

## Inverted Tenses and Negation Within the Galician-Portuguese Domain \*

### Introduction

A long time ago, Leite de Vasconcelos collected the following *cantiga* in the Minho area (Leite de Vasconcelos 1928:465, Willians 1938:205):

- (1) 1. Se tu fores, eu hei-d'ir,  
2. Se ficares, ficarei:  
3. Quando não, tirai-m'a vida,  
4. Q'eu apartar-me não hei. (Line numbers added)

'If you leave, I will leave  
If you stay, I will stay  
If not, take my life  
since/because I will not separate from you'  
(lit. that I separate-me not have/will-I)

Line four of this *Cantiga do Minho* contains the only potential example I know of in the literature of I(nverted) C(onjugation)s in which negation, *não* "not", intervenes in the sequence INF(itive)-[Cl(itic)-personal pronoun]-AUX(iliary) i.e. the sequence *apartar-me-hei* (lit. separate-me have/will-I). ICs<sup>1</sup> are syntactic constructions showing

a non-finite main verb preceding the finite auxiliary *haber* “have”. Since ICs are found in most Romance languages at some point of their development, we can label this syntactic construction a Panromanic phenomenon.

Another potential example of mesoclitic negation, or negation intervening ICs, has been reported in Old Spanish by London (1962:6), from the *Cid* (2). Here, it is presented as it appears in Menéndez Pidal (1911, line 197):

- (2) Merecer nolo hedes, ca esto es aguisado  
 Deserve not-it have-you, since that is agreed

Line 197 was corrected by M. Pidal, as he explains in M. Pidal (1911:915. f.n.2) “El que puso la *s* de que se habla en la nota anterior ... añadió otra *s* sobre *no*, y otra después de *lo*”. In the context of the *Poema*, an interpretation as *nos-los* is much more accurate for the interpretation, even accepting that the text was corrected later on. This is supported by the Montaner edition (Montaner 1993) and the Colin Smith edition (Smith 1982). In the former, line 197 is written *Merecérnoslos hedes*, with the added *s* after *no* and *lo*, and in the latter as *Mereçer no' lo hedes*, with an apostrophe after *no* suggesting a missing sound. The exclusion of (2) seems well motivated as a genuine IC example.

ICs are a well known construction among Romance languages and its study has recently captured the attention of syntacticians in formal terms (see Rivero 1991, 1993; Lema & Rivero (L&R) 1990, 1991, 1992; Roberts 1993; Fontana 1993, among others). In this article, I will focus on split futures and conditionals although ICs include also aspectual tenses (see Parodi 1995 for a study on aspectual ICs). The interest in this

construction comes from the problem it presents for a general theory of sentence formation, specifically, the strict locality conditions imposed on the movement of the non-finite verb (the infinitive) and the blocking effect of negation. This paper reviews why the ungrammaticality of (1.4) *qu'eu apartar-me não hei* is predicted by current theories of grammar and, at the same time, it proposes a workable analysis for the structure-puzzle (1.4). The first implicit assumption is that this example is genuine. Native speakers of European Portuguese provided positive judgements about it, confirming the grammaticality of (1). Since the *Cantiga do Minho* (1) is reported in the Galaico-Portuguese area, most of the data will come from there.

This article is organized as follows: section 1 discusses VP-Fronting vs. Inverted Conjugations in root and non-root sentences, with special attention to negation as an operation to identify or discriminate ICs from VP-Fronting. In section 2, a different variety of future tenses - periphrastic futures - is introduced in the discussion to provide a clearer picture of the different available options. In section 3, temporality is opposed to modality showing that this distinction is not appropriate when distinguishing different types of futures. Section 4 is the general discussion of previous sections.

