

The Galician Inflected Infinitive and the Theory of UG

Víctor Manuel Longa

Universidade de Santiago de Compostela and Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

In this paper, I will focus on the properties of the Galician Inflected Infinitive (henceforth, GII). I argue, against Raposo (1987), that the behaviour of the Inflected Infinitive in Portuguese and Galician is not the same. I will contend that all the GII structures are full CPs. Another important property of Galician, closely related to the existence of the Inflected Infinitive, is that agreement with non-finite forms is not restricted to the infinitival form: the gerund can also bear agreement. The analysis of Inflected Infinitive constructions as CPs will be extended to the inflected gerund.

1. Introduction

Although the linguistic tradition is full of references to the Galician-Portuguese domain, the study of its linguistic properties has been actually focused mostly on Portuguese. Thus, the study of Galician has been always subsidiary to the study of Portuguese. The same applies to the study of the Inflected Infinitive in the referred area: although this phenomenon exists in both languages, the Galician Inflected Infinitive has been described as showing the same principles governing the Portuguese Inflected Infinitive (henceforth, PII). Within the GB framework, the situation has not changed at all: for instance, Raposo (1987:92 fn 9) claims that the properties of the Inflected Infinitive in both languages are presumably the same.

In this paper, I shall focus on (some of) the main properties of the GII, with special reference to the characteristics in which both languages differ. Although the properties of the Inflected Infinitive in both languages are not expected to be extremely different, GII shows some properties that differ substantially from PII.

This paper is organized as follows: in section 2 general data of GII are presented, showing the main differences observed in relation with the Portuguese phenomenon. In section 3, Raposo's analysis will be briefly presented. Sections 4 and 5 will provide an analysis of the GII appearing as subject clause and as subcategorized complement, respectively. In section 6 the structure of the Inflected Infinitive introduced by a preposition will be analyzed, and some aspects related to clitics will be briefly discussed. Section 7 presents an analysis of the Galician Inflected Gerund, and finally, in section 8 some general conclusions will be pointed out.

2. The GII Data

Both in Galician and in Portuguese, the Infl(ection) element of infinitives is not specified for Tense distinctions, but it may be specified for Agr(eement) distinctions.¹ The Agr-markers in Galician are essentially the same than the ones in Portuguese, abstracting from some phonetical differences:

(1)	1	eu ter+Ø	nós ter+mos
		I have-INF	we have-INF+1pl
	2	ti ter+es	vós ter+des
		you have-INF+2sg	you have-INF+2pl
	3	el ter+Ø ²	eles ter+en
		s/he have-INF	they have-INF+3pl

¹ Usually, an infinitival form is neither specified for tense distinctions nor for Agr distinctions. Thus, as Raposo (1987:93-4) points out, the Inflected Infinitive is an extremely rare combination with respect to the options that Universal Grammar offers.

² As Gondar (1978:26) points out, in some dialects of Galician first and third person singular end in -e.

2.1. Some general restrictions on the occurrence of the GII are not different to the ones that apply in Portuguese according to Raposo (1987:87): GII cannot appear as an independent clause nor a matrix clause.

- (2) a. *Eles arranaxaren o muiño.
they arrange-INF-3pl the mill
b. *Eles admitiren chegar onte.
they admite-INF-3pl arrive-INF yesterday
c. É doado supoñeren as cousas.
is easy suppose-INF-3pl the things
'It is easy that they suppose the things.'
d. *É doado que supoñeren as cousas.
is easy that suppose-INF-3pl the things

Thus, the GII structures are only possible as embedded clauses, but without a complementizer, as the contrast (2c,d) shows.

2.2. More specifically, the contexts in which GII can appear are very much the same as PII, but with some differences in certain contexts that we are going to examine in next sections.

2.2.1. *Subject Clauses.* In this context, a preverbal subject is not possible in Galician, in clear contrast with Portuguese,³ where the preverbal position for the subject is the canonical choice:

³ And in contrast with what happens in Galician in the sentences introduced by a preposition, where preverbal subjects are possible (cfr. *infra*).

