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I. Introduction

In Spanish, there exists a verbal construction such that there are at least two verbs, and the first verb modifies the second verb. These structures vary slightly in their construction, from the V IP structure of *anda vestido* (goes around dressed) or *anda metiéndose* (goes around messing) to the V CP construction of *llega a verla* (to actually see her). Nonetheless, these two types of structures act much alike in their semantic makeup. First, we will explore them in non-technical terms, seeing how linguists explored them in the past, and looking at their constructions using descriptive methods as opposed to generative grammar methods. In this section, we will explore what they are, what kinds of verbs are used, and where and when they occur in the language. We will also note some problems that can occur in translation of these verb phrases, giving a specific example. After this non-technical background, the following sections will focus on the syntax of these structures and how Government and Binding Theory accounts for them. In these sections, we will look at the clausal V IP structure that is comprised of the Verb + Past Participle and the Verb + NDO constructions. Then we will look at more complicated data, which includes the V CP construction and problems that occur in GB Theory with these structures.

1 Acknowledgements: I would sincerely like to thank Ted Fernald, Donna Jo Napoli, Kari Swingle, Charles O’Brien, Mar Campelos, Jesus Fernandez Alvarez, Justin Aglialoro, Keith Early, Ellen Johnson, Carmen Bender, Cathy Bender, Arantxa Gil Irizar, Jill Ratzan, Brenda Baxter and Claudia Munoz for their suggestions, endless proof-reading, support, and help. Any errors which doubtless remain are, of course, mine.

2 All translations are my own, unless otherwise specified.
II. Background Information

A. Reasons for Using and Examining Periphrastics

Spanish periphrastic phrases have become a very important topic in Spanish linguistics, due to their extensive use throughout the written and spoken language. The studies of this verbal phenomenon have been ongoing in Spanish linguistics since the early 1900's. In earlier texts, such as Samuel Gili y Gaya's descriptive syntactic text (1943), we find the basis for many arguments today. The tendency in Spain is to steer toward semantic descriptions and translation techniques, though the syntactic properties of these PV's are also interesting. They properties differentiate them from regular verb phrases, as we will see.

It has been said that Spanish speakers use the PV's so often because adverbs are not so commonly used in the language. This is because Spanish is such a rhythm-conscious language, and adverbs can be extremely long. They are usually formed by adding -mente (two syllables) to the end of an adjective (which itself can sometimes be 3 or 4 syllables.) For instance, an adjective like evidente (which means evident and has 4 syllables) with the addition of -mente, becomes evidentemente (6 syllables.) The length of adverbs can sound very strange, or as I was told by a native Spanish speaker from Spain, it sounds "cargado," or stuffy. In addition, this can really break up rhythm, so speakers avoid using it whenever possible.

One manner of getting this meaning without using an adverb is by periphrastic verb phrases (PV's.) Perhaps because long adverbs are not avoided in languages such as
English (and French) the tendency to have special verb phrases like these is much less evident. Fewer PV’s exists in these languages. English and French, for instance, both share a common periphrastic phrase (in meaning) with Spanish: to be going + infinitive, aller + infinitive, ir + a + infinitive. The syntactic structures of the 3 languages are different, but in all of them the meaning of some intention in the future is added to the infinitive verb. However, Spanish has over 60 of these structures, many more than English and French together.

**B. Where and When Do They Occur?**

The use of these verb phrases, as mentioned before, is really quite common in Spain. It ranges from very colloquial (andar + NDO or PP) to a very eloquent, poetic speech (haber de + infinitive.) Social contexts do influence the choice of using a periphrastic phrase or not. Some periphrastic verbs modify the second verb in a way which has nothing or very little to do with their non-periphrastic meaning (while others take on a more figurative sense.) For instance, in a phrase like 1, given below, andar really does not carry its meaning to walk at all, but rather gives the impression that the speaker does not approve of the action, and that the doer of the action is doing something wrong. I have bolded the periphrastic phrase to call attention to it:

1. Este chico anda metiéndose con la gente.
   This boy walks messing (reflexive) with people.
   This boy goes around messing with people.
In this phrase, the boy does not walk. He isn’t necessarily going anywhere. The speaker of the sentence has a pejorative concept of what the boy is doing: messing with people. *Andar* is modifying the meaning of *meterse*. You could also say this phrase as in sentence 2, without the verb *andar*, but it loses the displeasure on the part of the speaker:

2. Este chico se mete con la gente.
   This boy (reflexive) messes with people.

In fact, sentence 2, while not really eloquent due to the more colloquial usage of *meterse* (which can also mean *to put* or *to place*, and can itself be used periphrastically) would probably be more acceptable in a rigid social environment than sentence 1. The use of *andar* in periphrastic phrases is very colloquial. The change in meaning is evident from the examples above. In sentence 1, we can certainly note that the meaning of *andar* is not *to walk*, although in normal circumstances, and in all social environments, *andar* means *to walk*. Interestingly enough, however, this verb is commonly used in many colloquial expressions. For instance, a young Colombian friend of mine once used the expression:

3. Esta niña y yo, andamos muy bien.
   Literally: This girl and I, we walk very well.
   This girl and I get along really well.

*Andar* in the you informal command form is often used as an exclamation that something another speaker said or did is ridiculous, questionable, or not believed at all. A professor in Spain once said to me, incredulously because I was carrying a tiny bilingual dictionary (which she deemed inadequate):
4. ¡Ay Dios mío! Anda! ¡Y tú te llevas ese diccionario?
   Oh my lord! Get out! And you actually carry around this dictionary?

   So *andal* does have a tendency to be used in colloquial situations, and it does have a tendency to stray from its more formal meaning of *to walk*. There are many other verbs used in periphrastic phrases, of course. And the degree to which they stray from their non-periphrastic meaning varies. For instance, in a non-formal class setting, one can find periphrastic phrases such as *no acabar de + infinitive*. I have included *no* in this phrase because it adds frustration that does not occur when *no* is not present. In non-periphrastic phrases the verb *acabar* means to finish. In non-negative periphrastic phrases, *acabar de* modifies the second verb, adding that the action of the second verb has just been completed. The negative of *acabar de* adds frustration that the action has not been completed entirely. A Spanish professor in class once addressed a student’s shyness to repeat a question:

5. No! ¡Repítelos! Es que no acabo de entender la primera parte.
   No! Repeat it! It’s that I just didn’t understand the first part!

Here again the periphrastic phrase is in bold. The verb *acabar* in a non-periphrastic phrase can be used in any social context. Periphrastically it is possible that one would not find it in a very formal social setting. A non-periphrastic use of *acabar* is given in sentence 6:

6. Se acabó la lluvia
   The rain has just stopped.
*Acabar* is a synonym for the verb *terminar*, which also means *to finish*. However, a phrase like 7 can be generated without redundancy:

7. Acabo de terminar.
   I have just finished.

This is because *acabar* no longer means to finish and is no longer interchangeable with *terminar*. *Terminar* cannot be used in a periphrastic phrase, and the two verbs here cannot be reversed. Thus, you would never have a sentence like 8 generated:

8 * Termino de acabar
   I finish of to finish.

