Sometimes descriptions of known facts about a language fail to be explanatory in a satisfying way, because they ignore parallelisms in related languages, including chronologically earlier stages of the same language. This article examines several Romance languages and dialects in terms of similarities in morphological evolutionary development. Consideration of comparative data indicates that the polarization of standards can overlay similar patterns of variation in different regions and that an explanatory description of nonstandard usage needs the added dimension offered by use of comparative and historical data. (Author/DB)
THE RELEVANCE OF COMPARATIVE AND HISTORICAL DATA
FOR THE DESCRIPTION AND DEFINITION OF A LANGUAGE

R. Posner

What I want to exemplify is that sometimes descriptions of known facts about a language fail to be explanatory in a satisfying way, because they ignore parallelisms in related languages, including chronologically earlier stages of the same language. The data to be considered may not therefore be limited to that of a closely defined dialect, but may profitably embrace that of related dialects.

One difficulty lies in delimiting the language to be described: how much variation is to be admitted and how is it to be handled? The Romance languages provide an interesting field for speculation on this point. They form an obvious delimited set which for some purposes can be best considered as variants of one and the same entity, while for others they are better subdivided into clusters that are more or less loosely inter-related.

It is easy to fall into the trap of treating substandard uses as necessarily variations on the standard to which they are politically or culturally linked which forms a model for most users (e.g. Spanish, French) while failing to recognize that parallel uses are to be found elsewhere in Romance and might conceivably be viewed as Romance variants rather than French or Spanish variants.

It would be easiest to illustrate from phonology — and indeed within the generativist framework differences between the Romance dialects are frequently assigned to surface phenomena with underlying phonological forms looking remarkably similar. Now I shall merely refer you to Posner (1975) in which I discuss persistent phonological rules (or meta-rules) which could account for certain parallelisms within Romance.

Illustrations from the field of lexical semantics are not infrequent in Romance studies, but more difficult to fit into the theme I have chosen. I shall merely refer to Posner (1974) and proceed to closer examination of two examples from the recent literature — both primarily concerned with American Spanish nonstandard usage, one with morphology (Harris 1975) and the other with syntax (Lavandera 1975). The difference in approach of the two writers should be noted.

James Harris working in the M.I.T. generative phonology tradition treats New Mexican nonstandard as a separate entity which in the case discussed differs from Spanish by the generalization of certain rules that are specifically constrained in the standard.

Beatriz Lavandera, a pupil of Labov, treats the Buenos Aires nonstandard usage under consideration by means of a variable rule favoured by certain semantic and social factors.

Harris, in his work, gives us no indication of the relative frequency or of determining factors for nonstandard and standard use (though we know from other sources that they are far from watertight compartments) whereas
Lavandera, as a socio-linguist, is primarily concerned with these questions.

Harris's study concerns verb-forms in New Mexican nonstandard Spanish, which he calls 'Chicano' -- a very well documented variety since Espinosa's 1930 study. Two (related?) features are discussed: stress assignment and the phonological form of the first person plural inflectional ending. The examples given are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>standard</th>
<th>chicano</th>
<th>standard</th>
<th>chicano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres indic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajó</td>
<td></td>
<td>trabajó</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajas</td>
<td></td>
<td>trabajás</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajá</td>
<td>(same)</td>
<td>trabajáb</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajamos</td>
<td></td>
<td>trabajámos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáis</td>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáen</td>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres subj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáe</td>
<td></td>
<td>trabajámos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáes</td>
<td></td>
<td>pensamos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáe</td>
<td></td>
<td>comemos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajámos</td>
<td></td>
<td>durámos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáis</td>
<td></td>
<td>salgamos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáen</td>
<td></td>
<td>vayamos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(not used)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(not used)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajemos</td>
<td></td>
<td>démos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperf ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajábaba</td>
<td></td>
<td>estemos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajábas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajába</td>
<td>(same)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajábamos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajábaís</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajában</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past subj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajára</td>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáramos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajára</td>
<td>(same)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáramos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajárais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trabajáran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We should note several features of this dialect:

1. As in other American varieties there is no distinctive 2p.pl. form and the -Vmos ending is the only two-syllable person inflection.