- (3) a. Non está claro aprobármolo exame.⁴
 not is clear pass-INF-1pl-the exam
- b. Será difícil eles aprovarem a proposta.⁵ (Portuguese)
 be-FUT-3sg difficult they approve-INF-3pl the proposal
- c. *Non está claro nós aprobármola proposta. (Galician)
 not is clear we approve-INF-1pl-the proposal

2.2.2. *Complements Subcategorized by Certain Predicates.* PII is allowed with matrix epistemic, declarative, and factive verbs, but GII can only appear in the subcategorization context of declarative verbs.⁶ This is shown below:

2.2.2.1. Epistemic Verbs:

- (4) a. Eu penso terem os deputados trabalhado pouco. (Portuguese)
 I think-1sg have-INF-3pl the deputies worked little

⁴ In contrast with Portuguese, the subject clause may be placed at the beginning of the sentence in Galician:

- (i) Aprobármolo exame non está claro.
 pass-INF-1pl-the exam not is clear

On the other hand, as regards (3) and similar examples, it must be observed that in Galician the definite article cliticizes onto the verb, depending on some phonetical conditions (i.e., when the verbal form finishes in *-s* or *-r*). For this reason, this cliticization should not be confounded with the infinitival *Agr* affix.

⁵ The Portuguese data have been taken from Raposo (1987).

⁶ The use of GII in this kind of constructions is much more restricted than in Portuguese.

- (4) b. *Xoan pensa xantaren os pais moito.⁷ (Galician)
 Xoan thinks eat-INF-1pl the parents a-lot

2.2.2.2. Factive Verbs:

- (5) a. Eu lamento os deputados terem trabalhado pouco. (Portuguese)
 I regret-1sg the deputies have INF-3pl worked little
 b. *Lamentei traballaren os meus amigos. (Galician)
 regreted-1sg work-INF-3pl the my friends

2.2.2.3. Declarative Verbs:

- (6) a. Eu afirmo terem os deputados trabalhado pouco. (Portuguese)
 I claim-1sg have-INF-3pl the deputies worked little
 b. O mestre afirmou facérmo-las cousas. (Galician)
 the teacher claimed-3sg make-INF-1pl-the things

2.2.2.4. Portuguese epistemic and declarative verbs do not allow the subject of the Inflected Infinitive to appear in preverbal position, while factive matrix verbs allow both preverbal and postverbal position. In Galician, the Inflected Infinitive appearing in subcategorized complements of declarative verbs does not allow preverbal subjects neither, as exemplified in (7):

- (7) a. *O mestre afirmou os nenos faceren as cousas.
 the teacher claimed-3sg the boys make-INF-3pl the things
 b. O mestre afirmou faceren os nenos as cousas.

⁷ A few speakers of Galician may accept this kind of construction, but this choice is clearly marginal and it must be related to contact between Galician and Portuguese.

2.2.3. *Adjunct and Predicative Clauses:*

- (8) a. Fixérono para traballaren ledos.
 made-3pl-3sgAcc for work-INF-3pl happy
 b. Isto non é para te recollereres.
 this not is for yourself retire-INF-2sg

Subjects of infinitival adjuncts and predicative clauses appear usually in postverbal position, but they can also appear in preverbal position:

- (9) Pra ti sanares téñenche que levar de meia noite.⁸
 for you cure-INF-2sg have-INF-2sgAcc that carry-INF by mid night
 'If you want to cure you have to be carried in the midnight.'

As we will see below, this is possible because of the prepositional status of the construction.

2.2.4. *Infinitives Subcategorized by N or A:*

- (10) a. Admitiu o feito de faceren a tarefa.
 admite-PAST-3sg the fact of make-INF-3pl the task
 b. Estados desexosos de rematárde-lo traballo.
 are anxious about finish-INF-2pl-the job

In the examples of (10), a dummy preposition must be introduced in order to license these constructions because N and A cannot assign structural Case to their complement.⁹

⁸ Taken from Gondar (1978:64).