Another common and rather colloquial periphrastic phrase is *meterse a + infinitive*. As the second verb of a periphrastic verb phrase used before in example 1, we can see that this verb is very flexible in its colloquial meanings. The meaning it adds to its second verb is one of initiation of an action, but it also adds a rather pejorative aspect to the action. It gives an impression that the speaker judges that the doer of the action does not really know what he or she is doing, or that the doer is not capable of doing the action. While it can be a bit difficult to apply this translation in English, an example of this verb in a periphrastic phrase is given below in sentence 9. Because it is the speaker himself who is determining his own action in a pejorative manner, it is especially difficult to get the full meaning of the periphrastic phrase when translating to *English*. A man in a train said to an acquaintance in that train:

9 Puedes irte cuando quieras. No sé... Es que me meto a hablar y ya verás...
   You can go whenever you like. I don't know. It's that I get wrapped up in talking and ... you'll see.
Meterse, in its formal usage, as mentioned earlier means to put or to place. Not only can it be used in formal contexts, but it is a more highly descriptive word than its synonym ponerse, which also means to put or to place. Ponerse, additionally, can be used in periphrastic verb phrases. Another synonym, which is deemed even more eloquent and more formal than either of these two is the verb colocar, and it cannot be used as a periphrastic verb. This will become more important later when we look at the semantic tendencies of periphrastic verbs.

All of the former examples of periphrastic phrases have been in an at least somewhat colloquial environment. However, as mentioned before, some of them do occur frequently in very formal speech too. In a political and economic book, Así Cambiará España, the writer addresses his audience in a very formal setting, and quotes several politicians addressing their public. One politician (Pierre Pflimlun) was quoted as saying:

10...la unificación de Europa es una idea justa y por ello acabará triunfando.
...the unification of Europe is a just idea and because of that, it will end up triumphant

Again we already know that the verb acabar means to finish, and that it is used to mean to have just when used with de and an infinitive. In the phrase above it is used with the -NDO (the progressive) form of the verb triumph, and is not colloquial at all. Also, it has only undergone a slight alteration of meaning, since it still carries a meaning of to finish or end in both periphrastic phrases.
Thus, we can draw from the examples above that the PV's do occur in all levels of the language, but that certain periphrastic phrases are usable in colloquial contexts only. We have also seen a glimpse of how verbs that are used often in colloquial contexts are often used in expressions, and are flexible verbs in that they can carry a variety of meanings depending on the context, can be used periphrastically.

C. Distinguishing Periphrastic Phrases

In this section, we will mostly look at the different arguments among linguists today about what does and does not make up a periphrastic verb phrase. In addition, we will see some interesting occurrences and uses of periphrastic phrases. According to many linguistics, one of the requisites that a verb phrase must fulfill in order to be called periphrastic is the loss of the original meaning of the conjugated verb. That is to say, the conjugated verb modifies the second verb, and not with the meaning it carries when used alone. One standard way of saying this was to say that the first verb acts as an auxiliary verb. According to Samuel Gili y Gaya (1943, p. 95), "para distinguir si un verbo esta' empleado como auxiliar basta fijarse en si ha perdido su significado propio." (In order to determine if a verb is employed as an auxiliary, all that is needed is to look at whether or not it has lost its own meaning.) This is still one method used to identify periphrastic phrases.

The real problem that occurs with this type of explanation is that there are verb phrases in which the first verb does not really lose its original meaning, but rather modifies the second verb with the meaning that it carries when used alone. If the above
explanation of semantic tendencies is used, than these verb phrases cannot be considered periphrastic even though they act exactly the same syntactically. This is probably not the most accurate manner of analyzing these phrases, since ideally there would not be a whole different type of phrase that follows the exact same syntactic patterns, but differ in whether the first verb retains or loses meaning. There are other linguists, such as Rafael Gómez Fente, Jesus Fernández Alvarez, and Lope G. Feijoo (1987), that claim there are periphrastic verb phrases and ‘medio-perifrasis’ (or half periphrastic phrases.) Those whose first verbs do not lose their meaning, but follow all of the syntactic patterns of a PV, are considered ‘medio-perifrasis.’ This line of thinking does not really offer much more than that of Gili y Gaya, though it does offer some line between them semantically without excluding the syntactically. However, they do not function as half-periphrastic phrases syntactically, and calling them such may suggest that. There really is not a need for it; mainly for this reason, there are others, such as Hella Olbertz (1998), that argue that all periphrastic phrases that meet the special syntactic tests are indeed PV’s, and that the loss of original meaning is just special to some phrases.

If we accept this line of reasoning, looking at the semantic properties of the periphrastic verb phrases we can find a whole range of verbs that vary from a complete loss of their non-periphrastic meaning, to verbs that have the same sense both periphrastically, and non-periphrastically. On the following page is a chart of verbs that can be used periphrastically with both their non-periphrastic and their periphrastic meanings (the given periphrastic meanings below are my translations of the meanings given in Fente-Gómez, 1987):
Table 1 – Periphrastic Verbs with Periphrastic and Non-periphrastic Meanings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periphrastic form</th>
<th>Non-periphrastic meaning</th>
<th>Periphrastic meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) + infinitive + to go</td>
<td>to walk</td>
<td>habitual, negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) + NDO</td>
<td>to go</td>
<td>slowly and/or with difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venir + infinitive</td>
<td>to come</td>
<td>more or less, approximately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venir + NDO</td>
<td>to come</td>
<td>gradual, with insistence or repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traer + past participle</td>
<td>to bring</td>
<td>perfective; duration, repetition, and/or accumulation with hint of obsession or dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llegar a + infinitive</td>
<td>to arrive</td>
<td>actually, really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meterse a + infinitive</td>
<td>to put or place, to mess with, to go, to come in, to get into</td>
<td>to begin with an incapacity to do it, aimlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tener + past participle</td>
<td>to have</td>
<td>perfective, duration, repetition, and/or accumulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tener que + infinitive</td>
<td>to have</td>
<td>to have to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quedar en + infinitive</td>
<td>to stay/remain</td>
<td>to plan on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ponerse a + infinitive</td>
<td>to put/place, to lay, to make, to impose, to become, to set</td>
<td>to start with intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echarse a + infinitive</td>
<td>to lie down, to throw oneself</td>
<td>to burst out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echar a + infinitive</td>
<td>to throw, to throw out, to post, to sack, to give off</td>
<td>to burst out/take off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volver a + infinitive</td>
<td>to return repetition, again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liarse a + infinitive</td>
<td>to get muddled up, involved</td>
<td>to get involved, forget everything else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hincharse de + infinitive</td>
<td>to inflate, exaggerate</td>
<td>to overdo it, get one’s fill of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dejar de + infinitive</td>
<td>to leave</td>
<td>to quit, stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acabar de + infinitive</td>
<td>to end, to finish</td>
<td>to have just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acabar por + infinitive</td>
<td>to end, to finish</td>
<td>to end up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seguir + NDO</td>
<td>to continue</td>
<td>to continue, keep on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasar a + infinitive</td>
<td>to go on, pass, to spend (time)</td>
<td>to go on, move on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deber de + infinitive</td>
<td>should/must</td>
<td>must</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at these verbs and their usage in the Spanish, we may be able to draw a certain correlation between the verbs that are completely losing their original meaning...
when modifying the second verb and their flexibility to be used in expressions in Spanish. There are, of course, many more PV’s in Spanish, but these cover the large varieties that exist, and are a good representation (as far as I know.) I have taken the liberty of breaking these verb phrases up into 3 tiers. In the first tier, the dotted-lined box, the periphrastic meaning is drastically different from the non-periphrastic one. In the second tier, the lined-box, the periphrastic meaning carries much the same meaning, or is figuratively the same as the non-periphrastic one. Finally, in the third (and smallest) tier, the periphrastic meaning is practically the same as the non-periphrastic meaning. I have broken them up into these tiers to show the semantic differences that can occur with these special phrases. Instead of claiming that periphrastic phrases include a loss of meaning of the first verb, arguing that there is a range from total loss of meaning to practically no loss just might be fruitful. Later we will see that syntactically they behave the same, whether they lose all meaning or not. Thus we may ask why a periphrastic verb must lose its original meaning in order to be labeled periphrastic if it meets all of the syntactic tests? And why should a different category of verbs be named when simply looking at the semantic reasons for changes that do or do not occur can account nicely for the losses or lack thereof?

