LOST IN GRAMMAR: EXPLICATING A CRUCIAL CLAUSE IN GÓMEZ DE CASTRO'S LAST WILL[1]

K. ANIPA

Abstract. A lengthy debate on the authorship of the *Diálogo de la lengua*, a 16th-century commentary on the Castilian language, was eventually settled early last century, then confirmed by the discovery of the last will of a humanist, in which the work, together with its author, were mentioned. As if the protracted debate had exhausted scholars, virtually no research has since been done on the manuscript's early history, which has remained largely obscure. In the belief that the will could have more to offer than just confirming the *Diálogo*'s authorship, this study sets out to investigate a crucial clause in it, through systematic grammatical analyses, in order to determine how Gómez de Castro handled the manuscript, and how the clause can help expand current knowledge of the work's early circulation. It is hoped that the findings of the study and the implications thereof will be a valuable contribution to the field.

1. INTRODUCTION

In his introduction to the complete works of Juan the Valdés, Alcalá Galve (2006: xlii) describes the state of our knowledge about the early circumstances of the manuscript of the *Diálogo de la lengua* (hereafter "the *Diálogo*") as naught ("ignorancia […] total"):

> Como nuestra ignorancia respecto al modo como llegó [el manuscrito] a España y en ella o en Italia lo adquirió Alvar es total, queda la duda, añadiendo un elemento de misterio más no sólo a la personalidad, sino al escrito aparentemente más claro de Juan de Valdés.

It is possible to construe this strong statement as an indirect exhortation to scholars to continue investigating the subject. That notwithstanding, it appears that, after the protracted debate on the true author of the *Diálogo*, which raged from the time of its first publication as anonymous by Mayans y Siscar in 1737, intensified from the last decade of the 19th century, with the acrimonious duel between Cotarelo y Mori and Padre Miguélez, then eventually settled early in the 20th century, scholars seem to have taken the issue surrounding this manuscript as done and dusted.

[1] The larger research project that generated this article was funded with a grant provided by the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland.

RRL, **LV**, *1*, p. 3–18, Bucureşti, 2010

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

It must be added that, apart from authorship confirmation and whether the title of the manuscript bore "lengua" or "lenguas" having been conclusively settled, largely on the strength of the work of Cotarelo y Mori (1920), the icing on the cake came from an unexpected source: the discovery by San Román of the last will and testament of a 16th century Toledan humanist, Gómez de Castro. This is the way San Román (1928: 547−555) emphatically expressed the results:

> En mi concepto, después de la contundente argumentación del ilustre Cotarelo, son innecesarios mayores razonamientos demostrativos de que el autor del *Diálogo de la Lengua* fué Juan de Valdés; pero si alguno faltase, ahí está el testimonio valiosísimo de Alvar Gómez de Castro, diciéndonos que era de Valdés […] Nadie se atreverá desde ahora a pluralizar el título de la obra *de Valdés*, expresado con toda claridad por Alvar Gómez.

He proceeded to put forward a theory about the successive hands through which the manuscript must have passed during the course of the 16th century. It was an informative theory, which he himself characterized thus: "Aunque todas mis deducciones sobre este punto no pasan de hipótesis, son tan verosímiles que podrían aceptarse como hechos verdaderos" (554). Yet, a closer examination of Gómez de Castro's will suggests that a crucial piece of the evidence, which would have given the matter a different dimension, eluded San Román, and has eluded all attention so far. The aim of the present study, therefore, is to bring to light that piece of evidence, on the back of a systematic analysis based on relevant grammatical features from the will. The next section will present the source of evidence and the raw data for subsequent analysis; section 3 will carry out several levels of grammatical discussion; and the final section will consist of concluding remarks, in which the findings of the investigation will be stated, together with some of its immediate implications.

2. THE EVIDENCE

The epistemological status of the concept of evidence has been a matter of debate in philosophical circles over the centuries. The present work adopts the stance of the school of thought that conceptualizes evidence as a guide to truth, a sign, symptom or mark, as expressed in these words of Austin (1962, cited by the Kelly 2008:13):

> The situation in which I would properly be said to have *evidence* for the statement that some animal is a pig is that, for example, in which the beast itself is not actually on view, but I can see plenty of pig-like

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

> marks on the ground outside its retreat. If I find a few buckets of pig-food, that's a bit more evidence, and the noises and the smell may provide better evidence still. But if the animal then emerges and stands there plainly in view, there is no longer any question of collecting evidence; its coming into view doesn't provide me with more *evidence* that it's a pig, I can now just *see* that it is. (Original italics).

The relevant passage from Gómez de Castro's will, which contains the crucial clause under investigation, is as follows:

> Ansi mesmo la *Gramatica de Romançe de Antonio de Nebrija* quiero que se enquaderne con el *dialogo de valdes de la lengua española, q̄ tengo escrito de mano*, y que se ponga en la libreria de dicha sta yglesia, lo qual ella mandara enquadernar en tablas, pues es libro raro para guardarse alli, y si en esto oviere olvido, mando q̄, a mi costa se enquaderne y se ponga en el dicho lugar. (After San Román 1928; original italics).