## 1. VP-Fronting vs. Inverted Conjugations

### 1.1. Clitics and Negation in Root/non-Root Environments

In E(uropean) P(ortuguese) when Neg, clitic pronouns and futures tenses interact in root clauses, ICs are disallowed in favor of synthetic futures (Silveira Bueno 1944:455 and Sten 1944:56, among others), as shown in (3) and (4):

- (3) a. A verdade não vol-a direi<sup>2</sup> (Góes 1936:104/111)  
 the truth not to-you-it will-tell  
 'The truth, I will not tell it to you'
- b. O meu rosto não o poderás ver  
 the my face not it you-will-be -able to-see  
 'My face, you will not be able to see it'
- (4) a. \*A verdade dir-não-vol-a-hei/\*dir-vol-a-não-hei)  
 (3a. elaboration)
- b. \*O meu rosto poder-não-o-has/\*podel-o-não-has)  
 (3b. elaboration)

The examples in (4) show that Neg, *não* "not", can not be bypassed by the infinitive *dir* "say", in (4a), and by the infinitive *poder* "be able", in (4b). In non-root sentences, two different options can be found in the Galaico-Portuguese area. Neither one of them allows ICs in non-root environments. EP illustrates this point in (5).

- (5) a. E como a porta de banho se não abria  
 and since the door of bathroom SE not would-open  
 'And since the bathroom door would not open'
- b. Quem se non espantaria?  
 who SE not would frighten  
 'Who would not get frightened?'
- c. Para que se entenda que o Senhor não se turbaria  
 in-order-to SE understand that the God not SE upset  
 'In order to be understood that God would not be upset'
- d. Será o último que não me fará nada

- will be the last that not to-me do nothing  
 'It will be the last one that will not do anything to me'  
 e. Pode ser un anjo ... que eu não o amarei  
 may be an angel ... that I not him will-love  
 'Whether or not an angel he is ... I will not love him'  
 (Figueiredo 1936:178/182/169/166/168)

The pattern shown in (5a-b) is called interpolation. The clitics, both *se* in (5a) and (5b), are encliticized into the subject *a porta de banho* "the bathroom door", (5a), and into the *Wh*-word *quem* "who", (5b) - the *exordia* in Ramsden 1963. Since these clitics are not adjacent to their respective verbal hosts at the Spell-Out, both pronominal clitics and finite verbs must be inserted independently to the derivation<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand, the pattern in (5c-e) is similar to (3a-b), suggesting that Neg can, but not necessarily must, create homogeneous domains in root and non-root environments.

The presence of the negative marker in (3) and (5) blocks raising of the infinitive into the C(omplementizer) position, but not clitic raising, as the examples (5a-b) - with interpolation - show. The explanation for this blocking effect is based on the claim that negation heads its own projection. This was first proposed for Romance by Kayne (1989) to account for the blocking effect negation has on clitic climbing. I will follow Zanuttini's (1991) view that in languages with preverbal negative markers negation is inserted later than the temporal features. I will also assume that clitics have to be inserted later than negation otherwise the NegP would block the derivation. This assumption is necessary if clitics are to be considered heads at the relevant part of the derivation (cf. Lema & Rivero (1990, 1991, 1992) and Fontana (1993) for a different

approach that considers clitics as maximal projections).

## 1.2. VP-fronting, Auxiliaries and Negation

VP-fronting among Indo-European languages is a common operation that moves the phrase containing the verb with argument structure over the Agreement and Negation checking-stages of the derivation. In sequences with auxiliaries, it produces an apparently unbounded effect, as in (6), where several heads are by-passed.

- (6) a. Digo-te que [ler o livro] Maria não pode  
 I-tell you that [read the book] Marie not can  
 'I am telling you that I can not [read the book]'
- b. [Einen Kuchen backen] wird er doch wohl koennen  
 [a cake bake ] will he presumably can  
 'Presumably, he can bake a cake' (L&R 1990:69)
- c. [Leer el libro] no ha debido poder  
 [read the book] not have may can  
 'He may not have been able to read the book'  
 (L&R 1990:69)

The examples in Portuguese (6a), German (6b) and Spanish (6c) show the VPs, marked with brackets, bypassing 'modals', as *pode* (6a), *koennen* (6b) as well as *devido* and *poder* (6c); 'aspectuals', as *ha* in (6c); and 'negation', as *não* (6a) and *no* (6c). The examples with negation have special relevance for us, since, unlike the IC construction (see the examples in (4), VP-fronting is not blocked by negation. (7) shows some additional Portuguese examples.