2. The -Vmos 1p.pl. ending is stressed on the vowel only in the pres. ind. the preterite and the future. Of these the preterite is extensively used, as in most American Spanish; no information is given about the use of the future -- which is not a popular form in most American Spanish varieties. Unlike the standard, the pres. subj. paradigm is here always stem-stressed.

3. The 1p.pl. inflections of the pres. ind. and the weak pre. are shown as identical, as in the standard but not as in many American varieties. I shall not pursue this point further here but refer to Pullum (1975) and his appeal to transderivational constraints -- an apparently 'revolutionary' idea in generative grammar but a commonplace of traditional
Romance thinking, where numerous examples relevant to the present problem can be cited.²

4. Although the 1p.pl. inflection of the pres. ind. and weak pret. are identical, the stem is frequently differentiated, for Standard alternating o/ue and e/ie pres. ind. paradigms are frequently levelled in favour of the diphthong, with the effect that the diphthong is no longer derivable from an underlying simple vowel by a synchronic phonological rule mentioning a [+stress] feature.³

5. The ending -nos [noh] is used for -mos only when preceded by an unstressed syllable. Harris describes this in terms of a morphologically determined rule which changes m to n. He rejects the traditional, indeed the obvious, explanation of analogical influence of the personal pronoun nos because he sees no reason why such an influence should be exerted only after an unstressed syllable.

It is my concern to show that we expect this change precisely in these conditions. With this object I shall examine other Romance languages.

Turning first to the question of stress in the 1p.pl. endings, all Romance languages retain traces of Latin -Vmús endings and nearly everywhere the dominant stress patterning (with the penultimate V stressed) has meant that this person has at some point in time been differentiated from the rest of the paradigm.⁴ Analogical levelling of this ending is particularly evident (cf. French -ons, Italian -iamo generalized to many parts of the system) and popular usage often avoids the person-ending altogether (cf. French on va, Italian noi si va, Brazilian Portuguese no is ama, etc).

Leftward shift of the stress is common so that the stem is stressed throughout certain paradigms.⁵ Such a shift is most common in the imperfect indicative and subjunctive (as in standard Spanish and much of Italy) with the present subjunctive also favouring rhizotonic forms (as in many Spanish, Portuguese and S.French dialects⁶). The present indicative more often resists the stress-shift: where it does take place, as in N.Italy, some Rheto-Romance dialects and S.E.France the 1p.pl. ending is often monosyllabic so that it is the surface penultimate syllable that is stressed. Most of these dialects do not use ending-stressed future or preterite forms. A conspiracy towards regular surface penultimate stress in verb paradigms can be suspected in such dialects.⁷

The tendency towards penultimate stress in Romance is so marked that apparent exceptions have received special attention from generativists like Foley (1965), Harris (1969) and Saltarelli (1972).⁸ Harris 1969, while confessing bewilderment about possible causes described the Standard trabajábamos/trabajáramos antepenultimate stress as being determined by a morphological feature (-perf). In his 1975 article⁹ he prefers the rules:

1. The vowel of the antepenultimate syllable is stressed if it is the theme vowel and if it is followed by a two-syllable inflection (eg. -Vmos).

2. Otherwise the vowel of the penultimate syllable is stressed.
3. The (only) vowel of monosyllabic forms is stressed.

Chicano differs from the Standard by generalizing Rule 1 so that ALL antepenultimate vowels are stressed if followed by a two-syllable inflection: this permits *trabjamos but excludes trabajamos as the vowel in the trabajamos forms is not part of the inflection but of the stem.\(^{10}\) But an added complication is that where there is antepenultimate stress -nos appears instead of -mos. If this were due to analogical influence by the personal pronoun 'NOS', why does it occur only in conjunction with antepenultimate stress? Let me again briefly examine Romance parallels.