It is obvious from this quotation that Gómez de Castro did have a manuscript of the *Diálogo* in his possession at some point; but the questions that San Román did not pose, most probably taking something for granted, are as follows:

(a) Did he only possess the manuscript, leaving no indication in the will of whoever wrote the copy that he referred to?

(b) Did he commission the copying of that manuscript?

(c) Did he copy it himself?[2]

These queries are at the heart of the present investigation. And the focus will be on the clause ", q̄ *tengo escrito de mano*,"[3] in the above quotation.

Although he did not investigate the language of the will *per se*, the conclusion that San Román arrived at about the will was one corresponding to question (a) above: based on his identification of seven marginal comments annotated on various folios of the earliest extant *Diálogo* manuscript (MS 8629) with the hand of Gómez de Castro, he concluded that this must have been the copy mentioned in the will.[4] None the less, not until we rule out queries (b) and (c)

[2] San Román did acknowledge that his analysis of the will was not exhaustive ("No creo haber apurado el análisis del documento", p. 547).

[3] For his publication, San Román made a diplomatic transcription of the will, maintaing abbreviations and overlining, capitalization, font style, errors or perceived errors – to which he appended the label "(sic)" – accentuation, etc. That being the case, there is no conceivable reason to doubt that he equally faithfully reproduced punctuation as well (but see an essential point in note 9). Therefore, the import of the preceding and following commas of the crucial clause (even without the larger construction), which I have expressly included (in line with Quirk, *et al*. 1985: 1258), cannot be overstated. In any case, these two commas are not an isolated usage in the will (see 3.5.1 below).

[4] Witness his "El manuscrito de la Nacional, antes de Alvar Gómez" (p. 554).

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

above, we cannot be certain that MS 8629 was precisely the copy that Gómez de Castro wanted bound together with Nebrija's grammar.

In this study, my proposition is that the *Diálogo* manuscript that he referred to was not MS 8629 held in the Biblioteca Nacional (and neither was it MS KIII.8 in El Escorial, nor MS 9939 in the British Library), but rather a copy that he had made from MS 8629, but which has since disappeared. This proposition is based on the meaning of the crucial clause indicated above. The next sections will be devoted to explaining that clause, with the help of other clauses and constructions, extracted from the will, used in similar grammatical contexts and with similar semantic contents,[5] as well as expressions that might provide contrastive semantic contents, all contributing towards the elucidation of what precisely Gómez de Castro meant by "*, q̄ tengo escrito de mano*,".

The Raw Data

i. La devocion que **tengo** cō la sanctidad y religion de aqueste bendito Templo

ii. Otro qualquiera de mi linaje q̄ lo **tenga** mas necesidad

iii. Lo mas que **tengo** q̄ distribuir son libros

iv. *Una blibia (sic)* ***de mano*** […], **escrita** en pergamino,

v. Un libro **de *s. Agustin***, **asimismo escrito de mano,**

vi. Otro libro **de quartilla** […], **escrito de mano** en pargamino,

vii. Unos libros **de *S. Ambrosio*** […], **que estan notados** en las margenes **de mi mano** […], los quales se anotaron con la conversacion del *Dor vergara*

viii. **Tengo** respuesta de que los embiara

ix. Un *boecio* ***de mano***, de encuadernacion Antigua, q̄ se trujo de sigüenza

x. Otros *dos libros* ***de mano***, de encuadernacion Antigua,

xi. **Tienen** el cuero leonado

xii. En el uno **ay** obras de *s. Ambrosio*

xiii. Otros *libros* ***de mano*** *en Romance* q̄ sō , tres

xiv. Otros *libros* ***de mano*** *diversos y mocedades mias*

xv. **Ay** otros [libros] de personas doctas

xvi. Otras cosas que mientras **tenia** salud servian de entretenimiento

xvii. **Ay** otro *libro* ***de mano*** *de cosas del doctor Vergara, y cartas de Erasmo*

[5] In the interest of concision, and due to limited space, the data, albeit raw, to start with, will be restricted to the most pertinent contexts relating to the issue at stake; thus, even some syntactically interesting examples, which can be left out without compromising the objective of the study, will not be included (see also 3.2 and note 10).