⁹ Infinitives do not need Case in any language, but in section 3 we will see that, in Raposo's framework, Case assignment to the infinitive is crucial to license constructions with inflected infinitives.

2.3. As for the position of clitics, some important differences can be found between Galician and Portuguese, as we can see in these examples:

- (11) a. de nos entenderdes / *de entendédesnos (Portuguese)
 if 1plAcc understand-INF-2pl if understand-INF-2pl-1plAcc
 b. de nos entenderdes / de entendédesnos (Galician)

Enclisis is not possible in this context in Portuguese (cf. Benucci (1992)), but both enclisis and proclisis are allowed in Galician.

3. Raposo's Analysis

3.1. I will adopt the main points of the analysis offered by Raposo (1987). In Raposo's view, the existence of the Inflected Infinitive is due to the interaction of two parameters: the Infl parameter and the null subject parameter.

3.1.1. *The Infl Parameter.* This author states that, in many languages, if Infl is finite, then it is specified for Agr, and that if Infl is specified for Agr, then it is finite.

However, this does not hold for Galician nor Portuguese, because in both languages an infinitival Infl may be specified for overt Agr distinctions. Thus, in many languages, if Agr is overtly specified, the choice of [\pm Tense] is predicted not to be free, but in Galician and Portuguese the choice is actually free.

3.1.2. *The Null Subject Parameter.* According to Chomsky (1982), Agr may be specified for Case in the pro-drop languages. The central hypothesis of Raposo derives from this assertion:

"In the absence of [+Tense], Infl (or Agr in Infl) is capable of assigning nominative Case to a lexical subject only if it is itself specified for Case." (Raposo (1987:92))

3.2. Raposo analyzes subject clauses and the complements of factive verbs, with subject-verb order, as bare IPs, without a CP level: the matrix Infl governs and assigns Case to the embedded Infl. For factive with verb-subject order, epistemic, and declarative constructions he proposes a CP structure: the Infl element of the matrix verb cannot govern the embedded Infl, and, consequently, cannot assign Case to it, because CP constitutes a barrier. However, following Belletti and Rizzi (1981), Raposo assumes that a maximal projection is not an absolute barrier in the sense that an element outside it can govern its specifier and head positions. In the case of CP structures, V governs the head of CP; therefore, if the embedded Infl raises to C, it will be governed and assigned Case features. Thus, Infl-to-Comp raising is the crucial proposal of Raposo's analysis.¹⁰

3.3. As I have already mentioned, I will adopt the essentials of this analysis, but I will assume that all GI structures are full CPs. Each case will be briefly analyzed in the next sections.

¹⁰ There are, however, some problems concerning the status of the subcategorized structures in Raposo's framework. Galves (1991) points out some of these problems, but she does not address all of them. In my view, the main problem of Raposo's conception is that his analysis depends excessively on the position of the subject. The double option IP/CP is unelegant in order to explain the double possibility allowed by factive verbs. For a similar conception to the one offered in this paper, see Hye-suk Yoon and Bonet-Farrán (1988), where all the non-nominal infinitival constructions are analyzed as CPs.

4. The Structure of GII as Subject Clauses

Consider (3a), repeated here as (12):

- (12) Non está claro aprobármolo exame.¹¹
not is clear pass-INF-1pl-the exam

(13) is part of the structural representation of (12):

- (13) non está claro [CP [C' [C aprobármolos] [IP pro [I' [I t_I] [VP t_I o exame]]]]]

In this S-structure representation, V, generated in the VP node, has raised to the head position of IP, picking up the features of Infl in this way. But this movement is not enough, because the embedded Infl is not governed in and it can not receive Case in that position. For this reason, [V+I] must raise further to the head of CP. In this position, the embedded Infl will be governed and assigned Case features by the matrix Infl (cf. Belletti and Rizzi (1981), Rizzi (1982), Chomsky (1986), Raposo (1987)). As a consequence, the embedded Infl will be able to assign Case to its lexical subject (if present). If V does not raise to the C position, the embedded Infl will not be governed nor assigned Case, and therefore, will not be able to assign Case to its lexical subject. Of course, the embedded Infl could be governed by V if an IP is postulated, but the structure with a bare IP would not explain the verb-subject order.¹²