In most languages inter-influence between the pronoun and inflection is not detectable, though not necessarily absent, because of overlaying of other phonological developments. In S.W. France and N.E. Spain, and in central Italy however it is likely that the two morphemes have tended to fuse, with 'mus' sometimes used for the pronoun (found also in S.E. France) and 'nos' for the inflection. The latter use certainly seems to be favoured in stress-shifted forms\(^{11}\) though some (more or less suspect) counter examples have been cited.\(^{12}\) In O. Tuscan examples where the inflection -no appears alongside -mo\(^ {13}\) (the pronoun also being no) it is uncertain where the word-stress fell. The best documented examples (apart from Chicano) are those recorded for mountain Aragonese dialects in surveys dating from 1932 (by Kuhn) and 1944 (by Badia Margarit). There -nos endings often occur after an unstressed vowel.\(^ {14}\)

It is worth noting that in fact the -nos forms occur much more frequently in the 1932 data (for the locality Hecho) than in the 1944: eg.

- Impf. ind. haber 1p.pl. Benasque hebán/Hecho hebános; 3p.pl. hebán for both;
- impf. subj. hacer 1p.pl. Benasque fésan/Hecho fésanos; 3p.pl. fésan for both;
- impf. ind. ser 1p.pl. Benasque yérán/Hecho, Bielsa yéranos; 3p.pl. yérán for all.

These data suggest that the -nos may be a detachable suffix in dialects where final -n marks the plural.\(^ {15}\) The 1932 Hecho data with abundant -nos inflections are more neatly patterned than those collected in 1944 -- perhaps indicative of a chronologically anterior stage or perhaps an effect more of the preconceptions of the informant or investigator than of linguistic reality.

However scant and unreliable the evidence on this question, the data garnered from all parts of Romance can be pieced together to suggest

1. that the 1p.pl. is apt to be exceptional in the verbal paradigm but that otherwise
2. there is a tendency to uniformity within the paradigm -- a tendency most resisted in the pres. ind. -- and that
3. there is a tendency to simplify stress assignment rules in the direction of stressing the penultimate syllable.

Taken together, these otherwise sometimes contradictory tendencies may have
'conspired' towards the Chicano outcome. I suggest that Chicano paradigms tend to be regularized with stress on the penultimate syllable, that ñ is used as a plural marker, and that the lp.pl. person is additionally marked by an enclitic nos pronoun, which as a separable morpheme, does not affect the operation of the stress assignment rule. The 'irregular' forms are not thus those with -nos endings but those in which stress falls on the final syllable (discussed by Pullum 1975) and those in which the -Vnos endings are preserved -- perhaps easiest explained as an effect of historical inertia.

Harris himself, against his theoretical predilections, has been forced to recognize the potency of the tendency towards paradigmatic uniformity in his own study of Chicano diphthongs (Harris, forthcoming). Here too, the most obvious solution -- one paralleled in other Romance dialects -- may be the right one.

Lavandera's excellent dissertation is concerned with a socially marked usage of Buenos Aires speech in which a so-called 'conditional' form r-RIA\textsuperscript{17} is used where the standard requires a so-called 'imperfect subjunctive' r-RA\textsuperscript{18} or r-SE\textsuperscript{18}. On the basis of her sociolinguistic investigations Lavandera posits a variable rule:

\[ \text{IMPF} \rightarrow \{\text{COND}\} / [+\text{HYP}] \]
\[ \hline \text{si} \]
\[ \hline \text{[+VERB]} \]
\[ \text{[aCONTR]} \]
\[ \text{[aNEG]} \]
\[ \text{[-PAST]} \]

(Not found for lexical items ser, haber, querer; favoured by factors: low educational status, middle-age, female)

\[ \{\text{-SE}\} \]

(i.e. imperfect subjunctive r-RA\textsuperscript{18}) becomes conditional (r-RIA\textsuperscript{17}) in hypothetical clauses with a verb referring to non-past time determined by alpha variables 'contrary to fact' and 'negative' where either both are + or both -\textsuperscript{19}. Moreover she finds that among those speakers who never use the r-RIA\textsuperscript{17} forms -- especially the younger better educated males -- a non-standard but non-stigmatized present indicative form is often used\textsuperscript{20} suggesting disfavour for the r-RA\textsuperscript{18} or r-SE\textsuperscript{18} forms but consciousness that the r-RIA\textsuperscript{17} forms are not socially acceptable.

