Foreword

The papers published in this issue of the *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* resulted from a binational project – *Português Europeu e Português Brasileiro: Unidade e Diversidade na Passagem do Milénio (European and Brazilian Portuguese: Unity and Diversity at the Turn of the Century)* –, launched in the year 2000, and coordinated by the guest editors and authors of this foreword, with the sponsorship of CNPq, in Brazil, and ICCTI, in Portugal. This comparative project has focused on the two best-established varieties of Portuguese – European (EP) and Brazilian (BP) – and involved linguists from both Brazil and Portugal. Its partial results were presented at annual meetings of the Portuguese Linguistics Association (APL) and the Brazilian Linguistics Association (ABRALIN)[1]. Moreover, part of the work on comparative semantics that was produced within the project appeared in issue 3.1 (2004) of this journal.

With the Principles and Parameters model, historical and comparative linguistics gained a new impulse and interest, initially with English invariably being one of the languages under study or comparison. Soon, however, as the number of descriptions made with the same metalanguage increased, closely related languages started to be compared. As a result, specific conferences and collections comparing traditional language families – Romance, Germanic, and Slavic, among others – are nowadays rather frequent. This movement led to what came to be known as "microparametric" syntax, which, in Kayne's words, "can be thought of as a new research tool, one that is capable of providing results of an unusually fine-grained and particularly solid character" (Kayne 2000: 5), and ultimately resulted in the comparison of even more closely related family members like dialects of the same language. The above mentioned project and the present collection of articles fall within this microparametric endeavour.

---

[1] See *Actas do XVI Encontro Nacional da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística* (APL) Lisboa, 2001, and *II Congresso Internacional da ABRALIN, Fortaleza – 13 a 16 de Março de 2001, Anais, Boletim da ABRALIN* 26 (número especial).

A different direction is defended in Baker (1996), who favours "macroparameters", more in line with typological studies. This approach is grounded on a strong belief in parameters as clusters of properties that go together, as in polysynthetic languages, a belief that, according to Baker, is being lost in the microparametric perspective, where parameters tend to be seen as construction-specific. This author notes that one of the most popular macro-parameters, the *pro*-drop parameter, has been shown to be undergoing a fragmentation, since many languages have been identified where not all the members of the parameter cluster are found. The comparison of EP and BP can shed light on the discussion about the existence or non-existence of such macro-parameters. At the same time, it can be revealing about some isolated property of a parameter where language varieties show contradictory behaviour, though apparently sharing the same value regarding the macro--parametric perspective, as is the case of EP and BP.

So far, the project showed, among other things, that EP and BP: (i) share many surface similarities, in spite of deep differences, like, e.g., in the nature of null categories; (ii) differ in many fundamental respects, like word order and clitic position; (iii) show a reasonable degree of uniformity in certain constructions, as exemplified by cleft constructions and negative concord. In this collection of articles, the focus was on topics where EP and BP exhibit less unity, and striking dissimilarities.

Several of the works developed within the project were co-authored by Portuguese and Brazilian linguists, which guaranteed fine native intuition in the two varieties. This is the case with the first three articles in the present collection. However, regarding certain topics, the researchers in the two countries shaped proposals based on different theoretical assumptions. This is the case with the treatment of clitics, as shown in the last two articles, which perspicuously illustrate how different theoretical frames handle the same empirical contrasts in the two language varieties.

Besides the traditional procedure of using only native speakers' intuition, the project also encouraged the use of real *corpora*, though the researchers were aware that, in many cases, more than strict grammatical competence was at stake, specially in BP, where part of the written norm is still very conservative, and more in consonance with EP grammar. The choice of newspaper interviews, ads, chronicles and translations of best-sellers guaranteed, to a certain extent, a less conservative style, with the frequent presence of the more widely spread and quantitatively significant innovations.

The first article (Barbosa, Duarte and Kato) compares EP and BP with regard to the Null Subject Parameter, showing that EP is a well-behaved Null Subject language (NSL), like Spanish and Italian, while BP does not conform strictly to the canonical NSL type, in many respects being more similar to non-NSLs like English and French. The authors show that, at first sight, the mismatch is only quantitative. Thus, their *corpus* analysis of the distribution of third person null and pronominal subjects in similar written texts shows

that, in four different contexts, EP has significantly more null subjects than BP, but the ordering of the contexts is similar, suggesting a change in progress, with BP in the process of losing the null subject. The qualitative analysis assumes a more radical view of change, assuming that the difference is structural. The claim is that while BP holds a standard subject position, namely [Spec, IP], EP assigns subjects a Left Dislocated position, and, as a consequence, doubles agreement, which is of pronominal nature. This explains one of the most categorical differences in the quantitative analysis, namely the fact that pronominal subjects in EP are always [+animate], while in BP they can be either [+animate] or [–animate]. This is an indication that in EP the subject pronoun is in topic position, where strong pronouns are merged, and that in BP it is in A-position, where weak pronouns check their features.