- (7) a. Estuda-lo não pode  
       [study-it-m.] not can-s/he  
       b. Ajudar-me não quis  
       [help-me] not want-s/he  
       c. Trabalha-la não quer  
       [work-it-f.] not want-s/he

This important difference between VP-Preposing and IC constructions leads L&R (1990, 1991, 1992) to distinguish both processes by the nature of the Aux involved in each. In the case of IC construction, treated by these authors as L(ong) H(ead) M(ovement), the auxiliary licensing of the movement is temporal and limited in lexical content. It does not assign a J-role to the VP complement it selects, since its semantics are similar to those of affixes found in synthetic tenses. They label this auxiliary class as 'functional'.

A second type of auxiliary is the one shown by Portuguese *pode* "can", *quis* "wanted", and *quer* "want" in (7). It licenses VP-Preposing, and has a semantic content close to that of verbs of propositional attitude. L&R (1991) label these auxiliaries as 'lexical'. This second type is immune to Negative Islands, as mentioned and shown in (6a) and (7) for Portuguese. Another property they have is that they can escape *Wh*-Islands, as shown in (8).

- (8) a. [<sub>i</sub> Ler esse livro] pergunto-me se poderei [<sub>VP-i</sub> ]  
       [<sub>i</sub> read that book] s/he ask me if will-be-able-(I)[<sub>VP-i</sub> ]

The Fronted VP bypass the indirect question introduced by *se* "if."

In Romance languages with no ICs, VP-Preposing is licensed only by lexical auxiliaries. Thus, Modern Sp. *poder/deber* and Fr. *pouvoir/*

*devoir* allow VP-Preposing (*lire ce livre Marie ne peut pas*, and *leer ese libro María no puede*) while *haber/avoir* do not (*\*leído ese libro María no ha*, and *\*lu ce livre Marie n'a pas*) (taken from L&R 1991). Portuguese present perfect behaves the same way (*\*lido isse libro Maria não tem/há*).

Two types of auxiliaries, *functional* and *lexical*, have been introduced in this section with different properties with regard to their ability to license movement out of *Wh-* and *Neg-*Islands.

## 2. Periphrastic futures

From their early days, the descendents of *cantare habeo* in North Western Iberian Dialects, namely, ICs and synthetic futures, have not been the only tenses with future temporal interpretation. The descendents of *habeo cantare* have competed with great success for a long time to get one position within Romance verbal systems. I will label them P(eriphrastic) F(utures), and in (9), some examples are shown.

- (9) a. *Aspera, que l'emos coger* (Alonso Garrote 1947:101)  
 wait, that him/it have catch  
 'Wait, because we will catch him/it'
- b. *Hei cantar canto queira* (ILGA 1986:47)  
 Have-I sing as-much-as want-I  
 'I will sing as much as I want'
- c. *A los que han lidiar tan bien los castigo*  
 (M. Pidal 1911:line 3523)  
 to the-ones-that have-they fight also to-them advised  
 'He also advised those who will fight'

These examples in (9), from Leonese (9a), Galegan (9b) and Old Spanish (9c), represent one of the options for *haber* + INF, but the most widespread varieties of PFs generally include a prepositional support -a "to" or *de* "of"- in between. The examples in (10a-b) come from Modern Galegan, and (10c-d) from Portuguese.

