UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Lexical auxiliaries in Spanish: how and why?

Olbertz, H.

DOI

[10.1515/ling-2016-0021](https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2016-0021)

Publication date

2016

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Linguistics

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Olbertz, H. (2016). Lexical auxiliaries in Spanish: how and why? *Linguistics*, 54(5), 947-979. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2016-0021>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Hella Olbertz*

Lexical auxiliaries in Spanish: How and why?

DOI 10.1515/ling-2016-0021

Abstract: Departing from a proposal by Keizer on how to bridge the gap between the grammar and the lexicon in Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG), this article deals with three aspectual verbal periphrases in Spanish, which are, in the order of their degrees of grammaticalization, (i) weakly grammaticalized resultative *tener* + participle, (ii) egressive *parar de* + infinitive and (iii) strongly grammaticalized habitual *soler* + infinitive. In spite of their different syntactic behaviors, none of them is a truly lexical or truly grammatical item. After a detailed description of the syntax and semantics of these auxiliary constructions in comparison with truly auxiliary constructions, the article discusses the proposal by García Velasco (this issue) for the lexicon in FDG. This serves as a starting point for the development of the concept of lexical auxiliaries, which is then applied to the three periphrastic constructions. The representation of these constructions in FDG makes use of “combinations of partially instantiated frames,” introduced by Keizer (this issue), and adequately reflects the meanings and the morphosyntactic structure of lexical auxiliaries.

Keywords: periphrasis, grammaticalization, auxiliary, Spanish, Functional Discourse Grammar

1 Introduction

In her article on the dichotomy between the grammar and the lexicon in Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG),¹ Keizer (2007) shows that in English there are quite a number of linguistic items that occupy an in-between position, i. e., they are neither fully grammatical, nor fully lexical items. In addition, the individual items may be grammaticalized to different degrees. Rather than simply rejecting the rigid distinction between grammatical and lexical items, Keizer (2007: 47) proposes a cline from content items via grammatical words to inflectional affixes. Although the analysis of

¹ For an explanation of the FDG concepts used in this article, the reader is referred to the introduction to this issue.

***Corresponding author: Hella Olbertz**, Departement Taal- en letterkunde, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Spuistraat 134, 1012 VB Amsterdam, Netherlands, E-mail: H.G.Olbertz@uva.nl

grammaticalization phenomena in terms of clines is common currency,² Keizer's cline has the advantage of proposing an account of partial grammaticalization in FDG: words are subdivided into primary and secondary grammatical words the latter being *lexical operators* when they add grammatical meanings to entities and *lexical functions* when they serve to establish relations between entities. Although Keizer explicitly restricts her conclusions to English, they are probably applicable to all languages that have inflectional affixes at the grammatical end of the cline.

Taking Keizer's lexical operators as a starting point, my article will discuss three Spanish grammaticalized verbs that do not fulfil all of the crosslinguistic and/or language-specific criteria for the identification of auxiliaries.

When languages have fully grammaticalized auxiliary verbs, the following four properties normally apply: (A) they accompany a non-finite lexical item and, through their finite forms, carry verbal agreement or coreference; (B) they can either be semantically empty (as in the case of copulas) or express some highly abstract meaning such as aspect, tense or modality; (C) together with the main verb they form a monoclausal rather than a biclausal construction, in other words, they do not subordinate the main predicate and its arguments (Steele 1978: 15, from Heine 1993: 19); (D) they cannot fulfil the role of the main predicate themselves (Marchese 1986: 82, from Heine 1993: 23)³ because they "have no valency and do not impose selection restrictions" (Hengeveld 1992: 30–31).⁴

The partially grammaticalized auxiliaries to be dealt with in this article, resultative *tener* 'have', egressive *parar* 'stop' and habitual *soler* 'be in the habit of', share the properties (A)–(C) with fully grammaticalized auxiliaries: they combine with lexical verbs in a non-finite form, they express meanings from the aspectual domain, and they do not subordinate the entity on which they operate. But they fail, in different ways, to satisfy the criterion given in (D), which suggests that they have retained some of their original lexical properties. The aim of this article is to solve the problem of how to represent this heterogeneous class within

² Cf. most notably Hopper (1991), Bybee et al. (1994), and Hopper and Traugott (2003).

³ It should be noted that Heine himself views auxiliaries as a gradient category rather than a clear-cut one (Heine 1993: 70; cf. also Heine and Narrog 2011: 415–416); the same holds for the authors mentioned in note 2 above.

⁴ In addition to the criteria A–D, a number of other less clear-cut criteria have been proposed (cf. Olbertz 1998: 43–44 for a discussion), most notably "clitic climbing" (Myhill 1988a, 1988b), i. e., the possibility to have the clitics referring to arguments of the main verb in front of the finite verb. Apart from being not fully reliable as a criterion for grammaticalization (see e. g., Fernández Soriano 1999: 1262–1263 for counterexamples), Myhill himself shows that animacy and topicality are important additional factors in clitic climbing. Furthermore, the difference between single clitics and combinations of clitics (Davies 1998) as well as register variation (Torres Cacoullós 1999) play a role.

Functional Discourse Grammar. The data used in this article come from different sources representing authentic oral and written Peninsular Spanish, the most important source being the Corpus of Alcalá de Henares.

The article is organized as follows: in Section 2 I will present a fully grammaticalized auxiliary in Spanish and describe the way in which its formulation and expression works in Functional Discourse Grammar, Section 3 will be dedicated to the description of the three partially grammaticalized auxiliaries, and in Section 4 I will present a proposal for how to deal with them within an FDG lexicon. Section 5 will show why the FDG solutions proposed in this article are more adequate than the predication formation solution for partially grammaticalized auxiliaries proposed by Goossens (1987: 118–119) within the framework of Functional Grammar (Dik 1978, 1997).

2 A true auxiliary and its expression in FDG

This section will centre on the syntactic properties of a fully grammaticalized auxiliary in order to contrast them with those of partially grammaticalized auxiliaries. I will first illustrate these properties with several examples, and then provide representations showing how these auxiliaries can be handled in FDG.

There is one case in Spanish of a “true” auxiliary in the sense that it does not express anything but its grammatical meaning: *haber* in the perfect periphrasis *haber* + participle. The originally possessive meaning of *haber* was lost by the beginning of the seventeenth century, *tener* becoming the only unmarked expression of possession (Hernández Díaz 2006: 1064).⁵ In addition to *haber*, which I will discuss in Section 3 in comparison to the weakly grammaticalized *tener* ‘have’, prepositional *ir a* ‘go to’ in the prospective periphrasis *ir a* + infinitive also has the characteristics of a true auxiliary. Unlike *haber*, *ir* continues to be used as a movement verb, a property which it shares with English *go*. However, the fact that both *ir* and *go* continue to express their original lexical meanings outside the prospective construction does not influence the degree to which they are grammaticalized within the periphrastic construction (cf. also Heine 1993: 22).

Let us now turn to the four criteria mentioned in the introduction and apply them to *ir a*. This auxiliary satisfies the first two criteria in the sense that it (A) expresses verbal agreement in the combination with a non-finite lexical verb, and (B) encodes a highly abstract meaning in this construction, i. e., prospective aspect and immediate future.

5 Marked expressions of possession are e. g., *poseer* ‘possess’ and *disponer de* ‘have at one’s disposal’.

With regard to the criterion (C), Spanish offers a syntactic way of testing this: the fact that the auxiliary does not subordinate the verb in the infinitive and its arguments is reflected through the impossibility of (pro)nominalizing the latter. Consider the following examples of *ir* ‘go’ as a lexical movement verb in (1) with auxiliary *ir a* in (2):

- (1) *Voy a París a estudiar.*
 go.1SG to Paris to study.INF
 ‘I’m going to Paris for my study’ (Internet)
 a. – *¿A qué vas?*
 to what go.2SG
 ‘What are you going for’
 b. – *A estudiar.*
 to study.INF
 ‘For my study’
- (2) *Voy a estudiar química.*
 go.1SG to study.INF chemistry
 ‘I’m going to study chemistry’ (Internet)
 a. – *¿A qué vas?*
 to what go.2SG
 ‘What are you going to?’⁶

6 What is fully grammatical but pragmatically marked, however, is an echo question:

- (i) – *¿Vas a QUÉ?*
 go.2SG to what
 ‘You’re going to WHAT?’