Although Lavandera suggests that r-SE\textsuperscript{18} and r-RA\textsuperscript{18} are equivalent, we should note that in this dialect, as in most American dialects and popular metropolitan Castilian, r-RA\textsuperscript{18} forms are more frequent, though r-SE\textsuperscript{18} is generally (if rarely) used, apparently as a slightly 'posh' equivalent of r-RA\textsuperscript{18} in all contexts, being favoured by haber as an auxiliary: e.g. hubiese tornado. It is therefore fair to assume, as Lavandera herself does at one point, that r-RIA\textsuperscript{17} is substituting for r-RA\textsuperscript{18} rather than r-SE\textsuperscript{18} .\textsuperscript{21}

A look at other Romance languages reveals certain parallelisms:

1. The r-RA\textsuperscript{18} type forms have at one time or another been used as a conditional in virtually all the Romance languages (Togeby 1966). In some it is still rivalled by the r-SE\textsuperscript{18} subjunctive (used in Latin), in others by the imperfect indicative (but usually to
minimize the unreality of the condition) and also by the "-RIA" conditional -- a Romance formation closely linked with the "-RA" future which Rohlfs (1922) saw as a French innovation that spread unevenly to Spain and Italy but was never adopted into many popular dialects.

2. Latin "SI" as the conditional conjunction has survived in all Romance languages although other devices are also used. In Daco-Rumanian să has come to have more general subordinating functions and dacă is the specifically conditional conjunction.

3. "SI" can be viewed as an underlying abstract verb governing the verb-form appropriate for indirect speech (Rivero 1972; Wagner 1936). Whereas in earlier times this was frequently the "-SE" subjunctive for past reference, more innovating dialects have preferred the imperfect indicative, or, where the neutrality of the speaker is emphasized, the "-RA" or "-RIA" conditionals.

4. The "-RIA" conditional, morphologically more regular, has ousted the "-RA" conditional in the more innovating dialects. No historical trace of the "-RA" conditional is to be found in Tuscan, N. Italian and Rheto-Romance, in which dialects "-SE" subjunctives are found in unreal "SI" hypothetical clauses.

5. The history of unreal conditions in mediaeval Spanish is well-documented and much discussed (Mendeloff 1960; Green 1972; Harris 1971, 1972). In these as in other contexts the "-RA" forms become virtually stylistic variants of the "-SE" forms, whereas elsewhere there was no discernible difference between the "-RA" and the "-RIA" forms (Spaulding 1929). Like other languages Spanish tends to parallelism in the protasis and apodosis, so that in both clauses the same verb-form is used: some dialects (e.g. Puerto Rican) use "-RA" in both; others (e.g. Buenos Aires) use "-RIA" in both.

Similar developments have taken place elsewhere -- in popular French the "-RIA" conditional is used in both clauses, a usage attested from early times (Renchon 1969);22 in several Italian dialects either two imperfect indicatives or two "-RIA" conditionals are used; in popular Portuguese and in Balkan Judeo-Spanish and popular insular Spanish two imperfect indicatives are preferred. In those areas where the "-SE" subjunctive is used for unreal conditions, again both clauses contain similar verb-forms (e.g. S. Italy, Lombardy, Rheto-Romance). A similar parallelism is to be found in languages where periphrastic verb-forms are used (e.g. Rumanian, Sardinian).

Catalan is perhaps the odd man out here, as popular usage prefers a "SI...-SE, ...-RIA" construction like that of standard Spanish, while correct usage is closer to standard French and Old Occitan. The sociolinguistic situation of Catalan no doubt accounts for the anomaly to some degree.

By and large though, popular tendencies are clear. What Lavandera needs then is not a variable rule that will transform the "-RA" / "-SE" form to "-RIA" but a framework that will incorporate recognition of a Romance trend towards parallelism in the protasis and apodosis, and rivalry between the old "-RA" conditionals and the new "-RIA" conditionals.
In citing these examples, I should emphasize that I do not maintain that these developments are Proto-Romance, nor that one dialect has influenced another. But that does not mean that, like Harris, I want to say they are independent of one another. Rather, I suggest that variation has always been possible within Romance but that some language communities resist it more than others.

