Syntax

This chapter outlines contemporary Brazilian Portuguese syntax. For an overview of the the diachronic changes that led to the emergence of this syntax, we refer the reader to ###Chapter 6. The outline offered in the present chapter is informed by the perspectives of two different theoretical and methodological frameworks: the functionalist perspective - which privileges the relations between language and its social functions, on levels that go beyond the sentence - and the formalist perspective - in which syntax is viewed as the grammatical-internal level in which core linguistic properties are computed to relate sound and meaning.

Syntax, Pronominal System, Predication, Complex predicates, Relativization strategies

1. Presentation: functionalist and formalist views of syntax

"*Syntax*", in its most basic definition, is the study of the rules and patterns by which languages combine words to build larger meaningful units such as phrases, clauses and sentences - rules and patterns that can be used in a dynamic way, producing infinite results from a finite number of resources (cf. among others Baker, 2002). Not surprisingly, the study of the "syntax" of any given language will privilege different aspects of these patterns of sentence-formation, depending on how one understands "Language" in the first place - and, as the purpose of this chapter is to debate a group of relevant syntactic aspects of Brazilian Portuguese (henceforth BrP) from both the functional and the formal view, a few introductory remarks on how "Syntax" is viewed by each of these approaches are necessary.

In the functionalist view, the structural settings of languages are considered to be decisively determined by the functions which they fulfill in the life of social individuals. From this point of view, the relations between form and function are naturally inseparable and unstable. *Inseparability* implies basic functionalist assumptions, such as the non-autonomy of the linguistic system in regard to cognitive and sociocultural forces, the weight of usage contexts in linguistic descriptions and the relationship of determination between the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic components. *Instability* implies the continuous and progressive system reorganization, evidenced by the non-discretionary nature of categories and processes and the coexistence of stable usage patterns and emerging patterns.

The formalist view of syntax is largely represented, nowadays, by the generative paradigm. Generative linguistics is interested in the study of an abstract object it calls "*Grammar*", rather than in the study of languages as social, historical facts. Grammar, in this perspective, is an inaccessible, logical object, that produces the linguistic facts we observe concretely - and generative linguistics tries to understand Grammar through the theoretically informed observation of *Languages*. For instance, in this perspective the variety of historical languages is explained by the proposal that Grammar involves not only immutable principles, but also variable parameters; this means that, by studying how different historical languages function – how widely they may vary, and how narrowly they may resemble one another – we would be able to understand the principles and parameters of Grammar (and, ultimately, how the unique human property of the "faculty of language" works). Syntax is a central component in the generative framework, as it involves the core grammatical mechanisms that relate "sound" and "meaning", in different ways, in different historical languages.

The formalist and the functionalist views of syntax, as our short summaries already show, are very distant in terms of their theoretical frameworks and objects of study. In this chapter, nevertheless, we attempt to summarize the aspects of Brazilian Portuguese that have been treated as relevant for both of these approaches to syntax. In this attempt we are helped by the fact that a great part of our exposition is grounded on the descriptions of spoken Brazilian Portuguese developed by the project '*Gramática do Português Falado*', 'Grammar of Spoken Portuguese', conducted by linguists from several Brazilian universities between the 1980s and 2000, under the coordination of Ataliba T. de Castilho. The project pioneered in the reunion of contributions from both formalist and functionalist syntactitians, many of which will be referred to along this text. The results of this very intense research initiative have been published as a whole in successive editions of the '*Coleção Gramática do Português Falado*', 'Collection Grammar of Spoken Portuguese' – of which Volume II (Kato/Nascimento, 2015) presents the syntactic research conducted by the formalist team, and Volumes III and IV (Ilari 2014, 2015) present the syntactic research conducted by the functionalist team.

The present chapter approaches topics that are relevant to both perspectives in a broad sense, from more morphosyntactic issues to issues concerning sentential syntax, organized as follows: the pronominal system (in Section 2), predication strategies (in Section 3), and relativization strategies (in Section 4). We will start each of the sessions with a review of functionalist work, and end it with a review of formalist work, making an effort to reveal the synergy between them wherever we see it as possible. With this, we will try to produce an outline

of the syntax of BrP that may serve as a foundation for further research, in both theoretical approaches.

2. Pronominal system and verb inflection

Among the linguistic features that characterize BrP and make it stand out in the scenery of other varieties of Portuguese, its pronominal system – and, in association, its the verbal inflection paradigm – are probably the ones that have been observed and debated for the longest period of time. In effect, the first observations made on the singularities of the variety of Portuguese spoken in Brazil already referred to this aspect (Coelho 1880, among others), which went on to be a central point of debate for the first 20th-century linguists concerned with the description of "*the language of Brazil*" (Silva Neto 1950; Melo 1946), for whom the particularities of the verbal-inflection paradigm in the '*popular*' varieties of what we now call BrP were a source of much debate (see Paixão de Sousa, 2010, for a historical account of these discussions). In more recent research, the focus on verbal inflection and pronominal system remains. To begin with, it has widely been noticed that "*The set of personal pronouns that is effectively used in Brazilian Portuguese is very different from that for European Portuguese, not only in the subject position (nominative), but also for direct (accusative) and indirect (dative) complements, and for the possessive (genitive)*" – as exposed in ###Chapter 6 Historical syntax, where a detailed account of important aspects of the diachronic course leading to this difference is outlined. Here, we focus on the main consequences of this change in BrP - as the rearrangements in the personal pronoun system of BrP allow us to understand aspects of its current composition and way of functioning.

In this sense, the two key points are the following; consider, in (1) below, a simplified picture of current BrP's verb-pronoun paradigm, in the subject position:

Diagram (1): *Paradigm – Old Portuguese, European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese*

Old Portuguese, European Portuguese	Brazilian Portuguese				
Eu falei 1SG speak.PST.1SG	**Eu** falei 1SG speak.PST.1SG				'I spoke'
Tu falaste 2SG speak.PST.2SG	**Tu** falaste 2SG speak.PST.2SG	~ Tu falou 2SG speak.PST.3SG	~ **Você** falou 2SG speak.PST.3SG		'you spoke'
Ele falou 3SG speak.PST.2SG	**Ele** falou 3SG speak.PST.3SG				'he spoke'
Nós falamos 1PL speak.PST.1PL	**Nós** falamos 1PL speak.PST.1PL	~ Nós falou 1PL speak.PST.3SG	~ **A gente** falamos 1PL speak.PST.1PL	~ A gente falou 1PL speak.PST.3SG	'we spoke'
Vós falastes 2PL speak.PST.2PL	**Vós** falastes 2PL speak.PST.2PL	~ **Vocês** falaram 2PL speak.PST.3PL	~ Vocês falou 2PL speak.PST.3SG		'you spoke'
Eles falaram 3PL speak.PST.3PL	**Eles** falaram 3PL speak.PST.3PL	~ Eles falou 3PL speak.PST.3SG			'they spoke'

As we can see above, in Old Portuguese and in current European Portuguese, the paradigm includes six pronominal forms and six corresponding verbal forms, whereas in BrP, the picture is more varied. The most immediate observations are:

i. **Pronouns.** In BrP there are two 'new' forms, which we analyze as pronominal forms – respectively, the second person singular-plural pair *você-vocês*, and the first person plural form *a gente*.

ii. **Verb forms**. There is considerable variation in the verb forms used with second person (singular and plural) pronominal forms and with the first person plural pronominal forms:

    -   With the second person singular pronominal *tu*, the verb may be second person singular or third person singular (*tu falaste ~ tu falou*). For the new pronominal form *você*, the verb is consistently third person singular (*você falou*); with the new second person plural pronominal *vocês*, the verb is consistently third person, but varying between plural or singular (*vocês falaram ~ vocês falou*).

    -   With the first person plural pronominal *nós*, the verb may be first person plural or third person singular (*nós falamos ~ nós falou*); with the new first person plural pronominal *a gente*, the verb form may be first person plural or third person singular (*a gente falamos ~ a gente falou*)[1].

A wealth of research has been conducted to explain the BrP paradigm shown above as regards these two main points (the rise of two new pronominal forms, and the associated inflection patterns), both in the diachronic and in the synchronic perspective – and, as we shall see, the two perspectives are closely interweaved. For a very thorough discussion of the diachronic progress of this change, we refer the reader to ###Chapter 6 (Section 2.1), as well as to the references therein. Here, we wish to highlight the association between the introduction of the new pronominal forms and the variation in the verb-subject agreement paradigm. To this regard, the first and most relevant point brought by the diachronic perspective is that it explains the use of third person verb forms with the 'new' pronominals. The second person pronominal forms *você/vocês* come from the reanalysis of Old-Portuguese forms of address *Vossa Mercê* 'your grace' – in fact, they are still common to other varieties of Portuguese as such; the

---

[1] There is also the following variation in the form of the second person plural verbal inflection: *falamos ~ falamo*, 1PL speak.PRES.1PL; the two forms may appear with *nós* and with *a gente*. We consider this a morpho-phonetic variation, so that both forms correspond to the same grammatical person and number – thus, this variation is not shown on the diagram describing the paradigm.

innovation, in BrP, is their status as pronominals. This explains the use of third person verb inflection with these forms – a trivial fact when they are forms of address, which remained in their use as pronominals. As for the new first person plural form *a gente*, its history may also explain the use of third person verb forms, in a slightly different way. The form *a gente* also derives from a nominal form – in this case, not a form of address, but the collective and indetermining noun *gente* 'people'.