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

xviii. Otros *quarto libros* ***de mano***, […], q̄ son del *D. Joan Ramirez*,
xix. Son **del *D. Joan Ramirez***, […], **los quales estan escritos de su mano**
xx. **Tengo** mas en mi poder una traslacion de los *fisicos de Aristoteles*
xxi. Ciertos libros **de la *methafisica***, trasladados por el *D. Joan de vergara,* ***escritos de su mano***,
xxii. *Quatro libros* ***de medicina, escritos de mano de*** *un aguelo mio*,
xxiii. El uno **tiene** cuero de becerro colorado
xxiv. El otro de menos volumen le **tiene** negro y llamase *Antidotorio*
xxv. El uno **tiene** en el lomo una A
xxvi. *Otros libros* ***de historia de españa***, asi *impresos* como ***de mano***,
xxvii. Haga su voluntad, por q̄ **tengo** en mas su juicio que el mio
xxviii. Las *treçientas* ***de Joan de mena***, porque fueron de su *visahuelo* y **estā** ***glosadas de su mano***
xxix. **Ay** muchos que no son ordinarios
xxx. Principalmente los que estan ***escritos de mano***, asi *griegos* como *latinos*
xxxi. Y ***omelias o mas de fiestas principales, escrito de mano*** *en griego*
xxxii. **Ay otro volumen asi mesmo *escrito de mano en griego de Anastasio sinaita***
xxxiii. **Ay** otros quarto **de quartilla** […] sobre *isaias*, **asimismo *escritos de mano*** *en griego*
xxxiv. **Ay** otros dos de quartilla de menos volumen
xxxv. **Ay** mas **otro *libro grande, escrito de mano*** *en griego*,
xxxvi. **Ay** mas el libro **de *Archimedes, escrito de mano de****l D. vergara*,
xxxvii. **Ay** tambien un *ynquiridion de epitecto en griego,* ***de letra de****l D. vergara*,
xxxviii. Otros *dos libros* ***de Cortona***, enquadernados en pergamino, ***escritos de mano*** *en griego*,
xxxix. Asi mesmo con otros mas q̄ **ay** conforme a la memoria de mis libros
xl. **Ay** *otros* ***de mano*** *latinos como son dos historias del Arçobispo don Rodrigo*
xli. **Ay** mas los *ofiçios de Tulio*
xlii. **Ay** *otro librillo* ***de mano****, de quartilla*,
xliii. **Ay** tambien otro libro enquadernado en pergamino
xliv. **Ay** *libros muy exquisitos asi griegos como latinos y vulgares*
xlv. Allende del dote me obligue a dalle, yo **tengo** una contraçedula suya en una arquilla
xlvi. Despues de eso yo **e dado** y pagado por Joan de villodre muchos mas ducados
xlvii. Tambien **tengo** un poder en causa propia que otorgo para que yo lo cobrase

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

xlviii. Tambien **tengo dadas** [i.e., **he dado**] copias del Año pasado a Joan de chaves

xlix. Siete reposteros que **tengo**, donde estan las armas mias y de Joan villodre

l. Quiero q̄ los **ayan** [i.e., **tengan**] y partan ygualmente

li. Y quarto Alhombras, las dos **aya** [i.e., **tenga**] mi sobrino diego de villodre

lii. **Tengo** su carta en el escritorio

liii. **Tengo** *diez y seis volumines [*sic*] de mano y algunos de letra Gothica*

liv. **Ay** tambien otros dos fragmentos de lo mismo, […], **escritos en pargamino**,

lv. Y los *dos volumines del* ***de mano*** **que yo hice transferir** de aqueste

lvi. Los demas papeles y anotaciones q̄ aproposito desto **tengo**, dar sean a quien su mag. mandare

lvii. **Tengo** un *brebiario moçarabe*, cuyo usufructo me dio el s^{r} bachiller Herrera

lviii. Despues de mis dias le **ayan** los capellanes Moçarabes, del qual **tengo hecha** [i.e., **he hecho**] una çedula

lix. **Tengo** unos libros del Collegio de sancta Catalina, q̄ estan señalados con este titulo Colegio

lx. Entre los libros mios **ay** uno que se llama *Grapaldus De partibus Aedium*

lxi. **Tengo** mas *otro libro,* ***escrito de mano de*** *buenaventura vulcanio, de anotaciones mias*

lxii. *Los Retratos de piedra* que **tengo** del *Car^{l} f. francisco ximenes* y *Antonio de Nebrija, de mano de mase Phelipe*

lxiii. Y porque todo esto **tenga** el effeto que deseo

lxiv. Quiriendo aceptar **tenga** facultad la misma que yo **tuviera** para quitar y poner en todo lo sobredicho

lxv. Declaro que yo **tengo** en mi poder un *libro de previllegios* que llaman del *tombo*

lxvi. Mando que los *papeles e libros* que yo **tengo** tocantes a la *obra de s^{r} sant ysidro*

3. ANALYSIS

The data can be separated into the following categories (with the corresponding numbers of the examples recorded against each category):

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

(a) Those containing some form of the verb *haber* (plus some participle verb form; included here is the impersonal form *ay*): xii, xv, xvii, xxix, xxxii-xxxvii, xxxix-xliv, xlvi, l-li, liv, lx
(b) Those containing some form of *tener* (plus some participle verb form): i-iii, viii, xi, xvi, xx, xxiii, xxv, xxvii, xlv, xlvii-xlix, lii-liii, lvi-lix, lxi-lxvi
(c) Those containing the words *de mano* (together with any form of *haber* or *tener*): vii, ix-x, xiii-xiv, xvii-xviii, xxvi, xxviii, xl, lv
(d) Those containing the words *de mano* (preceded by a participle form of the verb *escribir*): iv-vi, xix, xxi-xxii, xxx-xxxiii, xxxv-xxxvi, xxxviii, lxi