- (10) a. Hei de ir ó concello (ILGA 1986:47)  
 have-I of go to-the county office  
 'I will go to the county office'<sup>4</sup>
- b. E anche de dar queixas (Santamarina 1974:142)  
 and have-they-to-you of give complaints  
 'And, they will complain to you'
- c. Eu hei-te de falar claro (Góes 1936:128)  
 I have to/will speak frankly  
 'I will tell you frankly'
- d. Ha-nos de servir no rio  
 have-us of be-useful in-the river  
 'It will work in the river'

One of the properties of PFs is that the union between the auxiliary and the infinitive can be broken. In some dialects the preposition leans so strongly toward the auxiliary that it finally becomes attached to it. A good example in EP is (11a). The auxiliary is used alone when a *yes-no* question is answered in the affirmative, as in the Galegan example (11b).

- (11) a. — E eu hei-de mentir .. ? — Has-de, porque eu te mando  
 and I have-to lie ..? you have-to, because I you order

‘And, do I have to lie ..? — You have to, because I order that  
to you’ (Silva Dias 1933:320)

b. — ¿Sabes se han chegar cedo? — Han, home, han  
know-you if have-they arrive soon have-they, man, have-  
they

‘Do you know if they will be here soon? — They will, man,  
they will’ (Rojo 1974:92)

Another property of auxiliaries in PFs is that they can licence the trace of the verbal complement deriving a VP-Fronting-like construction, as in the EP (12a).

- (12) a. Cantá-la hei-de  
sing-it have-(I)-to

This property is shared by Old Romance languages. Old Spanish is just one example, (13).

- (13) a. Que a comprar avian (Strausbaught 1936:130)  
that to buy had-(they)  
‘Since they had to buy (it)/would buy (it)’  
b. Pues que a perder te  
since that to lose to-you-have-(I)  
‘Since I will lose you’

We can conclude from this section that PFs can alternate with ICs and, in some dialects, with similar interpretation in a number of contexts; they can be considered “allo-forms”. When they are inverted

they are very similar to ICs, specifically, the non-finite form can not be split from the auxiliary. Since the interpretation of PF has been claimed by some authors to be non-temporal, as opposed to ICs (L&R 1990, 1991, 1992), the next section is devoted to their interpretation.

### 3. Temporal vs. Modal Interpretation

This section argues for a non-temporal distinction between ICs and PFs. As Santamarina claims “del sentido de obligatoriedad al de simple futuridad se pasa insensiblemente” (Santamarina 1974:141). This author proposes that *cantarei* and *hei (de) cantar* “I will sing” are allomorphic variations in complementary distribution, namely, that each of them demands a specific context. This is confirmed by the single origin of both forms. Galegan maintains the duality as shown in the similar interpretation of (14a) and (14b).

- (14) a. Heiche dalo despóis (Santamarina 1974:142)  
       have-(I)-to-you give-it later  
       b. Xa cho darei despóis  
       all-right to-you-it will give later  
       ‘I will give you later’<sup>5</sup>

The single origin of *habeo cantare* and *cantare habeo* is supported by the fact that the secondary interpretations of both forms are basically identical.

The distinction between temporal interpretations for ICs and temporal interpretations for PFs has been claimed to be necessary to explain that the auxiliaries of PF constructions allow auxiliary move-

ment to initial position for clitic support. Let us remember that ICs always maintain the word order INF-CL-AUX. Several objections to this approach can be pointed out. On the one hand, traditional philologists and linguists have claimed that PFs have temporal readings (Grandgent, 1928:101; Strausbaucht, 1936:20; Rohlfs, 1928:2:334; Rojo, 1974:94; Rossi 1975:401; Tecavcsic, 1980:239; Roberts 1993:241; among many others). Nevertheless, the basic difficulty is clearly to distinguish modal and temporal readings. In the words of Comrie (1989:52):

The simplest case of the existence of a future tense would be a language in which some particular category, or set of categories, is used for all future time reference and only for future time reference. *This situation occurs rarely, if at all.* (My emphasis)

On the other hand, Modern Spanish shows that it is possible to get the same interpretation between Synthetic futures and PFs (15a-b).

- (15) a. Ya has de bajar  
       soon have-you to go down  
       ‘You will soon go down’
- b. Ya bajarás  
       soon go down have-you  
       ‘You will soon go down’ (=15a)

Additionally, the possible coordination of ICs and synthetic futures in Old Spanish with modal readings (16) suggests no conclusive temporal role for ICs.