The reason for this is that echo-questions do not have a syntactically independent status, rather, they copy the syntactic structure of the interlocutor’s Discourse Act – with the necessary deictic adaptations – questioning the part that has either not been acoustically perceived or has aroused surprise or disagreement. This part can consist of any part of a word or (group of) word(s) from the previous Discourse Act, such as in the following example illustrating the use of a neologism (*staycation* ‘vacation at home’):

- (ii) – *I’m going to have a staycation*
 – *A stay-WHAT?*

Rather than eliciting new information from the interlocutor, echo questions form part of ‘other initiated’ “next turn repair strategies”, i. e., “they look back to a prior turn and they look forward to [the] next turn” (Levinson 1983: 351), which explains their marked structure, i. e., the stressed question word *in situ*. This means that, unlike the case in (2b), echo questions are not true questions.

- b. – ≠ *A estudiar química.*
 to study_{INF} chemistry
 ‘To study chemistry’

The question in (2a.) and the corresponding answer in (2b.) are not ungrammatical, but they are not appropriate in the context of (2), because their use implies a lexical reading of *ir*. For the periphrastic auxiliary *ir a* in (2) this means that it cannot be used independently from the lexical verb in the infinitive, which means that *ir a* + infinitive fulfils criterion (C) as well.

Criterion (D), which basically is about the semantics of the auxiliary, also has a syntactic correlate in Spanish: the auxiliary is incapable of occurring on its own.⁷ The following examples illustrate the use of *ir* as a movement verb (3), as opposed to its auxiliary use in (4). Only the movement verb can be used independently:

- (3) [*por ejemplo ya con mis padres pues si me voy donde vaya (risa)* ‘for instance in relation to my parents, if I leave wherever I go (laughter)’]
como si me voy a comprar una barra de pan se lo
 like if REFL.1SG go.1SG to buy_{INF} a loaf of bread them it
digo
 say.1SG
 ‘like when I go away to buy bread I tell them’ (Alcalá M 23)⁸

⁷ Both in English and in Portuguese the analogous auxiliaries, *be going to* and *ir*, respectively, can occur independently:

- (i) *I didn’t go after Lily, and I’m not going to.* (CASO)
 (ii) – *Não podes consentir... vais usar os teus poderes, não vais?*
 not can.2SG consent_{INF} go.2SG use_{INF} the.PL your.PL powers not go.2SG
 – *Talvez. Sim, vou.*
 perhaps yes go.1SG
 – ‘You cannot allow [this]... you’re going to use your powers, aren’t you?’
 – ‘Maybe. Yes, I’m going to.’ (CdP, from 20th c. Portuguese literature)

This is illustrative of the fact that the test corresponding to criterion (D) is a language specific one.

⁸ In the examples from the Alcalá-corpus, the alphanumeric code identifies the speaker. The letters S, M, and P correspond to the educational levels *superior* (university), *media* (secondary school), and *primaria* (primary school), respectively; the letter is followed by the interview number. In the interest of readability, I have ignored several details of the transcription conventions of the corpus-project in the examples: most importantly, pause indications have been substituted by punctuation.

- a. *como si me voy muy poco tiempo*
 like if REFL.1SG go.1SG very little time
 ‘like when I go away for a very short while’

However, this is not possible in the periphrasis with *ir a*: (4a) is not a suitable answer to (4):

- (4) *nos tratamos habitualmente de tú y*
 REFL.1PL address.1PL habitually PREP you.INFORMAL and
vamos a seguir así
 go.1PL to continue.INF like-this
 ‘We usually say *tú* to each other and we will go on that way’ (Alcalá S 13)
 a. ≠ – *Sí, claro que vamos.*
 yes of_course that go.1PL
 ‘Yes, of course we go.’

The semantic aspect of criterion (D), the lack of valency and selection restrictions, is of course a basic property of all true auxiliaries. Example (5) may illustrate the unlimited applicability of the auxiliary *ir a* in the periphrastic expression with the infinitive:

- (5) *Va a comer un helado/ llorar/ nevar/ haber un*
 go.3SG to eat.INF a ice-cream cry.INF snow.INF EXIST.INF a
terremoto.
 earthquake
 ‘He/she/it/there is going to eat an ice-cream/to cry/to snow/to be an earthquake.’

In this example *ir a* consecutively combines with a two-place, a one-place, a zero-place verb and an auxiliary verb in a presentational expression,⁹ which shows that it has no valency of its own and does not impose any selection restrictions.

⁹ Example (5) illustrates the second function of *haber*, that of an existential verb in a presentational construction. Despite of the fact that the linguistic entity presented *un terremoto* ‘an earthquake’ syntactically behaves as if it were the possessee argument of *haber*, the existential verb is void of possessive meaning, given that there is no possessor. Gast and Haas (2011: 132) refer to this construction type as “formulaic presentational”, “coming close to being natural language correlates of an existential quantifier, commonly represented as ‘∃’ in predicate calculus.” In FDG existential verbs of this type are considered auxiliaries (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 183–184, 194).

Before turning to the FDG representation of *ir a*, we need to assess if *ir a* is indeed mainly an expression of prospective aspect in Peninsular Spanish, as has been claimed by Bravo (2003), Camus Bergareche (2006: 177–178), and Real Academia (2009: 2154–2155), among others. An analysis of the oral Alcalá corpus (443,533 words) yields more cases of *ir a* (750) than of the synthetic future (627). However, only four of the 750 cases of *ir a* contain clear adverbials of future tense of the type *dentro de... años* ‘in... years’ as opposed to 17 in the case of the synthetic future.¹⁰ In addition, most of the cases of *ir a* in the Alcalá corpus in some way or another fit Comrie’s definition of prospective aspect as a linguistic expression of “the already present seeds of some future situation, which future situation might well be prevented from coming about by intervening factors” (Comrie 1976: 65). The following example is illustrative of this aspectual use:

- (6) *Marta, así no puedes seguir, porque es que*
 Marta like_this not can.2SG continue.INF because COP.3SG that
te vas a agotar o sea tienes que descansar
 you.DAT go.2SG to exhaust.INF that-is have.2SG REL rest.INF
 ‘Martha, you can’t go on like that, because you are going to get exhausted,
 I mean you need to rest’
 (Alcalá M 30)

In FDG this means that *ir a* is the expression of an operator of prospective phasal aspect, which operates at the Representational Level. Example (7) may serve to illustrate the analysis of prospective aspect at the Representational Level (RL) and its encoding at the Morphosyntactic Level (RL).

- (7) [on the expected effects of having the historical center of Alcalá de Henares on UNESCO’s world heritage list]
Van a acudir muchos más visitantes
 go.3PL to come.INF many more visitors
 ‘many more tourists are going to come’ (Alcalá M 27)
- a. RL (prosp f_i^c : [(f_i : acudir_V (f_i)) (x_i : –muchos más visitantes– (x_i))_A] (f_i^c))
 b. ML (Cl_i : (Vp_i : ($\tilde{m}Vw_i$: ir-3pl (Vw_i) (Gw_j : a (Gw_j)) (Vw_j : [($\tilde{m}Vs_i$: acud- (Vs_i) (Aff_i : -ir (Aff_i))] (Vw_j) (Vp_i) (Np_i : –muchos más visitantes– (Np_i)) (Cl_i))

¹⁰ The situation in Peninsular Spanish is markedly different from the one encountered in several American variants, among them Mexican Spanish. On analyzing a Mexican corpus with a structure analogous to the Alcalá corpus, Lastra and Martín Butragueño (2010) show that *ir a* + infinitive is more than five times as frequent as the synthetic future and clearly expresses future meaning.

At the Representational Level (RL), represented in (6a.), auxiliary *ir a* appears as a prospective operator on the Configurational Property (fc_i). At the Morphosyntactic Level (ML), the Verb Phrase consists of two Verbal Words, the finite auxiliary, containing the placeholder “ir-3pl”, and the infinitival Verbal Word for the lexical predicate; in between the two Verbal Words, there is a Grammatical Word, the preposition *a*. The placeholder “ir-3pl” will be replaced by the corresponding suppletive form (i. e., unpredictable and irregular) *van* at the Phonological Level. The Verbal Word *acudir* consists of the stem *acud-* plus one Affix, i. e., the infinitive ending (including the conjugation class vowel, traditionally called “theme vowel”) *-ir*.

After having shown how Spanish true auxiliaries behave and how they would have to be represented in terms of FDG, I am now turning to the properties of partially grammaticalized auxiliaries in Spanish.

