Raising Issues in Brazilian and European Portuguese

ANA MARIA MARTINS
JAIRO NUNES

Abstract

This paper presents a comparative investigation contrasting Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese with respect to raising constructions. We provide an account of the attested fluctuation among raising, control, and impersonal constructions based on the Case- and θ-properties of the structures involved in each dialect. We also discuss the pervasive spreading of raising constructions (including cases of overt and "covert" hyper-raising) in Brazilian Portuguese and its relation to the loss of referential null subjects in this dialect.

0. Introduction[*]

This paper discusses the general similarities and differences between Brazilian Portuguese (BP) and European Portuguese (EP) with respect to a variety of raising structures. In addition to discussing standard cases of DP raising from the subject position of an infinitival clause to the subject position of a finite clause, we will also examine the close knit relationship among impersonal, raising, and control structures, and discuss instances of "hyper-raising" (A--movement out of finite clauses; see Ura 1994). By undertaking a detailed comparison between the two dialects, which are identical in some aspects but

distinct in others, we hope to offer some new insights with respect to the nature of syntactic variation regarding the availability of raising structures in a given grammar.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 discusses the relationship between impersonal and raising constructions (including *tough*-movement constructions) and the Case differences between them. Assuming Hornstein's (1999, 2001) analysis of obligatory control in terms of movement to thematic positions, section 2 examines the interplay between impersonal, raising, and control constructions and provides an account of the differences between BP and EP in terms of other independent properties that distinguish them. Section 3 then discusses A-movement out of finite clauses both in the overt and the covert component. Finally, section 4 presents a brief conclusion.

1. Impersonal, *Tough*-, and Raising Constructions

1.1. Towards Raising

As illustrated in (1) and (2) below, a set of impersonal predicates came to give rise to raising predicates both in BP and in EP. In the impersonal structures, these predicates select an inflected infinitival clause (cf. (1a) and (2a)), whereas the raising version selects an uninflected infinitival (cf. (1b) and (2b)/(2c)).

(1) a. *Impersonal*:
Demorou   muito tempo para os   organizadores   começarem
lasted-3SG   much time for the organizers   start-INF-3PL
a entender   o problema.   (BP/EP: OK)
to understand the problem

 b. *Raising*:
Os organizadores   demoraram muito tempo para começar
the organizers   lasted-3PL   much time   for start-INF
a entender   o   problema.   (BP/EP: OK)
to understand the problem
'It took the organizers a long time to understand the problem.

(2) a. *Impersonal*:
Calhou   vermos   o acidente.   (BP: ??; EP: OK)
happened-3SG   see-INF-1PL the accident

 b. *Raising*:
Nós   calhámos   de ver   o   acidente.   (BP: OK)
we   happened-1PL   of see-INF the   accident

 c. *Raising*:
Nós   calhámos   a ver   o   acidente.   (EP: OK)
we   happened-1PL   to see-INF the accident
'We happened to see the accident.'

Such an alternation can be accounted for, if the infinitival complement of these constructions is optionally specified for assigning nominative Case. If Case is assigned, which is signalled by agreement on the infinitival verb, the embedded subject is trapped within the embedded clause and we get an impersonal construction; if instead Case is not assigned, the embedded subject then moves to the matrix [Spec, TP], yielding a raising construction, as sketched in (3).

(3) a. *Impersonal*: $[_{TP} T_{+Case} V [_{TP} DP T_{+Case} \dots]]$
    b. *Raising*: $[_{TP} DP_i T_{+Case} V [_{TP} t_i T_{-Case} \dots]]$

One could hypothesize that the fluctuation between impersonal and raising predicates in BP is due to the weakening of its verbal agreement morphology (see Duarte 1995) with consequences for nominative Case assignment in infinitival clauses. Although this may certainly play a role, it cannot be the whole story, for EP has a stable rich paradigm of verbal agreement morphology, but nonetheless also allows such variation between impersonal and raising constructions for some predicates. What clearly sets BP apart from EP is the fact that raising structures are more deeply rooted in BP. The raising option has spread more extensively throughout the BP lexicon and the frequency of use of the raising alternative is much higher in BP than in EP (see Duarte 2003, 2004).[1] The debilitation of the pro-drop property in BP[2] appears to be the main factor behind the strong preference for raising over impersonal structures displayed by BP. In a sense, this can be seen as the effect of the general "avoid-pronoun" strategy (see Chomksy 1981) as applied to null expletives (see Duarte 2003, 2004).

The widespread replacement of null expletives by moved elements in BP ended up yielding new kinds of raising constructions, which are completely ruled out in EP. This is particularly interesting in the case of *tough-constructions*. A sentence such as (4) below, for example, may mean in both dialects that it is hard to praise João (the *tough*-interpretation). Remarkably, in BP (4) is actually ambiguous. As originally noted by Galves (1987), it can also mean that John rarely praises someone (the raising interpretation).[3] The

---

[1] This difference between the two dialects can be illustrated by speakers' reactions to the sentences in (1) and (2). Whereas all EP speakers judge (1a) and (2a) as fully grammatical, some may judge (2c) as marginal. By contrast, all BP speakers judge (1b) and (2b) to be fully acceptable and (2a) to be marginal, which suggests that the preference for raising in BP seems to be rendering some impersonal constructions obsolescent.

[2] For relevant discussion, see Galves (1993, 1998, 2001), Duarte (1995, 2004), Figueiredo Silva (1996), Kato (1999, 2000), Negrão (1999), Ferreira (2000, 2004), Modesto (2000), Barbosa, Duarte, and Kato (2001), Rodrigues (2002, 2004), and the collection of papers in Kato and Negrão (2000), among others.

[3] For further discussion of the derivations underlying the two readings of (4) in BP, see Ferreira (2000).

agreement with a plural subject in (5) below makes it clear that under the raising interpretation, *o João* in (4) occupies the subject position of the matrix clause:

(4)   O   João   é difícil   de elogiar.
            the   João   is difficult   of praise-INF
Tough-reading: 'It is hard to praise João.'   (BP/EP: OK)
Raising reading: 'João rarely praises someone.'   (BP: OK; EP: *)

(5) a.   É difícil   esses professores elogiarem. (BP/EP: OK)
               is difficult these teachers   praise-INF-3PL
               'These teachers rarely praise (someone).'
    b.   Esses   professores são difíceis   de elogiar.
               these   teachers   are hard-3PL   of praise-INF
Tough-reading: 'It is hard to praise these teachers.'   (BP/EP: OK)
Raising reading: 'These teachers rarely praise (someone).' (BP: OK; EP: *)

Given that both dialects allow the corresponding impersonal construction with a *tough*-predicate, as shown in (6), it is arguably the case that the raising interpretation arose as a by-product of the generalized reanalysis of impersonal as raising constructions in BP.

(6)   É difícil   o   João   elogiar.   (BP/EP: OK)
      is difficult the   João   praise-INF
      'João rarely praises (someone)'

To summarize, although EP and BP both display an alternation between impersonal and raising constructions for some predicates, BP seems to be undergoing a wholesale reanalysis of impersonal constructions, replacing them by their raising correspondents. As we will see in section 3 below, this strong preference for raising in BP may also affect impersonal constructions with finite complement clauses. But before we get to that, let us first discuss the role of prepositions preceding the infinitival complements in the raising counterparts of impersonal constructions.