- (16) a. Irás a casa y darte e una lexia       (Company 1985:100)

go have-you home and give-to-you-have-I a good scolding  
'You will go home and I will give you a good scolding'

Moreover, if we want to distinguish modal and temporal readings according to whether or not the auxiliary is split off, what kind of reading would be predicted in the case of split synthetic conditionals as *ser yen* in (17) taken from Old Spanish?

- (17) Aquelas non las puede levar, sinon, ser yen ventadas  
those not them can carry otherwise be had-they discovered  
'He could not carry them, because if he did they would be  
discovered'

(Fontana's translation, Fontana 1993:88)

Based on all these facts, I conclude that the distinction temporality / modality is not the best way to distinguish future tenses from one another. A distinction based on the different formal morphosyntactic status of *haver* "have", namely *clitic* for ICs, *lexical auxiliary* for PFs, and *affix* for synthetic futures, does not make any prediction about modal and temporal interpretations. (See Silva Villar 1995, 1996 for details.)

#### 4. Discussion

So far I have presented:

- ICs come up in root clauses as a local relationship between infinitives and the cluster pronominal clitic plus auxiliary. ICs are disallowed in non-root clauses.

- Negation blocks the raising of the non-finite verb in ICs.

- Mesoclitic negation in ICs between pronominal clitics and auxiliaries 6 is not allowed. This ban is based on the status of Neg as a head of a NegP.

- The feasible temporal interpretation for PFs is not exclusively modal as sometimes suggested.

- The regular inversion of the non-finite form in PFs based in the lexical status of the auxiliary. Nothing can intervene in this particular case between the non-finite form and the auxiliary except clitics. This property is shared by ICs.

- VP-Fronting and ICs are two unrelated constructions.

In what follows, we will apply and contrast the properties sketched for ICs and inverted structures in general to the structure and interpretation of the line 4 in (1) *Q'eu apartar-me não hei*.

The root non-root split presented in 1.1 seems to force ICs to be reserved to root sentences. This result *a priori* would exclude (1.4) as an IC construction. But, let us consider (18a-b) taken from the *Çid* (Menéndez Pidal 1911: lines 161 and 280).

- (18) a. Que sobre aquelas archas dar le yen v.j. çientos marcos  
 that about those chests give to-him have-they 600 marks  
 'That they would give him 600 marks for those chests'
- b. Ya lo vedes que partir nos hemos en vida  
 well it see-you-pl. that to leave us have-we in life  
 'It is obvious that we will die during our life'

Examples in (18) show that the split root/non-root is undoubtedly insufficient since it can not embrace ICs which are part of independent

clauses introduced by *que* "that". In (18a) *que* is a conjunction and in (18b) we have a doubling structure between the clitic *lo* and the CP headed by *que*. Probably, a better distinction may be between independent and non-independent clauses. We assume that ICs in Old Spanish behave similarly to Portuguese in the relevant way, a very plausible assumption if we consider the historico-genetical ties between all Northwestern Iberian languages (Otero 1976, Silva-Villar 1996). As a consequence of this refinement, line (1.4) can not be excluded as an instance of IC according to its *non-root* typology.

The interpretation of the auxiliary *hei* (lit. I-have) can be either temporal or modal as the English counterpart *will* is. This is what we expect as argued in section 3. It is impossible to split temporal and modal readings insofar as the type of tense used. Both types of auxiliary categories discussed in section 1.2 - *functional* and *lexical* - are feasible being inconclusive to ascribe the auxiliary *hei* either to ICs or to VP-Fronting constructions (i.e. modals); or ... to even PFs<sup>7</sup>.

The strict local movement of the non-finite verbal form in ICs and PFs (when they front) is, again, inconclusive, and both constructions provide correct interpretations within the constraints imposed so far. In fact VP-fronting can not be discarded even though the fronting is a non-local phenomenon, since at the Spell-Out it can apparently show up as local.