The use of third person forms with the new pronominals, however, is not the only striking fact about BrP's paradigm: there is also variation in the verb forms within each new form, and in fact with old forms as well. As regards variation within the new forms, notice that the second person plural pronominal *vocês* may appear with a third person singular verb (*vocês falou*) as well as plural (*vocês falaram*); and the first person plural pronominal *a gente* may appear with third person singular verb (*a gente falou*) as well as first person plural (*a gente falamos*). Also with the old pronominals there is a variation in the use of verb forms: the second person singular *tu,* the first person plural *nós,* and the third person plural *eles* may all appear with third person singular verb forms (*tu falou, nós falou; eles falou*), as well as with second person singular, first person plural, and third person plural forms, respectively (*tu falaste, nós falamos; eles falaram*).

Our summarized paradigm in (1), therefore, shows an ample specter of variation: between singular and plural verb forms, between second and third person verb forms, and between the different pronominal forms themselves (as the old forms *nós* and *tu/vós* still co-exist with the new first person plural form *a gente* and the new second person forms *você/vocês,* respectively). However, it is crucial to notice that this variation is not as unconditioned as our simplified picture might wrongly suggest: on the contrary, it is marked by well-known sociolinguistic conditionings – and some of the forms are very strongly marked by social stigma In fact, this variation is in the center of the observation of the socio-historical factors leading to the formation of different socio-dialects in spoken BrP, as Lucchesi (2001) has thoroughly shown. In current BrP, actual usage in the various written and spoken enunciation instances suggests that a part of this system is still undergoing changes, and that these changes affect different sociolinguistic groups in different ways[2]; not only that, but within each group,

---

[2] Notice that, as the range of possible socio-linguistic variations is very wide, in one extreme point of that variation there is the possibility of a paradigm where the only verb-person contrast is between 1st person singular and all other persons (*eu falei, você falou, ele falou; a gente falou, vocês falou, eles falou*). This is in fact amply documented in so-called 'popular' BrP, i.e., the variety of the language most closely associated with sociolinguistic parameters such as 'oral', 'informal', and most importantly, 'low formal education of speakers'. It constitutes, therefore, a marker of social stigma. However,

parameters related to the speech register, phonic salience of verb forms and the indetermination level of the constructions determine the predominance of each form (cf. Lopes 1999, 2003; Ilari 2014, in particular for the conditionings of the use of *a gente* vs. *nós*).

In view of the broadness and importance of the debate around the conditioning factors leading to the rearrangement in the morphosyntax of the personal system in BrP, we chose, here, to highlight one central point: *the generalization of the usage of third person singular form*. In effect, this point has been taken as crucial both by functionalist and formalist debates. Studies grounded in the functional view have long suggested that this structural setting has introduced the third-person verb form neutralization (*ele/ela estuda* 'he/she studies'*, você estuda* 'you study'*, a gente estuda* 'we study') in BrP – a phenomenon which, in turn, presses towards filling the subject position as a means to avoid ambiguity, since the pronouns gain the status of only person markers. For a careful and detailed account of this process in the light of the historical constitution of the vernacular creations *você/a gente*, we refer the reader to Faraco, 1996. In addition, the neutralization is related to the fact that the pronouns *você* and *a gente* may have a generalistic, indetermining character:

(1)   *engraçado que <u>você</u> saindo do Brasil...*
        funny that <u>you</u> leave.GER of-the Brazil...

        <u>*a gente*</u> *sente uma falta muito grande dessa parte de verduras*
        <u>we</u> feel.PRES.3SG a great loss of-these part of vegetables   [Ilari 2015, 35]

         'it is funny that when ones leaves Brazil…
        one misses this kind of vegetables very much'

This use of the new forms *você/a gente* as indeterminates has also called the attention of generative syntax studies. In this framework, the restructuration in the pronominal system of BrP has been analyzed in close connection with the loss of the '*null subject parameter*', one of the most important topics of current research into BrP in this field. The loss of null subjects, in this perspective, would be connected not only with the particular pronominal paradigm of BrP, but also this grammar's properties as regards the expression of arguments in a more general sense - including the order of constituents, for instance, as we shall discuss in Section 3 below. The contrast in BrP's paradigm regarding verbal inflection morphology is also a central topic in the research of the grammatical restructuring around the expression of subjects for generativist research, just as it is for functionalist studies. Here, however, the 'cause and consequence' relation is less

---

notice that in varieties associated with 'higher education of speakers' (and therefore, not marked with social stigma), the paradigm may also be very heavily marked by the third person, the only difference being the plural verb forms used with *vocês* and *eles*: *eu falei, você falou, ele falou; a gente falou, vocês falaram, eles falaram.*

clear, as different researchers are divided as regards one central question: is the the restructuring of the pronominal system a result of changes in inflectional morphology – or, in the contrary, are the changes in inflectional morphology caused by the restructuring of the pronominal system? An extensive review of this issue and its consequences to the analysis of the loss of null subjects may be seen in Torres-Morais (2000).

This tendency to display less agreement morphology than other varieties of Portuguese (either Old or European Portuguese), which we have shown here in a summarized fashion as regards the subject-verb paradigm, is a central morphosyntactic characteristic of BrP. This characteristic is related to other important aspects of its syntax as well, both within the verbal paradigm (noticeably, as regard personal infinitives) and elsewhere (noticeably, as regards agreement morphology within the noun phrase, with plural forms tending to be marked on the determiner but not on the noun, in some dialects: *as meninas ~ as menina*, i.e., 'the.PLURAL girl.PLURAL ~ the.PLURAL girl.SINGULAR'). For a thorough description of this aspect of BrP morphosyntax, we refer to Castilho (2010, 457-461).

Finally, it is important to notice that the new pronominal forms, both for second and first person, are present not only in the nominative case (as shown in the diagram in (1) above), but also as accusative, dative and oblique forms (*ele chamou a gente,* 'he called us'*; ele deu o cartão pra gente,* 'he gave us the card') – and once more, ###Chapter 6 presents a detailed account of their rise in positions other than the subject. Here, we wished to focus on their role as subject pronominals, as this is a most intense area of debate as regards the syntax of BrP, leading to important observations as regards other aspects of sentence construction, as we shall see now.

3. Predication: phrasal constituents expression and order

The complex and hierarchical relation that is formed by the verb with the arguments that complete it in order to form the sentences are a crucial factor in the description of a language. Here, we shall examine some instances of this relation that help us outline the syntax of BrP as regards the verbal domain, taking into account some particularly interesting references in this respect, such as Ilari (2014), Berlink et. al. (2013), Castilho (2010), Neves (2006), and Galves (2001). To start with a more general account of this aspect of the syntax, we may note that in BrP, verbs may require one to three argumental constituents, as in (2) to (4), whereas those which do not require any argumental element (verbs referring to climatic phenomena) or require four elements are considered exceptional, as shown in (5) and (6), respectively (all examples below are from Ilari 2014, 88):

(2)	Eu$_1$ acordo	V1
	I wake-up.PRES.1SG	
	'*I wake up*'	
(3)	Eu$_1$ conheço Bernadete$_2$	V2
	I know.PRES.1SG Bernadete	
	'*I know Bernadete*'	
(4)	Ele$_1$ não me$_2$ deu o violão$_3$	V3
	He.not give.PST.3SG me the guitar	
	'*He did not give me the guitar*'	
(5)	Nevou em Gramado	V0
	Snow.PST._ in Gramado	
	'*It snowed in Gramado*'	
(6)	Eu$_1$ traduzi um trecho$_2$ do inglês$_3$ para o português$_4$	V4
	I translate.PST.1SG a passage from English into Portuguese	
	'*I translated a passage from English into Portuguese*'	

Requiring arguments, of course, is not an exclusive property of verbs, but also of many nouns and adjectives and some prepositions, as shown in (7) to (9) below (examples from Ilari 2014, 104):

(7)	A estrada não estava **pronta** ainda	
	The road not be.IMPERF.3SG ready yet	
	'*The road was not ready yet*'	
(8)	Itauçu que é uma **cidadezinha** lá que inclusive me ofereceu hospedagem	
	Itauçu which be.PRES.3SG a town over there which even offer.PST.3SG me housing	
	'*Itauçu, which is a town over there which even offered me housing*'	
(9)	Foi uma palestra de oito minutos **sobre** a ocupação da Amazônia	
	Be.PST.3SG an eight-minute lecture about the occupation of the Amazon	
	'*It was an eight-minute lecture about the occupation of the Amazon*'	

In (7), *a estrada* 'the road' is the argument of the adjective *pronta* 'ready'; in (8), the argument of *cidadezinha* 'small-town' is *Itauçu*; in (9), *a ocupação da Amazônia* 'the occupation of the Amazon' and *uma palestra de oito minutos* 'an eight-minute lecture' are the arguments of the preposition *sobre* 'about'. In those cases, the verbs (respectively, *estava* 'be.IMPERF.3SG', *é* 'be.PRES.3SG', *foi* 'be.PST.3SG') are not responsible for the argument structure; they are required by syntax since nouns and prepositions cannot construct sentences on their own. The predicative nature of nouns and prepositions, along with the particularities of the adjoining verbs' syntactic and semantic way of functioning (*ser* 'be', *estar* 'be', *ficar* 'stay', *tornar-se* 'become', *andar* 'go' etc.) open yet little explored fields of study (cf. Neves 2006; Ilari 2014).