1.2. Raising and Case Assignment to Infinitival Clauses

The data in (2), (4), (5), and (6) above suggest the following generalization: once the alternation between impersonal and raising arises for some predicates, a preposition must precede the infinitival clause in the raising construction (including *tough*-movement, as in (5b)). Or to put it differently, preposition insertion is required when the matrix subject position is clearly

filled (cf. (2b)/(2c), (4), and (5b)).[4] The question then is what derives this state of affairs.

Preposition insertion before infinitival clauses in raising constructions is reminiscent of the paradigm in (7) (see Raposo 1987).

(7) a. o   professor   receia [ser   despedido]
     the   teacher   fears   be-INF   fired
     'The teacher fears being fired.'

     b. o   receio   (de) [ser   despedido]
     the   fear   of   be-INF   fired
     'the fear of being fired'

     c. o   professor   está   receoso *(de) [ser   despedido]
     the   teacher   is   fearful   of   be-INF fired
     'The teacher is fearful of being fired.'

Raposo (1987) proposes that the infinitival morpheme in Portuguese is a [-V,+N] element. As a nominal element, the infinitival morpheme (or its projection) is subject to the Case Filter. Thus, the infinitival clause of (7a) can be Case-marked by the verb *recear* 'fear' and satisfy the Case Filter. On the other hand, the infinitival complement of a cognate noun, as in (7b), or a cognate adjective, as in (7c), requires the insertion of a dummy preposition (*de* 'of') in order to be Case-marked, given that these elements are not Case--assigners.

Raposo's proposal can be straightforwardly extended to account for the generalization mentioned above with respect to the need for preposition insertion in raising constructions. Take the contrast between (5a) and (5b), for instance. In (5a), *esses professores* 'these teachers' receives/checks nominative within the infinitival clause; hence, the nominative Case of the matrix clause is still available to be assigned/checked and may license the infinitival clause.[5] In (5b), on the other hand, *esses professores* checks the Case of the matrix T and the infinitival clause can only be licensed if a dummy Case-marker such as the proposition *de* is inserted.

---

[4] BP actually allows preposition insertion in some impersonal constructions, as well, as illustrated in (i) below (see Ximenes and Nunes 2004). In this paper, we will restrict our attention to the raising cases where this insertion is obligatory.
(i) a. Calhou   de vermos   o acidente.   (BP: OK; EP: *)
     hapenned-3SG of see-INF-1PL the accident
     'We happened to see the accident.'
   b. É   difícil   desses   professores elogiarem.   (BP: OK; EP: *)
    is   difficult of-these teachers   praise-INF-3PL
    'These teachers rarely praise someone.'
[5] This analysis entails either that null expletives do not require Case-checking or that impersonal constructions may not involve null expletives to begin with (see Viotti 1999 for relevant discussion).

Independent evidence for an analysis of the contrast between (5a) and (5b) along these lines is found in Nunes's (1995) proposal for the distribution of infinitival "sentential subjects" in Old English. Lightfoot (1979) has observed that from the 10th to the 14th century, infinitival sentential subjects in Old English were preceded by the preposition *to* only when they occurred in "extraposed" position. Interestingly, before the phonological weakening of its inflectional morphology, English used to have an overt infinitival morpheme, *-an*, which would surface as *-anne* or *-enne* when preceded by *to*, thus exhibiting inflection for the dative Case assigned by *to* (see Callaway 1913). Based on the fact that Old English infinitivals display nominal morphology, Nunes (1995) analysed the distribution of infinitival clauses in impersonal constructions as sketched in (8).

(8) a. $[_{TP}$ [infinitival clause] T$_{+Case}$ V …]
    b. $[_{TP}$ *hit*$_{expl}$ T$_{+Case}$ V … *(to) [infinitival clause]]

In (8a), the infinitival clause occupies the matrix subject position and can be Case-licensed. By contrast, in (8b) the matrix clause is filled by the Old English expletive *hit*, which checks the available nominative Case, and the dummy preposition *to* must be inserted in order for the infinitival clause in the "extraposed" position to be Case-licensed (see Nunes 1995 for further discussion). Thus, here we have another example of preposition insertion to license infinitival clauses when there is no Case available.[6] Though less transparent, we find a similar interplay between lack of Case-licensers for infinitival clauses and preposition insertion in more complex paradigms

---

[6] A tricky question is to determine how Portuguese infinitivals that are complements of modals, the auxiliary *ir* 'go', or standard raising verbs like *parecer* 'seem', as in (i) below, are Case-licensed. Notice that the nominative Case of the matrix clause is checked by the raised subject and therefore the infinitival clause appears to be left unlicensed. Our suggestion is that modals and some raising verbs assign inherent Case (in the sense of Chomsky 1986) to their infinitival complements and therefore need not resort to dummy prepositions.

(i) a. Ele   pode (*de)   resolver   o   problema.
        he   can   of   solve-INF   the   problem
        'He can solve the problem.'
    b. Eles   vão   cantar.
        they   go   sing-INF
        'They are going to sing.'
    c. Ele   parece (*de)   estar   doente.
        he   seems   of   be-INF   sick
        'He seems to be sick.'

Interestingly, in Old Portuguese and some contemporary BP and EP dialects, the modal *dever* 'may' displays optionality in this regard, taking either a bare or a prepositional infinitival, as illustrated in (ii).

(ii)   Ele   deve (de)   estar   contente.
        he   may of   be-INF   happy
        'He's probably happy.'

involving impersonal and control structures such as the ones to be discussed in the next section.

2. Control and Raising Constructions

With his formulation of a minimalist program for linguistic theory, Chomsky (1995) promoted a substantial reevaluation of the whole theoretical apparatus available in GB. Assuming that only levels of linguistic representation that are motivated by interface conditions should be postulated, Chomsky argued that theory-internal levels such as D-Structure should be dispensed with. The abandonment of D-Structure as a theoretical primitive in turn has radical consequences within the model.

Take the control and raising constructions in (9), for instance.

(9) a. [John$_i$ tried [PRO$_i$ to solve the problem]]
    b. [John$_i$ seems [t$_i$ to have solved the problem]]

In both simplified representations in (9), we have two syntactic positions belonging to two different clauses, but associated with the same referent (*John*), as indicated by the indices. Within GB, the differences between these two constructions (see Hornstein, Nunes, and Grohmann 2005: chap. 2 for an overview) were standardly attributed to their different properties at D- -Structure: in (9a) *John* is generated in the matrix clause, whereas in (9b) it is generated in the embedded clause, more specifically, in the position where PRO in (9a) is generated. The main motivation for postulating PRO in (9a) was the D-Structure well-formedness condition requiring that all θ-positions should be filled. Once PRO was assumed, an additional grammatical module, the control module, also had to be incorporated into the model in order to ensure the appropriate interpretation of PRO. However, if D-Structure is to be eliminated for not being an interface level, the grounds for postulating PRO and the control module become considerably shaky.

With considerations such as these in mind, Hornstein (1999, 2001) proposes an alternative model where control is subsumed under movement, as will be briefly reviewed in section 2.1. We will adopt Hornstein's theory here and show in section 2.2 how it can shed light on the similarities and differences between BP and EP in what regards control structures.