As already shown, PFs usually, although not exclusively, have a preposition between the auxiliary and the non-finite form. In (1.1), the PF *hei d'ir* "I will/have to go" is an example with the preposition *de* (lit. of). The meaning of the PF mimics the meaning of the synthetic future *ficarei* "I will stay" in (1.2). The reason for choosing *ficarei* instead of *hei de ficar* is probably because the number of syllables is increased in

one with the subsequent breaking of the octosyllabic structure. The verbal interpretation of (1.4) is exactly the same as *hei d'ir* and *ficarei* but the shape of the verb does not easily fit any of them. Two remarks are necessary to be pointed out: first, although the preposition is absent within the configurational domain, a PF can not be excluded since as shown in section 2 - examples (9a-c) - the lack of preposition is less “normal” but not impossible. Second, a “missing *de*” can be explained by the lack of rhyme *ficarei /hei-de* and by the change in the number of syllables as well. The sequence with the added preposition *de apartarme não hei* is accepted by native speakers, Leite de Vasconcelos included (Leite de Vasconcelos 1928:465). At this point, the three structures under discussion, namely, ICs, PFs and VP-Fronting are potential choices.

Negation is the last point to be discussed in this section and the most illuminating. As seen in the first section, negation attracts clitics quite consistently among the languages under study. Two exceptions have been presented so far, interpolation (5a-b) and VP-fronting (7). One more can be added, negated PFs can be inverted, as shown in (19):

- (19) a. *Estuda-lo não hei* <sup>8</sup>  
           study-it not have-(I)  
       b. *Menti-lo não has-de*  
           lie-to-him not have to

At this point, it is hard to maintain that (1.4) contains an instance of ICs. The only way to theoretically save (1.4) as an IC is to extend the clitic status of the cluster of pronominal clitic plus auxiliary clitic (see endnote 7) to negation. If negation can interact with pronominal and

auxiliary clitics *as a clitic*, as locatives and partitives do (see endnote 6) then we can expect to save the IC configuration. Although this is a workable hypothesis much more research must be done to show that it is empirically correct.

One argument in support of the fronted PF is the variation of the auxiliary tense beyond Present and Imperfect as shown in (20) (Ferrel p.c.):

- (20) Q'eu apartar-me não haveri/houvera/houvesse...  
 since/because separate-me not will have/had had/ had-  
 Subjunctive...

In (20), the auxiliary *haver* "have" is conjugated as synthetic future, pluperfect and imperfect subjunctive. Although at first glance these temporal options support the PF interpretation, we can not discard VP-Fronting. The VP-fronting interpretation can be maintained if the auxiliary is considered "lexical", with modal interpretation (see section 1.2). This case should be very similar to (21):

- (21) Q'eu apartar-me não poderei  
 Since/Because separate-me not will-be-able

## Conclusions

- The complex way temporal futures/conditionals interact with each other in the Galaico-Portuguese domain can be clarified if the status of auxiliaries is refined: as *lexical* in the case of modals, as *functional* in the case of Periphrastic Future/Conditional tenses and as "functional clitic" as is the case in Inverted Conjugations.

- Negation plays a crucial role distinguishing VP-Fronting from ICs.
- PFs, when inverted, behave as ICs with respect to local properties but as VP-Fronting with respect to negation.
- An Inverted Periphrastic Future is the candidate that best fits the interpretation of the *Cantiga do Minho* (1) in its fourth line *Q'eu apartar-me não hei*. Considerations based on rhyme and metric structure affect the order auxiliary/non-finite verb and determine the lack of the preposition *de* "of".
- VP-Fronting can not be discarded since its local restrictions are neutralized and a modal interpretation is possible.
- Inverted Conjugations are the worst candidates to label (1.4) but further research on negation as a clitic could provide some credibility to this option. The filled Comp position is not enough to exclude (1.4) as an IC.
- The split root/non-root sentences must be better stated as independent/non independent sentences when studying ICs in order to cover all cases in the Galaico-Portuguese domain both synchronically and diachronically.