3 Partially grammaticalized auxiliaries

As pointed out before, partially (or weakly) grammaticalized auxiliaries differ from true auxiliaries with respect to the criterion (D): they may impose semantic restrictions on the construction in which they appear. Spanish weakly grammaticalized auxiliaries form quite a heterogeneous group: they differ with respect to (i) their degrees of grammaticalization, (ii) their productivity, (iii) the construction types they are used in, and (iv) the semantic domains they express: aspect and modality. The three examples I have chosen reflect some of this diversity: although they all have aspectual meanings, the restrictions on their use are diverse, as are their syntactic properties. With regard to the latter, they exemplify two different types of partially grammaticalized auxiliaries: (i) periphrastic auxiliaries and (ii) semi-auxiliaries. Resultative *tener* ‘have’ is a *periphrastic auxiliary*, i. e., its use as an auxiliary is confined to the periphrastic construction with a Configurational Property (fc_1) expressed by a non-finite form of a verbal lexeme (in this case a participle) and its second and further arguments. In this sense *tener* parallels *ir a* ‘be going to’ presented in the previous section, which is a periphrastic auxiliary as well: its use is tied to the combination with a lexical verb component, too. Egressive *parar de* ‘stop’ and habitual *soler* ‘be in the habit of’ on the other hand, are *semi-auxiliaries* (Olbertz 1998: 91–92), which means that they can, under certain conditions, express their grammatical functions without the presence of a combining lexical verb component.

This section consists of four parts. First I will discuss each auxiliary individually, beginning with *tener*, followed by *parar* and ending with *soler*. I will end this section with a brief summary.

3.1 *Tener* ‘have’

The resultative periphrasis *tener* + participle competes with the true auxiliary *haber* in the participial construction. The examples in (8) show the ways in which the use of resultative *tener* + participle is restricted.

- (8) a. *Ha/tiene escrito un manifiesto.*
 have.3SG written a manifest
 ‘He/she has written an manifest.’
 b. *Ha/*tiene llorado.*
 have.3SG cried
 ‘He/she has cried.’
 c. *Ha/*tiene nevado.*
 have.3SG snowed
 ‘It has snowed.’
 d. *Ha/*tiene sido interesante.*
 have.3SG been interesting
 ‘It has been interesting.’

As can be gathered from (8), the use of auxiliary *tener* is impossible with one-place and zero-place verbs and with non-verbal lexemes. In fact, the use of *tener* is restricted to two-place verbs. A further restriction on its use concerns the referent of the first argument:

- (9) [*¿Ha traído ese crecimiento [...] problemas?*]
 ‘– Has this growth brought about any problems?’
 a. – *Pues sí [...] pero también ha traído cosas buenas*
 well yes but also AUX.3SG bring.PTCP things good.PL
 ‘– Well yes, [...] but it also has brought good things’
 (Alcalá M 27)
 b. * – *Pues sí [...] pero también tiene traídas*
 well yes but also have.3SG bring.PTCP.FEM.PL
 cosas buenas
 thing(FEM).PL good.FEM.PL
 ‘– Well yes, [...] but it also has brought good things’

The ungrammaticality of (9b), in which the first argument refers to a second order entity, indicates that the expression of resultative aspect with *tener* is restricted to two-place predicates with concrete first arguments with animate referents.

A further difference from the truly auxiliary construction with *haber* can be appreciated in Example (10), which shows that in the construction with *tener* the participle agrees in gender and number with the second argument. This means that the participle behaves as if it modifies the second argument just like in a truly possessive construction.¹¹

- (10) *decidimos cambiar=lo de colegio porque ya*
 decide.PST.PFV.1PL change.INF=him.ACC of school because already
tenía creada una fama que le
 have.PST.IPV.3SG create.PTCP.FEM a.FEM fame.(FEM) which him.DAT
estaba resultando muy negativa
 be.PST.IPV.3SG turn-out.GER very negative.FEM
 ‘we decided to send him to a different school because he had already
 created a fame which was turning out to be very negative for him.’
 (Alcalá S 7)

Like Example (10), Examples (11) and (12) with two-place verbs and human referents for the first argument comply with the restrictions of *tener* in the participle construction and express resultative aspect.

- (11) [about parent’s plans for their children]
Tienes pensado algo en el futuro para ellos?
 have.2SG think.PTCP something in the future for them
 ‘Have you planned something in the future for them?’
 (Alcalá S 9)
- (12) *¿no te tengo dicho que no hagas eso?*
 not you.DAT have.1SG say.PTCP COMP not do.SUBJ.2SG that
 ‘Haven’t I told you not to do that?’
 (CREA)

The same holds for the following case, which is, however, remarkable because the verb *olvidar* ‘forget’ is semantically incompatible with the meaning of *tener* for expressing the very opposite of possession, i. e., the lack of possession:

¹¹ During the incipient grammaticalization of the *haber* construction in Latin, the participle agreed with the object as well, a situation that continued into Old Spanish (cf. e. g., Pinkster 1987 and Acosta 2011 on Latin and Macpherson 1967 on Old Spanish). Remnants of Latin object agreement persist in modern French and Italian, where there is gender and number agreement of the participle with clitic object referents whenever these precede the participle.

- (13) [about the difficulty of remembering the contents of evening classes]

lo tenía olvidado
 it.ACC have.PST.IPFV.1SG forget.PTCP
 'I had forgotten it'
 (Alcalá P 43)

Note that in combinations with verbs of thinking and saying, illustrated in (11)–(13), a possessive reading is excluded due to the semantics of the verb. On the other hand, when the Undergoer referent is an *effected object*, the construction can be ambiguous:

- (14) [about a cooking recipe]

Lo tengo apuntado en casa, ahora no
 it.ACC have.1SG put_down.PTCP in home now not
sabría decir=te=lo
 know.POST.PST.1SG say.INF=you.DAT=it.ACC
 resultative reading: 'I have put it down at home; right now I couldn't tell you'
 possessive reading: 'I have it put down at home, right now I couldn't tell you'
 (Alcalá M 29)

In (14) it is not necessarily the case that the subject referent of *tener* is also the Actor of the putting-down-event. If this is the case, which is in fact probable, then the resultative reading applies. Conversely, if someone else has jotted down the recipe, *tener* would have to be read as a possessive verb. In the latter case, it would be possible to reformulate the example simply by omitting the participle:

- (14) a. *Lo tengo en casa, ahora no sabría*
 it.ACC have.1SG in home now not know.POST.PST.1SG
decir=te=lo
 say.INF=you.DAT=it.ACC
 'I've got it at home, right now I couldn't tell you'

The context shows that the resultative reading of (14) is probably the intended one, evidence of which is the continuation of the conversation given in (15):

- (15) *porque te lo tengo preparado*
 because you.DAT it.ACC have.1SG prepare.PTCP
 'because I have made it for you'

In this case it is the beneficiary referent *te* 'for you' which disambiguates the utterance, because the presence of a beneficiary makes the active involvement of

the first argument referent highly probable. However, the only cases in which we can be entirely sure the construction with the participle has a resultative meaning are constructions with verbs of thought and communication, such as (11)–(13), which are somewhat more frequent with resultative *tener* than other verbs;¹² all other cases are at least potentially ambiguous. This, as well as the agreement of the participle with the direct object illustrated in (10), shows that as a periphrastic auxiliary *tener* is still very close to its original possession meaning.

3.2 *Parar de* ‘stop’

Parar de marks the end of an event, i. e., egressive aspect, an aspectual distinction that can in principle be applied to any kind of Aktionsart, including states, despite the fact that the etymology of the word *egressive* might suggest some kind of dynamism.

What interests us here, however, are the syntactic properties of *parar de*. To begin with, note that *parar de* has the typical semi-auxiliary property of being able to occur independently when the context allows this, i. e., when the Configurational Property to be modified has been specified immediately before.