2.1. Hornstein's (1999, 2001) Theory of Control

Hornstein (1999, 2001) argues that obligatorily controlled PRO should be eliminated as a theoretical primitive, by allowing θ-role assignment to license syntactic movement.[7] The distributional and interpretational properties of

---

[7] For arguments in favor of movement to θ-positions, see Bošković (1994), Lasnik (1995), Bošković and Takahashi (1998), Ferreira (2000, 2004), Pires (2001),

controlled PRO are then taken to follow from general well-formedness conditions on movement operations. The fact that PRO requires an antecedent that must be the closest c-commanding DP, for instance, follows from the fact that movement operations are constrained by the Minimal Link Condition (see Chomsky 1995). From this perspective, obligatory control gaps are DP traces/copies left by movement of the "controller". Thus, the essential distinction between control and raising structures is that movement of the embedded subject targets a thematic position in the case of the former, but a nonthematic position in the case of the latter.[8]

Kiguchi (2002), Rodrigues (2002, 2004), and Boeckx, Hornstein, and Nunes (2004), among others.

[8] As pointed out to us by Inês Duarte (p.c.), the fact that the nominative indefinite clitic *se* in Portuguese can be freely associated with control predicates, but not with raising predicates (see Matos and Duarte 1985) appears to argue against a unified treatment movement analysis of raising and control structures. Although the point is well taken, there seems to be so much variation in Portuguese with respect to the acceptability of *se* with specific raising verbs that it is unclear how to interpret the facts. For example, speakers who do not accept the example in (i) below, which was attested in the Portuguese press, may allow *se* with other raising verbs such as *demorar* 'take some time', as illustrated in (ii). In addition, all speakers accept *se* with copular verbs such as *ser* 'be' and *estar* 'be', as shown in (iii), which arguably function as raising verbs.

(i) Atenas entrou em   decadência, os abusos   sucedem-se   e   **parece-**
     Athens entered in   decadence,   the excesses succeed-SELF and seems-
     -se   ter
     -SE   have
     perdido as referências   políticas de conduta na   cidade
     lost   the references   political of conduct in-the   city
     'Athens entered into decadence, excesses follow one after the other, and political references of conduct in the city seem to have been lost.'

(In *CRPC – Corpus de Referência do Português Contemporâneo*, CETEMPublico, Ext 1505701 soc, 98b). See http://www.clul.ul.pt/).

(ii) Demorou-se muito   a resolver o problem.
      lasted-SE much   to solve   the problem
      'It took us a long time to solve the problem.'

(ii)a. Quando se é feliz, a vida é   um   eterno sorriso.
       when   SE is happy the life is   na   eternal smile
       'When one is happy, life is an eternal smile.'

   b. Nesta   terra, nunca se está triste.
      in-this   land   never SE is   sad
      'In this land, one is never sad.'

These facts point to the conclusion that there is no intrinsic incompatibility between raising verbs and impersonal *se* (see Cinque 1988, Mendikotxea 1999, and Bartra Kaufmann 2002, among others). However, why Portuguese speakers may display the variation reported above remains rather mysterious (see Raposo and Uriagereka 1996:794-796, in particular footnote 54). For further discussion on the variation of *se* constructions, see Martins 2003, 2005.

The relevant steps involved in the derivation of subject, object, and adjunct control structures under Hornstein's system are illustrated in (10) to (12):[9]

(10) a. John tried to buy the car.
 b. [$_{TP}$ John [$_{vP}$ ~~John~~ [$_{v'}$ v [$_{VP}$ tried [$_{TP}$ ~~John~~ [$_{T'}$ to [$_{vP}$ ~~John~~ buy the car]]]]]]]

(11) a. Mary persuaded John to buy the car.
 b. [$_{TP}$ Mary [$_{vP}$ ~~Mary~~ [$_{v'}$ persuaded+v [$_{VP}$ John [$_{V'}$ ~~persuaded~~ [$_{TP}$ ~~John~~ [$_{T'}$ to [$_{vP}$ ~~John~~ buy the car]]]]]]]]

(12) a. John called Mary after buying the car.
 b. K = [$_{PP}$ after [$_{TP}$ John [$_{vP}$ John buying the car]]]
 L = [$_{vP}$ v [called Mary]]
 c. *"Sideward" movement*:[10]
 K = [$_{PP}$ after [$_{TP}$ John [$_{vP}$ John buying the car]]]
 M = [$_{vP}$ John v [called Mary]]
 d. *Final structure*:
 [$_{TP}$ John [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ ~~John~~ v [called Mary]] [$_{PP}$ after [$_{TP}$ ~~John~~ [$_{vP}$ ~~John~~ buying the car]]]]]

In all the derivations above, *John* receives the external θ-role associated with *buy* and moves to the embedded [Spec, TP] to check the EPP. From there, it further moves to a thematic position of the matrix clause, the external argument position in (10b) and (12c) and an internal argument position in (11b). In (11b), *John* has its Case licensed in this position, whereas in the other constructions, it will have its Case licensed after it moves to the matrix [Spec, TP].[11] Deletion of the lower copies (see Nunes 2004) then yields the sentences in (10a), (11a), and (12a). The only relevant difference between the derivations of (10a) and (11a), on the one hand, and (12a), on the other, is that the latter employs "sideward" rather then upward movement. However, as argued in Nunes (2001, 2004) and Hornstein (2001), once movement is decomposed in the basic operations of Copy and Merge under the copy theory, "upward" and "sideward" movement are simply indistinguishable.

Let us now examine control structures in both BP and EP under Hornstein's system, keeping the term *control* from now on as a purely descriptive term.

---

[9] For expository purposes, we will assume that the embedded clause of a control structure is a TP.

[10] Sideward movement describes the result of copying a given element from within a syntactic object and merging it to another independent syntactic object (see Nunes 2001, 2004 for relevant discussion). In (12b), for example, *John* is copied from within the syntactic object K and merged with L, yielding M in (12c).

[11] For presentational purposes, we will ignore the possibility that in (11b) *John* could also move overtly to [Spec, vP] to check its Case.

2.2. Fluctuation between Control and Raising Structures

By and large, there is much more similarity than difference between BP and EP regarding control structures. And this is indeed what we should expect. The similarities should follow from the general architectural properties of the computational system once control is assimilated to movement, whereas the differences should be related to thematic properties of individual lexical items in each dialect or to deeper differences in their Case systems.

Adjunct control, for instance, seems to be the case where there is no difference between the two dialects. Let us consider why. In standard cases of subject and object control, the embedded clause out of which the "controller" moves is an argument (cf. (10b) and (11b)); hence, only verbs that can take infinitival complements may allow subject or object control and changes in the selection or Case properties of these verbs may in principle have consequences for the licensing of the control structure, as we will see below. By contrast, given that in adjunct control the clause from which the "controller" moves is an adjunct (cf. (12c)), it should in principle be insensitive to thematic or Case properties of the predicate that the adjunct clause modifies. In other words, although one may list the subject or object control verbs of a given language, there is no comparable list of "adjunct control verbs". The fact that there seems to be no substantial difference in adjunct control structures between BP and EP is therefore not surprising at all. Adjunct control simply follows from the general availability of sideward movement in the grammar (see Nunes 2001, 2004 and Hornstein 2001). In this regard, subject and object control structures constitute the adequate set for investigating potential dialectal variation.