It must be noted that the analysis presented here does not disagree with the one supported by Raposo, who suggests that the CP projection causes the verb-subject order. However, Raposo's analysis is empirically incomplete in the view of the Galician data, and, therefore, not really valid for the GII. The analysis presented here applies only to GII, not to PII. For this reason, here we do not pursue a unified approach to the subject PII (subject-verb order) and to

¹¹ As was said before, preverbal subjects are not allowed in this context (cf. (3e)).

¹² I assume that the subject appears in the [Spec,IP] position.

the GII (verb-subject order). A detailed discussion of this unified interpretation is beyond the scope of this paper.

5. The Structure of GII as Subcategorized Complements

Consider the structure of (6b), repeated here as (14):

- (14) O mestre afirmou facérmo-las cousas.
 the teacher claim-PAST-3sg make-INF-1pl-the things

The S-structure of (14) is represented in (15):

- (15) o mestre afirmou [CP [C' [C facermos_I] [IP pro [_I [_I t'_I] [VP t_I as cousas]]]]]

The analysis I propose for (14) is the same as for the GII appearing in subject sentences. The embedded V+Infl must raise to the C position, because in that position it will be governed and, thus, it will get Case features. Note that, as in section 4, to postulate an IP projection for these structures is clearly not enough. If such a projection is postulated, IP and I could be governed by V, but then there would be no explanation for the impossibility of the subject-verb order. For this reason, a bare IP analysis would not account for the obligatory verb-subject order.

This analysis fully agrees again with the one offered by Raposo for PII as subcategorized complements with declarative verbs.

6. The Structure of Preposition + Inflected Infinitive

6.1. This construction is the most common among those in which GII appears, and it is the only context in which a subject can appear in preverbal position, as the examples in (16) show:

- (16) a. De os nenos faceren o seu labor bicareinos.
 of the boys make-INF-3pl the their job kiss-FUT-1sg-3plAcc
 'If the boys make their job, I will kiss them.'
 b. De faceren os nenos o seu labor bicareinos.¹³

6.2. Several questions arise in connection to the P + Inflected Infinitive constructions:

- (i) the categorial status: IP vs. CP
- (ii) the position of the subject
- (iii) the position of the clitics: enclisis vs. proclisis

These three questions are undoubtedly related.

At first glance, it could be proposed, considering only the relative position of the verb and the subject in each case, that the projection of the infinitive is an IP in (16a) and a CP in (16b):

- (16) a. De os nenos faceren...
 b. De faceren os nenos...

(16a) could be analyzed as not containing a CP projection, because the subject-verb order suggests that [V+Inf] is not in C. It seems that there would be no apparent reason for the

¹³ The preverbal subject is not possible in temporal adjunct clauses, as (i) shows:

- (i) a. O saíren elas eu xantei.
 to-the go-out-INF-3pl they I ate
 'When they went out I ate.'
 b. *O elas saíren eu xantei.

I assume the analysis offered by Rigau (1992) to explain the ungrammaticality of this constructions. Although her analysis is referred to Spanish, it may be perfectly extended to Galician.

raising of the subject to [Spec,CP] but later on we shall see that there is actually some motivation. In (16b), however, it can be maintained that raising of Infl to C takes place. Thus, Agr gets specified for Case features, and, therefore, it can assign Case to the lexical subject.