From a functionalist point of view, the predicate construction shows the interface between the various levels of linguistic analysis, since it consists of an inherently grammatical fact which finds a pragmatic motivation and is subject to semantic restrictions. In this interface, the various ways of realization of a

predicate are not random choices, but rather result from constraints related to the communicative purpose. Departing from the central position of the *verb* in the predicate construction, the number and nature of the constituents which will complement the verb, as well as the means of expression and order of these constituents, are primarily determined by semantic and pragmatic factors.

In generative syntax, the sentence is defined as the projection of the argument structure of a verb - i.e., as the projection of the verb's semantic selection properties. Also here, therefore, the construction of predicates is in the center of attentions. However, it is not viewed as linked to pragmatic motivations; instead, it is the verb's formal traces, pre-defined in each linguistic system, that determine the argument structure it may project - and, thus, those pre-defined formal traces are in the basis of the projection that forms the sentence. In this context, BrP has received particular attention on account of what some researchers have called the '*special predication properties*' of this grammar (cf. Galves 2001), observed in the characteristics of the expression of subjects, as we shall see.

In subsections 3.1 and 3.2, we analyze the verb as predicate matrix to describe features of the constituents' modes of expression and order in BrP. In subsection 3.3, we study constructions in which the verbs are not predicators.

3.1 Phrasal constituents expression

Although both lexical and null subjects are possible in BrP, Duarte (1993), Neves (2006), Castilho (2010), among others, observe changes which point to the increasing tendency towards filling the subject. An apparently decisive factor in this increase is the neutralization of the verbal morphology in the different grammatical persons as a result of changes in the personal pronoun paradigm, in the process we have summarized in Section 2 above. Other factors involved in the expression or non-expression of the subject include the syntactic and semantic type of the verb, polarity, subject co-reference in coordinate and subordinate constructions, personal infinitive as well as prosodically determined factors (cf. Neves 2006; Castilho 2010).

In functionalist studies, the way constituents are expressed in the argument structure is seen as motivated by pragmatic-discoursive factors, such as the information flow, the topic organization of utterances and the need to provide a descriptive specification of the referents (cf. Neves 2006). Therefore, the expression of subjects or complements by means of a noun phrase, a pronoun, zero (ellipsis) or clause represents syntactic patterns guided by pragmatic choices.

As to the expression of the subject, Neves (2006) argues in favor of the weight of information processing, suggesting that the realization through noun phrases is

strongly related to the need to describe an entity as being *new*, whereas leaving the subject blank, which is possible in BrP, could involve shared information. Apart from the relevance of the informational status, functionalist and variationist-oriented studies (cf. Castilho 2010, among others), when considering also the semantic properties of the subject and the argument structure of the verb, provide evidence for the agentive character of the subject and the rich verbal morphology as being factors which support the omission of the subject.

In formalist studies, the expression of the subject is, perhaps, the most salient and well-studied aspect of BrP grammar. The observed tendency towards the lexical expression of subjects is seen as evidence that BrP is the result of a grammatical change in relation to other varieties of the language (diachronic varieties, such as Old and Classical Portuguese, and synchronic varieties, such as European Portuguese). This is particularly relevant since the property of a language allowing or not allowing for the subject to be expressed as '*null*' is considered as a core property that differentiates grammars - in other words, a '*parameter*'. It has been largely considered that BrP has lost the *null-subject parameter*, and there is a wealth of research into this process and its consequences to BrP grammar – among which we refer the reader, in particular, to the collection of works published in Kato/Negrão 2000 and to Galves 2001. In order to understand the relevance of this topic to generativist research, it is vital to notice that in formalist syntax, '*null subjects*' are conceptualized as empty grammatical categories - i.e., as constituents that may have semantic and formal content, even though they have no *phonological* content (i.e., even though they are not pronounced). In other words, in this view, even if it seems that subject is "*not there*"- it *is* there, as it carries both formal properties (for instance, they can be interpreted as 'third person singular') and semantic properties (for instance, as arguments of verbs, they bear thematic role interpretation, such as 'agent'). According to generative syntax, in order for a grammatical category to be 'licenced' as null, a group of conditions must apply that will ensure its interpretation and the felicity of the constructions in each language. This can be seen in the examples below. Here (as henceforth in the chapter), we represent empty categories with a gap sign, __, and as *ec* in the gloss, placing them where we claim their interpretable position in the structures is:

(10) *Null subjects in Brazilian Portuguese*

    a.   Ninguém sabe o que __ quer
         Nobody know.PRES.3SG the what *ec* want.INF
         '*Nobody knows what they want*'

    b.   O Pedro disse que __ ia viajar
         The Pedro say.PST.3SG that *ec* go.IMPF.3SG travel.INF
         '*Pedro said that he was going to travel*'

     c.   Antigamente __ punha mesa para tomar lanche   [Duarte 2000]
          Formerly *ec* put.IMPF.3SG table for take.INF snack
          '*Formerly one used to lay the table for snacks*'

One first relevant point shown by those examples is that saying that BrP has "*lost the null subject parameter*" does not mean there are *no* null subjects in BrP. Rather, it means that null subjects are less frequent than lexical subjects; and, more importantly, it means that very strict conditions apply in order for them to be properly interpreted. If we examine all the subjects represented by the gaps in (10) above, we will see that in (a), the only interpretation for the subject of *quer* 'wants' is as co-referent with the subject of *sabe* 'knows' in the main clause (*ninguém* 'nobody'); in (b), the subject of *viajar* 'to travel' can only be interpreted as co-referent with the subject of disse '*said*' in the main clause (*O Pedro*); and in (c), the subject of punha 'used to lay' can only receive an indetermined interpretation[3]. The particular conditions involved in the interpretation of the empty subjects in those examples illustrate, roughly, what generative theory refers to by '*restrictions*' on the licensing of null subjects. And, because 'subject' is a central grammatical category (among others, it is the position reserved for the most prominent argument of the verb), the extent to which a language licenses/limits the expression of this category as null (if at all) is central to its whole organization, and has consequences to several, seemingly unrelated aspects. Also, the way languages differ in this respect is central to its differentiation from other languages (which, again very roughly, is what the term '*parameter*' means in this context).

Generative research on BrP, in sum, claims that the loss of the *null-subject parameter* provoked a complete grammatical reorganization, and is at the root of most of the other important syntactic properties of the language - of which we discuss, further on, the order of constituents (3.2), and the conditions on argument movement (3.2.1, cleft-constructions and 4, strategies for relativization).

As to complement expression, BrP syntax displays two particular phenomena. The first one refers to the possibility of omitting the direct complement in cases where it provides information which can be recovered from the context, as ilustrated in (11) below (example from Galves, 1989):

(11)   No tempo do calor a gente come as maçãs e guarda __ para comer no inverno
        In-the time of-the heat the people eat.PRES.3SG the apples and keep.PRES.3SG *ec*
        to eat.INF in-the winter
        '*In summer we eat the apples and keep them to eat in winter*'

---

[3] Notice that none of this is true for other varieties of Portuguese: both in Classical and European Portuguese, all the 'gaps' in (10) above would be interpretable as linked to a definite referent mentioned in former discourse.

The second phenomenon, which commonly occurs in informal varieties, refers to the frequent usage of subject pronouns in a context where atonic clitics would be expected in formal registers, as shown in (12) below:

(12)   Eu emprestei *ele* ao colega ~ Eu emprestei-*o* ao colega)
        I borrow.PST.1SG it.NOM to the colleague ~ I borrow.PST.1SG it.ACC to the colleague
        '*I borrowed it to the colleague*'

The possibility of omitting direct complements and the use of subject pronouns in object positions are correlated to the fact that object clitic pronouns are falling in disuse in BrP. In cases such as (11) above, the insertion of a third person clitic pronoun as the argument of *guarda* 'keep' (forming *e **as** guarda*, 'and keep them') is not common in BrP; and in cases such as (12), the use of a third person clitic *o* 'it' instead of the nominative ele would only be common in written register. In both cases, the use of clitics would sound very formal – whereas in European Portuguese, they are part of the general vernacular. We refer the interested reader to ##Chapter 6 for a detailed account of the diachronic process involved in this change.

In formalist research, "null" objects are also conceptualized as empty grammatical categories, and their use in BrP has often been studied in relation to the major grammatical change pertaining the expression of subjects. In fact, both the possibility of null complements and the use of subject-pronouns in complement position may be seen as consequences of the reorganization of the pronominal system linked to the loss of the null-subject parameter (cf. Galves 1989; Kato 1993; Cyrino 1996).

3.2 Order of constituents

As to the positioning of sentence constituents, the different order patterns in BrP have been extensively described as sensitive to pragmatic motivations. This is a fundamental aspect to understand BrP syntax; and, beyond the points to be treated in this section (topicalization, focalization – including cleft constructions, and voice), a more detailed debate may be seen in Castilho (2002), Ilari (2003) and Neves (2003), respectively volumes I, II and VII of *Gramática do Português Falado*.

These and other important studies have shown that the most frequent patterns in BrP are SV(O) and VS(O) (Camacho/Pezatti 1997; Pezatti 1993). These patterns show a co-relation, in a complementary distribution, to verb types: SV(O) co-relates to transitive, intransitive and copula verbs (*eles preferem linguística* 'they prefer linguistics'*; o rapaz trabalha duro* 'the young man works hard'*; a regra é flexível* 'the rule is flexible'), whereas VS(O) covers ergative

constructions with existential, presentational verbs (*existem pessoas em condições privilegiadas* 'there are people in a favoured condition'*; veio um senhor de meia idade* 'there came a middle-aged man').