Certainly some sort of pattern can be noted. Those in the dotted lines are verbs that are noticeably flexible in the language. That is to say, these verbs either have several different meanings, or they can be used in slang expressions. They are very common verbs used in all registers of language. When we look at the second tier, we find much the same result. These verbs do seem to have several meanings, though their use in fixed
expressions may be slightly less common. And finally in the third tier, we find verbs that do not have a variety of meanings, and are not flexible to the extent that they can be used in expressions.

To put these observations to use, let us now look at some verbs that cannot occur in periphrastic phrases. It is interesting to note, looking at the chart, the absence of high information verbs, and of verbs used in the most elegant of speech registers. What does this mean? We can look, for instance, to the three verbs poner, meter, and colocar. All three of these verbs can mean to put or to place. Poner is used in everyday language, and also carries a variety of other meanings. Its usage can be very colloquial, and it is not considered at all eloquent. Meter also has a variety of meanings, but when used formally as to put or to place, it is a bit more eloquent than poner. Colocar is very specific, meaning only to put or to place (something somewhere.) It is used in a highly eloquent speech, and is not used as a periphrastic verb.

Another instance that is interesting is the difference between andar and caminar. Both mean to walk. Caminar is not used in expressions, and it is not used in slang. It cannot be found in a periphrastic phrase. As we have already seen, andar is used in expressions, and in slang. And of course, it is used in Periphrastic Verb Phrases.

We can see now that periphrastic verbs tend to be those with multiple meanings in non-periphrastic phrases, or verbs that can be used in expressions, or in less rigid social environments. It is especially interesting to note the modal verb deber and its periphrastic use. In most languages, the epistemic and deontic use of this modal are the same syntactic structures, but elegant Spanish draws a line between the two. The
epistemic use is a periphrastic phrase, whereas the deontic use is the modal alone. For instance, in example 11 below, the periphrastic phrase gives a different meaning than the modal alone would give, follow the most elegant Spanish register:

11. Sacas muy buenas notas, y no estudias! Debes de ser muy inteligente.
   You get good grades and you don’t study. You must be very intelligent.

The verb deber as a modal, non-periphrastically, would be used as in an instance like sentence 12:

12. Debes estudiar mucho; queremos que saques muy buenas notas.
   You must study a lot; we want you to get good grades.

The difference between these two forms of deber is rather important, and it might be an error to say that this verb really carries the same meaning periphrastically that it carries originally. I have put it in tier 3 nonetheless because these two forms have become practically interchangeable for a phrase like 11, the epistemic use, in Spain today. While 13 is not considered correct, many people see no difference between saying 11 and 13:

13. Sacas muy buenas notas, y no estudias! Debes ser muy inteligente.
   You get good grades and you don’t study. You must be very intelligent.

However, nobody would make the mistake of confusing the periphrastic phrase with the modal in 12. The deontic use of the modal alone is not interchangeable with the periphrastic phrase, so one would probably never encounter a sentence like 14:

14. *Debes de estudiar mucho; queremos que saques muy buenas notas.
   Trying to say: You must study a lot. We want you to get good grades.
The difference between the periphrastic phrase and the modal verb is not marked in English, as we see from the translations above. The periphrastic phrase does carry a different meaning though. To wrap up this section, we can note that while linguists do not agree on what determines a periphrastic verb phrase, all possible periphrastic phrases do share one thing in common: they all are of verbs that have multiple meanings, are colloquial, or are not high information verbs. This could be enough of a semantic tie to ignore whether the verb completely loses its non-periphrastic meaning or not.

D. Translating Periphrastics

Translating periphrastic verb phrases can be especially difficult. The real question, for at least some periphrastics, is whether you can translate them using the same method from context to context, or whether each context calls for an individual treatment of each periphrastic phrase. In other words, do they add the same basic meaning to the verb they modify, no matter what the context? Or does the alteration of meaning also depend on the context? To answer these questions, we will focus on one periphrastic phrase that does not have an equal periphrastic counterpart in English. The periphrastic verb will be used in several different contexts, with several different verbs. Our periphrastic phrase will be \textit{llegar a + infinitive}.

According to Jesus Fernandez, \textit{llegar a} can indicate \textit{conseguir} (to achieve), or a nuance of \textit{"ir hasta el extremo"} (to go to extremes.) In addition, he suggests that it sometimes adds a feeling of \textit{"por fin!"} (Finally!!) With no, it expresses a disappointment, \textit{"sin realizacion"} (without realization.) From Fernandez’s explanation
of what *llegar a* can add to an infinitive, we might already suspect that this PV cannot be
translated the same way all of the time. In examples 15-17, we have 3 phrases containing
the periphrastic phrase *llegar a*. The translation underneath each one is not complete.
The would-be translation of the PV *llegar a* has been left blank, to look at possible
translations of the periphrastic phrase.

In these three examples 15-17, there are many periphrastic phrases. Focusing in
on *llegar a*, there are four occurrences. We will go through each occurrence now, and try
to figure out just what the periphrastic verb is adding to the main verb.

15 **El canciller alemán, Helmut Kohl, afirmó que “el combate fue extraordinariamente duro” y que llegó a dudar de la posibilidad del acuerdo.”**

El Euro nace con Dolor
Xavier Vidal-Folch
El País

The German chancellor, Helmut Kohl, affirmed that “the combat was extraordinarily difficult”
and that ___________ the possibility of agreement.”

In example 15, *llegó a dudar* is our PV. *Dudar* means *to doubt*. We know that
this PV can carry a meaning of realization; here it seems to carry a measure of starting or
beginning (to doubt.) The actualization of doubting is what is important; the fact that he
doubted at all is stressed by *llegó a*. To capture this, we could maybe say

15.a He actually doubted the possibility of an agreement.

Because *llegar a* also indicates, in this instance, some sort of beginning of doubting, and
*actually* may not express this, a better translation may be:

15.b The German chancellor... and that he actually began to doubt the
possibility of the agreement.
Actually should be maintained in this translation in order to keep the sense of stressing that he shouldn’t have had to doubt the possibility, or the fact that he had to at all is important. The actualization of doubting is stressed. Of course, it’s really difficult to say what the best translation is, but 15.6 seems to capture it pretty well. Let’s look at some other examples:

16 ... nos callabamos a escuchar como embobados, pero cuando tuvimos más arranque, por el vino y la conversación, nos liamos a cantar en rueda y, aunque nuestras voces no eran demasiado templadas, como llegaron a decirse cosas divertidas, todo se nos era perdonado...

La Familia de Pascual Duarte
Camilo Jose Cela

...we quieted down like idiots to listen, but when we got started up by the wine and conversation we gathered in a circle and began singing without direction, and even though our voices weren’t really in tune, since they __________

funny things, we were forgiven all.

In example 16, our PV is llegaron a decirse. Decir means to say, and the reflexive here indicates that the saying occurs among them. It acts as a sort of passive construction and puts cosas divertidas (funny things) in the agent role. Thus, before translating llegar a, we should pay attention to the structure itself, and change the English structure to:

16 a ... since funny things were said...