6.3. However, if we follow the hypothesis suggested for the example (16a), one problem arises: Benucci (1992) proposes an analysis for the equivalent constructions in Portuguese based on the possibility of contracting the preposition with the article. There are many instances of contraction in this language. I will adopt some ideas developed in Benucci (1992) and adapt them for Galician. According to Benucci's proposal, the analysis of (16b) as a P + IP projection would predict the possibility of contracting. However, this is not possible in Galician, unlike in Portuguese. Consider (17):

- (17) a. De as cousas continuaren así, teremos medo.
of the things continue-INF-3pl in-this-way have-FUT-1pl fear
'If the things continue in this way, we will have fear.'
- a'. *Das cousas continuaren ...
of-the things continue-INF-3pl
- b. De os problemas considerárense, iraste.
of the problems considered-INF-3pl go-FUT-2sg
'If the problems are considered, you will go.'
- b'. *Dos problemas considerárense ...
of-the problems considered-INF-3pl
- c. De o neno vir, chorarei.
of the boy came-INF cry-FUT-1sg
'If the boy came, I will cry.'
- c'. *Do neno vir ...
of-the boy came-INF-3sg

This generalization extends to the rest of prepositions capable of being contracted with the article in an appropriate context. For instance, *por* ('by') can be generally contracted with the definite article *o* ('the') as in *polo*, but not in the context under consideration:

- (18) a. Por os nenos viren, dareiche un premio.
 because the boys come-INF-3pl giveFUT-1sg-2sgAcc a prize
 b. *Polos nenos viren ...

The impossibility of having the contraction seems to lead us to two considerations:

(i) In Galician, P does not seem to be CP-internal, in the sense of Kayne (1991) and Benucci (1992). The latter assumes Kayne's analysis, according to which P occupies the specifier position of the infinitival CP in certain cases, in order to account for the fact that contraction is possible, under certain specific conditions.¹⁴ In Galician, as I have already mentioned, contraction is not possible. This suggests that the preposition in the above examples is a true preposition generated outside CP.

(ii) The impossibility of contraction raises the question of whether we can analyze the infinitive as a bare IP when the subject-verb order is present. If we did, there would be no way of ruling out contraction, following Rizzi (1990) and Benucci (1992). For this reason, it seems that when the subject-verb order is present, the construction must be analyzed as a full CP, not as a bare IP.

¹⁴ A CatWPL anonymous reviewer has pointed out to me the theoretical problems derived from Kayne's assumption; according to standard X' theory, a head cannot be in specifier position, but in head position. And so, the reviewer suggests that when P is contractable, P could occur in head position, but not in specifier position. However, in spite of the problems derived from the X' structure, I will maintain P in specifier position, because both orders — subject-verb and verb-subject — are possible. Otherwise, in order to explain the double order, two possibilities should be pointed out: (i) P would be in head position in subject-verb order, and (ii) P would occur in specifier position in verb-subject order. It must be noted that in the latter case it is not possible for P to occupy the head C because this position is occupied by V, resulting from Infl-to-Comp raising.

6.4. For infinitive constructions with verb-subject order it seems adequate to propose a CP projection, for reasons already seen: P + CP. In the case of subject-verb order the simplest hypothesis is that both elements are placed inside the IP projection, but I will assume that this IP is embedded in a CP because of the impossibility of contraction: if P were inside the CP projection, we would not expect anything preventing contraction. Two options are available to account for the phenomenon:

(i) If we assume the D(eterminer) P(hrase) hypothesis, that is, if we postulate that the infinitive is a DP projection, the explanation would be similar to the one proposed by Rizzi and Benucci: there would be two barriers, CP and DP, that prevent contraction.

(ii) If the DP hypothesis is not assumed, the crucial factor for the (im)possibility of having contraction is the presence of two nodes, CP and IP, as opposed to the presence of only one node, IP, when contraction is possible, as in Portuguese. The second option, the presence of only an IP node, seems to be excluded by the Galician data.