To explain the choices of standard uses in different areas is perhaps one of the prime problems of Romance linguistics; undoubtedly sociolinguistic factors are of paramount importance though chance has also a part to play. What consideration of comparative data can teach us is that the polarization of standards can overlay similar patterns of variation in the different regions and that an explanatory description of nonstandard usage needs the added dimension offered by use of comparative and historical data.

NOTES

1. I have not yet been able to consult Hernandez (1975) which I understand to be mainly composed of previously published works on the subject.

2. In those Romance languages where the preterite is popularly used, a distinctive 1p.pl. form has often been adopted thus avoiding homonymy with the present indicative (e.g. American Span. and Ptg. use -emos for 1 conj. preterites; Rum. and Occitan use a [Vr'] infix in the preterite; standard Ptg. 1 conj. uses [emuf] for the pres., [amuf] for the pret. etc).

3. Harris 1973 cites vuelamos pr. ind. (standard volamos) as current, while attested pienaamos (st.penalamos) is, he believes, not usual among young adults.

4. Rumanian alone retains the Latin distinction between conjugation 3 ('-Mvms') and the rest ('-Mvms'): vedem / scrtem: though traces of irregular reduced forms are to be found (e.g. FACIMUS > hemos, fames.) Mussafia 1883:4 declares of the stress alternation pattern in the pr. ind. paradigm 'Diesen Unterschied zu verwischen bestrebt sich ebenfalls der romanische Sprachgenius'. He demonstrates that the widespread use of the inchoative infix -ISC- often results in uniformity of stress patterning.

5. The future and weak preterite endings are usually stressed throughout the paradigm. Note that these forms are not in popular usage in many regions.

6. For Spanish cf. especially Alonso 1930. In E.France an "EF" infix of uncertain origin is uniformly stressed throughout the paradigm. Note that sometimes in Romance the 1p.pl. is stem-stressed while the 2p.pl. is ending-stressed: Andaluz salqamos / salgas (Mondéjar 1970); Lombard portem, tegnem / portè, tegne (but imperative portèm, tegnèm); Fr.Swiss plydron / pilyorāde (Mussafia 1883).
7. Where stress falls on the final surface syllable, as in French, it is possible to argue that this is an underlying penultimate syllable in forms where inflections may or may not be spelled out.

8. Some languages use stress to differentiate one form from another: cf. Pullum 1975; also e.g. Gascon lp.pl. pres. subj. perdên / pres. ind. perdên (Kelly 1973); Aragonese pres. subj. lp.pl. díguen / 3p.pl. díguen (Badia 1947).

9. The rules are formalized thus:

a) Theme V \rightarrow [+stress]/[[...S]-S -S] standard
   V \rightarrow [+stress]/[[...S]-S -S] chicano
b) /[[...S] -S] both
   /[[S]] both

or, more discursively,

STANDARD
a) The vowel of the antepenultimate syllable is stressed if it is the theme vowel and is followed by a two-syllable inflection (S = 'syllable'):
   Theme V \rightarrow [+stress]/[[...S] - S - S]_verb
   Examples: trabajaba-mos, trabajara-mos
b) Otherwise, the vowel of the penultimate syllable is stressed:
   V \rightarrow [+stress]/[[...S] - S]_verb
   Examples: trabajamos, trabajemos, trabajamos, trabajamos
   c) The (only) vowel of monosyllabic forms is stressed:
      V \rightarrow [+stress]/[[S]]_verb
      Examples: se, hñ, dñ, de, os, soy

CHICANO
a) The vowel of the antepenultimate syllable is stressed (whether or not it is the theme vowel) if it is followed by a two-syllable inflection:
   V \rightarrow [+stress]/[[...S] - S - S]_verb
   Examples: trabajamos, (trabaj + a + nos)
   trabajabamos, (trabaj + a) + ba + nos)
b) Same as standard b., e.g. trabajamos ([trabaj + a] + mos)
c) Same as standard c.