Now we will focus in on what llegar adds to this translation. The stress is on how the things were funny. Again, as in Example 15, we could probably use actually:

---

3 Another interesting side note is the choice of the adverb extraordinariamente by the German (non-native) Spanish Speaker. The word has 9 syllables, and is quite a standout in the phrase. After reading the article through, it is quite a standout in the writing style.
16.b ... since funny things were actually said...

This translation may be a bit awkward and hard to interpret. It does not really fit in well with the context of the phrase. To find a way to say this in English is very difficult. One native English speaker who has lived in Spain for over 10 years and speaks the language very well suggested that the phrase just be translated as in 16.c:

16.c ... and since funny things were said...

There are certainly reasons to reject a translation like this one, even if finding another is extremely difficult. Translation 16.c is of the phrase se dijeron cosas divertidas and not of llegaron a decirse cosas divertidas. In the end I would refer to 16.b as the best translation. More than anything, this shows just how difficult translating PV’s can be. Another example we can look at which contains the PV llegar a two times, shows even more problems with translating this PV:

17 Mucha me dio que pensar, en muchas veces, y aun ahora mismo si he de decir la verdad, el motivo de que a mi madre llegase a perderle el respeto, primero, y el carino y las formas al andar de los anos, mucho me dio que pensar, porque queria hacer un claro en la memoria que me dejase ver hacia que tiempo dejo de ser una madre en mi corazón y hacia que tiempo llegué después a convertirme en un enemigo.

La Familia de Pascual Duarte
Camilo José Cela

It gave me a lot to think about, times over, and even now if I must tell the truth, the reason why I ______ respect and the caring ways for my mother over the years, it gave me a lot to think about, because I wanted to clear my memory so that I could see when she quit being a mother in my heart and when she ______ in an enemy.

In example 17 we have llegar a two times: llegase a perderle (perderle means to lose plus the object, here being mi madre or my mother,) and llegó ... a convertirse
(convertirse means to convert with its reflexive, and the me refers to the speaker.) In the first instance, Pascual Duarte is saying that he lost respect for his mother. Before adding the periphrastic modification, a usual translation might be:

17.a ...the reason why I first lost respect for my mother, and over the years the caring ways...

The modification of llegar a here is to stress losing. I'm not sure that actually quite captures the meaning of the phrase, because it isn't stressed that its odd that he lost respect at all, but rather that somehow he lost it. For this reason, even though actually could probably be used here, I would have a preference for a translation like 17.b:

17.b ... the reason why I first somehow lost respect for my mother, and over the years the caring ways...

In translation 15.a, we included actually began in place of the periphrastic phrase. Here again there is some hint of focus in when he lost respect, but this time it comes from the context, and the word first. The beginning in began to doubt also comes more from the context than the periphrastic verb itself, probably. It is difficult to separate the two. Perhaps it is not necessary.

In the second llegar PV, llego (despues) a convertirseme, we have the reflexive se (referring to the one who converts), and the clitic me, referring to Pascual, the speaker. Before the periphrastic modification, the translation I would propose is:

17.c ... and when she turned me into an enemy...
We could say *converted me into an enemy*, but this would probably not be an elegant translation. *Convert* doesn’t fit the tone of the text; it’s too stuffy. As for the addition of *llegar a* here, again it stresses the actualization of her making him an *enemy*, and, again *actually could* be used in the translation.

17.d ...and when she actually turned me into an enemy.

After looking rather quickly at these examples, one may want to say that *llegar a* simply adds *actually* to the sense of the verb. However, by looking closer at the texts we have seen that it is not that simple at all. It is really difficult to say whether or not each translation with this verb really needs to be treated individually. When *llegar a* does not follow *no*, or is not followed by *ser*, however, *actually* may be a decent translation.

There will always be exceptions though. Example B was rather difficult to translate. Perhaps *actually* is not the best word choice. And *actually* certainly does not work with *ser*. *Llegar a ser* is always translated as *to become*, as seen here in example 18:

18 El *llegó a ser* presidente

He became president.

In addition, we can see with examples 19-21 below that *no llegar a* is different. *Actually* does not translate well in all of these examples:

19 Quería *ver la película*, pero no *llegué a verla*.

I wanted to see the movie, but I _________.

21
This phrase was given to me as an example of the frustration *no llegar a* can show. I was told by a Spanish professor (Jesus Fernandez), as he stomped his foot in disgust for not having had the chance to see the movie, that he would translate this phrase as in 19a:

19.a I wanted to see the movie, but daggonit, I just didn’t get to see it!

Because, in this case, *daggonit* is not really used that frequently, and because more than anything *daggonit* is out of place, a translation like in 19.b, in my judgement, would suffice:

19.b I wanted to see the movie, but I just didn’t get to see it.

Comparing this translation of *no llegar a* with our earlier translation of *llegar a*, we see a difference in the nuance that *no* alone couldn’t add. However, with the periphrastic phrase, *no* gives a sense of frustration that actually just does not give. Compare translation 19.b with just to 19.a, the translation using actually instead:

19.c I wanted to see the movie, but I didn’t actually get to see it.

Though I may be wrong, I believe that actually hints that the speaker expected to get to see the movie (along with wanting to get to see it.) *Llegar a* does not, to my knowledge, give any hint of this. In addition, actually does not show any great disappointment on the part of the speaker. Another big difference between 19.b and our earlier translations of the periphrastic phrase *llegar a* is the usage of *to get to*. What
would happen if we took it out of translation 19.b? Would the translation still be good?

We can see this result in 19.d:

19.d  I wanted to see the movie, but I just didn't see it.

19.d, like 19.c, does not express the disappointment or frustration at not seeing the movie. Thus, the combination just + not + get to (19.b), is probably the best translation for 19.

Given another context with no llegar a, would the same translation fit? Example 20 is from another passage in *La Familia de Pascual Duarte*:

20  Yo andaba preocupado y como pensativo, como temeroso del paso que iba a dar --

   casarse es una cosa muy seria, ¡que caramba! -- y momentos de flaqueza y desfallecimiento tuve, en los que le aseguro que no me faltó nada para volverme atrás y mandarlo todo a tomar vientos, cosa que si no llegué a hacer fue por pensar que como la campanada iba a ser muy gorda y, en realidad, no me había de quitar más miedo...

   *La Familia de Pascual Duarte*, 82.

   Camilo José Cela

   I went around worried, and somehow pensive, apprehensive about the step I was about to take -- to get married is a very serious thing, geez! -- and I had moments of weakness and faltering, moments in which I assure you it wouldn't have taken much to make me turn back and tell them all to get lost, which if I __________, it was because I was thinking about how the bells were going to ring out, and really, that took away enough of the fear.

   *Si nunca llegué a hacer* is a very interesting phrase to translate. Using our previous combination, we would get a translation like 20.a:
20.a something that if I just never got to do,

This sounds like he really wanted to do it. From the context we can draw that that is not necessarily the case. In fact, for the flow of the context, our earlier translation of actually may be the best:

20.b something that if I never actually did it...

This translation expresses that he thought a lot about doing it, but he never actually did. The real sense of the passage is captured by this translation through the word actually. Because for as much as he thought about it, he did not actually do it. And that's what the phrase captures. 20b captures that well. Thus, no llegar a does not always indicate a frustration for not having gotten to do something. It can also indicate the counterpart of llegar a, by simply meaning not actualized.