In any event, both analyses suppose the existence of a CP projection.¹⁵

¹⁵ A CatWPL anonymous reviewer points out to me that if the preposition is outside CP it is hard to find a governing element to I unless I raises to CP. It is worth noticing that if subject raising to [Spec,CP] and V raising to C are proposed we can give an account for the subject-verb order, but we wrongly predict that contraction should be permitted. We can try two different solutions to the problem. The first one is based on the idea that the preposition governs IP by induction, as Benucci suggests in order to account for similar government processes. The second one, more attractive and pointed out to me by G. Lorenzo, consists in proposing the presence of a modal operator in C, responsible for the conditional value of the preposition in this construction, in such a way that the conditional value reaches the preposition through movement of the operator to P. Once this movement has applied, the original governing domain of C becomes part of the governing domain of the preposition, as an instantiation of the Governing Transparency Corollary of Baker.

"A lexical category which has an item incorporated into it governs everything which the incorporated item governed in its original structural position." (Baker (1988:64))

6.5. We have seen before that contraction is not possible in Galician in this context. However, a remarkable exception must be tackled: I have exemplified the impossibility of contracting P and the article in cases such as the following ones:

- (19) *de as nenas sanaren*
of the girls cure-INF-3pl

But consider now examples like (20):

- (20) a. *antes de as nenas sanaren*
before of the girls cure-INF-3pl
b. *antes das nenas sanaren*
before of-the girls cure-INF-3pl

In (20b) contraction is perfectly possible. So, it seems that in this case, the preposition *de* ('of') is not outside CP, but inside it. The particle *antes* ('before') would act as a true preposition. Therefore, Kayne's and Benucci's proposals that some Romance prepositions are CP-internal, occupying the [Spec,CP] position, seems to be right. The preposition *de* will be inside CP, and contraction is possible. (21) is the structure of (20b):

- (21) [pp antes [CP d(e) [IP as nenas [_i [_i sanaren_i] [VP t_i]]]]]

Following Benucci, the IP projection does not count as a barrier because the particle governs it by induction.¹⁶

¹⁶ In this case the modal operator does not need to be postulated because the true preposition *antes* conveys a clear temporal meaning by itself, and *de* occupies the specifier position. It is worth noticing that the anteposition of the subject is possible in this case, contrary to what we saw in fn 13. This must be related to the presence of two particles, one inside CP and the other outside it.

6.6. As was said in section 2, the clitics appearing in the GII constructions show much more mobility than in the Portuguese equivalent constructions. In Galician the canonical position for clitics in these structures is the enclitic position: V + clitic, unlike Portuguese. Consider (22):

- (22) a. de nos encontrarmos¹⁷ (Portuguese)
 of 1plAcc meet-INF-1pl
 a'. *de encontrámonos
 b. de nos atoparmos (Galician)
 of 1plAcc meet-INF-1pl
 b'. de atopámonos
 c. de o faceren (Galician)
 of 3sgAcc make-INF-3pl

Therefore, the double possibility, enclisis and proclisis, is allowed in Galician. These data are relevant to the question of the status of prepositions and its relation with cliticization, as I will show.

In Benucci's view, full prepositions may be assimilated to the *que* ('that') complementizer, but this is not possible in Galician. If strong prepositions were really complementizers, we would expect proclisis, not enclisis. For reasons that we will see directly, clitics offer evidence that P does not occupy the first position of the clause because the canonical position is enclisis, not proclisis. (23) shows the inexistence of parallelisms between P and the complementizer:

- (23) a. Penso que Xoan o magullou (vs. *magullouno).
 think-1sg that Xoan 3sgAcc scratch-PAST-3sg scratch-PAST-3sg-3sgAcc
 b. Pensamos para facérmolo.
 think-1pl for make-INF-1pl-3sgAcc

¹⁷ The Portuguese data have been taken from Benucci (1992).