The categories have been devised, in order to make sure that all elements – including possible alternative ways of expressing them – of the crucial clause under study are covered in the data and analysis. As will be shown, in due course, the *haber* components of categories (a) and (c), incongruous as they might first appear, are important for the study as a whole. The *tener* element of category (b), as well as *de mano* + *escribir* of category (d) are conspicuously reflected in the crucial clause. Wherever there is an overlap between, say, two categories, the corresponding numbers of the examples are duly entered under both categories, e.g., (xvii) under (a & c) and (xxviii) under (a & d), for the obvious reason that, proceeding otherwise would jeopardize the devising of the categories.

3.1. *Haber* and *Tener*

These two common verbs have had a rather interesting historical trajectory in Castilian, in that they have shared, or, to express it in more romantic terms, fought over, the same semantic fields for centuries (see Seifert 1930, Keniston 1937, Corominas & Pascual 1954, Chevalier 1977, Lapesa 1981, Alvar & Pottier 1983, Harre 1991, Bustos Gisbert & Moreno Bernal 1992)[6]. Scholars have established that *haber* used to be the more common of the two, but that usage gradually adopted and expanded the semantic field of *tener*, to the point that the latter's status eventually evolved from that of "an assistant" to "a usurper" (Seifert 1930: 16). A micro study has also revealed probably the most unexpected of all uses of *tener*, in lieu of *haber*: its use as the inflectional segment of the future indicative (and, potentially, the conditional) in the morphosyntactic feature called the split or analytic future, as in "ahorcaros *tenemos*", in place of "ahorcaros *hemos*" > "os ahorcar*emos*" (see Anipa 2000). In effect, Corominas & Pascual observe that the

[6] In his *La Lozana andaluza*, Delicado (1524), for instance, uses "¡Vosotras tenéis los buenos días y habéis las buenas noches!", amongst other things (see Anipa 2001); but perhaps, to a historian of the Castilian language, the most emblematic example of the overlapping usage of these verbs is Garcilaso's oft-quoted "arca de Noé", whereby *Noé* stands for "no (h)e" > "no tengo" (see Lapesa 1981: 399).

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

morphological and semantic diachrony of *tener* is an integral part of the Castilian grammar: "En realidad la historia de las formas y acs. del verbo *tener* es parte de la gramática" (s.v. *Tener*).

What interests me, first and foremost, for this study is the use of *tener* as the auxiliary element of compound tenses (like *haber*), either in combination with pure past participles of intransitive verbs (as in "tengo dicho que ya se acabó" for "he dicho que ya se acabó", or plus participles with the grammatical status of adjectivized verb forms (as in "tengo leída la carta" for "he leído la carta"). Like all other uses shared by these two verbs, the auxiliary function has been shared by them throughout their history, a feature that had been reported and commented on by linguistic thinkers during the Early Modern epoch (see, for instance, Oudin 1597, Sanford 1611, Texeda 1619).

Looking at this usage from a (historical) sociolinguistic perspective, a discipline that takes the recovery, reporting, appreciation and celebrating of linguistic variation as the core of language description, it becomes pleasantly surprising that the long-standing use of *tener* in an auxiliary function lasted well beyond the Renaissance – and sufficiently widespread to have been described and exemplified in the first grammar of the Real Academia Española as they discussed the participle, as follows:

> Se puede inferir verosimilmente que quando en lo antiguo se usaba el participio en terminacion femenina con el verbo *haber*, era porque este equivalia algunas veces al verbo activo *tener*, y así no se puede reputar como auxîliar. Como quiera que esto sea, lo cierto es que hoy solo tiene una terminacion quando se usa con el verbo *haber* para formar los tiempos compuestos, y esta propiedad le constituye verdadero participio pasivo auxíliar. Esta misma propiedad tiene quando se junta con el verbo *tener* si este se usa como auxîliar: v.g. yo tengo *escrito* á fulano ó fulana que venga: tengo *hablado* á fulano ó fulana para tal cosa: el padre y la madre tenian *consentido* que su hijo vendria. Pero si el verbo *tener* se usa como activo, pierde el participio con que se junta la propiedad de auxîliar, y adquiere figura y valor de adjetivo verbal concertado en género y número con el sustantivo en que termina la accion del verbo *tener*: v.g. tengo *escrito* un papel: tengo *escrita* una *carta*, ó tengo *escritos* dos papeles, o *escritas* dos cartas: el padre y la madre tenian *consentida la venida* de su hijo (1771: 183−184).