In fact, lexical idiosyncrasies aside, BP and EP do not differ substantially with respect to subject control. They however confirm the crosslinguistic observation that diachronically, control verbs tend to give rise to raising verbs and that it is not uncommon to find pairs of control and raising verbs with the same phonological realization. Such lexical ambiguity is found in both dialects with respect to some modal (e.g. *poder* 'be able'/'be likely', *dever* 'ought to'/'be likely'), aspectual (e.g. *parar* 'stop', *começar* 'start'), and, more interestingly, "volitional" verbs (e.g. *prometer* 'promise'/'be likely', *ameaçar* 'threaten'/'be likely', and *querer* 'want'/'show signs of'), as illustrated in (13)-(17).

(13)   O   director   *pode*   demitir   os   funcionários.
        The   manager   can/may   fire-INF   the   employees
Control: 'The manager has the power to fire the employees.'   (BP/EP: OK)
Raising: 'The manager is likely to fire the employees.'   (BP/EP: OK)

(14)   a.   *Control*:
            O   João   decidiu   *começar*   a   trabalhar. (BP/EP: OK)
            The   João   decided   start-INF to   work-INF
            'João decided to start working.'

b.   *Raising*:

O	tempo	*começou*	a	melhorar.	(BP/EP: OK)
the	weather	started	to	improve-INF	

'The weather is getting better.'

(15)   a.   *Control*:

Eles	*prometeram*	fazer	a	tarefa.	(BP/EP: OK)
they	promised	do-INF	the	homework	

'They promised to do the homework.'

b.   *Raising*:

Ele	*prometia*	ser	um	bom	poeta.	(BP/EP: OK)
he	promised	be-INF	a	good	poet	

'He seemed to be a promising poet.'

(16)   a.   *Control*:

Eles	*ameaçaram*	denunciar	o	plano.	(BP/EP:OK)
they	threatened	denounce-INF	the	plan	

'They threatened to denounce the plan.'

b.   *Raising*:

O	desemprego	*ameaça*	alastrar.	(BP/EP: OK)
the	unemployment	threatens	spread-INF	

'Unemployment is likely to spread.'

(17)   a.

O	João	'tá	*querendo*	ficar	doente.	(BP)
the	João	is	wanting	become-INF	sick	

b.

O	João	está	a *querer*	ficar	doente. (EP)
the	João	is	to want-INF	become-INF	sick

Control: 'João wishes to get sick.'   (BP/EP: OK)
Raising: 'It seems that João is getting sick.'   (BP/EP: OK)

The lexical ambiguity underlying the fluctuation between control and raising can be accounted for if the external θ-role of some verbs that take nonfinite clausal complements may be optional. If the θ-assigning version of these verbs is chosen, DP movement out of the embedded clause will first target the specifier of the subcategorizing verb before targeting [Spec, TP], yielding a control structure. By contrast, if the non-θ-assigning version is chosen, movement proceeds directly from [Spec, TP] to [Spec, TP], resulting in a raising structure. Notice that the point here is not that GB could not account for the lexical ambiguity of these verbs by resorting to optional external θ-role assignment. Rather, the problem for GB is that, given its postulation of a fundamental D-Structure difference between raising and control structures, the fact that control and raising verbs in general tend to overlap comes out as completely accidental. On the other hand, by analysing both control and raising structures under movement, Hornstein's (1999, 2001)

theory actually makes room for the pervasive lexical ambiguity between raising and control for some classes of verbs.[12]

As for object control, there are two cases to consider. The first one involves standard object control structures such as (18), where the "controller" is assigned (structural) accusative Case by the matrix verb.

(18) Eu   convenci   a   Maria   a   viajar.   (BP/EP)
      I   convinced   the Maria   to   travel-INF
      'I convinced Maria to travel.'

The two dialects differ with respect to this type of structure only when the controller is a third person pronoun. As is well known (see Tarallo 1983, Duarte 1986, Galves 1987, 2001, Nunes 1993, Cyrino 1993, 1997, Corrêa 1991, and Kato 1993, among others), BP has lost third person accusative clitics, replacing them with weak pronouns with nominative morphology. Thus, a sentence such as (19a) is characteristic of written BP, whereas (19b) is only admitted in some nonstandard EP dialects.

(19) a. Eu   convenci-a   a   viajar.   (written BP /EP: OK)
          I   convinced-her(CL) to travel-INF
      b. Eu   convenci ela   a   viajar. (BP: OK; EP: *)
          I   convinced she   to travel-INF
          'I convinced her to travel.'

The second type of object control structures involves control by an inherently Case-marked dative clitic and with respect to these structures, BP and EP behave differently, as illustrated in (20).

(20) a. Como   nos   custou   a contratar   (BP: *; EP: OK)
          how   us(DAT)   cost-3SG to hire-INF
          aquele empregado!
          that   employee
          'How hard it was for us to succeed in hiring that employee!'
      b. O   chefe não   percebeu que   nos   demorou
          the boss   not   realized that us(DAT)   lasted-3SG
          a   resolver o   problema.   (BP:*; EP: OK)
          to   solve-INF the problem
          'The boss didn't realize that it took us some time to solve the problem.'

---

[12] In accordance with our suggestion made in footnote 6, the infinitival complements of the raising alternatives in (13), (15b), (16b), and (17b) should be licensed by an inherent Case assigned by the matrix verb.

Two pieces of evidence indicate that the "controller" of structures such as (20) is to be analysed as receiving inherent Case. First, the matrix predicates in (20) do not have an external argument; thus, in consonance with Burzio's generalization (see Burzio 1986), these verbs should be unable to assign structural Case. And second, standard dative clitics can be replaced by a corresponding PP, but this does not happen with the dative clitics in (20), as respectively shown by (21) and (22) in EP.

(21) a. A   Maria deu-lhe o   livro.   (EP)
          the Maria gave-him(DAT)   the book
          'Maria gave him the book.'

      b. A   Maria deu   o   livro   ao   João.   (EP)
          the Maria gave   the   book   to-the João
          'Maria gave João the book.'

(22) a. Custou-lhe   a   fazer   aquilo.   (EP)
          cost-him(DAT)   to   do-INF   that
          'It was hard for him to succeed in doing that.'

      b. *Custou   ao   João   a   fazer   aquilo.   (EP)
           cost   to-the João   to   do-INF   that
          'It was hard for João to succeed in doing that.'

We saw in section 1.1 that impersonal constructions may give rise to raising constructions if the infinitival clause fails to Case mark its subject. This is arguably what is at stake here, as well. As shown in (23) and (24) below, not only do the constructions in (20) have parallel impersonal constructions with inflected infinitives, but they themselves cannot take inflected infinitival complements. This indicates that the only relevant difference in the cases under discussion is that the raised embedded subject lands in a thematic position, namely, [Spec, VP], as schematically illustrated in (25).

(23) a. *Impersonal*:
          Como custa **despedirmos** um empregado!   (BP/EP: OK)
          how   costs fire-INF-1PL   an employee
          'How hard it is to fire an employee!'

      b. *Object control*:
          *Como   nos   custou   a   **despedirmos** aquele
          how   us(DAT) cost-3SG   to fire-INF-1PL   that
          empregado!   (BP/EP: *)
          employee
          'How hard it was for us to succeed in firing that employee!'

(24) a. *Impersonal*:
Demorou a **resolvermos** o problema. (BP: ?*; EP: OK)
lasted-3SG to solve-INF-1PL the problem

b. *Object control*:
*O chefe não percebeu que nos demorou
the boss not realized that us(DAT) lasted-3SG
a **resolvermos** o problema.   (BP/EP: *)
to solve-INF-1PL the problem
'The boss didn't realize that it took us some time to solve the problem.'