If P and the complementizer were really equivalent, we would not expect enclisis in (23b). However, if we assume that P is generated outside the CP projection, and if, according to Benucci, clitics have to occupy the second position inside CP, then we can account for the enclisis facts:

- (24) a. ... [CP que o fagan
 1st. 2nd
 b. ... para [CP facéren-o]¹⁸
 1st. 2nd

7. The Galician Inflected Gerund

7.1. The last characteristic of Galician I would like to refer to in this paper is that the possibility of having [+Agr] with [-Tense] is not restricted to the infinitive. The gerund may also have full agreement with its lexical subject. This agreement is phonetically realized in less forms of the verbal paradigm than it is in the infinitival form. The paradigm is offered in (25):

- | | | | |
|------|---|---------------|------------------|
| (25) | 1 | eu cantando+Ø | nós cantando+mos |
| | | I singing | we singing+1pl |
| | 2 | ti cantando+Ø | vós cantando+des |
| | | you singing | you singing+2pl |
| | 3 | el cantando+Ø | eles cantando+Ø |
| | | s/he singing | they singing |

¹⁸ Benucci presents empirical evidence on the double possibility in Portuguese, enclisis and proclisis, but only when an adverb is placed between both elements, clitic and P. He thinks the adverb is transparent, and for this reason, proclisis is allowed. In Galician, as we have seen, we can have proclisis quite independently of the presence of any intervening element. In proclisis, the clitic would climb to the left of V element, being adjoined to it.

On the other hand, this hypothesis cannot explain examples like (22b). At the present stage, I have no consistent explanation for this example.

Consider these two examples:

- (26) a. Cantándodes así, gañaréde-lo premio.
 singing-2pl in-this-way win-FUT-2sg-the prize
 b. Téndonos paciencia pasará todo.
 having-1pl patience finish-FUT-3sg everything

In (26a,b) there is no lexical subject. The following examples show that preverbal subjects are not possible:¹⁹

¹⁹ A preverbal subject is possible in certain cases, like the following one offered to me by C. Folgar:

- (i) Nós traballando e vós cantando.
 we working and you singing

The use of the Galician Inflected Gerund (henceforth, GIG) is not possible in these sentences (cf. Longa (1993)), as this example shows:

- (ii) *Nós traballándonos e vós cantándodes.

Furthermore, structures like (i) can not be inserted in a matrix sentence, as opposed to example (28). In the sentence considered in this footnote, the Aux element has been deleted, but the crucial point is not deletion in itself but the fact that such a deletion is incomplete. In spite of the absence of the Aux element, some of its features remain inert, mainly agreement. We can explain in this way the impossibility of the presence of the Inflected Gerund. The structure (ii) is made ungrammatical by the presence of the agreement feature because it violates a basic condition of the Galician and Portuguese non-personal inflected forms, which determines the ungrammaticality of a structure like (iii):

- (iii) *...Z...X-Agr Y-Agr...W...

where Z and W are in the place of variables, X is a finite verb and Y is a non personal form, as in (iv):

- (iv) *Queremos cantarmos.
 want-1pl sing-INF-1pl

With a postverbal subject these restrictions disappear because the Aux element has not been generated.

- (27) a. *Vós cantándodes así, gañaréde-lo premio.
 you singing-2pl in-this-way win-FUT-2sg-the prize
 b. *Nós téndomos paciencia pasará todo.
 we having-1pl patience finish-FUT-3sg everything

Only subjects in postverbal position are allowed:

- (28) a. Cantándodes vós así, gañaréde-lo premio.
 singing-2pl you in-this-way win-FUT-2sg-the prize
 b. Téndomos nós paciencia pasará todo.
 having-1pl we patience finish-FUT-3sg everything

The explanation for the examples of (28) is quite similar to the one proposed for the case of the Inflected Infinitive with verb-subject order. The structure of (28a) is represented in (29):

- (29) [CP [C' [C cantándodes_I] [IP vós [I' [I t'_I] [VP t_I]]]]] ...

As in the case of infinitives, the proposal of an IP projection would allow Infl to be governed, according to Raposo's Case theory, but it would not give an account for the verb-subject order. So, V must raise to Comp after passing through I. In its final placement, V is governed by the matrix Infl. This element assigns Case features to the verb in such a way that Agr will be able to assign Case to the lexical subject. The Infl-to-Comp approach is once more the most plausible analysis.