- (16) – ¿*Sigue lloviendo?*
 continue.3SG rain.GER
 – No, *ya ha parado.*
 not already AUX.3SG stop.PTCP
 ‘– Is it still raining?
 – No, it has stopped by now.’
 (Gómez Torrego 1999: 3382)

In addition, this example shows that there is no restriction with respect to the valency of the combining predicate: *parar (de)* can even be used with zero-place verbs. Given that the restricted independence of *parar (de)* might suggest that it is really a lexical verb, it is worthwhile showing that it is in fact a kind of

¹² Despite the productivity of *tener* + participle, there is a slight preference for *tener* to occur with mental action verbs. The Alcalá corpus contains 71 cases of the construction, with 39 different transitive verbs, which, with the notable exception of *olvidar* ‘forget’, are all agentive. There is a total of 21 tokens of verbs of communication, cognition and thought, such as *pensar* ‘think, plan’ (eight tokens), *entender* ‘understand’ and *olvidar* ‘forget’ (both four tokens) and *decir* ‘say’, *definir* ‘define’, *planear* ‘plan’, *programar* ‘schedule’ and *proyectar* ‘plan’, each of which occurs only once.

auxiliary. Consider the following example, which illustrates the monoclausality of the construction with *parar de* (Olbertz 1998: 110–111).

- (17) a. *no paraban de hacer=le encargos*
 not stop.PST.IPV.3PL of make.INF=him.DAT commissions
 ‘they commissioned him endlessly’
 literally: ‘they didn’t stop commissioning him’
- b. **¿De qué no paraban?*
 of what not stop.PST.IPV.3PL
 ‘What didn’t they stop with?’

On the other hand, the comparison between *parar de* and the competing fully grammaticalized periphrastic construction with *dejar de* ‘stop’, shows that the use of *parar de* is severely restricted:

- (18) a. *ambas alternativas dejaron de ser posibles para mí*
 both alternatives stop.PST.PFV.3PL of COP.INF possible for me
 ‘both alternatives were no longer possible for me’
 literally: ‘both alternatives had stopped being possible for me’
 (CREA)
- b. **ambas alternativas pararon de ser posibles para mí*
 both alternatives stop.PST.PFV.3PL of COP.INF possible
 for me
 ‘both alternatives had stopped being possible for me’
- (19) a. *dejé de temer al marido de tía Alicia*
 stop.PST.PFV.1SG of fear.INF PREP_the husband of aunt Alicia
 ‘I stopped being afraid of aunt Alicia’s husband’
 (CREA)
- b. **paré de temer al marido de tía Alicia*
 stop.PST.PFV.1SG of fear.INF PREP_the husband of aunt Alicia
 ‘I stopped being afraid of aunt Alicia’s husband’

These examples indicate that *parar de* cannot be used to express the egression of states. The following example is not stative, but describes a habitual activity:

- (20) a. *Rosa dejó de fumar hace 10 años*
 Rosa stop.PST.PFV.3SG of smoke.INF ago 10 years
 ‘Rosa stopped smoking ten years ago’
 (CREA)

- b. ??*Rosa paró de fumar hace 10 años*
 Rosa stop.PST.PFV.3SG of smoke.INF ago 10 years
 ‘Rosa stopped smoking ten years ago’

It is due to the fact that habitual activities are in a sense stative as well that (20b) with *parar* is doubtful. However, it is less unacceptable than the use of *parar* in the fully stative Examples (18b) and (19b).¹³ The following example illustrates a further restriction on the use of *parar de*:

- (21) a. *No terminé el primer capítulo y dejé*
 not finish.PST.PFV.3SG the first chapter and stop.PST.PFV.3SG
de leer=lo
 of read.INF=it
 ‘I didn’t finish the first chapter and stopped reading it’
 (Internet)
- b. **No terminé el primer capítulo y paré*
 not finish.PST.PFV.3SG the first chapter and stop.PST.PFV.3SG
de leer=lo
 of read.INF=it
 ‘I didn’t finish the first chapter and ceased to read it’

Example (21) shows that *parar de* cannot be used in the context of telic dynamic situations. The following four examples of *parar de* are fine:

- (22) *antes era normal ir por Alcalá y no*
 before COP.PST.IPV.3SG normal walk.INF through Alcalá and not
parar de saludar
 stop.INF of greet.INF
 ‘in the old times it was normal to walk about in Alcalá and to greet people continuously’
 literally: “in the old times it was normal to walk about and not stop greeting”
 (Alcalá S 7)
- (23) *Las manos arrugadas no paran de mover=se*
 the hands wrinkled not stop.3PL of move.INF=REFL.3
en su regazo
 in her lap
 ‘Her wrinkled hands do not stop moving in her lap’
 (CREA)

¹³ I am grateful to Daniel García Velasco for pointing this out to me.

- (24) *desde el mal de las vacas locas,*
 since the problem of the cows mad
no paran de poner=nos todos los días carne
 no stop.3PL of put.INF=US.DAT all the days meat
 ‘since the problem of the mad cows they have not stopped serving us meat
 each and every day’
 (CREA)
- (25) *había parado de llover*
 AUX.PST.IPV.3SG stop.PTCP of rain.INF
 ‘it had stopped raining’
 (Alcalá M 27)

In (22)–(25) the use of *parar de* is appropriate because the Configurational Properties are both dynamic and atelic. In addition, these examples illustrate that the number of arguments is irrelevant: there is one in (22) and (23), there are two in (24), and there is none in (25). However, apart from the use of *parar de* with meteorological verbs as in (25), *parar de* is preferably used with agentive verbs, as is the case in 50 out of the 53 cases of *paró de* ‘s/he stopped’ I found in the Peninsular Spanish section of the CREA-corpus (cf. also Real Academia 2009: 2180).¹⁴ In addition, there is a strong preference of *parar de* to appear in negative contexts, as illustrated in (22)–(24).

Given the constraints on its use, *parar de* is much less frequent than its competitor *dejar de*, of which there are 40 tokens in the Alcalá corpus, against only 3 of *parar de*. The restriction of *parar de* to dynamic and atelic situations is probably related to its lexical origin, the lexical verb *parar*, which essentially expresses the cessation of movement and can be used both as an intransitive and a transitive verb (Real Academia 2009: 2180).¹⁵

3.3 *Soler* ‘be in the habit of’

The case of *soler* differs radically from that of *parar de* in the sense that it can be used both as a semi-auxiliary and as a fully grammaticalized auxiliary, expressing habituality in both cases. Consider (26), where *soler* operates on an existential construction, similarly to the last part of Example (5), which was meant

¹⁴ On the relation between agentivity and meteorological verbs cf. e. g., Olbertz (1998: 212).

¹⁵ There is also a reflexive form, which is basically a free variant of intransitive *parar*, although the use of the reflexive variant is obligatory when the one and only argument of *parar* refers to a concrete entity that is incapable of autonomous movement (Olbertz 1998: 115).

to illustrate the unrestricted applicability of fully grammaticalized prospective *ir a* ‘go to’.

- (26) *No suele haber ningún problema*
 not usually_do.3SG EXIST.INF no problem
 ‘There is usually no problem’
 (Alcalá S 15)

In this example *soler* expresses habituality as defined by Comrie (1976: 27), marking “a situation which is characteristic of an extended period of time”. Dahl (1985: 97) additionally mentions that “the cases where HAB[ituallity] is typically used are those in which the adverb *usually* is possible in English”. This confirms that (26) is a typical example of habituality.

However, in addition to this fully grammaticalized use of *soler*, there is a semi-auxiliary verb that has a more specific use, corresponding faithfully to the meaning of *soler* given in the title of this section, i. e., ‘be in the habit of’. In this function, it requires the lexical verb to be agentive. Consider the following example:

- (27) *¿A qué hora sueles llegar [a casa] más o menos?*
 at what hour usually_do.2SG arrive.INF to home more or less
 ‘What time do you usually arrive [home] more or less?’
 (Alcalá S 9)

When *soler* is used in this restricted way, it can occur independently, thus behaving almost like a verbal lexeme in Spanish.

- (28) *Habló mucho más de lo que solía,*
 talk.PST.PFV.3SG much more from what usually_do.PST.IPFV.3SG
sin desanimar=se por las cortas y secas réplicas
 without discourage.INF=REFL.3 by the short and brusque answers
de ella.
 of she
 ‘He talked much more than he used to without getting discouraged by her brief and brusque answers.’
 (CdE)

Despite this apparent behavior as a lexical verb, it should be noted that any instance of *soler* with an infinitive forms a monoclausal construction, given that there is no way of pronominalizing the infinitive construction. Consider the

question in (29a) and the ungrammaticality of the answer (29b), in which the infinitive has been pronominalized:

- (29) a. – *y cuénta=me ¿qué soléis cenar?*
 and tell.IMP=me.DAT what usually_do.2PL dine.INF
 ‘and tell me what do you usually have for dinner?’
 (Alcalá M 29)
- b. – **¿Cenar? no lo solemos*
 dine.INF not it.ACC usually_do.1PL
 ‘Have dinner? We usually don’t do it’

Therefore, however differently it behaves from the two partially grammaticalized auxiliaries presented above, *soler* will have to be categorized as a semi-auxiliary as well.