In order to show that the proposal makes the right grammaticality predictions, the article explores other qualitative differences, such as: (i) the high frequency of "double subjects" in BP, while in EP such constructions are rarely attested; (ii) the exclusive V…S order of Gerund Absolute clauses in EP, while BP allows SV order; (iii) like in other NSLs, the fact that indefinite pre-verbal subjects in EP take wide scope with respect to a scope bearing element inside the clause while BP behaves just like English or French, where narrow scope is possible. The article concludes with the suggestion that not only structurally are EP and BP different, but also regarding the nature of the null subject: while the EP null subject is a pronoun, the BP one is a pronominal anaphor.

The second article (Martins and Nunes) also addresses phenomena that involve the subject position, namely raising and control. Observing that, crosslinguistically, control and raising verbs often constitute overlapping sets and that, diachronically, control verbs tend to originate raising verbs, the article starts by showing that BP and EP follow this pattern, both broadly concentrating raising and control structures in the same classes of verbs. Despite this similarity, the authors show that EP has more (object) control structures than BP, and that BP has more raising structures than EP. They argue that these differences follow from two independent facts: (i) that inherent dative Case was lost in BP but not in EP, and (ii) that BP is on the verge of becoming a non-pro-drop language (which, incidentally, provides additional evidence for the thesis advocated in the previous paper).

The appearance of new raising structures in BP is attributed by the authors to the reanalysis of the impersonal construction, whose matrix subject is a null expletive. This hypothesis is related to the fact that BP is becoming a non-pro drop language, and the consequence is a general tendency for subject positions to be filled with phonetically realized material. It is also asserted that the general replacement of null expletives by moved elements in BP ended up yielding new kinds of constructions, which are ruled out in EP. Within this view, t*ough*-constructions, for example, are taken to have been reanalyzed in

BP in such a way that they became ambiguous between a standard *tough-*-interpretation, also available in EP, with the matrix subject being interpreted as the internal argument of the embedded clause, and a new raising interpretation, with the matrix subject being interpreted as the external argument of the embedded clause. Another innovation the authors allege to be part of the same change process are hiper-raising constructions, in which raising takes place from finite clauses. The authors claim that the supposed fluctuation between control and raising is actually expected under Hornstein's (1999, 2001) analysis, if the assignment of the "controller"–role is or becomes optional.

The third article (Cyrino and Matos) presents a microvariation study of VP-ellipsis in EP, BP and English, and extends the analysis to languages that lack this phenomenon, even if the relevant licensing condition seems to obtain (French, Spanish and Italian). The authors attribute the presence and absence of VP-ellipsis to a parameter stated as follows: "Asp selected by T may have a ± *Tense feature* and a ± *Predicative feature"*. According to their proposal, in English and Portuguese, Asp has a positive predicative feature, while in languages like French, Spanish, Italian and German, where the verbal aspectual complexes are highly grammaticalized, Asp presents a positive tense feature, and a negative predicative feature. VP ellipsis is possible whenever Asp selected by T is <+ predicative>. In other words, the claim is that VP ellipsis is impossible in languages like Spanish, French and German, because the verb raised to T or C does not locally c-command the elliptical predicate, and this is due to the fact that Asp, which is not interpreted as an element of the elliptical predicate, intervenes between T and *v*P.

The different behaviour of English and Portuguese is explained by the authors in terms of another parameter, Verb Movement, regarding which they emphasize the following facts: (i) while in English such movement is restricted, in Portuguese it is generalised to all classes of verbs; (ii) VP-ellipsis in English and Portuguese may also vary regarding the requirement for parallelism; the authors attribute the relaxation of this requirement in BP to a different construction, *Null Complement Anaphora*, which is exempt from it.

Turning to the comparison of EP and BP, it is shown that VP ellipsis may exhibit differences concerning the licensing and identification of the elliptical constituent. In fact, while VP-ellipsis is shown to be allowed, in both varieties whenever the remnant of the ellipsis is just the auxiliary, it is claimed that there may be contrasts in the interpretation. The authors propose that in EP the ellipsis is canonically licensed by T, while in BP it may also be licensed by functional heads bellow TP: Asp or Passive. Besides, it is suggested that, in BP, all sentence functional projections, including the Passive Phrase (or Voice Phrase), were reanalysed as extended V projections with full V-features. This phenomenon is correlated with the loss of unrestricted Generalised V--Movement, that is, with the fact that although Verb raising to sentence

functional projections is available in BP, it is kept to a minimum, leading, in particular, to the apparent loss of T-to-C Movement.

The fourth article (Duarte, Matos and Gonçalves) addresses the old puzzle of clitic placement in Romance, more specifically the choice between proclisis and enclisis in Portuguese. In a survey of previous treatments of Romance clitics, the authors show that these cannot be reduced to phonological clitics and neither can they be analyzed as affixes. A basic assumption is that Romance clitics are deficient lexical units consisting of a bundle of ϕ-features, which, due to their (phonological and syntactic) defective status, require a specific host. Moreover, it is also assumed that clitics are merged in a fixed position in the clause, the ClP, above AspP, which explains the impossibility of their occurrence in participial clauses. The following are shown to be different types of clitics in Romance: (i) substantive clitics, with argumental content (definite reflexive/reciprocal, non-reflexive and arbitrary nominative clitics) or predicative content (predicative clitics); (ii) clitics that change the argument frame of the main verb (passive and ergative clitics); (iii) clitics devoid of any substantive or functional content (inherent clitics). Those that present argument or predicative content are taken to have a construal relation between CLP and a position inside vP.