8. Conclusions

The analysis of the data offered in this paper support the claim that, although GII and PII are not extremely different phenomena, they differ in some crucial properties like the basic order (subject-verb vs. verb-subject), the position of clitics, the levels of projection in the structures,

and so on. Moreover, it has been shown that given the existence of enclisis and the impossibility of contraction with the article, Galician prepositions seem to be true prepositions. These facts show that Galician prepositions do not occupy the [Spec,C] position, against Kayne's analysis for some Romance prepositions.²⁰

It has also been shown that agreement can manifest overtly not only in the infinitive but also with gerund forms.

One of the main objectives of this paper is to defend the idea that all structures with non finite inflected forms should be analyzed as CPs, not as IPs. So, we have found further evidence for Kayne's (1991) proposal about the CP nature of infinitival complements of a V, and we have unified the structures of infinitives and gerunds. On the one hand, Raposo establishes an automatic relation between Infl-to-Comp raising and the existence of a CP structure, that result in the verb-subject order, and, on the other hand, between the lack of Infl-to-Comp raising and the absence of a CP projection in the cases of subject-verb order. This kind of automatic relation is not plausible for Galician: although there is no Infl-to-Comp movement in the cases with an Inflected Infinitive introduced by P and with subject-verb order, the relevant structure has been shown not to be an IP but a CP. Summing up, Galician grammar chooses inherently a CP structure in all the cases with non finite inflected forms, independently of the subject-verb/verb-subject order.

The hypothesis developed in this paper should be applied also to the PII. However, as it has been mentioned before, to undertake this task is beyond the scope of these pages.

²⁰ As we have seen, there are some cases in which contraction is possible, but in those cases P occupies a position outside CP in such a way that another preposition can stay in [Spec,C]. Therefore, when only one preposition is present it must occupy the position of a true P.

• This is an extended version of a paper presented at the II Workshop on the Syntax of Central Romance Languages, Barcelona, May, 1993. The beginning of this research was supported by a grant of the Xunta de Galicia that made possible my stay as visiting scholar in the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. I would like to thank the comments on an earlier version of this paper offered by F. D'Introno (University of Massachusetts at Amherst), M.L. Hernanz (UAB), T. Jiménez Juliá (Universidade de Santiago), G. Rigau (UAB), and a CatWPL anonymous reviewer. I am specially indebted to G. Lorenzo (Universidad de Oviedo and MIT) for his comments and his help.

References

- Baker, M. (1988) *Incorporation. A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.
- Belletti, A. and L. Rizzi (1981) 'The syntax of *ne*: Some Theoretical Implications', *The Linguistic Review* 1, 117-154.
- Benucci, F. (1992) 'Prepositional Particles and the Portuguese Personal Infinitive', *WPL University of Venice*, 1-20.
- Chomsky, N. (1982) *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, N. (1986) *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Galves, C. (1991) 'Inflected Infinitive and Agr Licensing', ms. Universidade de Campinas.
- Gondar, F. G. (1978) *O infinitivo conxugado en galego*, Universidade de Santiago, Santiago de Compostela.
- Hye-suk Yoon, J. and N. Bonet-Farrán (1988) 'The Ambivalent Nature of Spanish Infinitives', ms. University of Chicago.
- Kayne, R. S. (1991) 'Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO', *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 647-686.

- Longa, V. M. (1993) 'Gerundios gallegos, posición de sujetos y concordancia', paper presented at the XXIII Symposium of the Sociedad Española de Lingüística, Lleida, december 1993.
- Raposo, E. (1987) 'Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese', *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 85-109.
- Rigau, G. (1992) 'Propiedades de Flex en las construcciones temporales de infinitivo: la legitimación del sujeto', ms. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Rizzi, L. (1982) *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, L. (1990) *Spiegazione e Teoria Grammaticale*, Unipress, Padova.

Praza Isabel a Católica, 2, 2ºE

E-36204 Vigo