3.4 Summary

I have shown that there are two types of partially grammaticalized auxiliaries in Spanish: first, the periphrastic auxiliary type, exemplified by *tener* + participle, which is strictly tied to the non-finite construction in which it occurs and highly constrained by the restrictions inherited from its lexical source; second, the semi-auxiliary type, which can occur without the non-finite construction whenever this construction can be retrieved from the immediately preceding context. The semi-auxiliary type comes in two subcategories, one that has a fully grammaticalized counterpart, illustrated by *soler*, and another that has no such counterpart, illustrated here with *parar de*. Both semi-auxiliaries are tied to certain restrictions, which are, however, of very different kinds. In Section 4, I will propose a way in which these different types of partially grammaticalized auxiliaries can be accounted for within the theory of Functional Discourse Grammar.

4 Lexical auxiliaries

Before going into the way weakly grammaticalized auxiliaries could be dealt with in the FDG lexicon, I will first discuss the nature of the lexical component in this theory and elaborate on the proposal by García Velasco (this issue) (Section 4.1). Next, I will turn to the lexical entries corresponding to both the lexical and the auxiliary uses of the three partially grammaticalized auxiliaries from the previous section (Section 4.2), and end with a brief summary in 4.3.

4.1 The lexical component in FDG

The set of primitives at the levels of Formulation, i. e., the Interpersonal and the Representational Levels as described in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008), contains frames and lexemes with meaning definitions. For the way in which lexemes would have to be linked to the corresponding frames and other details, the reader is referred to García Velasco and Hengeveld (2002). According to these authors, meaning definitions would have to be such that they contain mention of the entities associated: e. g., in the case of verbs, both the predicate variable (f_1) and the variable corresponding to potential arguments (such as x_1 for concrete entities) would have to appear in the meaning definition. The presence of these variables in the meaning definition allows for the association of lexical properties with predication frames, such as in the following example (García Velasco and Hengeveld 2002: 114):

- (30) *open* [V]
 $[f_1: [\text{CAUSE } (x_1) [\text{BECOME } \textit{open}' (x_2)]]]$

Whatever criticism such an approach may arouse, it is to be preferred to the Functional Grammar (Dik 1978, 1997) approach, in which each lexeme was linked to one predicate frame and any valency variation had to be accounted for by means of predicate formation rules (cf. e. g., Groot 1986), which, as García Velasco and Hengeveld observe (2002: 96–107), is neither typologically nor psychologically adequate.

A major problem of this new approach is the decompositional meaning definition. Although this may work in relatively straightforward cases, it becomes very tricky in the case of highly general lexemes. An example mentioned by García Velasco (2011) is the adjective *heavy*, which receives very different interpretations from its *meaning potential* depending on the context: e. g., *a heavy stone* vs. *a heavy problem* vs. *a heavy drinker*. Decompositional meaning definitions incur further problems with more specialized vocabulary such as *geranium*, because a meaning definition of such a lexeme will probably no longer represent the common language user's knowledge of its meaning. For these and other reasons, García Velasco (2007, 2009, 2011) proposes to link the FDG lexicon to the conceptual component, thus accounting for the fact that lexical knowledge forms part of communicative competence, which varies greatly between speakers, and to have fragmentary pieces of shared knowledge representations take the place of meaning definitions. García Velasco (2007: 179) provides the following representation of the “pieces of information which could be assumed to be part of normal competence” with respect to the verb *open*:

(31) *Open*:

- a. Opening is an event.
- b. By opening somebody allows entrance of something.
- c. Tins, doors, etc. can be opened.
- d. People open doors to enter buildings.

This approach, which is attractive from a psychological point of view but fails to account for the conventionality of the lexicon and the fact that language users perceive lexical innovations as such, has been revised in García Velasco (this issue).

In this study, the author follows Keizer (2009: 1204), according to whom “the meaning definition of a lexeme must minimally provide the kind of information needed (e. g., about the number of key participants, their roles in the SoA or relation to other participants, as well as further features of these participants) to predict which frames the lexeme in question can plausibly be combined” (see also Keizer and Honselaar 2009: 384). García Velasco (this issue) chooses a formalized representation in terms of attribute–value pairs, based on among others Vossen (1995), where the abstract attributes on the left hand side (essentially consisting of ENTITY and DENOTATION) and values expressed in terms of lexical material on the right side. García Velasco provides a description of the lexeme *glove*, a simplified version of which is (32):

(32) *glove*

ENTITY = hand clothing => clothing => physical object

DENOTATION = CONSTITUTIVE = leather; wool; cotton

FUNCTION = warming; protecting

AGENTIVE = manufactured; knitted

In this example, the ENTITY category is structured hierarchically, such that the rightmost element indicates the highest value. This value indicates that the lexeme *glove* by default would have to be inserted into a slot for (x_1) in a predication frame. The values given in DENOTATION can vary greatly between individual speakers. Depending on the lexeme to be described, attributes may have to be added. The author emphasizes (i) that representations of this type represent the linguistic competence of an average native speaker, i. e., lexical representations in speakers may vary, and (ii) that in language use not necessarily all aspects of the meaning of a lexical item are activated at the same time.

Applying such a meaning description to the case of verbs, the hierarchically highest value for ENTITY type would have to be *event*, to be understood in its “technical” sense i. e., not specified for any kind of Aktionsart. Note that this use of “event”, it is not equivalent to “State-of-Affairs” in the FDG sense. The

denotation will be given in the form of an informal meaning description as well as a description of the participants involved. A possible representation of *open* would have to be something like:

- (33) *open*
 ENTITY = change => event¹⁶
 MEANING = make [not closed]
 PARTICIPANT 1 = opener
 PARTICIPANT 2 = opened

This description looks very different from the one in (32) quoted from García Velasco (this issue), because the meaning description has not been formalized, and, I have used the more neutral MEANING instead of DENOTATION. The reason for the latter is that I would like the same format for lexical auxiliaries, which doubtlessly have ‘meaning’, but probably not ‘denotation’. Furthermore, this difference is due to the difference between nouns and verbs on the one hand and to different degrees of specificity of the lexical units involved on the other. The values for the ENTITY attribute identify the event that brings about a change, which means that it is typically to be applied in a verbal property slot of a given predication frame. Following Goldberg (1995: 51) I have used the neological descriptors *opener* and *opened* in the values of the PARTICIPANT attributes in order to clearly indicate the transitive relation between the participants. The item in (33) may be used in very different contexts:

- (34) a. *John opened his eyes.*
 b. *John opened the door with a screwdriver.*
 c. *John opened the meeting.*
 d. *The door was opened.*
 e. *The door opened.*

In the case of (33d) only the second participant has been specified but the first is implied in the sense that “its existence will simply be inferable from the relevant meaning definition [...] in the lexicon” (Keizer 2009: 1207). Example (33e) illustrates a case of coercion, i. e., “fitting verbal lexemes into syntactic slots for

¹⁶ As this change need not be brought about intentionally, I refrained from using ‘action’ in this context. I also refrained from further specifying the PARTICIPANT values, in order not to unnecessarily restrict the applicability of the lexical item. For an alternative representation of *open*, which is closer to Dikian FG, see Butler (2012).

which they are not designed” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 403). In such a case, there is no inference with regard to any other participant involved.

This approach to the lexicon will form the starting point of the proposed representation of auxiliaries in the lexicon in the next section.

4.2 Auxiliaries in the lexicon

In Section 4.1 we have been exclusively concerned with lexical items, and not with auxiliaries. Whereas it is in the interest of a typologically and psychologically appropriate lexical component for FDG to have a maximal flexibility with which lexical items link with frames, the representation of auxiliaries in the lexicon will require some additional specification.

In the following subsections, I will first provide a lexical entry in analogy to the one given in (33) and then provide examples of different lexical uses of *tener* ‘have’ and *parar* ‘stop’ which can be accounted for by means of the lexical entry proposed. After that I will consider some examples of the auxiliary use of the corresponding item and propose a lexical entry. This presentation of the lexical auxiliary within this context has been chosen in order to account for the fact that both the meaning and the restrictions on the use of the auxiliary have been inherited from its lexical origin. As *soler* is on the more grammatical side of the cline, it requires a somewhat different treatment. The sections will be organized in this very order.