—Luis Silva-Villar  
University of California, Los Angeles

## Notes

\* I would like to thank the following people: Eduardo Dias, Cinelandia Ferrel, Carlos Otero, Susan Plann, Ian Roberts and the Portuguese and



<sup>7</sup> Auxiliaries in ICs and PFs are distinguished by their clitic/non-clitic status. See Silva-Villar (1995) for discussion.

<sup>8</sup> Entonation plays an important role distinguishing ICs and PFs.

### Works Cited

- Alonso Garrote, Santiago. *El dialecto vulgar leonés hablado en la Maragatería y Tierra de Astorga. Notas gramaticales y vocabulario*. Madrid: CSIC, Instituto Antonio de Nebrija, 1947.
- Álvarez, Rosario et al. *Gramática Galega*. Vigo: Galaxia, 1986.
- Badía i Margerit, Antonio M. *Gramàtica històrica catalana*. Barcelona: Tres i Quatre, 1981.
- Campos, Héctor. "Clitic Position in Modern Galegan." *Lingua* 77 (1989): 13-36.
- Chenery, Winthrop H. "Object Pronouns in Dependent Clauses: A Study in Old Spanish Word Order." *MLA* vol. XX, 1. New Series, vol. XIII, 1(1905): 1-151.
- Coelho, F. Adolpho. *Theoria da conjugação. Estudo de grammática comparativa*. Lisboa: Antunes, 1870.
- Company, Concepción. "Los Futuros en el Español Medieval. Sus Orígenes y su Evolución." *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* XXXIV(1985): 48-107.
- Comrie, Bernard. "On Identifying Future Tenses." *Tempus-Aspect-Modus*, eds. W. Abraham and T. Janssen. 51-63. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1989.
- Couceiro, Xosé L. "El Habla de Feás." *Verba*. Anexo 5. Santiago de Compostela: U de Santiago de Compostela, 1976.

Figueiredo, Candido de. *O problema da Colocação de Pronomes*. 8th. ed. Lisboa: Livraria Clásica, 1952.

Fontana, Joseph. "Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish." Dissertation, U of Pennsylvania, 1993.

Góes, Carlos. *Syntaxe de Construção*. Rio de Janeiro: Hirmãos Pongetti. 1936.

Grandgent, Charles H. *Introducción al Latín Vulgar*. Madrid: Hernando, 1928.

ILGA (Instituto da Lingua Galega), Sección Didáctica do. *Galego Coloquial*. Biblioteca gallega (serie nova), La Coruña: La Voz de Galicia, 1986.

Lema, José. and María L. Rivero. "Long Head Movement: ECP vs. HMC." *Cahiers Linguistiques D'Ottawa* 18 (1990): 61-78.

———. "Types of Verbal Movement in Old Spanish: Modals, Futures and Perfects." *Probus* 3.3 (1991): 237-278.

———. "Inverted Conjugations and V-Second Effects in Romance." In Christiane Laeuffer and Terrell A. Morgan. *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992: 312-328.

Lobo, Tânia. "A Colocação dos Clíticos em Português. Duas Sincronias in Confronto." Tese de Mestrado. Faculdade de Letras da U de Lisboa, 1992.

London, G. H. "Nota sobre el futuro y condicional indicativos en la obra de Alfonso X." *Boletín de Filología Española*, Nov., año III(1961):6-8.

Martins, Ana M. "Clitic Placement from Old to Modern European Portuguese." Ms. U of Lisbon, 1993.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. *Cantar del Mío Cid, Texto, Gramática y Vocabulario*. Madrid: Bailly-Bailliére, 1911.

Montaner, Alberto, ed. *Cantar de Mío Cid*. Estudio preliminar de F.