(25) a. *Impersonal*: $[_{TP} \ldots [_{VP} V [_{TP} DP\ T_{+Case} \ldots]]]$
b. *Object control*: $[_{TP} \ldots [_{VP} DP_i [_{V'} V [_{TP} t_i\ T_{-Case} \ldots]]$

The question then is why object control structures such as (20a) and (20b) are not possible in BP.[13] Our suggestion is that, lexical variation aside, this is related to the fact that BP is loosing its ability to assign inherent Case to pronominal clitics, as independently shown by the data in (26), whose clitics are arguably marked with inherent Case.[14]

(26) a. Ninguém aqui te   é   hostil. (BP: *; EP: OK)
nobody   here you(DAT) is   hostile
'Nobody here is hostile to you.'

---

[13] At first glance, the acceptability (ia) below (without the preposition *a*) in BP is unexpected, as it resembles the object control structure in (iia). Notice however that structures such as (ia) allow inflected infinitivals, as shown in (ib), contrary to structures like (iia), as shown in (iib). This indicates that what we have in (i) is not an object control construction (see Duarte, Martins, and Nunes 2002 for further discussion).
(i) a. Como nos   custou **despedir** aquele empregado!   (BP/EP: OK)
how   us(DAT) cost-3SG fire-INF   that   employee
   b. Como nos   custou **despedirmos** aquele empregado! (BP/EP: OK)
how   us(DAT) cost-3SG fire-INF-1PL that   employee
'How hard it was for us firing that employee!'
(ii) a. Como nos   custou a **despedir** aquele empregado! (BP: *; EP: OK)
how   us(DAT) cost-3SG to fire-INF that   employee
'How hard it was for us firing that employee!'
   b. *Como nos   custou a **despedirmos** aquele empregado! (BP/EP: *)
how   us(DAT) cost-3SG to fire-INF-1PL that   employee
'How hard it was for us to succeed in firing that employee!'

[14] Thanks to Inês Duarte (p.c.) for pointing out the relevance of the loss of constructions such as (26b) in BP (see Cyrino 1997 for a description of this change in BP). Mary Kato (p.c.) has pointed out to us that in her dialect a construction such as (26a) becomes acceptable if the dative clitic is the first person singular *me*. This indicates that the on-going loss of dative clitics in BP may affect some clitics before others (for some speakers). We have nothing to add here on the reasons for why this lexical-syntactic change should proceed in this way.

      b.   Inteligente, o   João   não   o   é. (BP: *; EP: OK)
            intelligent the   João   not   it(ACC) is
            'João isn't intelligent.'

With the on-going loss of inherent Case in BP, the embedded subject that has moved to the matrix [Spec, VP] in (25b) must further move to [Spec, TP] in order to be Case-licensed, as sketched in (27) and illustrated by the sentences in (28).[15]

(27) $[_{TP} \, DP_i \, T_{+Case} \, [_{VP} \, t_i \, [_{V'} \, V \, [_{TP} \, t_i \, T_{-Case} \, \ldots \,]]]]$

(28)   a.   Eu   custei   a   contratar   aquele
            I   cost-1SG   to hire-INF   that
            empregado!   (BP; nonstandard EP: OK)
            employee
            'It was hard for me to succeed in hiring that employee.'
      b.   O chefe não percebeu que os organizadores demoraram
            the boss not realized that the organizers   lasted-3PL
            a   resolver   o   problema.   (BP/EP: OK)
            to solve-INF   the   problem
            'The boss didn't realize that it took the organizers some time to solve the problem.'

Here, we find once again the types of low level differences between BP and EP regarding the acceptability of raising and impersonal constructions (see section 1.1), with some raising constructions judged as nonstandard in EP (cf. (28a)) and some impersonal constructions becoming obsolescent in BP (cf. (24a)). At the same, the data discussed in this section exhibit another instantiation of the intimate connection between control and raising as expected under Hornstein's (1999, 2001) theory.

3. Overt and Covert Hyper-raising

As is well known, null subjects in BP are severely restricted (see references in footnote 2). (29) below, for instance, shows that null subjects in BP require an antecedent in the sentence, which must be the closest c-commanding one.

---

[15] This construction differs from traditional subject control structures in that the controller moves through [Spec, VP], rather than [Spec, vP], the external argument position (cf. (10) and (12)).

(29) Ele$_i$ disse que [o pai   d[o   Pedro]$_j$]$_k$ acha
  he said that the father of-the Pedro   thinks
  que $\varnothing_{k/*i/*j/*l}$ vai ser   promovido
  that   goes be   promoted
BP: 'He$_i$ said that [Pedro$_j$'s father]$_k$ thinks that he$_{k/*i/*j/*l}$ is going to be promoted'

By assuming movement to θ-positions, Ferreira (2000, 2004) and Rodrigues (2002, 2004) provide an illuminating account of the restricted interpretation of null subjects in BP. Technical differences aside, Ferreira and Rodrigues assume that with the substantial weakening of its verbal morphology (see Duarte 1995), BP is no longer able to license a "referential" null *pro* in subject position. They propose that what appears to be a null subject in constructions such as (29) is actually a trace (a deleted copy) left by movement to a θ-position. Once movement is invoked, the relevance of c--command and minimality then becomes straightforward.

Assuming Ferreira's and Rodrigues's general account of null subjects in BP in terms of movement, we will restrict our discussion to Ferreira's specific analysis of "hyper-raising" cases such as (30b) in BP.[16]

(30) a. Parece que o João comprou um carro novo.
   seems that the João bought a car new
   'It seems that João bought a new car.'
  b. O João parece que comprou um carro novo.
   the João seems that bought a car new
   'João seems to have bought a new car.'

According to Ferreira, the weakening of verbal morphology in BP led finite T to become an optional Case assigner. If the Case-assigner version of T is selected, it will assign nominative to the DP in its Spec, freezing it for further A-movement. This is arguably what happens in (30a), with *João* being Case-marked in the embedded clause. If the non-assigning version of T is selected instead, the DP in its Spec will have to undergo further movement in order to have its Case checked. Ferreira argues that this is what goes on in the derivation of the hyper-raising construction in (30b), where *João* moves from

---

[16] Ura (1994) coined the term *hyper-raising* to describe cases where the subject of a finite embedded clause moves to the subject position of the subordinating clause, as illustrated in the examples below (Ura 1994:68).
(i) *Dholuo*   (Nilotic language) (Creider 1989)
  Un$_i$ **u**-calo [ni t$_i$ u-sin]
  you(PL) 2PL-seem COMP   2PL-unhappy
  'It seems that you are unhappy.'
(ii) *Xhosa*   (Bantu language)   (du Plessis and Visser 1992)
  Ábántwánà$_i$ **bá**-mèlé   [úkúbá t$_i$ **bá**-fúndè]
  children   3PL-necessary COMP 3PL-study
  'It is necessary that children study.'

the embedded [Spec, TP] and can be licensed in the matrix clause (if its T is of the Case-assigning type).[17] In a sense, hyper-raising illustrates in the finite domain the same kind of phenomenon examined earlier with respect to raising out of impersonal infinitival constructions. The big difference is that hyper--raising out of finite clauses is restricted to BP, as will be discussed below.