4.2.1 *Tener*: lexical verb and lexical auxiliary

As a lexical verb, *tener* ‘have’ is highly frequent and can be used in many different contexts. A lexical entry of *tener* would have to be as follows:

(35) *tener* ‘have’

ENTITY = state => event

MEANING = possess

PARTICIPANT 1 = possessor

PARTICIPANT 2 = possessed

This lexical entry can account for the uses exemplified in (36):

(36) a. *tenemos demasiadas cosas*
 have.1PL too-many things
 ‘we have too many things’
 (Alcalá S 16)

- b. *¿y cuántos años tiene la niña?*
and how_many years have.3sg the girl
'and how old is the girl?'
(Alcalá S 10)
- c. [on the advantages of living in a given neighbourhood]
yo tengo todo muy céntrico allí, lo tengo
I have.1sg everything very central there it have.1sg
todo muy cerca
everything very close
'I have everything very much in the centre here, I have everything very close'
(Alcalá S 17)
- d. [description of a flat]
tiene cuatro habitaciones
have.3sg four rooms
'it has four rooms'
(Alcalá S 10)
- e. *el trabajo le tiene absorbido completamente*
the work him.ACC have.3SG absorb.PTCP completely
'work has him completely absorbed'
(Alcalá M 30)

In (36a)–(36c) the possessor-argument refers to a person, with the peculiarities that in (36b) the second argument refers to the person's age, illustrating the standard expression of age in Spanish and other Romance languages, and that in (36c) there is a secondary predication involved, specifying the location of the second argument. In (36d) both arguments refer to concrete inanimate entities, and in (36e) the first argument refers to an event and the second is an animate referent undergoing possession in given state, the latter being expressed by means of the depictive secondary predication *absorbido completamente*. Interestingly, despite all this variation, there is no intransitive use of *tener*, a fact that is also relevant for the lexical auxiliary.

As we have seen in Section 3.1, the periphrastic auxiliary *tener* can only combine with transitive verbs, and it requires a human referent for the first argument position. In this sense it is closest to the first three of the examples in (36). On the other hand, the relation to possession has been lost in the auxiliary use, as shown in the unambiguously auxiliary examples given in Section 3.1, which I repeat as (37) for convenience:

- (37) a. *decidimos cambiar=lo de colegio porque ya*
 decide.PST.PFV.1PL change.INF=him.ACC of school because already
tenía creada una fama que le
 have.PST.IPFV.3SG create.PTCP.FEM a.FEM fame.(FEM) which him.DAT
estaba resultando muy negativa
 be.PST.IPV.3SG turn-out.GER very negative.FEM
 ‘we decided to send him to a different school because he had already
 created a fame which is turning out to be very negative for him.’
 (=Example (10))
- b. *¿tienes pensado algo en el futuro para ellos?*
 have.2SG think.PTCP something in the future for them
 ‘have you got something planned for them in the future?’ (=Example (11))
- c. [about the difficulty of remembering the contents of evening classes]
lo tenía olvidado
 it.ACC have.PST.IPFV.1SG forget.PTCP
 ‘I had forgotten it’ (=Example (13))
- d. *¿no te tengo dicho que no hagas eso?*
 not you.DAT have.1SG say.PTCP COMP not do.SUBJ.2SG that
 ‘Haven’t I told you not to do that?’ (=Example (12))

The second argument of the main verb refers to a Propositional Content in (37a)–(37c) and to a Communicated Content in (37d). The lexical entry for the auxiliary use of *tener* must account for its resultative meaning as well as for the constraints on its use, i. e., (i) the restriction to transitive verbs and (ii) on the nature of the first argument, (iii) the participial form of the main verb and (iv) the agreement of the participle with the second argument of the main verb, whenever applicable. A possible way to account for this are “Combinations of partially instantiated frames” (ComPIFs), introduced into FDG by Keizer (this issue) in order to account for idioms. In Keizer’s work, the partial instantiation consists of lexical elements that are fixed in idioms. What will be partially instantiated in the case of lexical auxiliaries is not lexical but grammatical information. (38) is a tentative representation of the lexical auxiliary *tener* on this basis:

- (38) *tener*_v
 MEANING: result from x_1 ’s previous involvement in f^c_1
 IL: (T₁) (R₁) (R₂)
 RL: (res f^c_1 : [(f_{v1}) (x_1 : <+anim> (x_1)) (v_2)] (f^c_1))

ML: (VP₁: [(^{fin}VP_{W1}: tener_V (VP_{W1})) (^{ptcp}VP_{W2})] (VP₁)) (NP₁) (XP₂)
 iff X in (XP₂) = N, then gender, number in ptcp = gender, number in (NP₂)

In this representation there is no ENTITY value, which accounts for the auxiliary status of *tener*, there is a word-class index instead. In the partially instantiated predication frame, the obligatory presence of (R₂) reflects the requirement of a transitive verb at the Interpersonal Level (IL). The operator *res* at the Representational Level (RL) preceding the Configurational Property (f₁) represents the function of auxiliary *tener*. The stipulations at the Morphosyntactic Level (ML) show that the Verb Phrase (Vp) consists of finite *tener* and a main verb in the participial form. Furthermore, there is a stipulation that if the second argument has the form of a Np, then the participle must agree in gender and number.

4.2.2 *Parar*: lexical verb and lexical auxiliary

The case of *parar* ‘stop’ is quite different because it is much less frequent than *tener* and semantically less complex. Recall that *parar* (*de*) is a semi-auxiliary, which means that *parar* can occur independently whenever the Configurational Property in question can be retrieved from the context.

Before going into the details of an account of *parar* (*de*) in the FDG lexicon, I would like to deal with the question whether independent *parar* is not just an instance of the intransitive lexical verb *parar*. The difference between the semi-auxiliary and the lexical verb is that the former always allows the specification of some Configurational Property (by means of *de* + infinitive), whereas the latter does not. Consider the case of lexical *parar* in (39), which is given with its wider context in order to clearly illustrate the utter inappropriateness of adding the specification *de conducir* ‘driving’ in (39b):

- (39) a. – *Oiga, pare aquí, aquí mismo.*
 listen.IMP.(FORMAL) stop.IMP.(FORMAL) here here self
 – *Pero como voy a parar aquí, en medio de María Molina?*
 but how go.1SG to stop.INF here in middle of Maria Molina
 – *Que pare, le digo.*
 CONJ stop.IMP.(FORMAL) you.DAT.(FORMAL) say.1SG
 ‘– Listen, stop here, exactly here.’
 – How am I supposed to stop here, in the middle of Maria Molina Street?
 – I say: Stop.’
 (CREA)

- b. ??*Oiga, pare de conducir aquí, aquí mismo.*
 listen.IMP.(FORMAL) stop.IMP.(FORMAL) PREP drive.INF here, here self
 ‘Listen, stop driving here, exactly here.’

The independent occurrence of semi-auxiliary *parar*, on the other hand, always allows for the specification of the corresponding Configurational Property. Consider the following example of independent *parar* and its variant (40b), where the preposition and infinitive have been added:

- (40) a. *Ella se ríe y no para.*
 she REFL.3 laugh.3SG and NEG stop.3SG
 ‘She starts laughing and doesn’t stop’
 b. *Ella se ríe y no para de reír=se.*
 she REFL.3 laugh.3SG and NEG stop.3SG PREP laugh.INF=REFL.3
 ‘She starts laughing and doesn’t stop laughing’
 (es.answers.yahoo.com)

The difference between intransitive *parar* and the independent use of semi-auxiliary *parar* (*de*) being clarified, let us now turn to the representation of the lexical item *parar*:

- (41) *parar* ‘stop’
 ENTITY = change => event
 MEANING = interrupt movement
 PARTICIPANT 1 = stopper

In this lexical entry there is no PARTICIPANT 2, despite the marginal possibility of *parar* to be used transitively, as I consider the intransitive variant to be the default. The reason for this is not only that intransitive *parar* has always been much more frequent than the transitive variant,¹⁷ but also the fact Spanish aspectual periphrastic auxiliaries are generally based on intransitive verbs, the notable exception being the possession based perfect constructions (Gómez Torrego 1988; Olbertz 1998: 324–377). Therefore, the sentence in (42a) exemplifies a straightforward use of *parar* as described in (41), whereas (42b) is a case of coercion of the intransitive frame into a transitive one.