Functionalist studies have remarked that the interaction between the constituents' informational status and the pragmatic functions of topic and focus help understand the choice of either pattern. Camacho and Pezatti (1997) propose a general order pattern, represented by P1 (V) S (V) O (V), which accounts for alternative verb (V) positions and defines P1 as the initial position to be filled by *wh*–type grammatical constituents, relative pronouns and subordinate conjunctions, or, in their absence, by constituents which take on topic or focus functions.[4] The abbreviations S and O refer to subject and complement respectively.

The P1 (V) S (V) O (V) scheme is sufficient to organize the most frequent order patterns in BrP systematically. In (13), the grammatical function of subject and the pragmatic function of topic overlap in P1 (*a produção* 'the production'). In this case, the constituent's topical status depends on a context in which (13) answers the question: *Has the production increased?* Conversely, (14) to (16) include cases with no pragmatic motivation to place the subject in P1, since it does not have the function of topic. In the ergative structure in (14), P1 remains empty and the subject is post-verbal. In (15), P1 is filled by the *wh*-word *onde*, inherently focal, a property which is reinforced by the cleft *é que*. In (16), P1 is filled by the topic (*cem mil cruzados* 'one hundred thousand cruzados') and the VS structure, as a block, provides focal information which usually is new (examples from Camacho/Pezatti 1997):

(13) A produção cresceu muito   (P1/S V O)
      The production increase.PERF.3SG much
      '*The production has increased much*'

(14) Expirou o prazo   (__ V S)
      Expire.PERF.3SG the deadline
      '*The deadline has expired*'

(15) Onde é que estão os economistas?   (P1 V S)
      Where É QUE be.PRES.3PL the economists
      '*Where are the economists?*'

(16) Cem mil cruzados faturou nossa barraca. (Votre & Naro, 1986) (P1 V S)
      Hundred thousand cruzados earn.PST.3SG our stall
      '*Our stall earned 100.000*'

---

[4]   The *topic* function is assigned to the constituent comprising the entity about which a predication is made, and the *focus* function, to the constituent which holds the most important or outstanding information, considering the communicative situation (Dik 1989).

In generative syntax research, the order of constituents in BrP is taken as one of the most relevant features in the study of this grammar, and is seen as closely related to the loss of the null-subject parameter. This can be explained by the general observation that languages with ample use of null subjects are also, very frequently, languages with rich verb-agreement morphology, and relative liberty in the ordering of constituents; and that, in historical processes, the three properties tend to be lost in conjunction. This is the case in Portuguese, where BrP has lost, in the same process, null subject, rich subject-verb agreement morphology, and liberty in word order.

Also for formalist studies, different orders of constituents are taken as related to different informational properties; therefore, the variation between different languages in this regard will express a difference in the relation between syntax and information structure in each grammar (and also other linguistic levels, notably, phonology). In this context, the interaction between discourse and syntax has been a central factor of the research into the properties of the order of constituents in BrP, particularly since Negrão (1999).

In the following, we discuss two phenomena which interact in an especially relevant manner with the order: topicalization and focalization strategies and voice constructions.

3.2.1 Topicalization and Focalization strategies

There are two key pragmatic functions involved in the linguistic organization of information: *topicality*, which characterizes the starting-point, or topic of the messages; and *focality,* which characterizes the most salient aspects of the information about topics. The pragmatic functions *topic* and *focus* are indicated by phrasal constituents treated as topical or focal, respectively (cf. footnote 2). BrP, as other languages, presents specific syntactic strategies that allow for the unambiguous marking of topical and focal phrasal constituents, some of whom we summarize in this session.

3.2.1.1 Cleft constructions represent a syntactic focus mechanism which rearranges the sentence constituents in a type of equational structure which establishes a relationship of identification (cf. Halliday 1985), in which the identifier function, mapped in the focal constituent, creates a sense of exclusiveness which triggers contrastive readings. Therefore, cleft sentences are highly contrastive. BrP presents at least five cleft variants, exposed below, whose

structural configurations and usage conditions differ slightly (Braga 1991; Longhin 1999), as shown in (17) to (21) – examples from Longhin 1999:[5]

(17) *Regular cleft constructions* (CLIV):

A agricultura de ciclo anual não vive e **é *essa agricultura* que alimenta o homem**.

The yearly season agriculture not live.PRES.3SG and CLIV-this agriculture-CLIV feed.PRES.3SG mankind

'The yearly season agriculture does not survive and it is this agriculture that feeds mankind.'

(18) *Constructions with 'é que'* (ÉQUE):

A física também tinha estagnado depois de um grande avanço, depois da física nuclear, e não estava produzindo coisa nova. O novo vinha da genética. De fato, ***a genética* é que produziu uma série de transformações**.

Physics stagnate.PST.PERF.3SG after a great advance after nuclear physics and not produce.PST.PROG.3SG new thing. The new come.IMPERF.3SG from genetics. In fact genetics ÉQUE produce.PST.3SG a series of transformations.

'Physics had also stopped after a great advance, after nuclear physics, and was not producing anything new. The new came from genetics. In fact, it was genetics that led a series of transformations.'

(19) *Constructions with que* (QUE):

Não sou feia não, viu? ***Você* que é feia**.

I not be.PRES.1SG ugly no see.PST.3SG? You QUE be.PRES.3SG ugly.

'I am not ugly, do you hear? You are ugly.'

(20) *'To be' focus* (SF):

Põe lá na caixa. Não, **vou pôr *é aqui***.

Put.IMP.3SG there in the box. No I put.FUT.1SG SF here.

'Put it there in the box. No, I will put it here.'

(21) *Pseudo-clefts* (PC):

É que aqui falta comida, o pessoal padece fome. Um país tão grande e organizado tão mal. **O que nós somos é *um país faminto***.

Be.PRES.3SG that here lack.PRES.3SG food people suffer.PRES.3SG hunger. A country so great and organized so bad. PC we be.PRES.3SG PC a hungry country.

'It happens that we don't have enough food, people suffer famine. Such a great country and so poorly organized. What we are is a hungry country.'

Functionalist-oriented research (cf. Braga 1991; Longhin 1999) has suggested that a strong co-relation exists between the type of cleft, the order of the constituents and the informational status of the element in focus. 'Regular' clefts,

[5] In these examples, we have used bold to mark the whole cleft sentence, underline to indicate the formal cleft marks and bold-italic for the focal constituent.

cleft constructions with 'é que', and cleft constructions with 'que' (CLIVs, É QUEs and QUEs in (17) to (19) above) are more likely to focus pieces of information which are already known in the communicative situation, whereas constructions with 'to be' focus and pseudo-clefts (PCs and SFs in (20) and (21) above), in turn, are preferred for focalizing new pieces of information. The position of the focal constituents in cleft sentences can be explained, at least to some extent, by the referred principle of information distribution, according to which new elements tend to follow given elements. Thus, since the focus of PCs and SFs tends to codify new information, it will most naturally appear to the right, and since the focus of CLIVs, É QUEs and QUE tends to codify known information, it will most naturally appear to the left.

In formalist syntax, the properties of cleft constructions in BrP have been investigated by Kato et. al. (1996), Modesto (2001), among others. This perspective views cleft constructions as complex sentences formed by a clause headed by an auxiliary verb merged with a second clause in which one of the arguments is co-indexed (i.e., share the same referent) with an argument of the first clause - resulting in a construction in which the two clauses form one and the same logical proposition - and which present specificational readings such as contrastivity, exclusivity, and exhaustivity. Different analysis may be given to these constructions by different researchers; in the examples below, for instance, *que* is not treated as an argument of the verbs in the second clauses, but rather as a phrase-marker, or "*Complementizer*" (marked 'COMP't in the examples; the index (i) represents co-indexing of constituents (i.e, sharing of referents), and represents a gap in the structure:

(22)   é **essa agricultura**(i)   que-COMP _(i) alimenta o homem.
(23)   De fato, **a genética**(i) é que COMP _(i) produziu uma série de transformações.

One of the main points of interest surrounding cleft-constructions in the formalist perspective is understanding the mechanisms by which the movement of the argument of one verb to the domain of another verb, within the same sentence domain, may trigger such specificity readings. Cleft-constructions in BrP present a particular interest for this line of research, since they reveal important properties of the relation between the conditions on predication and the restrictions on the movements of argumental and non-argumental constituents in this grammar.

3.2.1.2 Topicalization constructions. As briefly mentioned above, the pragmatic property of *topicality,* which characterized the starting-point of the messages, may be expressed by different structural strategies by which a language indicates the function "*topic*" in a phrasal constituent. Among those strategies, the order of constituents is, in itself, strongly related to topicality. This may be seen

preliminarily in the following examples, where the left-most phrasal constituents, highlighted in each sentence, may be analyzed as *topics,* under different perspectives as we describe further below:

(24) **Essa competência** ela é de natureza mental   [Pontes 1987,19]
      This competence she be.PRES.3SG of nature mental
      '*This competence, it is of a mental nature*'

(25) **A Rosa** eu falei com ela ontem   [Pontes 1987,14]
      Rosa I speak.PST.1SG with her yesterday
      '*Rosa, I spoke to her yesterday*'

(26) **Essa torneira aí** não sai água?   [Pontes 1987,35]
      This faucet there not come-out.PRES.3SG water
      '*This faucet, does no water come out of it?*'

(27) **Esse rádio** estragou o ponteiro   [Pontes 1987,31]
      This radio-set spoil.PST.3SG the marker
      '*This radio set has a broken marker*'

(28) **A lanterna**, já comprou as pilhas?   [Pontes 1987,14]
      The flashlight, already buy.PST.3SG the batteries
      '*The flashlight, did you buy the batteries yet*?"