For almost any context, this periphrastic phrase has to be treated individually in translation. There seems to be no lone method of translating it. This occurs with many of these Spanish periphrastics, and is one of the main reasons so many linguists are studying just what is beneath each phrase.

III. V IP Structures

As we mentioned before in earlier sections, PV's include two basic types of structures. In this section we will look at the V IP periphrastic structures and their
syntactic characteristics, including the types of movement they allow. The V IP structures are those that have a periphrastic verb and either the past participle or the -NDO form of another verb. Some possible V IP periphrastic phrases are given below in sentences 21-23:

21  Este chico anda metiéndose con la gente.  
This boy goes around messing with people.

22  Yo andaba preocupado.  
I went around worried.

23 a. Voy a ir yendo  
b. Me voy a ir yendo.  
I'm going to get going.

21 should look familiar, as we saw it earlier. In 21 we have the V (anda) IP (metiéndose con la gente) structure where the IP verb is the progressive (or -NDO) form. In addition, we see the reflexive se adjoined to the end of the progressive. Later we will look at movements of this se, and of clitics that can adjoin to the progressive.

22 gives us an example of a V IP structure where the second verb is the past participle. The past participle in 22 agrees in number and gender with its theme yo. This phrase may also look familiar, as it was taken from an earlier example which was chosen from a passage in *La Familia de Pascual Duarte*.

23 is an especially interesting structure. First we have the V CP structure of voy a ir, and in addition we have the V IP structure of ir yendo. The reflexive me can be either attached to the progressive (as in B) or raised up in front of the first verb phrase of the structure (as in A.) This first verb construction (voy a ir) is the CP structure we will later
explore. For now, let's look at the deep structure and surface structure of the V IP phrases, with their lexical entries:

A. Lexical Entries and Sentence Structures

First we'll look at the lexical entries of our verbs. In sentence 21, we have *andar* and *meterse*. In giving the entries for periphrastic verbs, we can either give lexical entries for verbs when used periphrastically and non-periphrastically, or just when used periphrastically. All that really interests us are the periphrastic uses when the verbs are periphrastic. Thus, when periphrastic, we will only deal with them. This means we'll ignore uses such as:

24. Este chico anda por la calle.
This boy walks the road.

Purposefully overlooking uses like these, *andar* takes only an IP. The verb of this IP can be in either the progressive or the past participle form. No other form works. Thus, the subcategorization frame for *andar* would be as given in 25:

25. Andar, V [ ___ IP [+ fin]]

The IP phrase it takes must be finite. As for *meterse*, in this instance, it takes a PP sister where [con] is specified. So it's subcategorization frame is shown in 26:

26. meterse, V [ ___ PP [con]]

*Meterse* can also take a CP sister as a periphrastic phrase (*meterse a*), but the periphrastic *meterse* is not the one used in sentence 21, nor subcategorized for in 26.
Given these subcategorization frames, we can see a sort of basic surface structure of 21 as represented below in 27:

27 is not a good representation of our example yet. We have to decide on a few issues. Where does yo start out in the deep structure? As a contentful, overt NP, we know it must get case. Where does its case come from, and where does its theta-role come from? I now propose what Fernández de Castro (1990) sought to prove about periphrastic structures: the periphrastic verb does not assign the subject's theta role (nor its case.)

If we accept Fernández de Castro's claim, it is only natural for us to now propose that the subject starts out in the Spec of the lower IP. There it gets its theta role from the main verb. The subject then moves up to the spec of the higher IP clause in order to fulfill the Extended Projection Principle. Therefore, the periphrastic verb itself does not
assign an external theta role. It does, however assign an internal theta role to its sister IP (or CP) clause. This means the lexical entry of the periphrastic andar is as shown in 28:

28. andar, V [ ___ IP[+fin] ]

<θ>

Andar assigns one theta role, and that is to its IP phrase. Sentences 21 and 22 should have the same basic structure, even though their IP phrases may differ. Because sentence 22 is very interesting in that the past participle must concur in number and gender with the subject, and because the deep structure of these two constructions as periphrastic verb phrases will be similar, we will examine the likely deep structure and surface structure of 22. To do this, we will need the lexical entry for preocupar, which would be as given in 29:

29. preocupar, V [ ___ (PP[de]) ]

<θ, (θ)>

Preocupar assigns an external theta role. Optionally it takes a prepositional phrase as its sister, to which it can assign an internal theta role. With this information, we can construct the Deep Structure (DS) of sentence 22, given in 30:
In this structure, the NP yo gets its theta role from preocupado. The higher Spec, IP is empty right now. According to the Extended Projection Principle, Spec, IP must be filled at SS. Thus, yo moves up to the first Spec, IP position, and leaves a trace behind. According to Burzio's Generalization, if a predicate does not have an external argument, then it does not assign case. Yo is a contentful noun phrase, so it must get case. Thus, we may be forced to assume that, like wh-question words, in periphrastic verb phrases this contentful NP that moves up can inherit its case from the trace it leaves behind. This is not a really odd concept, since it does occur. In addition, the past participle must agree in number and gender with this contentful NP, or more likely, share spec/head agreement with the trace the NP leaves behind. The NP yo then moves up to the higher Spec, IP position. And we have a surface structure (SS) like that given in 31:
This is an example of a raising structure. If the V IP clauses are indeed raising structures as presented in trees 30 and 31, then we would expect these structures to also permit clitic climbing. In addition, we would expect that the special characteristics of raising structures that can be seen in wh-movement and passive structures will also be present and important in periphrastic phrases of this structure.

B. Clitic Climbing in V IP’s

The following data in 32-34 show how the direct object clitic, and the reflexive can be attached to either the end of the progressive verb, or can be moved to the front of the first verb of the verb phrase. In all of these, both a and b are good sentences, which mean the same thing:
32. a. Va cambiándolo.
   b. Lo va cambiando.
   S/he is slowly changing it.

33. a. Anda metiéndose con la gente.
   b. Se anda metiendo con la gente.
   S/he goes around messing with people.

34. a. Voy a ir yéndome
   b. Me voy a ir yendo.
   I am going to get going.

In the following section, we will look at the basic structures underneath this movement. The lexical entries for \textit{ir}, \textit{cambiar}, and \textit{meter} are given below in order to generate trees for these phrases. This time we have added the possibility of the CP to the periphrastic \textit{ir}. However, in the data above we also have the non-periphrastic \textit{ir} in sentence 34. Therefore, we have given the lexical entry for the periphrastic \textit{ir} in 35, and the non-periphrastic \textit{ir} in 36:

35. \textit{ir}, V [ \_ \{IP_{[+fin]}\} ]
   \{CP_{[-fin]}\}
   \langle\emptyset\rangle

36. \textit{ir}, V [ \_ ]
   \langle\emptyset\rangle

As can be seen with these lexical entries, the structure of the periphrastic \textit{ir} is really different. It can also take a CP, which we will later see. To be periphrastic, however, it MUST choose between the IP and the CP. One of them is necessary. It's
internal theta role then goes to either its IP or its CP. The other lexical entries necessary (before we see the structures) of these sentences are given in 37 and 38 below:

37. *cambiar, V [___ (NP)]

<\(\Theta_1, (\Theta_2)\)>

38. *meterse, V [___ ((PP\{con\})]}

<\(\Theta_1, (\Theta_2)\)>

*Cambiar* (which is non-periphrastic, of course) can optionally take an NP, to which it then assigns an internal theta role. *Meterse*, non-periphrastic here, can take a PP sister with the preposition *con*, to which it then assigns its internal theta role. We can see through these examples that the V IP structures do indeed allow clitic raising. In trees 39 and 40 below we will see first the DS of 32 (a and b, which share the same DS) and then the SS of 32 a. After this, we will see the further movement that occurs between the DS of 32 b (the tree given in 39) and its SS in tree 41. From the DS in 32, we see how the clitic starts out attached to the progressive, and the subject, in this case *pro*, starts out in the lower Spec, IP position. (Spanish is a pro drop language.) The clitic itself is co-indexed with some direct object, which is normally represented with *PRO*:
Between 39 and 40 we show the movement of pro to the higher Spec, IP. This is the SS of 32a, represented here in 40:
We know that in sentence 32b the clitic \(lo\) has moved up to pre-verb position.