Ferreira presents two types of evidence to show that constructions such as (30b) in BP really involve moved subjects, rather than topics. First, the DP in question triggers agreement with the matrix predicate, as shown in (31) below, and second, elements that cannot occur in a marked topic position in BP such as the weak pronoun *cê* 'you' or the quantifier *alguém* 'someone' can appear in hyper-raising constructions, as shown in (32). Another example of the second type that we would like to add to Ferreira's diagnostics is that idiom chunks cannot be topicalized, but can be hyper-raised, as shown in (33).

(31) a. Eles parecem   que compraram   um carro novo.   (BP)
         they seem-3PL   that bought-3PL   a   car   new
         'They seem to have bought a new car.'

     b. Eu 'tou parecendo   que   'tou doente.
         I   am   seeming   that   am sick.
         'I seem to be sick.'

(32) a. *Cê/*alguém, o João me disse que está doente.   (BP)
         you/someone the João me said that is   sick
         'João told me that you/someone were/was sick.'

     b. Cê/alguém   parece que está doente.   (BP)
         you/someone   seems   that is   sick
         'You/someone seem to be sick.'

(33) a. A   vaca   foi   pro   brejo.   (BP)
         the cow   went to-the   swamp
         Idiomatic reading: 'Things went bad.'

     b. A   vaca, o João disse que foi   pro   brejo. (BP)
         the cow   the João said that went to-the swamp
         Idiomatic reading ('João said that things went bad.'): *

     c. A   vaca parece que foi   pro   brejo. (BP)
         the cow seems that went to-the swamp
         Idiomatic reading ('It seems that things went bad.'): OK

---

[17] It is worth observing that there is no intrinsic asymmetry between matrix and embedded finite Ts in Ferreira's (2000, 2004) system: both can freely be of the Case-assigning or the non-Case assigning type. It just happens that the derivation of hyper-raised sentences such as (30b) will only converge if the T head selected from the numeration and inserted in the embedded clause is not a Case-assigner and the one inserted in the matrix clause is. See Ferreira (2000, 2004) for a discussion of this point, as well as some conjectures on how such a property can be acquired based on primary linguistic data.

To summarize the discussion so far, BP exercises an option that is generally restricted to nonfinite clauses in other languages, namely, it allows raising out of a finite embedded clause when its T is not a Case assigner. If such movement targets a θ-position, we have a control-like structure as in (29); if it targets a nonthematic position, we get a hyper-raising construction as in (30b).

With this general picture in mind, let us now consider colloquial BP sentences such as (34), with a "double subject" (see Duarte 2003, 2004).

(34) a. O   João   parece   que   ele   está   doente.   (BP)
          the João   seems   that   he   is   sick
          'João seems to be sick.'
      b. Os   meus   pais   parecem   que eles   vão   viajar.(BP)
          the my   parents seem-3PL   that   they   go-3PL   travel
          'It seems that my parents are going to travel.'

Constructions such as (34) appear to present a paradox. On the one hand, they differ from hyper-raising constructions in the sense that their matrix DP behaves like a topic. Hence, they are systematically incompatible with quantified expressions, as shown in (35), and idiom chunks, as shown in (36)-(37).[18]

(35) Algum aluno   parecia   que (*ele) ia   viajar.   (BP)
      some student   seemed-3SG   that he   went-3SG   travel
      'It seemed that some student was going to travel'

(36) a. A   vaca   foi   pro   brejo.   (BP)
          the cow   went   to-the   swamp
          Idiomatic reading: 'Things went bad.'
      b. A   vaca   parece que (*ela) foi   pro   brejo.   (BP)
          the cow   seems that   it   went   to-the   swamp
          Idiomatic reading ('It seems that things went bad.')

(37) a. A   cobra   vai   fumar.   (BP)
          the snake   goes   smoke
          'It's going to be a mess.'

---

[18] In this regard, these double subject constructions also differ from English "copy--raising" constructions such as (i) below, in that the latter is compatible with quantified elements and idiom chunks, as illustrated in (ii). For a recent overview of the properties of copy raising constructions and an analysis in terms of movement, see Fujii (2005).
(i)   John seemed as if he was sick.
(ii) a.   Someone seemed as if he was tired.
      b.   The cat seems as if it was out of the bag.   (from Rogers 1971)

      b.   A   cobra parece que (*ela) vai   fumar   (BP)
           the   snake   seems that it   goes smoke
           Idiomatic reading: 'It seems that it's going to be a mess.'

On the other hand, the matrix DPs of constructions such as (34) do not seem to behave like topics in that they must be in a local relation with the embedded subject. In other words, although a regular topic may be associated with an embedded object pronoun "skipping" the embedded subject, as shown in (38a), this is not possible in the construction under consideration, as shown in (38b).

(38)   a. Esses professores, **parece** que a   Maria gosta deles. (BP)
           these teachers   seems that the Maria likes of-them
           'It seems that Maria likes these teachers.'
      b. *Esses professores **parecem** que a Maria gosta deles. (BP)
           these teachers   seem-3PL that the Maria likes of-them
           'It seems that Maria likes these teachers.'

We suggest that this apparent paradox is related to another salient property of BP grammar: the pervasive use of base-generated topics.[19] Let us assume that "unmarked" topics in BP check their "topic Case" in a position above TP (see Martins 1994, for instance) and that finite T in BP optionally assigns Case, as proposed by Ferreira (2000, 2004). That being so, the derivation of a sentence such as (39), for instance, should be along the lines of (40) (with English words for ease of exposition).

(39)   Esses professores **parecem** que eles gostam da   Maria. (BP)
        these teachers   seem-3PL that they like   of-the Maria
        'It seems that these teachers like Maria.'

(40) $[_{XP}$ [these teachers $]_i$ $[_{TP}$ t_i T_{+Case} $[_{VP}$ seem $[_{CP}$ that $[_{TP}$ they$_k$ T_{-Case} $[_{vP}$ t_k like Maria]]]]]]

In (40), the embedded subject moves from its θ-position to the embedded [Spec, TP] to check the EPP. Given that the selected embedded T in (40) is not of the Case-assigning type, the pronoun only checks the agreement of the embedded clause, and still has to check its own Case. In hyper-raising constructions, this is achieved after the embedded subject overtly moves to check the EPP of the higher clause, thereby reaching a position where it can have its Case feature appropriately checked if T is a Case-assigner. In (40), however, a DP marked with topic Case merges with the matrix TP, checking the EPP, before moving to the position where it can have its topic Case

---

[19] For relevant discussion, see Pontes (1987), Kato (1989, 1998), Britto (1997, 2000), Galves (1998, 2001), and Negrão (1999), among others.

checked. Suppose that *these teachers* in (40) may check the agreement of the matrix clause, but not the nominative Case of T, given that it is specified for "topic Case". Under this scenario, the derivation reaches Spell-Out with the embedded pronoun and the matrix T with their Case-features unchecked. The derivation can however converge if the formal features of the embedded subject move in the covert component (see Chomsky 1995) and adjoin to the matrix T, allowing their Case-features to be checked.

To sum up, by assuming that the matrix DP in constructions such as (39) is indeed a topic, we account for its incompatibility with quantified expressions and idiom chunks, as seen in (35)-(37).[20] On the other hand, by invoking covert movement to check the Case-feature of the matrix T, we account for the fact that only the embedded subject is a suitable checker. Were an embedded object pronoun to check the Case of the matrix T in the covert component, the embedded subject should induce a minimality violation; hence, the contrast between (36b) and (39). Constructions such as (39) are thus hyper-raising structures in the covert component.