(29) **Eu agora**, acabou desculpa de concurso, né?   [Pontes 1987,13]
      I now, finish.PST.3SG excuse of exam, no
      '*For me there is no more the excuse of exams*'

(30) **Eu**, café eu gosto tanto sem açúcar como com   [Pontes 1987,30]
      I, coffee I like.PRES.1SG much without sugar as with
      '*I myself like coffee both with and without sugar*'

The classical examples of Pontes (1987) reproduced in (24) to (30) above show salient distinctions in their structural configuration and discoursive functioning. As regards their structural configurations, we can identify:

(i)   Constructions in which topics and subjects are co-referential, cf. (24)

(ii) Constructions in which the topics and (part of) the indirect objects are co-referential, cf. (25)

(iii) Constructions in which the co-reference is indirect or associative, grounded in *frame*s, cf. (26), (27), (28);

(iv) Constructions that involve more than one topic, cf. (30) - in which *café* 'coffee' is of course the topic (the element of which something is predicated, i.e., which one 'likes with or without sugar'); but this is joined by another topic, *eu* 'I', which takes over the property of

topicality by reason of contrastivity (i.e., 'I' versus 'others', or other participants in the context of enunciation).

Functionalist research (cf. Braga 1987, among others) considers the aspects of form and meaning in topic constructions in conjunction, with the main goal of evidentiating the discoursive functions of those structures in actual communicative situations. Braga states that topic constructions like (31) below, with the direct object dislocated to the left, have the essential functions of singling out one of the elements from a group, referring back to elements mentioned in the previous discourse, or setting contrast relations. Constructions like (32), in turn, function essentially as strategies to introduce and re-introduce topics in the discourse (examples from Braga, 1987):

(31)   Assim, **segredo**, só falo pra ela
         So, secret, only speak.PRES.1SG to her
         '*Secrets, I only tell her*'

(32)   **O Éder**, no outro jogo, ele não foi
         The Éder, in-the other game, he not go.PST.3SG
         '*Éder, in the other game he didn't show up*'

In generative syntax, *topicality* would be viewed as a (stable and universal) pragmatic function, and the operations of *topicalization* as one of the points of interface between pragmatics and syntax. Topicalization constructions are operated within the syntactic component, where the sentence may be re-structured - for instance, re-ordered- in order to satisfy *pragmatic* (or *discoursive*) requirements. Grammars will vary as regards the form of this interaction, because the options open for the restructuring depend on the general syntactic properties of this language: specifically syntactic requirements (for instance, the limits and rules for the expression of arguments) will combine with pragmatic requirements and result in different outputs, different *topicalization constructions*, in each language. In this sense, the topicalization constructions characteristic of BrP are seen as again revealing of the restriction on null subjects parameter - as, for strict syntactic reasons, this grammar presents a strong preference for SV order. The conjunction between this particular syntactic requirement and the universal pragmatic requirement of marking topicality would explain, for instance, the characteristic topicalization construction where there is a topic and a lexical (pronominal or nominal) pre-verbal subject, as in examples (33)-(34) above, analyzed below:

(33)   [TOPIC **Essa competência**$_{(i)}$][**ela**$_{(i)}$ é de natureza mental]
(34)   [TOPIC **A Rosa**$_{(i)}$][**eu** falei com ela$_{(i)}$ ontem]

Notice, in this analysis, that the topic *Essa competência* shares its referent with the subject of the clause, *ela,* in (33), as indicated by the index (i); the same

applies to *A Rosa* and the complement *ela* in (34). One interesting topic of research in this sense, for instance, would be: what are the conditions are for the sharing of referential interpretation between those elements, when one of them is beyond the predication domains of the verb (*Essa competência; A Rosa*)? Topicalization, in this sense, is a promising field of research in generative syntax, as it points to the challenges for the research of an important grammatical interface that looks beyond the sentence; and the characteristic constructions of BrP make it a rich case-study in this regard.

3.2.1 Voice

The voice options represent alternative wordings which reveal different perspectives or points of view for the same content, derived from the change in the informative weight of the argumental constituents of the sentence, or possibly the omission of one of them. In these terms, functionalist literature has approached voice as a primarily pragmatic-discoursive mechanism (cf. Camacho 2002; Ilari 2014).

Different syntactic order patterns mark functional voice options, whereby pieces of information can be put in evidence, put into the background or even hidden for the purpose of creating particular meanings. In BrP, the motivation for placing the agent in the final position often lies in the need to mark it as *new* in the communicative situation; on the other hand, the reason for omitting the agent, which is common for certain kinds of passive sentences (for example, *eu nunca fui assaltado* 'I have never been robbed') is the ability to retrieve the information, the impossibility to identify the agent or even its low informational relevance, as judged by the user.

Among the various voice alternatives, in BrP we highlight three passive voice constructions which share the fact of hiding the agent, even though they are based on different structural settings. We mean the passive constructions formed by the periphrasis *ser* ('be') + *past participle,* impersonal constructions with the passive clitic pronoun *se* and constructions with *ter* ('have') + *past participle,* as shown in (35), (36) and (37), respectively:

(35) O condomínio foi construído recentemente (pelo empreendedor)
      The condominium be.PST.3SG build.PTPC recently (by the entrepreneur)
      '*The condominium was built recently (by the entrepreneur)*'

(36) Aluga(m)-se ternos
      Rent.PRES.PASS suit
      '*Suits for rent*'

(37) Diretor da empresa tem telefone grampeado (pela polícia federal)
      Company director have.PRES.3SG telephone wiretap.PTPC (by the federal police)

'Company director has his telephone wiretapped (by the federal police)'

In (35) and (37), the grammatical subject is mapped in the patient, which acts as a topic, i.e. starting point of the sentence. In this case, omitting the agent is optional. In (36), the pronoun *se* does not display reflexivity and reciprocity properties, playing the role of agent indeterminer. In this case, the patient, usually an inanimate entity, is mapped in the post-verbal grammatical subject, the single argument. The difference in the perspective of both passive sentences is clear: the choice between a construction with an auxiliary verb and an impersonal one is strongly related to the fact that the first allows an agent noun phrase to be inserted and displays a topic, features not available for the impersonal construction, which comes closer to subjectless sentences.

In a formalist view of syntax, the term "voice" is less used than is the case in functionalist theory. This may be related to the fact that for formalists, the notion of the grammatical subject being "mapped" in different thematic roles - agent, patient - is not a valid concept. It is rather the reverse: arguments with different thematic roles will be projected, or not, as subjects, depending on each construction. Therefore, "passive", "active", "middle", are not seen as properties of the interaction between the pragmatic, semantic and syntactic levels: formalist will refer to "active" or "passive" *constructions*, as different syntactic realizations of the same argument structure. It may be interesting here for us to analyze the same sentences again, within a formalist perspective:

(35)   O condomínio foi construído recentemente (pelo empreendedor)
(36)   Aluga(m)-se ternos

Let's focus on sentence (35) above: this is the passive construction of the argument structure [*construir: condomínio, empreendedor*], and it would be analyzed, formally, as an alternative predication to this argument structure, triggered by the formal trace of "passive" in the auxiliary *ser* (*to be*, in the past tense, *foi*), in contrast with the active predication, which is constructed in the absence of this trigger. In the sentence, the subject is [*o condomínio*]. This brings no special provision to the analysis, since, in this perspective, there is no direct mapping of thematic roles and the property "subject": the subject is the argument that occupies a prominent position, and that establishes a special relation with the verb (which can, but not necessary has to, present itself as "overt agreement", or morphological agreement). The subject may have different thematic roles depending on the structure; in passive constructions, it will be patient. This becomes interesting when we turn to sentence (36) above. In a functionalist analysis, this sentence is analyzed in the same way, whether the verb presents agreement with the subject or not: *aluga(m)-se*. In a formalist analysis, the presence or absence of agreement makes all the difference. If the sentence is like (38) below (with evidence of agreement), then *as casas* is the subject. If the sentence is like (39) below (with no evidence of agreement), there is an

alternative analysis, in which *as casas* is not the subject of this sentence - rather, it is the object; and the subject of the sentence (surprisingly) is the pronoun *se*:

(38)   Alugam-se <u>ternos</u>-*Subject*

(39)   Aluga-<u>se</u>-*Subject* <u>ternos</u>-*Object*

In this analysis, (39), crucially, is not a passive construction - rather, it is an active construction in which the subject has the particular (referential) property of indetermination. In formalist studies on BrP, there is a great interest in the properties of this grammar as regards the problem of indeterminate subjects and non-active subjects, as can be seen in Duarte et. al. (2001) and Negrão and Viotti (2008) among others.

3.3 Complex predicates

In this session, we discuss constructions in which the verb is not the sole semantic base for the construction of the clause - i.e., in which the verb is not the only predicator (as was the case in what we were describing up to this point). Instead, the verb carries syntactic-semantic functions, as we shall see now as regards *light verbs* (3.3.1), or grammatical functions, as we shall see further as regards *auxiliary verbs* (3.3.2).