Example 41 shows this further movement:

From examples 33a-b and 34 a-b, we can see that reflexives can also be in either position. Again, this is a common trait of raising constructions. If this is common only of raising structures, than there must also exist those that do not allow this movement. Control structures don't allow this. We will later see instances where the clitic and reflexive cannot be raised from their attached position at the end of the last verb of the verb phrase to the position before the first verb of the verb phrase.
C. WH-Movement in V IP’s

The following data show wh-movement in the V IP structure. Just as clitic-raising is fine, so is the A’ movement of wh-questions:

42. a. Va haciendo.
   S/he is slowly doing it.
   b. ¿Qué va haciendo?
   What is s/he (slowly) doing?

This certainly is not surprising, because we would expect a raising structure to allow wh-movement out of the object position. In 44 we have given the lexical entry for decir (not periphrastic):

44. decir, V [ ___ {NP} (PP)]
   {CP _{que}]
   <θ₁, θ₂, (θ₃)>

Decir assigns an external theta role to its agent. In addition, it assigns a theta role to its NP or CP. This verb can also optionally take a PP sister along with its NP or CP, to which it can assign a third theta role. Thus, we have a surface structure of 43a like in 45:

45.

```
 NP          IP
       |      /
   pro₁  I'    VP
        |      /
       I_{[+fin]}  V'
        /
       VP
       /
      V'
      /
   anda NP     IP
       |      /
   t₁    I_{[+fin]}  VP
       |      /
      V'
```
The DS of the sentence 43 b would then be as given in 46:

46. \[ \text{CP [+qu]} \]
   \[ \text{C' [-qu]} \]
   \[ \text{C [+qu]} \]
   \[ \text{IP} \]
   \[ \text{I'} \]
   \[ \text{I[+fin]} \]
   \[ \text{VP} \]
   \[ \text{V'} \]
   \[ \text{V} \]
   \[ \text{IP} \]
   \[ \text{anda NP} \]
   \[ \text{I'} \]
   \[ \text{I[+fin]} \]
   \[ \text{VP} \]
   \[ \text{V'} \]
   \[ \text{V} \]
   \[ \text{NP} \]
   diciendo
   lo mismo
   \[ \text{que} \]

Finally, in 47 with the A’-movement of the NP que, and the movement of pro from the lower Spec, IP to the higher Spec, IP, we generate the SS of 43b as given in 47:

47. \[ \text{CP [+qu]} \]
   \[ \text{NP} \]
   \[ \text{C' [+qu]} \]
The wh-movement that occurs in 47 (sentence 43b) is fine, just as we would predict of a raising structure. The trace left behind gets both its theta role and its case from the verb decir, which is also fine. If we are to believe Fernández de Castro's assertion that the first verb of the periphrastic phrase gives neither case nor a theta role, the progressive and the past participle must at some point be capable of giving the trace of the NP that has moved up its case. Then the NP must inherit its case from that trace.

D. Passive Movement in V IP's

One of the key characteristics of raising structures involves passive movement. In this section we will explore the passive movement of a periphrastic V IP structure and
compare that with the passive movement of a control V IP structure. This will then help
confirm our lexical entries and earlier structures of periphrastic verbs by showing what
happens when a verb is not of this type. Consider the following example sentences
46-49, which are examples presented by Fernández de Castro (1990)4:

46. El gobierno va liberando a los presos.
The government is slowly liberating the press.

47. Los presos van siendo liberados por el gobierno.
The press is slowly being liberated by the government.

48. El gobierno acertó liberando a los presos.
The government succeeded in liberating the press.

49. Los presos acertaron siendo liberados por el gobierno.
The press succeeded in being liberated by the government.

46 and 47 are logical equivalents, but 48 and 49 are not. We will now explore the
reason for this. The underlying structures of 46 and 47 are the same, whereas the
underlying structures of 48 and 49 are different. 46 is an example of a periphrastic
construction, and as we have indicated before, a raising structure. 48 is an example of a
control verb (acertar), and for this reason, a control structure. The first step to showing
this underlying difference is to show the difference between our verbs used. The lexical
entries of ir, liberar, and acertar are given in 50-52:

50. ir, V [ ___ {VP [+modal]} ]
   {CP [a] }
   {IP [+fin] }
   <θ>

---
4 The translations of these sentences are still my own.
51. \( \text{liberar}, \ V \ [\_ \ _ \ NP] \hspace{1cm} \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle \)

52. \( \text{acertar}, \ V \ [\_ \ (VP \ [+\text{modal}])] \)
\( (\text{IP} \ [+\text{fin}]) \hspace{1cm} \langle \theta_1, \theta_2 \rangle \)

Ir, as a periphrastic verb, may choose among a VP, CP or IP sister. It assigns an internal theta role to its CP or IP sister. Liberar assigns both an external theta role, and an internal theta role (to its NP.) Acertar assigns both an external and an internal theta role.

The internal theta role goes to its IP. Just as in our earlier trees of periphrastic phrases, the NP moves up from the lower Spec, IP position, and leaves behind a trace. The SS of 46 would be as shown in 53:

53. 
\[ \text{el gobierno, } \ I_1 \ [+\text{fin}] \ \text{VP} \]
\[ \text{va} \ \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{liberando a los presos} \]
The reason 47 is the logical equivalent to 46 is because, in its DS, the same theta roles get assigned to the same NPs by the same verbs. The only fundamental difference is the movement between DS and SS. The DS of 47 is shown in 54:

The previously external theta role of *liberar* is now assigned to *el gobierno* through the prepositional phrase. The internal theta role of *liberar* still gets assigned to *los presos*. Before SS, *los presos* moves up to the lower spec, IP position. There we find Spec, head agreement, and then it moves again, leaving behind a trace. It must stop off there in order to fulfill the Extended Projection Principle. That is to say, all Spec, IP’s must be filled. Because it stopped off there, *liberados* must concur in gender and number.
with los presos. At this point, there is still an empty Spec, IP position. The next movement of los presos is to that higher Spec, IP position, where it remains at SS. This movement is just like in our earlier periphrastic structures. Thus, the SS is as shown in 55:

\[
\text{55. IP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{I'} \\
\text{los presos} \quad \text{I\{+fin\}} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{V'} \\
\quad \text{V} \\
\quad \text{van} \\
\quad \text{V'} \\
\quad \text{V} \\
\quad \text{siendo} \\
\quad \text{NP} \quad \text{I'} \\
\quad \text{t} \quad \text{I\{+fin\}} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{V'} \quad \text{PP \{<\&, from liberated\}} \\
\quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP \{<\&, from liberated\}} \quad \text{por el gobierno} \\
\quad \text{liberados} \quad \text{t} \\
\]