¹⁷ Of the 47 tokens of lexical *parar* the Alcalá corpus (443,533 words), only two are used transitively. This quantitative relation can be observed from Old Spanish onward.

- (42) a. *para no chocar=me con ellos [...] tuve*
 in-order-to not collide=REFL.1SG with they have.PST.PFV.1SG
que parar
 CONJ stop.INF
 ‘in order not to bump into them I had to stop’
 (Alcalá M 19)
- b. *un hombre me paró en la calle.*
 a man me.ACC stop.PST.PFV.3SG in the street
 ‘a man stopped me in the street’
 (CREA)

Let us now turn to the semi-auxiliary use of *parar*. The following examples, part of which has been cited in Section 3.2 already, exemplify the use of *parar de*.

- (43) a. *La gente no para de comprar esta droga.*
 the people not stop.3SG of buy.INF this drug
 ‘People continue to buy this drug’
 (CREA)
- b. *antes era normal ir por Alcalá y no*
 before COP.PST.IPV.3SG normal walk.INF through Alcalá and not
parar de saludar
 stop.INF of greet.INF
 ‘in the old times it was normal to walk about in Alcalá and to greet people continuously’
 literally: “in the old times it was normal to walk about and not to stop greeting” (=Example (22))
- c. *Las manos arrugadas no paran de mover=se*
 the hands wrinkled not stop.3PL of move.INF=REFL.3
en su regazo
 in her lap
 ‘Her wrinkled hands do not stop moving in her lap’ (=Example (23))
- d. *había parado de llover*
 AUX.PST.IPV.3SG stop.PTCP of rain.INF
 ‘it had stopped raining’ (=Example (25))

These examples illustrate the fact that the lexical meaning of interruption of movement has become generalized to the interruption of any dynamism in the lexical auxiliary, and that there are no restrictions with respect to the valency

of the combining lexical verb, which may even be zero, as in (43d). The lexical entry for the auxiliary *parar de* in (44) accounts for these properties:

(44) *parar*_V

MEANING: interrupt dynamism

IL: (T₁)

RL: (egr f₁: < + dyn, -tel> (f₁))

ML: (Vp₁: [(^{fin}Vw₁: *parar* (Vw₁)) (Gw₁: *de* (Gw₁)) (^{inf}Vw₂)] (Vp₁))

The partially instantiated predication frame accounts for the following facts: at the Interpersonal Level, only an Ascriptive Act is required, at the Representational Level a dynamic and atelic Configurational Property is required, and the Morphosyntactic Level describes the expression including the preposition.

So far, we have only seen cases in which the lexical auxiliary is followed by the preposition *de* and an infinitive. In (45a)–(45c) *parar* is used independently:

- (45) a. *Repentinamente, empezó a reír=se.*
 suddenly begin.PST.PFV.1SG to laugh=REFL3
No podía parar.
 no can.PST.IPV.3SG stop.INF
 ‘suddenly she began to laugh. She couldn’t stop.’
 (Puértolas, quoted from Olbertz 1998: 110)
- b. *se ponía a llover tres días seguidos sin parar*
 REFL.3 set.PST.IPFV.3SG to rain.INF three days consecutive without
 stop.INF
 ‘it started to rain for three days in a row without interruption’
 (Alcalá S 3)
- c. – *¿Sigue lloviendo?*
 continue.3SG rain.GER
 – *No, ya ha parado.*
 not already AUX.3SG stop.PTCP
 ‘– Is it still raining?
 – No, it has stopped by now.’ (=Example (16))

As is obvious from the examples in (45), the specification of the Configurational Property with the independent semi-auxiliary *parar* is only possible when this Configurational Property (f₁) has been mentioned in the immediate context. In order to account for this fact in FDG, we will have to resort to the Contextual Component, which feeds into the Grammatical Component at all levels. Hengeveld

and Mackenzie (2014) convincingly argue that the Contextual Component is a structure onto which each Discourse Act is stacked such that the most recent one is the upper item of the stack. All linguistic aspects of the Acts on this stack, be they of an interpersonal, representational, morphosyntactic or phonological nature, are available as input to all levels of the Grammatical Component. Making use of this approach for the solution of the present problem implies that we simply need to stipulate that the independent use of *parar* is possible on the sole condition that the Configurational Property (f^c_1) is present in the upper item of that stack, as a condition for a simpler morphosyntactic expression:

(44') *parar*_V

MEANING: interrupt dynamism

IL: T_1

RL: (egr f^c_1 : <+ dyn, -tel> (f^c_1))

ML default: (Vp₁: [(^{fin}Vw₁: parar (Vw₁)) (Gw₁: de (Gw₁)) (^{inf}Vw₂)] (Vp₁))

ML non-default: (Vp₁: (^{fin}Vw₁: parar (Vw₁)) (Vp₁))

Condition for non-default: (f^c_1) is contained in the most recent item within the Contextual Component

If this condition is not fulfilled the independent variant of the lexical auxiliary is not available, and the speaker/writer has to resort to the default variant as specified in the default morphosyntactic description.

Instead of specifying all this explicitly, one could think of applying coercion, here too, but this is problematic, given that such a procedure is possible only for lexical auxiliaries of the semi-auxiliary type, but not for cases like *tener*.

4.2.3 *Soler*: lexical auxiliary

In Section 3.3 we saw that *soler* is not a lexical verb. It has a truly auxiliary variant as well as a semi-auxiliary variant, which can be identified as such due to the possibility of leaving the Configurational Property unspecified, which is only possible when the main verb is agentive and the first argument has an animate referent. Only the semi-auxiliary will form part of the lexicon. The following examples illustrate the use of *soler* that will be reflected in its lexical entry:

- (46) a. *¿A qué hora sueles llegar [a casa] más o menos?*
 at what hour usually_{do.2sg} arrive to home more or less
 ‘What time do you usually arrive [home] more or less? (=Example (27))

- b. *Habló mucho más de lo que solía,*
 talk.PST.PFV.3SG much more from what usually_do.PST.IPFV.3SG
sin desanimar=se por las cortas y secas
 without discourage.INF=REFL.3 by the short and brusque
réplicas de ella.
 answers of she
 'He talked much more than he used to without getting discouraged by
 her brief and brusque answers.' (=Example (28))

The lexical entry corresponding to *soler* with an infinitive must, in some way, account for the restriction of *soler* to animate referents for the first argument, as well as for the agentivity of the combining verb. I believe that these facts can most appropriately be accounted for in the meaning definition, because, as already mentioned in Section 3.3, (i) only animate referents can have habits and (ii) having a habit implies control:

- (47) *soler_v*
 MEANING = *have habit*
 RL: (hab e_1)
 ML default: (V_{p_1} : [$(^{fin}V_{w_1}$: *soler* (V_{w_1})) ($^{inf}V_{w_2}$)] (V_{p_1}))
 ML non-default: (V_{p_1} : ($^{fin}V_{w_1}$: *soler* (V_{w_1})) (V_{p_1}))
 Condition for non-default: (e_1) is contained in the most recent item within the Contextual Component

An important difference between *tener* and *parar* on the one hand and *soler* on the other, is that the latter expresses event-quantification, and as such operates on a State-of-Affairs (SoA), represented by (e_1) in the partially instantiated frame.

In analogy of the case of *parar*, the possibility of not specifying the SoA is represented as a non-default alternative at the Morphosyntactic Level tied to the condition concerning the contextual component. If (e_1) has not been mentioned in the immediately preceding context, and thus is not available in the upper stack, this variant is not available.

4.3 Summary

In this section, I have elaborated on the proposal provided by García Velasco (this issue) for the representation of verbal lexemes in the lexicon, which are supposed to represent the lexical knowledge of an adult native speaker. Part of the description of meanings of these items, the values for the PARTICIPANT attribute can serve as linking devices for their insertion in predication frames.

With this idea as a starting point, I have provided lexical entries for lexical auxiliaries, which crucially differ from truly lexical verbs by having neither an ENTITY nor a PARTICIPANT attribute, because they are not independent lexical items. They have both a meaning definition as well as a representation as operators, which, in my view, correctly reflects their status as lexical operators. The latter representation forms part of a “combination of partially instantiated predication frames (ComPIF)” (Keizer, this issue), which account for the specific conditions of use due to the partial grammaticalization of these auxiliaries.