10. A simplified version of Harris's suggestion runs as follows:

The morphological structure of finite verb forms in Spanish can be presented schematically:

R = root
TMA = tense-mood-aspect morpheme
TV = theme vowel
PN = person-number morpheme
S = stem
V = verb

\[[R + TV]_S + TMA + PN\]_v

The theme vowel does not appear in the surface representations.
of certain forms because it is deleted by the morphological rule of Truncation, which can be stated for present purposes as:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[[...Theme V] + V ...]} \rightarrow \text{Verb} \\
&\quad \rightarrow \emptyset \\
&\text{Examples of the operation of this rule are:}
\end{align*}
\]

1 sing. pres. ind. 1 pl. pres. subj.

\[
\begin{align*}
&[[\text{trabaj} + a] + o] \\
&\quad \downarrow \\
&\text{trabaj} \emptyset + o
\end{align*}
\]

1 pl. pres. subj.

\[
\begin{align*}
&[[\text{trabaj} + a] + e + \text{mos}] \\
&\quad \downarrow \\
&\text{trabaj} \emptyset + e + \text{mos}
\end{align*}
\]

Incidentally, the estémos form is explained as not having epenthetic e in the systematic phonemic representation when stress assignment takes place. Note that non-standard Spanish sometimes omits the 1st syllable: tá for está, taba for estaba etc. (e.g. Navarro 1948).

11. This is so not only in American Spanish (e.g. Rosenblat 1946:221; Navarro 1948:127) but also in Spain (e.g. for Leonese, Alonso Garrote, 1947:79).

12. Rosenblat (1946:222) quotes Vizcayan henos for hemos from a description of 1892. García de Diego (1959:165) quotes topabános for Asturian, alongside íbanos, tábanos. Zamora Vicente (1967) seems to suggest that parabánus and andabánus are used in Leonese in the Órbigo region; this information has been inserted only in his second edition and the reference is obscure. I have so far found no independent evidence of such forms.

13. The connection between Tuscan (and standard) 3p.pl. -no ending, of uncertain origin, and the Old Tuscan apparently homophonous 1p. pl. ending is obscure. The -no 1p.pl. ending survives in some Tuscan dialectal speech: in Lucchese in the pres. indic. the accent falls on the surface penultimate, -ño, in the 1p.pl. and on the antepenultimate in the 3p. pl. -ño; the imperf. ind. contrasts 1p.pl. -dúvino with 3p.pl. -dúvino etc. Pieri (1886) suggests that 1p.pl. -no is an enclitic personal pronoun attached to an apocopated form: i.e. facciamo > facciam > facciano.

14. The dialect of isolated Peisla constitutes an apparent exception. Badía's 1944 investigation of Aragonese was followed in 1947 by a more intensive one of this dialect, which at that time was spoken habitually only by the old, with middle-aged people using Castilian lexicon with dialectal morphology in their dialect speech (the young had only passive knowledge). The dialect had been in contact with Castilian only since 1920: the villages had been destroyed and the population evacuated to France during the Civil War but all had returned and the population numbered some 800 at the time of Badía's investigation. The proparoxytonic 1p.pl. forms are found only in irregular verbs: íbanos (imperf. ind. ír); hábanos (imperf. ind. haber); yéranos (imperf. ind. ser) / imperf. subj. ínos, hénos, yéanos. Otherwise the 1p.pl. imperf. ind. and imperf. subj. forms are
identical, with penultimate stress: sacånos, meténos, partínos etc. The -nos ending regularly appears in this ending and nowhere else (cf. e.g. pres. ind. sacómıos, metémıs, partımıs; pret. and pres.subj. sacémıos; metémıs / metámıs; partémıs / partámıs. A generativist would have no difficulty in explaining e.g. sacånos as a surface form matching underlying imperf. ind. /sacabanos/ (cf. sacáb- in the rest of the paradigm) and imperf. subj. /sacásanos/ (cf. sacás- likewise). What is extraordinary about Badía's data is that they show amazing homogeneity: the variant hábanos is registered once for imperf. ind. hábanos and occasionally tentános is found for imperf. ind. tenénos. Badía concludes that -nos is a mark of the imperfect, maintained with great consistency by los baléstanes viejos. It does not appear to be linked to surface stress, which is uniformly placed on the penultimate syllable except in the pret. fut. and cond. singular and 2p.pl., and in the 2p.pl. pres. ind. It is to be noted that Badía says the stress is strong and that syncope of unstressed vowels is frequent, and also that Castilian proparoxytons often appear as paroxytons, though with a good deal of vacillation.