Thus, in this raising structure 46 and 47 are logical equivalents because the same theta roles are assigned to the same contentful NP's. To compare, let us now look at the DS of 48 and 49 in 56 and 57, respectively:

\[
\text{56. IP} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{I'} \\
\]
The major difference between 56 and 53 is the PRO in 56, coindexed with el gobierno, and the trace left behind by el gobierno in 53. In 56, el gobierno starts out in the higher Spec, IP position. This is because acertar assigns an external theta role. Liberar also assigns an external theta role, so it is necessary to have a contentful NP in the lower Spec, IP position that can absorb that theta role. PRO counts as a contentful NP, and absorbs that theta role. It is co-indexed with el gobierno (as mentioned before.) This major difference in the structures accounts for the reason that 48 and 49 are not logical equivalents. 56 (48) is an example of a control structure. Next, in 57, we have the DS of 49:

57. IP
   NP I'

los presos, I_+[fin] VP

\( ^5 \) This a is the personal a in Spanish. It is a preposition, but since this does not really make a difference in our analysis, for now we will treat it as part of the NP.
El gobierno, in 56, gets its external theta role from acertar. In this tree it gets its theta role from liberar. Los presos gets the external theta role from acertar. This accounts for the difference in the meanings of 48 and 49.

Thus, we can see that raising predicates have a different behaviour in passive movement than control structures. And periphrastic phrases with the V IP structure are indeed raising predicates. We have yet to examine the V CP construction, which is for the next section.

IV. V CP Structures

We have seen a couple of instances of V CP constructions to this point, but in this section we will concentrate solely on their structure. in the sentences 58-60 given below, we have several different V CP constructions:

58. Voy a ponerme a trabajar.
    I'm going to set myself down to work.
59. Acabo de hincarme de comer chocolate.
   I have just eaten chocolate till I popped.

60. Iba a dar un paso.
   I was going to take a walk.

61. Acabo por comerlo.
   I ended up eating it.

58 and 59 are interesting because they combine periphrastic phrases. In them we find a verb plus CP which contains a verb plus a CP. 60-1 show periphrastic V CP constructions in which there is only one V CP construction. In addition, in 59 and 61 we see the verb phrases acabar de and acabar por. This shows us that different complementizers do change the meaning, and that the verb subcategorizes for its complement. A sentence like 62 below is bad because acabar does not subcategorize for the complementizer a:

62. *Acabo a comerlo.
   I finish to eat it.

Just as we saw clitic raising, wh-movement, and passive structures in the V IP structure, we will explore these movements in the V CP structure.

A. Lexical Entries and Sentence Structures

In V IP’s, Fernandez de Castro (1990) asserts that the theta role of the NP in the highest Spec, IP is assigned by the non-periphrastic verb. He claims the same holds true for the V CP structure. As one might already have noticed, the verb of the CP phrase is
never finite, so the periphrastic verb must subcategorize for a non-finite verb. This means we must assume that CP can inherit [-fin] from its IP clause below.

Looking back now at example 58, we have two periphrastic verbs that subcategorize for a CP [-fin], and our lone verb, *trabajar*. The lexical entries necessary to construct a tree are given in 63-65:

63. *ir*, V [ ___ {IP [+fin]} ]
   {CP [a, - fin]}
   <θ>

64. *ponerse*, V [ ___ {CP [a, -fin]} ]
   <θ>

65. *trabajar*, V [ ___ ]
   <θ>

Periphrastic *ir*, as seen before, can take a finite IP, or it can take a non-finite CP with the complement *a*. It assigns an internal theta role to its IP or CP clause. *Ponerse*, as a periphrastic, takes a non-finite CP with *a* as its complement. Finally, *trabajar* assigns an external theta role and does not have an internal argument. Given these lexical entries, we can generate the DS of 58 as in 66:

66.
```
     IP
    /  
   I'   
  /   
IP [+fin] VP
     /
    V'  
  /   
V    
   /
CP (\&<\&, nom voy)
    /
C'   IP
```
In this DS, the first CP gets *ir*'s internal theta role. The second CP gets ponerme's internal theta role, and pro gets the external theta role of *trabajar*. For the SS, pro eventually moves up to the highest Spec, IP position. Along the way, however, it must stop off at the Spec, IP of the higher CP phrase. This fulfills the Extended Projection Principle, and each trace is antecedent governed. Finally we have a SS as shown in 67:
We assumed that the NP subject got its case from the progressive or past participle in the V IP structure, because according to Burzio's Generalization, if a verb does not have an external argument, than it does not assign case. Thus, we must again
assume this *pro* somehow inherits case from the foot of its chain (of traces.) This also means that a non-finite verb assigns its case. Again, we have a raising structure.

In the next few sections, we will examine the types of movement that occur in the V CP periphrastic verb phrase. Oddly enough, the addition of the CP will not change the types of movement that can occur.

B. Clitic Climbing in V CP’s

The following data in 68 - 71 represent some phrases with clitics and reflexives arranged in their possible positions for the sentences. A and B mean the same thing, and both are good sentences:

68. a. Voy a ponerme a trabajar.
   b. Me voy a poner a trabajar.
   I am going to set myself to work.

69. a. Voy a ir yendo.
   b. Me voy a ir yendo.
   I am going to get going.

70. a. Vas a tener que hacerlo.
   b. Lo vas a tener que hacer.
   You are going to have to do it.

   b. Lo voy a hacer a Paris.
   I'm going to do it in Paris.

6 Example 71 a and b were taken from Fernandez de Castro, 1990. The translations are my own.
In examples 68 and 69, we see that the reflexive can move up over the CP phrase. In 70 we see that the clitic lo can climb over even two periphrastic CP's. Let's look at how the raising of the clitic occurs. To do this, we need the lexical entry for tener (periphrastic) and hacer. We already have the lexical entry for ir (63), which is repeated here as 72 for convenience:

72. $\begin{align*}
\text{ir, } V \left[ \_ \_ \{IP \left[ +\text{fin} \right]\} \right] \\
\{CP \left[ a, -\text{fin} \right]\}
\end{align*}$

73. $\begin{align*}
\text{tener, } V \left[ \_ \_ \text{CP} \left[ \text{que}, -\text{fin} \right]\right] \\
<\emptyset>
\end{align*}$

74. $\begin{align*}
\text{hacer, } V \left[ \_ \_ \text{NP}\right] \\
<\emptyset, \emptyset>
\end{align*}$

Tener, like all periphrastic verbs, assigns one internal theta role to its CP. Unlike other periphrastic verbs, it subcategorizes for the complement que (that), but like all others that subcategorize for a CP, it requires a -finite CP predicate. Hacer takes an NP sister and assigns its internal argument a theta role. In addition, it's not periphrastic, and it assigns an external theta role. The DS of sentences 70 a and b is given in 75:

75. $\begin{align*}
\text{IP} \\
\_ \_ \_ \\
I' \\
\_ \_ \\
I \left[ -\text{fin} \right] \\
\_ \_ \\
\text{VP} \\
\_ \\
\text{V'} \\
\_ \\
\text{V} \\
\_ \\
\text{CP} \\
\_ \\
\text{vas} \\
\_ \\
\text{C'}
\end{align*}$
The little *pro* moves up first to Spec, IP of the lower IP clause, then to the higher Spec, IP. It gets its theta role from *hacer*, and somehow inherits case from its trace in the SS. The clitic *lo* can climb up over all of the CP's. (It is difficult right now to see just how that affects or does not affect GB Theory. This is definitely something for further research.) The surface structure of 70b would be as given in tree 76:
While we can definitely see that this clitic raising happens, and we know this is characteristic of raising constructions, we do lack an explanation of this. It is very important, as it may pose a problem for our assumptions. As mentioned before, this is
something to be further researched and thought out. For now, we will accept this as further proof that V CP's too are raising constructions. Further proof of this is the example in 77, also taken from Fernández de Castro (1990). In this sentence, clitic climbing is not possible:

77. a. Voy a Paris a hacerlo.
   b. *Lo voy a Paris a hacer.