Given that overt and covert hyper-raising is contingent on optionality of Case-assigment by a finite T, which in turn is related to verbal morphology impoverishment, we should not expect to find any instances of hyper-raising in a morphologically rich language such as EP. In this regard, one should not be misled by apparent cases of hyper-raising constructions such as (41) below, which are indeed acceptable in EP. The agreement contrast in (42) clearly indicates that in EP, the matrix [Spec, TP] in (41) is filled by a null expletive and the left-peripheral DP is a "marked" topic sitting in a higher position (see Duarte 1987). This is further confirmed by the complete unacceptability of what we have analysed as covert instances of hyper-raising such as (34),

---

[20] As we saw in (32a), the weak pronoun *cê* 'you' in BP cannot appear in a marked topic position,. However, it can appear in a "double subject" structure, as illustrated in (i) below. As argued in Martins and Nunes (2005), this is due to the fact that the "topic-subject" in sentences such as (39) does not sit in the left-periphery position reserved for marked topics, but in a lower position that is targeted by unmarked topics and does not exclude weak pronouns. Independent evidence for this is provided by the data in (ii). The marked topic construction in (iia) allows only the [+human] interpretation for the pronoun *ele*, whereas the "double subject" structure in (iib) allows both the [+human] and the [-human] readings. This contrast indicates that we are dealing with a strong pronoun in (iia) but a weak pronoun in (iib).

(i) Cê   parece que   cê   sabe   a   resposta.
     you   seem   that   you   know   the   answer
     'You seem to know the answer.'

(ii) a. Ele,   a   Maria   disse   que   caiu.
         pro-3SG the   Maria   said   that fell
         'Maria said that he fell down.' [e.g. *ele* = 'João']
         *'Maria said that it fell down.' [e.g. *ele* = 'the book']
     b. Ele   parece que   ele   caiu.
         pro-3SG seems   that pro-3SG fell
         'He seems to have fallen down.'   [e.g. *ele* = 'João']
         'It seems to have fallen down.' [e.g. *ele* = 'the book']

repeated below in (43) (Note that in (43a) *o João* is not to be interpreted as a hanging or marked topic).

(41)   O   João   parece   que   vai   viajar.   (EP)
     the   João   seems   that goes   travel
     'It seems that João is going to travel.'

(42)   a.   *Eles   **parecem**   que   vão   viajar.   (EP)
         they   seem-3PL   that go-3PL   travel
         'It seems that they are going to travel.'
      b.   Eles   **parece**   que   vão   viajar.   (EP)
         they   seem-3SG   that go-3PL   travel
         'It seems that they are going to travel.'

(43)   a.   *O   João   parece   que   ele   está   doente.   (EP)
         the   João   seems   that he   is   sick
         'João seems to be sick.'
      b.   *Os   meus   pais   parecem   que   eles   vão   viajar.   (EP)
         the   my   parents   seem-3PL that they   go-3PL travel
         'It seems that my parents are going to travel.'

To sum up, hyper-raising structures arise when a finite T fails to assign Case to its subject position. Once we find such defective finite Ts, nothing in principle should prevent hyper-raising from taking place in the covert component, as well. BP hyper-raising structures with "double" subjects instantiate this theoretical possibility, lending support for the whole approach. By contrast, given that EP finite Ts are well-behaved Case-assigners, both overt and covert instances of hyper-raising are excluded in this dialect.

4. Conclusion

Exploiting the natural fluctuation between control and raising structures, BP uses raising as a strategy to fill the matrix subject position and to compensate for the loss of inherent Case. The subject raising strategy is further extended to finite domains in order to license subjects that are not assigned Case within finite embedded clauses. Hence, in BP some raising structures are progressively replacing their control counterparts, a number of nonraising predicates such as *tough*-structures are being reanalysed as raising predicates and new subject raising constructions are appearing which involve A--movement from a finite clause. By contrast, in EP the fluctuation between control and raising structures tends to remain stable, there being no grammatical motivations for one structure to be preferred over the other. In addition, hyper-raising from finite clauses or *tough*-structures is not available.

The empirical contrasts between BP and EP described along the paper are natural outbursts of a divergence pattern setting BP and EP apart in what concerns the pro-drop property, the strength of their verbal morphology, and the licensing of inherent Case. Finally, it is worth noting that BP and EP pattern alike not only with respect to the fluctuation between control and raising structures, but also with respect to the tendency to reanalyse impersonal as raising structures. But sure enough, even in these pockets of similarity, the path towards generalized raising is visibly more entrenched in BP.

References

Barbosa, P., Duarte, M. E. & Kato, M. (2001) A distribuição do sujeito nulo no português europeu e no português brasileiro. In *Actas do XVI Encontro Nacional da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística* (C. N. Correia & A. Gonçalves, editors), pp. 539-550. Lisboa: Associação Portuguesa de Linguística.

Bartra Kaufmann, A. (2002) La passiva i les construccions que s'hi relacionen. In *Gramática del Català Contemporani* (J. Solà, J. Lloret, J. Mascaró & J. Pérez Saldanya, editors), pp. 2111-2179. Barcelona: Empúries.

Boeckx, C., Hornstein, N. & Nunes, J. (2004) Overt copies in reflexive and control structures: A movement analysis. Ms., Harvard University, University of Maryland and Universidade de São Paulo.

Bošković, Z. (1994) D-structure, Theta-Criterion, and movement into theta-positions. *Linguistic Analysis,* **24**, 247-286.

Bošković, Z. & Takahashi, D. (1998) Scrambling and last resort. *Linguistic Inquiry,* **29**, 347-366.

Britto, H. (1997) *Deslocamento à esquerda, resumptivo-sujeito, ordem SV e a codificação sintáctica de juízos categórico e tético no português do Brasil.* PhD dissertation, Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

Britto, H. (2000) Syntactic codification of categorial and thetic judgments in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Brazilian Portuguese and the Null Subject Parameter* (M. Kato & E. Negrão, editors), pp. 195-222. Madrid & Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana & Vervuert.

Burzio, L. (1986) *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Callaway, M. (1913) *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon.* Washington: Carnegie Institution.

Cardinaletti, A. & Starke, M. (1999) The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe* (H. van Riemsdijk, editor), pp. 145-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, N. (1986) *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use.* New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Cinque, G. (1988) Two types of *si* and the theory of Arb. *Linguistic Inquiry,* **19**, 521--581.

Corrêa, V. (1991) *Objeto nulo no português do Brasil.* M.A. thesis, Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

Creider, C. (1989) *The Syntax of Nilotic Languages.* Berlim: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Cyrino, S. (1993) Observações sobre a mudança diacrônica no português do Brasil: objeto nulo e clíticos. In *Português Brasileiro: uma Viagem Diacrônica* (I. Roberts & M. Kato, editors)*,* pp. 163-184. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.

Cyrino, S. (1997) *O Objeto Nulo no Português do Brasil: Um Estudo Sintático--Diacrônico*. Editora UEL, Londrina.

Duarte, I. (1987) *A construção de topicalização na gramática do português: regência, ligação e condições sobre o movimento*. PhD dissertation, Universidade de Lisboa.

Duarte, M. E. (1986) Variação e sintaxe: clítico acusativo, pronome lexical e categoria vazia no português do Brasil. M.A. thesis, Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo.