Still more interesting is the fact that the construction is still current, in the 21st century, used by thousands, if not millions, of native speakers; and despite the obvious fact that it is not from a grammar book or a dictionary that the sociolinguist usually expects to find abundant information about variation in a language (see Cameron 1995), we have a case again that *tener*, in an auxiliary

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

function, is considered widespread enough by the RAE to be recorded in one of the latest editions of their dictionary: "tr. U. como auxiliar con participio conjugado, **haber**. *Te tengo dicho que no salgas*" (2006: s.v. *Tener*). In effect, Gili Gaya (1993: 115−116) simply discusses this grammatical feature, not as a historical one, but, as one of modern Castilian. Here is how he states it:

> Sabido es que el verbo *haber* + *participio* forma perífrasis llamadas <<tiempos compuestos>> de la conjugación. Estas perífrasis significaron al principio la acción perfecta o acabada en el presente […], en el pasado […], o el en futuro […]. *He conocido a este hombre* equivalía originariamente a **lo que ahora expresamos con** la oración *tengo conocido a este hombre*, es decir acción acabada en el presente […]. En la lengua moderna, con un verbo auxiliar que no sea *haber*, […]. Los verbos *llevar*, *tener*, *estar* y *ser*, y a veces *traer*, *quedar* y *dejar*, forman frases verbales en las cuales funcionan como verbos auxiliares, desposeídos por lo tanto de su significado propio […]. *Tener* + *participio* puede emplearse solo cuando el participio sea de verbo transitivo y usado en acepción transitivo: *Tenía leídas muchas novellas semejantes*; *tienen pensado ir a España* (My boldface).

Another usage dimension of these verbs in pre-modern Castilian, which is of interest to this study, is the overlap of *haber* and *tener* in expressing the concept of possession (as in "he veinte años" for "tengo veinte años") – an equally well-documented grammatical feature.

3.2. Whittling Down the Raw Data

Given that the object of this study is to arrive at the intended meaning of the crucial clause, the analyses will be made clearer, if, at this juncture, those aspects of the data that are largely redundant are sieved out, in order to concentrate on the examples that are expected to provide either positive or negative evidence (in the vein of Bayesian Epistemology) for the aims of the study. Consequently, it has been judged that 18 of the 66 statements from the data can safely be discarded. They correspond to the following numbers: i-iii, viii, xi-xii, xvi, xxiii-xxv, xxvii, xxxix, xlv, xlvii, xlix, and lxii-lxiv. It can be seen that, with the exception of (xii and xxxix), all the statements contain the use of *tener*, but which are not connected with the possession of books or manuscripts; thus, they do not fit the relevant semantic context of the crucial clause. It must also be noted that one particular example in that category, (iii), has only been eliminated, at this stage, on technical grounds, since reference will be made to it again later on.

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

3.3. Lexico-Semantic Equivalence

This section brings to light the shared semantic field of *tener* denoting possession as well as the uses of the impersonal form of *haber* as found in many statements within the data. Working from what can be taken as Gómez de Cartro's real opening statement of distributing his books − "Lo mas que **tengo** q̄ distribuir son libros" − it can be appreciated that his use of "ay" in the following statements bear the same semantic value as "tengo": xv, xvii, xxix, xxxii-xxxvii, xl-xliv, liv, and lx. Since "tengo" is in a perfect paradigmatic relation with "ay" in these contexts and can, therefore, be substituted for it, they will be treated as semantic equivalents in this study.

3.4. Reconstruction of Ellipsis

Proceeding from the real opening statement (containing "tengo" as a key word) reproduced in the previous section, a number of statements can be quite easily identified as elliptical; and we can expand them by reinstating the skipped verb, which is "tengo"; for instance, "[Tengo] *una blibia* (*sic*) *de mano* […], escrita en pergamino" (iv). The statements in question are: iv-vii, ix-x, xiii-xiv, xviii, xxi-xxii, xxviii, xxxviii, and li. It is self-evident that, in a document that has an inventory-like structure, Gómez de Castro should, naturally, vary his language; and part of that variation is the use of elliptical statements (probably subconscious), in order to avoid having to repeat "tengo" dozens of times, i.e., each time he mentioned an item. A second type of ellipsis that is important to draw attention to is the clause of the kind "escrito de mano", an adjectival participle clause that also has the grammatical function of a relative clause (see Swan 1993: 454), for it can be conceptually expanded into "(el) que/el cual está escrito de mano", etc., along the lines of the construction in (vii) and (xix). Furthermore, the noun phrase "de mano" can also be viewed as an ellipsis for "(el) que/el cual está escrito de mano" (equivalent to "in manuscript" > "which is handwritten")[7]. These operations have the merit of bringing out the embedded relative clauses, which is of interest in this study.

3.5. The Syntactic-Semantic Status of Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses

The grammatical phenomenon that is most central to the problem under investigation is the status of what is sometimes termed "non-identifying relative

[7] Having said that, the form "de mano" is too severely embedded to be syntactically relevant to this study.