3.3.1 Light verbs

Constructions with a light verbs are made of two parts, *verb + noun phrase*. The light verb (usually *dar* 'give', *levar* 'take', *tomar* 'have'/'take', *fazer* 'do') holds the grammar categories (mode, tense, number and person), but it is not the only decisive element for the argument structure: this is also mobilized by the noun phrase, which plays a relevant role in the predication. This may be seen in (40), where the non-referential NP *uma análise* 'an analysis', rather than playing a semantic role as a participant in the event expresses by *fazer* 'to make', actually functions as a predicator; it co-determines, with the verb 'to make', the arguments *João* 'John' and *a situação* 'the situation'. The proposition *João fez uma análise da situação*, while literally translating to 'João made an analysis of the situation', in fact means 'João analized the situation', with *fez uma análise* 'made an analysis' as a 'periphrase' of *analisar*, 'to analyse':

(40)   João **fez uma análise** da situação
         John make.PST.3SG an analysis of the situation
         '*John made an analysis of the situation*'

In BrP, constructions with light verbs show different levels of idiomaticity, in which highly formulaic constructs, such as (41), coexist with morphosyntactically flexible structures, such as [*dar uma X-₍da₎*], which can be filled in various manners, as in (42) and (43).

(41)   A seleção **deu um banho** de técnica e ousadia (= excelência)
         The national team give.PST.3SG a bath of skill and courage
         '*The national team gave a master performance of skill and courage*'

(42)   Quando tinha tempo, **dava uma limpada** na casa
         When have.IMPERF.1SG time give.IMPERF.1SG a clean-up in the house
         '*When I had time, I would give my house a wipe*'

(43)   Eu **dei uma lida** no artigo de linguística
         I give.PST.3SG a reading on the linguistics paper
         '*I had a look at the linguistics paper*'

Occurrences such as (42) and (43) make evident that constructions with light verbs and their counterparts with full verbs (*limpava a casa* 'cleaned the house'*; leu o artigo* 'read the article') do not create the same sense, nevertheless being legitimate semantic functional options. Apart from the mitigating effect of (42) and (43), functionalist-based researches (cf. Neves 2002, 2006; Ilari 2014) have supported the syntactic versatility (e.g. *tomar a decisão final/decidir* 'to take the final decision / to decide'), semantic precision (e.g. *tomar a decisão final* vs *decidir finalmente* 'to take the final decision / to finally decide') and appropriateness of register (e.g., *fazer xixi* 'to pee') which make constructions with light verbs unique.

Formalists studies about BrP have also paid special attention to constructions with light verbs (cf. Scher 2006, among others), as they reveal interesting singularities in the properties of predication in this grammar. As we said above, one perspective towards constructions with light verbs is saying that the light verb supports grammatical features but has no argument structure. In this view, the clause structure in those cases would be similar to constructions with auxiliary verbs (i.e., complex predicates), as illustrated in (44) below; Another analysis, however, would be to say that the light verbs still carry predicative properties (i.e., are still argumental verbs), as illustrated in (45) below:

(44)   <u>Eu₍ᵢ₎</u> **dei** uma __₍ᵢ₎ **lida** no artigo de linguística
(45)   <u>Eu</u>-*Subject* **dei** <u>uma lida</u>-*Object* <u>no artigo de linguística</u>-*Oblique*

What would single out those constructions, in this case, would be the particular argument structure of a class of verbs (and the potentials and constraints of this change over time). Constructions with light verbs, therefore, would make us better understand the interaction between argument structure and phrase construction (i.e., the projection of argument structure). Notice that, to

follow the concept of phrase construction in this theory, the sentence is the projection of the argument structure of the verb - and this, in turn, is "a given", i.e, is pre-established. This does not mean, however, that there isn't any interest in formalist syntax towards argument structure - on the contrary, many studies have been dedicated to it, and those studies rely heavily in the phenomenon of light verbs.

3.3.2 Auxiliary verbs and other verbal periphrases

A characteristic of BrP syntax, resulting from the general tendency to analysis which permeated the constitution of Romanic languages, is the great variety of V1 V2-type verbal periphrases, in which V1 is the auxiliary verb centering the grammatical information, while V2 is the full verb and defines the semantic conditions in regard to the other sentence elements. Together, V1 and V2 form a construction which equals a simple verb. In the set of verbal periphrases, we observe those formed by gerunds (*estar + -ndo, ir + -ndo, acabar + -ndo, vir + -ndo, ficar + -ndo, continuar + -ndo*), by infinitives (*ter que + -r, dever + -r, saber + -r, conseguir + -r, deixar de + -r, acabar de + -r, passar a + -r, terminar de + -r*) and by past participles (*ser + -do, ter + -do, estar + -do, ficar + -do*).

Research on periphrases in BrP (cf. Neves 2006; Ilari 2014, among others) has shown that, within this set, actual auxiliary verbs coexist with others which relate only partially to the auxiliaries. This fluid categorization can be explained in the light of the grammaticalization processes which have affected full verbs, pressing them towards a status of auxiliariness. Since grammaticalization processes take place over the course of centuries and might even remain unfinished, it is reasonable that not all traces of the new category might be assimilated, which explains the fluidity.

From this perspective, important studies about this aspect of BrP syntax (cf. Ilari 2014) have defined criteria or tests to assess the level of auxiliariness (e.g. subject sharing, scope of negation, presence of intervening material between V1 and V2, semantic emptying of V1 etc.), whose implementation allows us to observe that most periphrases pass the auxiliariness test, while others fail in one or another criterion, revealing a yet incomplete auxiliarization course and thereby capturing the gradative constitution of verb categories.

Also in the domain of verbal periphrases, BrP uses a complex construction, innovative in the diachrony of Portuguese, which is common in more informal spoken and written registers, described according to its aspectual value or, then again, based on its value of overturned expectation and emphasis (cf. Tavares 2008; Rodrigues 2009). From the morphosyntactic point of view, it is a

periphrasis formed by a minimal and invariable sequence of two verbs, V1 and V2, which share subject and the verb inflections. The verbs which can fill position V1 form a restricted group, in which *ir* 'go', *chegar* 'arrive', *pegar* 'take', *vir* 'come' and *virar* 'become' are the most recurring. The verbs which fill V2, in turn, are a relatively open class. V1 and V2 appear connected by the conjunction *e* or can be juxtaposed, corresponding to the types (46) and (47) (examples from Tavares, 2008 and Rodrigues, 2009, respectively):

(46)   No cinema, não via as letras, minha filha. E o povo ria, e eu ria. O povo ficava sério, e eu ficava séria. Eu só via a imagem. Aí **eu peguei e pedi** pro meu noivo trazer né? a fita de vídeo pra mim ver.
In the cinema not see.IMPERF.3SG the letters my daughter. And the folks laugh.PST.3SG and I laugh.PST.3SG. The folks get.IMPERF.3SG serious and I get.IMPERF.3SG serious. I only see.IMPERF.3SG the image. Then I ask.PST.1SG my fiancée to bring.INF, right? The videotape for me see.INF.
'*In the cinema I could not see the letters, my child. And the folks laughed, and I laughed. To folks got serious, I got serious. I could only see the image. Then I asked my fiancée to bring it, right? The videotape for me to see.*'

(47)   Ele atravessou na frente do carro, não é? **O carro foi, jogou ele para o alto**, caiu na calçada.
He cross.PST.3SG in front of the car no be.PRES.3SG? The car go.PST.3SG throw.PST.3SG him into the high fall.PST.3SG on the sidewalk.
'*He crossed in front of the car, right? The car came and threw him into the air, fell on the sidewalk*'

The periphrases *V1 (e) V2* formally and pragmatically approach paratactic constructions, which leads Rodrigues (2009) to develop a hypothesis about an existing relatedness in which the periphrases would have been grammaticalized based on parataxis. According to the author, just as in parataxis, in the periphrases *V1 (e) V2* the second member of the construction is in focus. The change process consisted of decategorization of V1 and, subsequently, full reanalysis of the construction. In the context of periphrasis, V1 underwent syntactic-semantic changes, such as the lexical meaning opacification and loss of the property to select arguments, which led its full verb status to be weakened and a new discoursive-pragmatic function to be obtained, namely to dramatize or emphasize the events expressed in V2. Thus, in the periphrases *V1 (e) V2,* V1 creates the conditions to add V2, putting it into a prominent position, where V2 adds new and/or contrastive, usually unexpected or surprising information to the communicative situation.

4. Relativization strategies

Since the groundbreaking work of Tarallo (1983), BrP relativization strategies have been one of the more researched aspects of this grammar, in any theoretical outlook. The main generalization that could be made, in this regard, is that BrP shows a preference for constructions such as (49) and (50), rather than (48) - i.e., a preference for "*chopping*" relatives or "*resumptive*" relatives, rather than "*standard*" relatives - these are some classic examples in Tarallo (1988,141-142):

(48)   *Standard relative*:

   E um deles foi esse fulano aí, **com quem eu nunca tive aula**
   And one of-them be. PST.3SG this chap there, with whom I never had class
   '*And one of them was that chap with whom I never had class*'

(49)   *Resumptive relative*:

   E um deles foi esse fulano aí, **que eu nunca tive aula com ele**
   And one of-them be.PST.3SG this chap there, that-REL I never had class with him
   '*And one of them was that chap who I never had class with him*'

(50)   *Chopping relative*:

   E um deles foi esse fulano aí, **que eu nunca tive aula**
   And one of-them be.PST.3SG this chap there, that-REL I never had class
   '*And one of them was that chap with whom I never had class*'

To functionalist syntax, BrP displays singularities regarding relativization strategies, having a typology in which relative constructions are not free variants, but choices governed by decisions in the scope of semantic and pragmatic components, which amounts to saying that relativization strategies are linked to different communicative purposes (cf. Camacho 2013). Communicative intentions along with change facts explain, to a great extent, the variable morphosyntactic encoding of relative clauses, which predicts relative constructions with and without a preceding noun, as in (51ab); relative clauses embedded or not in an NP, as in (52 ab); relative clauses headed by a relative pronoun and relative clauses headed by conjunctions, as in (53ab).