5 Conclusion

As an extension of Keizer’s (2007) proposal, the concept of lexical auxiliaries can help to fill the gap between the lexicon and the grammar in FDG, accounting for auxiliaries that occupy an intermediate position between operators and verbal lexemes. The relation between the lexical auxiliary and the frames associated is assumed to be rigid in the sense of excluding the possibility of having the lexical auxiliary used in any other way.

In Functional Grammar (Dik 1997) it is necessary to resort to predicate formation for cases of very weak grammaticalization such as that of *tener* + participle (Olbertz 1995: 40–41). As stated by García Velasco and Hengeveld (2002: 99), the implication of the procedure of predicate formation is that the use of derived predicates would require more encoding and processing time than that of non-derived predicates, because the latter can be accessed in a straightforward way. Although not explicitly mentioned by the authors, the same may be assumed to apply to the difference between derived predicates and operators, so that *tener* + participle would require more encoding and processing time than *haber* + participle. As the authors show, there is no such difference in encoding and processing time, and therefore predicate formation is not in accordance with the aim of FDG “to reflect psycholinguistic evidence in its basic architecture” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 2). Therefore, the lexical entries proposed in this article offer a psychologically adequate account of weakly grammaticalized auxiliaries.

Acknowledgements: I gratefully acknowledge the valuable comments I was given by the participants of the Workshop on the lexicon in Functional Discourse Grammar in Vienna, as well as the comments by Daniel García Velasco, Inge Genée, Evelien Keizer, Josefien Sweep, and two anonymous

reviewers on earlier versions of this article. All remaining shortcomings are mine. Part of this article was written during a one-year stay at the São Paulo State University, financed by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), grant no. 2014/00034–5.

References

- Acosta, Diego de. 2011. Rethinking the genesis of the Romance periphrastic perfect. *Diachronica* 28(2). 143–185.
- Bravo, Ana. 2003. Properties of the prospective aspect. In Claus D. Pusch & Andreas Wesch (eds.), *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero-) romanischen Sprachen*, 135–146. Hamburg: Buske.
- Butler, Christopher S. 2012. An ontological approach to the representational lexicon in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Language Sciences* 34(4). 619–634.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Camus Bergareche, Bruno. 2006. *Ir a* + infinitivo. In Luis García Fernández (ed.) *Diccionario de perífrasis verbales*. 177–182. Madrid: Gredos.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Davies, Mark. 1998. The evolution of Spanish clitic climbing: A corpus-based approach. *Studia Neophilologica* 69. 251–263.
- Dik, Simon C. 1978. *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of Functional Grammar: The structure of the clause*. 2nd revised edn., Kees Hengeveld (ed.). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fernández Soriano, Olga. 1999. El pronombre personal: formas y distribuciones; pronombres átonos y tónicos. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. 1209–1273. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- García Velasco, Daniel. 2007. Lexical competence and Functional Discourse Grammar. *Alfa: Revista de lingüística* 51(2). 165–187. <http://seer.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/article/view/1442/1150> (accessed 24 February 2013)
- García Velasco, Daniel. 2009. Conversion in English and its implications for Functional Discourse Grammar. *Lingua* 119(8). 1164–1185. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S002438410800082X> (accessed 24 February 2013)
- García Velasco, Daniel. 2011. The causative/inchoative alternation in Functional Discourse Grammar. In Pilar Guerrero Medina (ed.), *Morphosyntactic alternations in English: Functional and cognitive perspectives*, 115–135. London: Equinox.
- García Velasco, Daniel & Kees Hengeveld. 2002. Do we need predicate frames? In Ricardo Mairal Usón & María Jesús Pérez Quintero (eds.), *New perspectives on argument structure in Functional Grammar*, 95–123. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gast, Volker & Florian Haas. 2011. On the distribution of subject properties in formulaic presentationals of Germanic and Romance: A diachronic-typological approach. In Andrej Malchukov & Anna Siewierska (eds.), *Impersonal constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 127–166. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Gómez Torrego, Leonardo. 1988. *Perífrasis verbales*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Gómez Torrego, Leonardo. 1999. Los verbos auxiliares: las perífrasis verbales de infinitivo. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 3321–3389. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Goossens, Louis. 1987. The auxiliariation of English modals. In Martin Harris & Paolo Ramat (eds.), *Historical development of auxiliaries*, 11–143. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Groot, Casper de. 1986. Predicate formation in Functional Grammar. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 36(1–4). 69–91.
- Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heine, Bernd & Heiko Narrog. 2011. Grammaticalization and linguistic analysis. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis*, 401–423. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-verbal predication: Theory, typology, diachrony*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2014. Grammar and context in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Pragmatics* 24(2). 203–227.
- Hernández Díaz, Axel. 2006. Posesión y existencia: la competencia de *haber* y *tener* y *haber* existencial. In Concepción Company Company (ed.), *Sintaxis de la lengua española. Primera parte: La frase verbal*, 1053–1160. Mexico: Universidad Autónoma de México.
- Hopper, Paul. 1991. Some principles of grammaticalization. In Bernd Heine & Elizabeth Closs Traugott (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, vol. 1, 17–31. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keizer, M. Evelien. 2007. The lexical-grammatical dichotomy in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Alfa: Revista de Lingüística* 51(2). 35–56. <http://seer.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/article/view/1436/1138> (accessed 12 June 2008)
- Keizer, M. Evelien. 2009. Verb-preposition constructions in Functional Discourse Grammar. *Lingua* 119. 1186–1211.
- Keizer, M. Evelien & Wim Honselaar. 2009. A Functional Discourse Grammar account of set nouns in Dutch and its implications for lexicography. *International Journal of Lexicography* 22(4). 361–395.
- Lastra, Yolanda & Pedro Martín Butragueño. 2010. Futuro perifrástico y futuro morfológico en el corpus sociolingüístico de la Ciudad de México. *Oralia: análisis del discurso oral* 13. 145–172.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macpherson, Ian. 1967. Past participle agreement in Old Spanish: transitive verbs. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 44. 241–254.
- Marchese, Lynell. 1986. *Tense/aspect and the development of auxiliaries in the Kru languages*. Arlington, VA: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Myhill, John. 1988a. The grammaticalization of auxiliaries: Spanish clitic climbing. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14. 352–363.

- Myhill, John. 1988b. Variation in Spanish clitic climbing. In Thomas J. Walsh (ed.) *Synchronic and diachronic approaches to linguistic variation and change*, 310–325. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Olbertz, Hella. 1995. *Tener* + participium in Functionele Grammatica. In Cees van Esch & Maarten Steenmeijer (eds.), *6e Symposium Spaans in onderwijs, onderzoek en bedrijfsleven*, 31–44. Nijmegen: Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Olbertz, Hella. 1998. *Verbal periphrases in a Functional Grammar of Spanish*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1987. The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tense auxiliaries in Latin. In Martin Harris & Paolo Ramat (eds.), *Historical development of auxiliaries*, 193–223. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Real Academia. 2009. Nueva gramática de la lengua española, publicada por la Real Academia Española y Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española. Madrid: Espasa.
- Steele, Susan. 1978. The category AUX in a language universal. In Joseph Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of human language*, vol. 3, 7–45. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Torres Cacoullos, Rena. 1999. Construction frequency and reductive change: Diachronic and register variation in Spanish clitic climbing. *Language variation and change* 11(2). 143–170.
- Vossen, Piek. 1995. *Grammatical and conceptual individuation in the lexicon*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.

Appendix: Corpora

- [Alcalá] Moreno Fernández, Francisco, Ana María Cestero Mancera, Isabel Molina Martos & Florentino Paredes García. 2002–2007. *La lengua hablada en Alcalá de Henares. Corpus PRESEEA - ALCALÁ*. 3 vols. (CD-ROM). Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá.
- [CASO] Davies, Mark. 2001–present. *Corpus of American Soap Operas, 2001–2012*. <http://corpus2.byu.edu/soap/> (accessed 30 December 2013).
- [CdP] Davies, Mark & Michael Ferreira. 2006–present. *Corpus do Português: 45 million words, 1300s–1900s*. <http://www.corpusdoportugues.org> (accessed 1 July 2014).
- [CREA] Real Academia Española. online. *Corpus de referencia del español actual*. <http://corpus.rae.es/> (accessed 18 September 2015).
- [CdE] Davies, Mark. 2002–present. *Corpus del Español: 100 million words, 1200s–1900s*. <http://www.corpusdelespanol.org> (accessed 30 December 2013).