The variation found in Romance is attributed to the interplay of verb movement and a Proclisis Parameter, stated as follows: "the ϕ-features of pronominal clitics block *Agree* and *Attract* operations of the probe complete T: yes/no." Since the clitic is taken to intervene in the V-path, this parameter expresses sensitivity of *Agree* to the presence of the clitic, itself a ϕ-feature bundle. Given the Proclisis Parameter, languages are partitioned in the following way; in languages that set the value 'yes' for the parameter, proclisis is the obligatory pattern in finite sentences, since the ϕ-features of the clitic block *Agree* between complete T and V (the clitic order pattern found in non-finite clauses depending, in these languages, on whether V targets non complete T); in languages with value 'no' for this parameter, enclisis is the dominant order, since the ϕ-features of the clitic do not block *Agree* and *Attract* between complete T and V. However – the authors claim – in languages such as EP, enclitics in T block *Agree* probing the sub-array of V-like features of T, and, by probe, *Attract* T of quantified XPs, yielding proclisis as a last resort. This means that, in this approach, enclisis is the default option for clitic placement in EP. As for BP, the author's data reveal free choice between enclisis and proclisis, except in sentential initial position of root clauses, where proclisis does not occur. They attribute this exception to prescriptive rules: in general, in non finite domains, the verb does not move beyond *Asp*, thus yielding the proclitic pattern. It is shown, however, that although the innovative grammar of BP sets the value 'yes' for the *Proclisis Parameter*, together with Spanish, French and Italian, it differs from these in the loss of long clitic climbing, as had already been observed by Brazilian linguists.

The fifth article (Galves, Ribeiro and Moraes) addresses the same topic as the previous work, namely the enclisis/proclisis phenomenon in EP and BP. The authors' proposal is that the different behaviour of clitics in EP and BP follows from the interaction of two different properties: a syntactic property – EP clitics are *Infl-cli*tics and BP clitics are *V-clitics* – and a morpho--phonological property – EP clitics, but not BP clitics, are required to be in a non-initial position with respect to some boundary. The paper starts with an extensive comparison of the position of clitics in two versions of *O Alquimista*, by the Brazilian novelist Paulo Coelho: the original one and the adapted version published in Portugal. The comparison confirms most of the well-known facts described by both Portuguese and Brazilian linguists, who have shown that enclisis and proclisis in EP have very clear contexts where they occur – proclisis being sensitive to affective operators – while clitic placement is a variable phenomenon in BP. The authors' interpretation of this variability is that it constitutes what has been known as competition of grammars. Despite this variability in the data, the authors claim that the BP grammar selects generalized proclisis to the thematic verb.

One important topic tackled by these authors is the behaviour of third person accusative and dative clitics, which have been shown, in diachronic studies, to have vanished, giving space to null objects and pronouns in the nominative form. They show that while first and second pronouns behave in consonance with the BP generalized "rule" of proclisis to the thematic verb, the third person clitics follow the European alternative of cliticization to the inflected verb, exhibiting long clitic climbing. This inconsistent behaviour of third person clitics is ascribed to their late acquisition through schooling. An original point is the consideration that accusative clitics have structural case, while dative clitics are inherent, and that the clitics that are still productive in BP (first and second) are inherently dative, requiring adjacency to the thematic verb.

In its coverage of more recent studies on the subject, the article describes three different types of approach regarding the enclisis/proclisis phenomenon, summarized as follows: (i) t*he syntactic computation only generates proclisis*; (ii) *the syntactic component generates enclisis*; and (iii) *clitic-placement is not derived at all by syntactic processes.* Along the discussion, the authors show the problems raised by each analysis, and the advantages of their proposal.

The paper also brings into discussion diachronic facts. In this respect, the authors maintain that their approach easily accounts for the changes that occurred in BP, of which the main one is the loss of the phonological constraint.

The uniqueness of this collection of articles lies in the empirical demonstration that what is often considered to be two dialects of the same language can reach high levels of parametric differentiation, notwithstanding the fact that mutual understanding between speakers of Portuguese from both Brazil and Portugal is by and large so far preserved.

While enthusiastically supporting the publication of the papers contained in this collection, as a means for stimulating meaningful debate on the topics they address, the editors do not necessarily agree with all the theoretical stances of the authors or, for that matter, with their judgments on data.

References

Baker, M.C. (1996) *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kayne, R. (2000) *Parameters and Universals.* Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Mary Aizawa Kato
Dept. de Lingüística
Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem
Universidade Estadual de Campinas
Cidade Universitária Zeferino Vaz
13084-100 Campinas, SP
Brasil
makato@terra.com.br

João Andrade Peres
Dept. de Linguística Geral e Românica
Faculdade de Letras da
Universidade de Lisboa
Alameda da Universidade
1600-214 Lisboa
Portugal
jperes@fl.ul.pt