Duarte, M. E. (1995) A perda do princípio "Evite Pronome" no português brasileiro. PhD dissertation, Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

Duarte, M. E. (2003) Sujeitos expletivos no portugês brasileiro: As Construções de Alçamento. Ms., Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

Duarte, M. E. (2004) On the embedding of a syntactic change. *Language Variation in Europe, Papers from ICLaVE 2,* 145-155. Uppsala: Universitetstryckeriet.

Duarte, M. E., Martins, A. M. & Nunes, J. (2002) Controle e alçamento/elevação em português: Aspectos temáticos e casuais. Paper presented at 3.º Colóquio "Português Europeu e Português Brasileiro – Unidade e Diversidade na Passagem do Milénio", Universidade de Lisboa, 23-25/09/02.

Ferreira, M. (2000) *Argumentos nulos em português brasileiro*. M.A. thesis, Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

Ferreira, M. (2004) Hyper-raising and null subjects in Brazilian Portuguese. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 47: Collected Papers on Romance Syntax*, 57-85.

Figueiredo Silva, M. C. (1996) A Posição do Sujeito no Português Brasileiro: Frases Finitas e Infinitivas. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.

Fujii, T. (2005) Cycle, Linearization of Chains, and Multiple Case Checking. Ms., University of Maryland.

Galves, C. (1987) A sintaxe do português brasileiro. *Ensaios de Lingüística,* **13**, 31-49.

Galves, C. (1993) O enfraquecimento da concordância no português brasileiro". In *Português Brasileiro: uma Viagem Diacrônica* (I. Roberts & M. Kato, editors)*,* pp. 387-408. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.

Galves, C. (1998) Tópicos, sujeitos, pronomes e concordância no português brasileiro. *Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos,* 34, 7-21.

Galves, C. (2001) *Ensaios sobre as Gramáticas do Português*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.

Hornstein, N. (1999) Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry,* **30**, 69-96.

Hornstein, N. (2001) *Move! A Minimalist Theory of Construal*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Hornstein, N., Nunes, J. & Grohmman, K. K. (2005) *Understanding Minimalism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kato, M. (1989) Tópico e sujeito: duas categorias em sintaxe? *Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos,* **17**, 109-132.

Kato, M. (1993) The distribution of pronouns and null elements in object position in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Linguistic Perspectives on the Romance Languages* (W. J. Ashby, M. Mithun, G. Perissinoto & E. Raposo, editors), pp. 225-235. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Kato, M. (1998) Tópicos como predicados alçados. *Cadernos de Estudos Lingüísticos*, **34**, 67-76.

Kato, M. (1999) Strong pronouns, weak pronominals and the null subject parameter. *Probus,* **11**, 1-37.

Kato, M. (2000) The partial pro-drop nature and the restricted VS order in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Brazilian Portuguese and the Null Subject Parameter* (M. Kato & E. Negrão, editors), pp. 223-258. Madrid & Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana & Vervuert.

Kato, M. and Negrão, E., editors (2000) *Brazilian Portuguese and the Null Subject Parameter*. Madrid & Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana & Vervuert.

Kiguchi, H. (2002) *Syntax unchained*. PhD dissertation, University of Maryland.

Lasnik, H. (1995) Last resort and Attract F, *Procedings of FLSM,* **6**, 68-81. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Lightfoot, D. (1979) *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martins, A. M. (1994) *Clíticos na história do português*. PhD dissertation, Universidade de Lisboa.

Martins, A. M. (2003) Construções com *se*: Mudança e variação no português europeu. In *Razões e Emoção: Miscelânea de Estudos em Homenagem a Maria Helena Mateus* (I. Castro & I. Duarte, editors), vol. 2, pp. 163-178. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional – Casa da Moeda.

Martins, A. M. (2005) Passive and impersonal *se* in the history of Portuguese. In *Romance Corpus Linguistics II: Corpora and Diachronic Linguistics* (C. D. Pusch, J. Kabatek & W. Raible, editors), pp. 411-430. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Martins, A. M. & Nunes, J. (2005) Topic-pronoun relationship in Brazilian Portuguese and the operation Agree. Paper presented at XIV Congresso Internacional da ALFAL, Monterrey, 17-21/10/05.

Matos, G. & Duarte, I. (1985) Se "impessoal" sua caracterização sintáctica. In *Actas do 1º Encontro da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística,* pp. 335-352. Lisboa: Associação Portuguesa de Linguística.

Mendikotxea, A. (1999) Construcciones con *se*: medias, pasivas e impersonales. In *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española* (I. Bosque & V. Demonte, editors), pp. 1630-1722. Madrid: Espasa.

Modesto, M. (2000) *Null subjects without "rich" agreement*. PhD dissertation, University of Southern California.

Negrão, E. (1999) *O português brasileiro: Uma língua voltada para o discurso*. "Tese de livre-docência", Universidade de São Paulo.

Nunes, J. (1993) Direção de Cliticização, Objeto Nulo e Pronome Tônico na Posição de Objeto em Português Brasileiro. In *Português Brasileiro: uma Viagem Diacrônica* (I. Roberts & M. Kato, editors), pp. 207-222. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.

Nunes, J. (1995) The diachronic distribution of bare and *to*-infinitives in English. In *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 124: Historical Linguistics 1993* (H. Andersen, editor), pp. 357-369. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nunes, J. (2001) Sideward Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry,* **32**, 303-344.

Nunes, J. (2004) Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Pires, A. (2001) The syntax of gerunds and infinitives: Subjects, Case, and control. PhD dissertation, University of Maryland.

Plessis, J. A. du & Visser, M. (1992) *Xhosa Syntax*. Via Africa Limited.

Pontes, E. (1987) *O Tópico no Português do Brasil*. Campinas: Pontes.

Raposo, E. (1987) Romance Infinitival Clauses and Case Theory. In *Studies in Romance Languages* (C. Neidle & R. Nuñes-Cedeño, editors), pp. 237-249. Dordrecht: Foris.

Raposo, E. & Uriagereka, J. (1996) Indefinite *se. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* **14**, 749-810.

Rodrigues, C. (2002) Morphology and null subjects in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change* (D. Lightfoot, editor), pp. 160-178. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rodrigues, C. (2004) *Impoverished morphology and A-movement out of Case domains*. PhD dissertation, University of Maryland.

Rogers, A. (1971) Three kinds of physical perception verbs, *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 7*, 206-218. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Tarallo, F. (1983) *Relativization strategies in Brazilian Portuguese*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Ura, H. (1994) Varieties of raising and the feature-based bare phrase structure theory. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics,* **7**. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Viotti, E. (1999) *A sintaxe das sentenças existenciais do português do Brasil*. PhD dissertation, Universidade de São Paulo.

Ximenes, C. & Nunes, J. (2004) Contraction and duplication of prepositions in coordinated structures in Brazilian Portuguese. In *WCFFL 23: Proceedings of the 23rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistic*s (V. Chand, A. Kelleher, A. J. Rodriguez & B. Schmeiser, editors), pp. 815-828. Sommerville: Cascadilla Press.

Ana Maria Martins
Dept. de Linguística Geral e Românica
Faculdade de Letras da
Universidade de Lisboa
Alameda da Universidade
1600-214 Lisboa
Portugal
anamartins@fl.ul.pt

Jairo Nunes
Dept. de Lingüística, FFLCH
Universidade de São Paulo
Av. Prof. Luciano Gualberto 403
Cidade Universitária
05508-900 São Paulo, SP
Brasil
jmnunes@usp.br