15. At Benasque the imperf. ind. and subj. 1 sg. -a and 3 sg. -e are matched by 1p.pl. -an and 3p.pl. -en in many verbs.

16. Kuhn (1935) used as his informant for Hecho a 35-year-old 'maestro nacional y oficial 1° de la Secretaría del Ayuntamiento de Hecho'. Most of his other informants were in the 50-60 age group, with occupation designated 'labrador'. Apart from the frequent Hecho use of -nos in the imperf. ind. and subj. Kuhn quotes only one example from another locality: tenébanos at Torla where the informant was a 77-year-old shepherd.

17. E.g. Pienso que si yo estaría en algún apuro como si un vecino mío estaría en un apuro, haría lo imposible por salvarlo 'I think that if I were in a spot of trouble just as if one of my neighbours were in a spot of trouble, I would do the impossible to save him.' Si tuviera dinero y podría [pudiera] comprar una casa, sería muy feliz. (Cf. Si tuviera ... podría ... y sería...) 'If I had money and could buy a house, I'd be very happy.

18. I use the labels "-RA", "-SE" and "-RÍA" referring to cognate forms in other languages.

(AMAV)"-ERAT" pluperf. ind. → "-RA" conditional
(AMAV)"-ISSAT" plup. subj. → "-SE" subj.
Future stem + past ending → "-RÍA" conditional

19. E.g. ¿Si yo no creería en Dios, qué hago?

〈+CONTR〉

+NEG

(cf.fn 17) Si yo estaría...

〈-CONTR〉

-NEG

20. E.g. (pres. ind.) Si me ofrecen un sueldo de 400.000 pesos, ahora lo aceptaría 'If I were offered 400.000 pesos pay, then I'd accept.'
21. Similar usage is attested in Spain. Espinosa 1930b points out that it is frequent in the popular speech of Burgos.

22. For 'unreal' conditions Green (1972:84) on the other hand suggests that it is the protasis that is governed by an abstract verb [COND] (e.g. [I think probable that] COMP). If both clauses were seen to be governed by abstract verbs, e.g.

\[
\text{[let us imagine]} \ldots \ldots \text{[we conclude ]}
\]
\[
\text{COMP expect suppose etc COMP}
\]

it would be easier to understand the parallelism of treatment. The unreal conditional sentence is surely unlike other complex sentences in that the apodosis can be considered a 'main clause' or 'matrix sentence' only by straining its semantics. It is perhaps better viewed as a kind of co-ordinated sentence. However we must always bear in mind that the 'unreal condition' label covers a host of semantic sins (cf. e.g. Nutting 1925).

23. The use of the imperfect indicative in standard French unreal si clauses has sometimes been ascribed to Occitan influence. Old Provençal certainly showed a preference for it though the "RIA" form is very occasionally found even in the literary language--curiously enough, especially in Italian troubadours' work (Henrichsen 1955). However, modern dialects sometimes show preference for the "RIA" form: Gévaudan, cf. Camproux 1954; for modern Occitan in general, cf. Lafont 1967 ('not unknown'). Use of the "RIA"-rait form in French is often, incomprehensibly, ascribed to interference from another language -- in Canada, to English; in North Africa, to Spanish, and in Belgium, to Flemish (similar usage in New York City English is often said to be due to Yiddish influence, equally incomprehensibly). That Sardinians speaking Italian use similar forms can be linked to the Sardinian dialect use of parallel periphrastic conditionals in both protasis and apodosis, but the use is attested also in other Italian regional forms.

24. It is to be noted that even in languages where parallelism is not standard for si-conditions, where si is not used a parallelism is permitted: e.g. Vous auriez un moment que je vous expliquerai tout. García de Diego 1950 suggests that the tendency towards rhythmic parallelism in conditional sentences is universal. Wagner 1939 sees the tendency as an intrusion of logic into grammatical usage.
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