I am going to Paris to do it.

It is important first to see that the ir in 77 is not periphrastic. Thus, it does assign an external theta role, and case (to pro.) The a in a Paris is a preposition. A in a hacerlo is a complement. The clitic cannot climb over these two phrases. This is not a raising construction. There is more to explore about why the clitic can climb in the raising structures of PV's and not structures like 77. Again for now we will just take this as confirmation that the periphrastic phrase is a raising construction.

C. Wh-Movement in V CP's

The following data reflect wh-movement in the V CP structures. As can be expected, in an instance where clitic climbing is permitted, so is wh-movement. When wh-movement is not allowed, neither is the raising of the clitics. One can compare 78-80 below with earlier examples to see this is true:

78. a. Vas a tener que hacer algo.
    You are going to have to do something.
   b. ¿Qué vas a tener que hacer?
    What are you going to have to do?
79. a. Voy a hacerlo a París.
    I'm going to do it in Paris.
b. ¿Qué voy a hacer a París?
    What am I going to do in Paris?

80. a. Voy a París a hacerlo.
    I'm going to Paris to do it.
b. *¿Qué voy a París a hacer?
    Trying to say What am I going to Paris to do?

Immediately, 80 jumps out as a non-periphrastic verb structure, and we also note the A-bar movement of wh-phrases is not allowed. In 78 we have A-bar movement over two CP clauses. For the interest of seeing how the wh-movement occurs, let's look at the DS and SS of 78 b. We have our lexical entries for these verbs in 72-73 of the last section. The DS of 78b is shown in 81:
In this tree, pro gets its theta role from hacer, which also given an internal theta role to que. Vas gives a theta role to its CP, and tener gives a theta role to its CP. For the SS, pro moves into the lower Spec, IP, leaves a trace, and then moves to the higher Spec, IP position. Que also moves, obviously. It cannot move directly to the highest Spec, CP position. The trace would not be properly licensed, because it would not be in the closest possible A' position. Thus, que first moves up to Spec, CP that is sister to the verb tener. It leaves a trace there and continues to move up. It cannot yet go to the Spec, CP [+que] position, because this second trace of the chain would not be properly licensed. There exists another closer A' position: Spec, CP (the CP that is sister to the verb vas.) After
moving to this position, *que* then moves finally to the highest Spec, CP: it's goal to form the question. A tree reflecting this movement, the SS of 78b, is given in 82:

82. CP [+qu]
   
   NP
   |
   Que
   |
   C [+qu]
   |
   IP
   |
   NP
   |
   pro
   |
   I [-fin]
   |
   VP
   |
   V'
   |
   V
   |
   vas
   |
   NP
   |
   t_i
   |
   C'
   |
   NP
   |
   t_i
   |
   C'
   |
   IP
   |
   NP
   |
   a
   |
   t_i
   |
   I [-fin]
   |
   VP
   |
   V'
   |
   V
   |
   tener
   |
   NP
   |
   t_i
   |
   C'
   |
   que
   |
   NP
   |
   t_i
   |
   I [-fin]
   |
   VP
   |
   V'
\( \text{Que} \) inherits its case from the foot of its chain. As given, wh-movement of periphrastic V CP's is further proof that they are indeed raising constructions.

D. Passive Movement in V CP's

In this section we will explore the passive constructions of the V CP structure opposed to a non-raising (or, in other words, a control) predicate. In the examples 83-86, given next, we will consider passive movement, and then raising of the passive structure in periphrastic phrases. Finally, we will see passive movement where raising brings about different results in control predicates:

83. Este hombre va a causar problemas.
   This man is going to cause problems.

84. Los problemas van a ser causados por este hombre.
   Problemas are going to be caused by this man.

85. El gobierno desea afrontar ese asunto.
   The government wishes to address that issue.

86. Ese asunto desea afrontado por el gobierno.
   This issue wishes to be addressed by the government.

As with the V IP periphrastic structures, we immediately note that 83 and its passive 84 are logically equivalent. Again we see a control structure (85) and its passive (86) are not equivalent. The same analysis that we did in the V IP section about passive holds true for the V CP structure. Because los problemas gets its theta role as the internal

\footnote{Examples 85-86 are taken from Fernández de Castro (1990)}
argument of causar in both 83 and 84, the two examples are logically equivalent. To make a passive equal to 85, ese asunto would have to get an internal theta role from afrontar. In 86 it gets an external theta role from desea. In 87-90, we have our lexical entries necessary for tree structure to explain this further. Periphrastic ir has been repeated from 35 earlier for convenience:

87. ir, V [ ___ {IP [+fin]} ]
   {CP [a, -fin]}
   <θ>

88. causar [ ___ NP]
   <θ₁, θ₂>

89. desear, [ ___ {IP [-fin]} ]
   {NP}
   <θ₁, θ₂>

90. afrontar, [ ___ NP]
   <θ₁, θ₂> .

In 83, problemas gets its internal theta role from causar, and este hombre starts out in the lower Spec, IP position where it gets the external theta role from causar. As in all PV constructions, it then moves up to the first Spec, IP position. 84 is the logical equivalent to this because problemas starts out in the DS as the internal argument of causar. It then moves up to Spec, IP of causar and we have spec/head agreement with the past participle causado. Este hombre still gets the same theta role in 84 that it got as the external argument of causar in 83. The surface structure of 84, along with all of this movement and theta role assignments, is reflected in 91:
Passive movement occurs, then the raising that normally occurs in periphrastic phrases takes *los problemas* up to the first Spec, IP position.

In order to get an equivalent passive sentence of 85, we would have passive movement, but raising does not occur, because it is a control structure. 92 shows only passive movement in 85, which would be a logical equivalent to it:
In the actual passive structure of this sentence, we would find a CP (which may exist here with a null complement) as the sister to the verb *desea*. In 92 *el gobierno* still gets the external theta role of *desea*, and *ese asunto* gets the internal argument structure/theta role from *afrentar*. In the passive movement, it moves to Spec, IP, sister to *ser*, where spec/head agreement between the past participle *afrentar* and *ese asunto* takes place. Finally, to finish its passive movement it goes to the next available Spec, IP. In the DS of 85, we would find *PRO* in that spot. This is an example of passive
movement in a control structure. As we can see, passive movement in raising structures is distinctive.

V. Conclusion

Periphrastic verb phrases are truly an interesting phenomenon in the language. Whether the first verb loses its original meaning or not, the same syntactic characteristics separate them from other verb structures. Both V IP and V CP structures are raising predicates. Many linguists study them today because they are so very difficult to translate. Because they are raising structures with CP's, it is also very interesting to see just how Government and Binding Theory accounts for them. At this point, there are many aspects left to be accounted for, from case assignment to localization effects. Using our current assumptions of Government and Binding, we do at least know they are raising constructions that allow clitic climbing, wh-movement, and have very distinctive passive characteristics. The periphrastic verbs do not assign theta roles and case. This actually only begins to explain their unique characteristics.
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