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

clauses", in contrast with identifying ones[8]. An extensive quotation from Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1058−1059) becomes necessary and helpful here:

> An integrated relative is tightly integrated into the matrix construction in terms of prosody, syntax, and meaning, whereas a supplementary relative clause is related only loosely to the surrounding structure […] A supplementary relative is marked off prosodically from the rest of the sentence by having a separate intonation contour; there is typically a slight pause separating it from what precedes and, if it is non-final in the sentence, from what follows […] This prosodic difference is largely reflected in writing by a difference in punctuation. A supplementary relative is characteristically preceded and (if non-final) followed by a comma, or, less often, by a dash, or the clause may be enclosed within parentheses. Conversely, an integrated relative is not separated from its antecedent by a comma or other punctuation […] but it must be emphasised that punctuation is […] not a wholly reliable guide: it is by no means uncommon to find clauses that are not marked off punctuationally even though the syntax and/or meaning requires that they be interpreted as supplementary […] The content of an integrated relative is presented as an integral part of the meaning of the clause containing it, whereas the content of a supplementary relative is presented as a separate unit of information, parenthetical or additional.

Without doubt, one of the defining features in these two categories of relative construction is some pause, typically realized in writing by the use of a comma (or commas, depending on the extension of the sentence containing the clause). This description equally holds in Castilian. Gili Gaya (1993: 302−303), for instance, presents it as follows:

> Hay que distinguir entre oraciones relativas *especificativas* y *explicativas* [ESPECIFICATIVAS: *Los alumnos que vivían lejos llegaron tarde a la escuela*; EXPLICATIVAS: *Los alumnos, que vivían lejos, llegaron tarde a la escuela*]. Las especificativas indican que llegaron tarde solo los alumnos que vivían lejos, […]. Las explicativas van separadas de la [proposición] principal por una pausa (en lo escrito con una coma). Con ellas expresamos que todos los alumnos llegaron tarde, […]. Las especificativas restrigen [*sic*] el concepto del antecedente, mientras que las explicativas se limitan a añadir una cualidad.

[8] As usual, the grammatical metalinguistic nomenclature varies. Traditional grammars of English, for instance, use "restrictive"/"non-restrictive"; some use "identifying/non-identifying", etc.; and Huddleston & Pullum (2002) prefer to distinguish the two classes as "integrated"/"supplementary".

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

Once again, the structural feature of a pause in speech, and a comma in writing, is explicitly stated, something to be borne in mind, when it comes to examining the crucial clause of this study.

3.5.1. *The Crucial Clause*

In the light of the discussion in the previous section (and of the fact that, from a modern perspective, Gómez de Castro's will is quite well written, in terms of syntactic quality), it is now easier to see that the data under examination contain a fair number of relative clauses, both restrictive and non-restrictive (bearing in mind Huddleston & Pullum's word of caution that, sometimes, poor punctuation may obscure the latter).[9] The following 9 numbers correspond to clearly identifiable restrictive relative clauses in the data: xiii, xxix-xxx, xxxii, lv-lvi, lx, and lxv-lxvi; and those corresponding to explicitly identifiable non-restrictive ones, 20 in all, are: iv-vii, ix-x, xviii, xxi-xxii, xxvi, xxxiii, xxxv-xxxviii, xlii, liv, lvii, lix, and lxi.

It becomes self-evident that the crucial clause is syntactically identical to as many as twenty others as an example of a non-restrictive relative clause.[10]

3.5.2. *What the Crucial Clause Is Not and Cannot Be*

In addition to the fact that the crucial clause, by implication from the previous section, is not a restrictive relative clause, one can still try to imagine a few dummy tests, with the goal of refuting them, for the sake of confirmation (along Popperian lines). First, one could try to imagine a comma after "tengo". However, that would not be practical, for, apart from the unacceptability of tampering with the data – especially when there is no imperative whatsoever to resort to that – the operation would involve more than just inserting a comma; it would equally require having to delete one of the two original commas that define the non-restrictive clause; thus, more harm would be done than good. Moreover, one wonders whether such an operation, if attempted at all, would be applied across the board, i.e., equally to, at least, the other twenty non-restrictive clauses – something that would amount to "syntactic genocide", as it were.

[9] In this respect, Marcos Marín, *et al*. (1999: 401-02) observe that, at times, we can have perfectly legitimate non-restrictive relative clauses without the expected commas, i.e., not to be necessarily characterized as poor punctuation, because, they argue, it is primarily conditioned by the context or situation, rather than punctuation or intonation *per se*, that determines the difference between the two types of relative clauses. One can only heave a sigh of relief, since the task of mustering up a convincing argumentation about the crucial clause would be much more difficult, if it was one of such unpunctuated cases.

