BETA = *Bibliografía Española de Textos Antiguos* [available on-line at www.bancroft.berkeley.edu/philobiblon]

Bosque, Ignacio. 1989. *Las categorías gramaticales*. Madrid: Síntesis.

Bosque, Ignacio. 1999. El sintagma adjetival. Complementos y modificadores del adjetivo. Adjetivo y participio. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (dirs.): *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. I, pp. 217-310. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Brinton, Laurel. 1988. *The Development of the English Aspectual Systems: Aspectualizers and Post-Verbal Particles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan. 1985. *Morphology: a Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan. 2002. Word Frequency and Context of Use in the Lexical Diffusion of Phonetically Conditioned Sound Change. *Language Variation and Change* 14:261-90.

Carrasco Gutiérrez, Ángeles (ed.). 2008. *Tiempos compuestos y formas verbales complejas*. Madrid: Iberoamericana Editorial Vervuert.

Cartagena, Nelson. 1999. Los tiempos compuestos. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (dirs.): *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. II, pp. 2935-2975. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Company Company, Concepción. 1983. Sintaxis y valores de los tiempos compuestos en el español medieval. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 32.2:235-256.

Corominas, Joan & José Antonio Pascual. 1980-91. *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*. Madrid: Gredos.

Davies, Mark. 2010. *Corpus del español*. [available on-line at www.corpusdelespanol.org]

Demonte, Violeta. 1983. Pasivas léxicas y pasivas sintácticas en español. In *Serta Philologica F. Lázaro Carreter*, pp. 61-157. Madrid: Cátedra.

Di Tullio, Ángela. 2008. Participios y adjetivos. In María José Espiñeira and Jesús Pena Seijas (eds.) *Categorización lingüística y límites intercategoriales*, pp. 99-125. Santiago de Compostela: Servizo de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico.

Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language* 67:547-619.

García Martín, José María. 2001. *La formación de los tiempos compuestos en español medieval y clásico*. Valencia: University of Valencia.

Gili Gaya, Samuel. 1955. *Curso superior de sintaxis española*. 5th edition. Barcelona: Bibliograf, S.A.

Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Harre, Catherine E. 1991. *Tener +Past Participle*. New York: Routledge.

Iatridou, Sabine. 2002. Some Observations about the Form and Meaning of the Perfect. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press

Inclán, Sara. 1991. Participle Agreement in Old Spanish. *Romance Linguistics and Literature Review* 4:55-64.

Kearns, Katherine. 2003. Durative Achievements and Individual-level Predicates on Events. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26:595-635.

Lapesa, Rafael. 2000. *Estudios de morfosintaxis histórica del español*, 2 vols. Madrid: Gredos.

Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.

Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 2005. *Argument Realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macpherson, Ian R. 1964. Past Participle Agreement in Old Spanish: Transitive Verbs. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 44:241-254.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir (ed.). 1988. *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pountain, Christopher J. 1985. Copulas, Verbs of Possession and Auxiliaries in Old Spanish: The Evidence for Structurally Interdependent Changes. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 68:337-355.

Real Academia Española: Banco de datos (CORDE) *Corpus diacrónico del español* [available on-line at www.rae.es]

Rodríguez Molina, Javier. 2004. Difusión léxica, cambio semántico y gramaticalización: el caso de *haber + participio* en español antiguo. *Revista de filología española* 84:169-209.

Romani, Patrizia. 2008. La ambigüedad de *haber* + participio y *ser* + participio en el castellano medieval. In Concepción Company Company and José Moreno de Alba (eds.) *Actas del VII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la lengua española,* pp. 1073-1085. Madrid: Editorial Arco.

Salvi, Giampaolo. 1987. Syntactic Restructuring in the Evolution of Romance Auxiliaries. In Martin Harris and Paolo Ramat (eds.) *Historical Development of Auxiliaries,* pp. 225-236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Timberlake, Alan. 1977. Reanalysis and Actualization in Syntactic Change. In *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, Charles N. Li (ed.), pp. 141-177. Austin TX: University of Texas Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Bernd Heine (eds). 1991. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 2 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Varela, Soledad. 1992. Verbal and Adjectival Participles in Spanish. In Christiane Laeufer and Terrell A. Morgan (eds.): *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics,* pp. 219-234. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Varela, Soledad. 2003. Lexical Morphology Revisited: Form/meaning Correspondences in Psych Adjectival Participles. In Geerts E. Booij, et. al. (eds.): *Topics in Morphology*. *Selected Papers from the 3rd MMM,* pp. 51-75. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Varela, Soledad. 2005. Lexicalización y cambio categorial. In Santos Ríos, et al. (eds.): *Palabras, norma, discurso*. *En memoria de Fernando Lázaro Carreter*, pp. 1133-1145. Salamanca: Ediciones de la Universidad.

Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, New York.

Selected Proceedings of the
15th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

edited by Chad Howe, Sarah E. Blackwell, and Margaret Lubbers Quesada

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Doroga, Jason P. 2013. Late Attestations of Participle Agreement in Spanish Perfective Constructions.
In *Selected Proceedings of the 15th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Chad Howe et al., 17-28. Somerville,
MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2872.