(51)   a. **a recepção** que foi preparada pelos alunos superou as expectativas
   the reception that.REL be.PST.3SG prepare.PTCP by the students exceed.PST.3SG the expectations
   '*The reception which was prepared by the students exceeded the expectations*'

   b. **quem já deu** não tem para dar
   who-REL already give.PST.3SG not have.PRES.3SG to give.INF
   '*They who have already given have nothing to give*'

(52)   a. O médico **que fez o parto** deu entrevista
   The doctor that.REL do.PST.3SG the childbirth give.PST.3SG interview
   '*The doctor who delivered the child gave an interview*'

   b. O João, **que é um excelente aluno**, atingiu todas as metas
   John who.REL be.PRES.3SG an excellent student reach.PST.3SG all goals

John, who is an excellent student, reached all goals

(53)   a. O time **que** não treina não tem sucesso
         The team that.REL not practice.PRES.3SG not have.PRES.3SG success
         'A team which does not practice does not succeed'

        b. Não conheço o rapaz **que** o João emprestou o livro
         Not know.PRES.1SG the guy that.REL John borrow.PST.3SG the book
         '*I don't know the guy who John borrowed the book*'

In the context of relativization possibilities, functional research has been focusing on aspects related to the generalization process which has affected the relative pronoun *que* (roughly equivalent to the English relative 'that'), especially in oral enunciations, narrowing the set of relative pronouns (*quem* 'who', *qual* 'which', *cujo* 'whose', *onde* 'where', *quanto* 'how much') - given that, due to changes, *que* has expanded contextually, taking the place of other relative pronouns and therefore being established as a universal relative pronoun (cf. Castilho 2010).

As to the typology of relative clauses, some have the purpose of *identifying* or *restricting* a subset within a greater reference set, by fulfilling a condition for the noun core. The group of restrictive clauses includes standard constructions, more frequent in the formal written register, in which the participating relative pronouns show causal specifications, as in (54) to (57).

(54)   Despachei uma encomenda para meu tio **que mora na capital**   (*Subject*)
        Dispatch.PST.1SG a parcel to my uncle that-REL live.PRES.3SG in the capital
        '*I sent a parcel to my uncle who lives in the capital*'

(55)   A cidade **em que nasci** fica na região noroeste   (*Oblique*)
        The city in that-REL I be-born.PST.1SG be.PRES.3SG in the northwest region
        '*The city where I was born lies in the Northwest*'

(56)   Comi o bolo **que eu mesma fiz**   (*Direct complement*)
        Eat.PST.1SG the cake that-REL I myself make.PST.1SG
        '*I ate the cake which I baked myself*'

(57)   Este é o professor **a quem me refiro**   (*Indirect complement*)
        This be.PRES.3SG the professor to whom-REL I refer.PRES.1SG
        '*This is the professor whom I refer to*'

In the field of restrictive clauses, BrP displays two particular patterns, both strongly related to the dispronominalization of the relative pronoun, which involves loss of phoricity and a reinforced conjunction status, decisive transformations which make it come closer to a complementizer. In one of these patterns, as in (58), the relative clause holds a personal pronoun, usually joined by a preposition, which ensures the co-reference with the preceding NP. These are the so-called "*copying relative clauses*" (cf. Tarallo 1983; Camacho 2013, among others), constructions which are stigmatized in the context of more formal enunciations.

(58)   A professora **que você gosta <u>dela</u>** vai se aposentar
        The professor that-REL you like.PRES.3SG of-her will-retire.FUT.3SG
        '*The professor that you like her will retire*'

The second particular pattern covers restrictive relative clauses whose main characteristic is the lack of a co-referential anaphoric element. They are so-called "*chopping relative clauses*", as in (59), which are recurrent in spoken and written genres in BrP.

(59)   A professora **que você gosta** vai se aposentar
        The professor that-REL you like.PRES.3SG her will-retire.FUT.3SG
        '*The professor who you like will retire*'

Another kind of relative clause, different from the restrictive, is motivated by the purpose of adding supplementary information, an apposition, to the usually defined referent of the preceding NP. These are called *appositive relative clauses*. In this case, the constructions are realized in a non-embedded mode of syntactic composition, in which the main clause and the relative clause have different illocutionary forces, as in (52b) mentioned above.

It should be added that BrP has relative clauses with the specificity of enabling interpretations typical for circumstantial clauses, as in (60) to (62), which can be read in terms of cause, contrast and condition, respectively. In this case, the circumstantial readings are strongly pragmatic, dependent on linguistic and pragmatic-cognitive contextual factors.

(60)   Meu irmão, **que morou na Itália**, conhece bem o percurso
        My brother that-REL live.PST.3SG in Italy know.PRES.3SG the route well
        '*My brother, who lived in Italy, knows the route well*'

(61)   O atleta, **que acumulou glórias no futebol**, morreu esquecido
        The athlete that-REL accumulate glories in soccer die.PST.3SG forgotten
        '*The athlete who received much glory in soccer died in obscurity*'

(62)   Seriam selecionados todos **que tivessem experiência internacional**
        Be.COND.3SG select.PTPC all that-REL have.SUBJ.PST.3SG international experience
        '*All who had international experience would be selected*'

For generative syntax, the strategies of relativization in BrP have long been an intense field of research, since Tarallo (1988), with important repercussion, as Kato 1993 has shown. In this perspective, there was particular interest in what the relative constructions in BrP may reveal about conditions of movement of constituents to different parts of the sentence structure. For some researchers in this field, the contrast of standard and non-standard relatives in BrP has been linked to general restrictions on movement of argumental constituents in BrP (as already mentioned for Cleft-constructions), with the options involving less movement being preferred. A summarized typology of one of the possible analyses in generative literature is presented below, based on sentences already shown and glosed above:

(63) *Indirect Complement relatives:*

a. ...<u>esse fulano aí</u>_(i), [com <u>quem</u>_(i) eu nunca tive aula]   (*Standard*)
b. ...<u>esse fulano aí</u>_(i), [que-COMP eu nunca tive aula com <u>ele</u>_(i)]   (*Copying*)
c. ...<u>esse fulano aí</u>_(i), [que-COMP eu nunca tive aula ___(i)]   (*Chopping*)

d. Esse é [<u>o professor</u>_(i) [a <u>quem</u>_(i) me refiro ___(i)]]   (*Standard*)
e. [<u>A professora</u>_(i) [que-COMP você gosta <u>dela</u>_(i)]] vai se aposentar   (*Copying*)
g. Não conheço [<u>o rapaz</u>_(i) [que-COMP o João emprestou o livro ___(i)]   (*Chopping*)

In this analysis, '*que*', in "*copying*" and "*chopping*" relatives is not a relative pronoun (as '*quem*' is), but a complementizer (similar to the analysis for clef-constructions further above). Notice, however, that this analysis applies more immediate for indirect complement relatives, as the ones shown above; for direct complement relatives and subject relatives, there is an analitic ambiguity between the standard and the chopping structure - see it for examples (56) *Comi o bolo que eu mesma fiz* and (54) *Despachei uma encomenda para meu tio que mora na capital* shown further above:

(64) *Direct Complement relatives - Standard or Chopping?*:

a. Comi [<u>o bolo</u>_(i) [<u>que</u>_(i) eu mesma fiz]] *or*
b. Comi [<u>o bolo</u>_(i) [que-COMP eu mesma fiz ___(i)]] *?*

(65) *Subject relatives - Standard or Chopping?*

a. Despachei uma encomenda para [<u>meu tio</u>_(i) [<u>que</u>_(i) mora na capital]] *or*
b. Despachei uma encomenda para [<u>meu tio</u>_(i) [que-COMP ___(i) mora na capital]]

Some researchers have argued that subject and direct complement relatives may also present the chopping structure, similar to indirect relatives - as shown in the options (b) above; for others, chopping relatives may receive an analysis involving movement in BrP (cf. Kato/Nunes 2014 for a recent review of the debate). As for the copying relatives, empirical data shows that this option is indeed active in subject and direct complement relatives, too (examples from Kato/Nunes 2014, 581) - which might strengthen the analysis in which *que* is not a pronoun in any instance:

(66) *Direct object relatives and Subject relatives - Resumptive:*

a. Esse é o livro **que o João sempre cita ele**
   This be.PRES.3SG the book that-REL the João always cite.PRES.3SG it
   '*This is the book that João always cites*'
   Analysis: Este é [<u>o livro</u> _(I) [<u>que</u>_(I) o João sempre cita <u>ele</u>_(i)]] *or*
   [<u>o livro</u> _(I) [que-COMP o João sempre cita <u>ele</u>_(i)]] *?*

b. Eu tenho uma amiga **que ela é muito engraçada**
   I have.PRES.3SG one friend that-REL she be.PRES.3SG very funny
   '*I have a friend who is very funny*'

Analysis: Eu tenho [uma amiga _(I) [<u>que</u>(I) <u>ela</u>(i) é muito engraçada]]   *or*
[<u>uma amiga</u> (I) [que-COMP <u>ela</u>(i) é muito engraçada]]

Similar debates involve other syntactic structures with *que* - very noticeably, interrogatives (where, in fact, the conceptual category "*movement*" translates concretely in a dislocation around the sentence). Notice the different positions of interrogative words *como*, 'how', in (a) and (b) below (from Hornstein/ Nunes/Grohmann 2005, 41-42):

(67) *Interrogatives in Brazilian Portuguese*

   a. **Como** você consertou o carro?   '*How did you fix the car*'?
      How you fix.PST.3SG the car
   b. Você consertou o carro **como**?
      You fix.PST.3SG the car how

As the examples show, interrogatives in BrP may be constructed with movement of an interrogative word to the beginning of the sentence (as in most Romance languages), but this is not obligatory. Even more interestingly, there is a construction using both an interrogative word and the particle *que* (c):

(68)   **Como que** você consertou o carro?
       How QUE you fix.PST.3SG the car
       '*How did you fix the car*'?