- Rico. Barcelona: Crítica, 1993.
- Moreira, Julio. "Questões de philologia." *O Ensino*, Nov. 1, Anno 1(1877): 19-21.
- Mussafia, Alfredo. "Una Particolarità Sintattica della Lingua Italiana dei Primi Secoli." *Miscellanea de Filologia e Linguistica*. In Memoria N. Caix e U.A. Canello (1886): 255-261. Firenze: Successori le Monnier.
- Nebrija, Antonio de. *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Estudio e introducción A. Quilis. 3rd ed. Madrid: Editorial Centro de Estudios Ramón Areces, 1989. (First ed., 1492).
- Ogando, Victoria. "A Colocación do Pronome Atono en Relación co Verbo no Galego-Portugués Medieval." *Verba* 7 (1980): 251-282.
- Otero, Carlos P. *Evolución y revolución en romance II*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1976.
- Parodi, Claudia. "Verb Incorporation and the HMC in XVIth Century Spanish." In Jon Amastae et al., eds., *Contemporary Research in Romance Linguistics*. LSRL 22, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.
- Ramsden, Herbert. *Weak Pronoun Position in the Early Romance Languages*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1963.
- Rivero, María L. "Long Head Movement, and Negation: Servo-Croatian vs. Slovack and Czech." *The Linguistic Review* 8 (1991): 319-351.
- . "Long Head Movement vs. V2, and Null Subjects in Old Romance." *Lingua* 89 (1993): 217-245.
- Roberts, Ian. "A Formal Account of Grammaticalisation in the History of Romance Futures." *Folia Linguistica Historica* 13 (1993):219-258.
- Rohlf's, Gerhard. *Grammatica Storica della Lingua Italiana e dei suoi Dialetti: Morfologia*. Turin: Einaudi, 1968.

- Rojo, Guillermo. "Perífrasis Verbales en el Gallego Actual." *Verba*. Anexo 2. Santiago de Compostela: U de Santiago de Compostela, 1974.
- Rossi, Teresa M. "Formas de Futuro en un Romanceamiento Bíblico del Siglo XIII". *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 91(1975): 386-402.
- Santamarina, Antonio. "El Verbo Gallego. Estudio Basado en el Valle de Suarna." *Verba*. Anexo 4. Santiago de Compostela: U de Santiago de Compostela, 1974.
- Saco e Arce, Juan A. *Gramática Gallega*. Lugo: Soto Freire, 1868.
- Silva Dias, Augusto E. da *Syntaxe Historica Portuguesa*. 2nd ed., Lisboa: Livraria Clásica, 1933.
- Silva Villar, Luis. "Merge and Cliticization in Old Romance Futures/Conditionals." In Karen Zagona ed., *Grammatical Theory and Romance Languages*. LSRL 25. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.
- . "Enclisis in Northwestern Iberian Languages: A Diachronic Theory." Dissertation, UCLA, 1996.
- Silveira Bueno, Francisco da. *Gramática Normativa da Língua Portuguêsa*. S. Paulo: Saraiva & CIA, 1944.
- Smith, Colin, ed. *Poema de Mío Cid*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1981.
- Sten, Holger. *Les particularités de la Langue Portugaise*. Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague, vol. II, Copenhague: Einar Munksgaard, 1944.
- Strausbaught, John A. *The Use of 'Auer a' and 'Auer de' as Auxiliary Verbs in Old Spanish from the Earliest Texts to the End of the Thirteenth Century*. Chicago: U of Chicago Libraries, 1936.
- Tekavcsic, Pavao. *Grammatica Storica dell'Italiano*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1980.

- Tobler, Adolf. Review of J. le Coultre. *De l'ordre des mots dans Chrétien de Troyes*, reprinted in A. Tobler (1912) *Vermischte Beiträge zur Französische Grammatik*, V. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1875.
- Vasconcelos, J. Leite de. *Opusculos* vol. II. *Dialectologia* (Parte I), Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade, 1928.
- Williams, Edwin B. *From Latin to Portuguese*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1938.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. "Syntactic Properties of Sentential Negation. A comparative study of Romance Languages." Dissertation, U of Pennsylvania, 1991.