[10] It must be reiterated that the data for this study has been severely restricted to the most directly relevant examples. There are several other syntactically appropriate examples in the document that have not been included. See, for instance, the highlighted relative in the following sentence: "Y si estas murieren eredenlo sus padres, Alonso gonçalez y su muger y Juan de Villodre, mis hermanos, y si por caso Juan de villodre quisiere mostrar una çedula de çien ducados**, que allende del dote me obligue a dalle,** yo tengo una contraçedula suya en una arquilla" (559).

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

Second, one could wonder whether Gómez de Castro could have framed his clause as ", q̄ tengo escrito de la mi mano," or ", q̄ tengo escrito de mi mano,". But, again, that would amount to an unfounded speculation, for if these are variant ways of expressing the same notion, it would not make linguistic sense to take him to task for choosing one of the grammatical alternatives available to him. There is one case of "de mi mano" in the data, which, even if it had the same context as the crucial clause, would still not invalidate the point made in this paragraph regarding "the option of saying 'the same thing' in several different ways" (Labov 1972: 271); but, in addition, the context is different, in that it is about the marginal annotations that he made in a book (either manuscript or printed). It is quite clear to see why he needed to specify that the annotations were in his hand[11]. It is worth pointing out, moreover, that, with the first person verb "tengo" in the crucial clause, an additional "de (la) mi" would become manifestly pleonastic. In other words, just "escrito de (la) mi mano" would be fine, with the first person agent understood, but", q̄ tengo escrito de (la) mi mano," would have some redundancy about it, and also smack of unnecessary emphasis.

Third, one could consider whether Gómez de Castro could have had in mind the expression of him having had the manuscript copied for him by somebody else, rather than having copied it himself. In this case, too, grammatical considerations seem to disprove that possibility. This is because Castilian does not employ "tener algo hecho" (in the sense of the English construction "to have something done"); rather, it uses "hacer hacer algo" (whereby any verb can take the place of the second "hacer"), a construction that appears to be fairly common to Romance languages (cf. French "faire faire", and Italian "far fare"). And, as if Gómez de Castro wished to extend a grammatical helping hand to posterity, he, indeed, used the expected "hacer hacer" construction: "*dos volumines [*sic*] del de mano* que yo **hice transcribir** (lv))". It is, therefore, safe to discard this third, dummy explanation as well.

3.5.3. *The True Semantic Value of* ", q,¯ tengo escrito de mano,"

By this time, it has become sufficiently clear that this crucial clause in Gómez de Castro's will can be understood in the context of a specific set of grammatical features regarding the interchangeability of "tener" and "haber" in Castilian over the centuries. There is even no room to speculate about some formulaic Castilian usage in the will; that would be pushing the refutation operation a bit too far – an overkill, as it were. We have the use of *haber* to express possession (as in (l), (li) and (lviii), for instance, whereby *aya* and *ayan* mean *tenga* and *tengan*). There is also the continued use of *haber* as an auxiliary, just as it is

[11] Other examples of similar syntactic structure are found in xix, xxi-xxii, xviii, xxxii, xxxvi-xxxvii, and lxi, all of which, none the less, involve the specification of someone else's action.

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

known in modern Castilian (as in "*e* dado y pagado" in (xlvi)). And, most crucially, we have two specific examples of "tener" + past participle, forming compound tenses, just as the structure of the crucial clause. The examples are: *tengo dadas copias* (xlviii) and *tengo hecha una çedula* (lviii), which can only be equivalent to "he dado copias" and "he hecho una cédula", respectively (see Gili Gaya in 3.1 above). These two examples can equally be subjected to the dummy syntactic tests outlined in the previous section, with the same conclusions. What we have on our hands here in the crucial clause, it must be emphasized, is an archetypal Castilian/Romance morphosyntactic feature. The identical syntagmatic relation between "tengo" and "escrito", "tengo" and "dadas", and "tengo" and "hecha" is beyond doubt; and that this relation sticks out, not only as distinct from all the other uses of *tengo* in the data, but also distinctive, is equally beyond doubt.

4. CONCLUSION

This study has successfully demonstrated, by means of grammatical analyses, that the supplementary relative construction within the larger construction "el *dialogo de valdes de la lengua española,* q̄ *tengo escrito de mano,*", in Gómez de Castro's last will and testament, specifically meant "el *dialogo de valdes de la lengua española,* q̄ *he escrito de mano,*" (i.e., ", que he copiado,"), rather than anything else. This meaning has, fairly surprisingly, hitherto remained lost in a construction that has been an integral part of the grammar of Castilian, from the Middle Ages up to the 21st century. That grammatical "obscurity" had a direct effect on one of San Román's conclusions about the early history of Valdés's *Diálogo* (MS 8629), when he published the will; being unaware that Gómez de Castro actually copied the manuscript for himself, San Román thought that he only possessed it. Consequently, he concluded that the copy mentioned in the will was MS 8629, which has been held in the Biblioteca Nacional since 1753. The consequence of that conclusion was that it shut all doors to the quest, amongst other things, for Gómez de Castro's copy of the manuscript.

Even though delving deep into the wider implications of this new evidence is well beyond the scope of the present study, it is worth briefly making a few relevant observations. From the results of this study, the question arises as to where Gómez de Castro's own copy must be. It appears that the executors of his will must have judged it imprudent keeping the work of an infamous heretic in a church library at that time, and either destroyed it (along with the other materials that he wished torn up or burnt, should he himself fail to do so before his death) or simply concealed it. Thus, the possibility of finding it some day cannot be discarded. That possibility has never existed before, until the understanding of the crucial clause that this study has brought to light. San Román reports that an inventory of the church's library, compiled in 1591, a decade after the death of Gómez de Castro

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

(1580), did feature Nebrija's grammar, but not Valdés's *Diálogo* (let alone bound together with it as he had desired). In any case, the annotations in the margins of MS 8629 that have been identified with Gómez de Castro's hand constitute evidence that the Toledan humanist did handle this particular manuscript at some stage. But we now know that that was not his personal copy; it is likely that he made his copy from MS 8629, during the course of which he carried out his annotations in it[12]. The present study may well constitute a catalyst for further investigation into the early history of Valdés's MS 8629.

REFERENCES

Alcalá Galve, Á. (ed.), 2006, *Obras completas de Juan de Valdés,* Volumen 1, Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, Madrid, Fundación José Antonio de Castro.

Alvar, M., B. Pottier, 1983, *Morfología histórica del español*, Madrid, Gredos.

Anipa, K., 2000, "A Study of the Analytic Future/Conditional in Golden-Age Spanish", *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, LXXVII, 325–337.

Anipa, K., 2001, *A Critical Examination of Linguistic Variation in Golden-Age Spanish*, New York, Peter Lang.

Austin, J. L., 1962, *Sense and Sensibilia*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bustos Gisbert, E., J. Moreno Bernal, 1992, "La asimetría 'Hemos'/'Habéis'", *Actas del II congreso internacional de la historia de la lengua española*, Madrid, Pavellón de España.

Cameron, D., 1995, *Verbal Hygiene*, London, Routledge.

Chevalier, J.-C., 1977, "De l'opposition 'haber'-'tener'", *Cahiers de linguistique hispanique médiévale*, 2, 5−48.

Corominas, J., J. A. Pascual, 1980 [1954], *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano o hispánico*, Madrid, Gredos.

Cotarelo y Mori, E., 1920, "Cuestión literaria: ¿Quién fué el autor del 'Diálogo de la lengua'?", *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, VII, 10−46, 158−197, 269−290, 671−698.

Delicado, F., 1969 [1524], *Retrato de la lozana andaluza*, Madrid, Clásicos Castalia.

Gili Gaya, S., 1993, *Curso superior de sintaxis española*, Barcelona, Biblograf.

Harre, C., 1991. *Tener + Past Participle. A case study in linguistic description*, London, Routledge.

Huddleston, R., G. K. Pullum, 2002, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, T., 2008, "Evidence", in: Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2008 Edition), URL = http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/evidence/.

Keniston, H., 1937, *The Syntax of Castillian Prose: The Sixteenth Century*, Chicago and Ilinois, The University of Chicago Press.

Labov, W., 1972, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lapesa, R., 1981, *Historia de la lengua española*, Madrid, Gredos.

Marcos Marín, F., *et al*., 1999, *Gramática española*, Madrid, Síntesis.

Mayans y Siscar, G., 1737, *Orígenes de la lengua española, compuestos de various autores*, Tomo II, Madrid, Juan de Zúñiga.

Nebrija, A. de, 1989 [1492], *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, Madrid, Ramón Aceres.

[12] It is even tempting to argue, further, that, had MS 8629 been the copy that he referred to, he would have indicated those annotations he made in it, in the form of "que estan notados en las margenes de mi mano […], los cuales se anotaron con la conversacion de…" (as in vii).

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)

Oudin, C., 1597, *Grammaire et observations de la langue espagnole recueillies et mises en François*, Paris, Marc Orry.
Quirk, R. *et al*., 1985, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London, Longman.
Real Academia Española, 1984 [1771], *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, Madrid, Editora Nacional.
Real Academia Española, 2006, *Diccionario de la lengua española*, 22ª edición, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
San Román, F. de B., 1928, "El testamento de Alvar Gómez de Castro", *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, XV, 543-566.
Sanford, J., 1611, *An Entrance to the Spanish tongue*, London, Haveland.
Seifert, E., 1930, "'Haber' y 'Tener' como expresiones de la posesión en español", *Revista de Filología Española*, 17, 345–389.
Swan, M., 1993, *Practical English Usage*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Texeda, J. de, 1979 [1610], *Gramática de la lengua española*, Mexico, Universidad Nacional Autónoma.
Valdés, J., de, 1535, *Diálogo de la lengua*, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 8629.

BDD-A355 © 2010 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.169 (2026-11-07 03:00:23 UTC)