The co-occurrence of *que* with interrogative words such as *como*, 'how' (but also, *quem*, 'who'; *qual*, 'which', etc.) in BrP poses the question of the nature of this particle as an interrogative pronoun - as in fact, as a pronoun at all, in its general usage (for instance, in relatives and cleft-constructions, as we saw). In a more general sense, analysis on the conditions on movement in BrP interrogatives have put forward interesting problems for the development of Generative syntax models, and is to this day a topic of interest for researchers in comparative and theoretical linguistic in this framework.

5. Final Remarks

As we mentioned in the beginning, in this chapter we tried to review important research on the syntax of BrP, covering both functionalist and formalist studies; and in order to do so, we have selected those aspects of BrP syntax that have deserved the attention of researchers from both fields. In this process, we inevitably had to skip many other, important aspects. Some of these are dealt with in the chapters dedicated to Historical Syntax and Morphology. The interested reader may also refer to some of the more comprehensive items of the

bibliography, such as Castilho (2010), Kato and Negrão (2000), and the collection *Gramática do Português Falado* (in particular Kato/Nascimento, 2015, Ilari 2014, 2015). We hope the brief outline presented here may lead to further explorations into the rich literature on the syntax of BrP, in both the funcionalist and the generativist frameworks.

6. References

Baker, Mark C. (2002). Syntax. In M. Aronoff / J. Rees-Miller (orgs), *The Handbook of Linguistics*, Blackwell Publishing, 2002. Blackwell Reference Online. 31 August 2015 <http://www.blackwellreference.com/public/book.html?id=g97814051025 20_9781405102520>

Braga, Maria Luiza (1987), Topicalizações, deslocamento à esquerda e discurso. *Relatório de Pesquisa Apresentado ao CNPq*.

Braga, Maria Luiza (1991), As sentenças clivadas no português falado no Rio de Janeiro. *Organon*, UFRGS, vol. 5, n. 18.

Camacho, Roberto (2002), Construções de voz. In: Abaurre, M. B./Rodrigues, A. C. S. (org) *Gramática do Português Falado* (VIII: Novos estudos descritivos). 1a. ed. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP, v. 8, p. 227-316.

Camacho, Roberto (2013), Construções relativas nas variedades do português: uma interpretação discursivo-funcional. *Filologia e linguística portuguesa*, São Paulo, 15(1), p.179-214.

Camacho, Roberto/Pezatti, Erotilde (1997), Aspectos funcionais da ordem de constituintes. *D.E.L.T.A.*, vol. 13, n.2,

Castilho, Ataliba Teixeira de (2002), *Gramática do Português Falado* (I: Ordem). Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP.

Castilho, Ataliba Teixeira de (2010), *Nova gramática do português brasileiro*. São Paulo: Contexto.

Cyrino, Sonia (1996), O objeto nulo do português brasileiro. *D.E.L.T.A.* 12 (2): 221-238.

Dik, Simon (1989), *The Theory of Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Duarte, Maria Eugênia L. (1993), Do pronome nulo ao pronome pleno: a trajetória do sujeito no português brasileiro. In: Roberts, Ian/Kato, Mary A. (org.). *Português brasileiro: uma viagem diacrônica*. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp, p.107-128.

Duarte, Maria Eugênia L./Kato, Mary/Barbosa, Pilar (2001), Sujeitos indeterminados em PE e PB. *Anais do II Congresso Internacional da ABRALIN*, vol. I, p. 405-409.

Faraco, Carlos Alberto (1996), O tratamento *você* em português: Uma abordagem histórica. *Fragmenta*, n. 13, p.51-82.

Galves, Charlotte (2001), *Ensaios sobre as gramáticas do português*. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp, 280pp.

Galves, Charlotte (1989), O objeto nulo no português brasileiro: percurso de uma pesquisa. *Caderno de Estudos Linguísticos*, 17.

Halliday, Michael (1985), *An introduction to funcional grammar*. New York: Arnold.

Hornstein, Norbert/Nunes, Jairo/Grohmann, Kleanthes (2005), *Understanding Minimalism*. 1. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ilari, Rodolfo (2003), *Gramática do português falado* (II: Níveis de análise linguística). Campinas, SP, Editora da UNICAMP.

Ilari, Rodolfo (2014), *Gramática do português culto falado:* Palavras de classe aberta. São Paulo: Contexto.

Ilari, Rodolfo (2015), *Gramática do português culto falado:* Palavras de classe fechada. São Paulo: Contexto.

Kato, Mary A. (1993a), The distribution of null and pronominal objects in Brazilian Portuguese. *Linguistic Perspectives on the Romance Languages: Selected Papers from the XXI Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* (Currents Issues in Linguistic Theory Series), Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 225-235.

Kato, Mary A. (1993b), Recontando a estória das relativas. In: Roberts, Ian/Kato, Mary (orgs.) *Português Brasileiro: Uma Viagem Diacrônica.* Campinas: Ed. da Unicamp,223-261

Kato, Mary/Negrão, Esmeralda V. (eds) (2000), *Brazilian Portuguese and the Null Subject Parameter.* Frankfurt-Madrid: Vervuert-Iberoamericana.

Kato, Mary/Braga, Maria Luiza/Corrêa, Vilma/Rossi, Maria Aparecida/Sikansi, Nilmara (1996), As construções-Q no Português Brasileiro falado: perguntas, clivadas e relativas. In: Koch, Ingedore (org.), *Gramática do Português Falado*. Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP, pp 303-368.

Kato, Mary/Nunes, Jairo (2014), Uma análise unificada dos três tipos de relativas restritivas do Português Brasileiro. *Sociodialeto*, v. 4, p. 575-590.

Kato, Mary/Nascimento, Milton (2015) *Gramática do português culto falado*: a construção da sentença. São Paulo: Contexto Editora, 2015.

Longhin, Sanderléia (1999), *As construções clivadas: uma abordagem diacrônica*. Dissertação (Mestrado), Campinas, IEL/UNICAMP.

Lopes, Célia Regina dos Santos (1999), *A inserção de "a gente" no quadro pronominal do português: percurso histórico*. Tese (Doutorado), Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ.

Lopes, Célia Regina dos Santos (2003), *A inserção de "a gente" no quadro pronominal do português*. Frankfurt/Madri. Vervuert/Iberoamericana, 2003.

Lopes, Célia Regina dos Santos (2004), Vossa mercê > você e Vuestra merced > usted: o percurso evolutivo ibérico. *Alfa*, São Paulo, v. 14, p. 173-190.

Lucchesi, Dante (2001). As duas grandes vertentes da história sociolinguística do Brasil. *D.E.L.T.A*. São Paulo, v. 17, n. 1, p. 97-130.

Melo, Gladstone Chaves de (1946). *A Língua do Brasil*. 3rd Edition. Rio de Janeiro: FGV, 1975. 1st Edition: 1946.

Modesto, Marcello (2001), *As construções clivadas no português do Brasil: relações entre interpretação focal, movimento sintático e prosódia*. São Paulo: Humanitas.

Negrão, Esmeralda (1999) *Português brasileiro: uma língua voltada para o discurso*. Tese de Livre Docência, Universidade de São Paulo.

Negrão, Esmeralda/Viotti, Evani (2008), Estratégias de impessoalização no português brasileiro. In: Fiorin, José Luiz/Petter, Margarida Maria Taddoni (org.) *África no Brasil: A formação da língua portuguesa*. São Paulo: Editora Contexto, p. 179-203.

Neves, Maria Helena de Moura (2002), Estudos das construções com verbo suporte em português. Koch, Ingedore (org) *Gramática do Português Falado* (VI Desenvolvimentos). Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP, pp 201-230.

Neves, Maria Helena de Moura (2003), *Gramática do português falado* (VII: Novos Estudos). Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP.

Neves, Maria Helena de Moura (2006), *Texto e gramática*. São Paulo: Contexto.

Paixão de Sousa, Maria Clara (2010). A morfologia de flexão no Português do Brasil: Ensaio sobre um discurso de perda. *Estudos da Língua(gem),* v. 8, p. 55-82.

Pezatti, Erotilde Goreti (1993) A ordem de palavras e o caráter nominativo/ergativo do português falado. *Alfa*, v. 37, p. 159-78.

Pontes, Eunice S. L. (1987), *O Tópico no português do Brasil*. Campinas, SP: Pontes Editores.

Rodrigues, Angélica (2009), "Ir e pegar nas construções do tipo 'foi fez': gramática de construções de contexto de gramaticalização", In: Castilho, Ataliba (org) *História do Português Paulista. Série de Estudos*, Vol. 1. Parte III. Campinas/SP, Setor de Publicações do IEL/UNICAMP.

Scher, Ana Paula (2006), Nominalizações em ada, com o verbo leve dar em português brasileiro. *Letras de Hoje*, v. 143, p. 29-48.

Silva Neto , Serafim (1950). *Introdução ao estudo da língua portuguesa no Brasil*. 3rd Edtion. Rio de Janeiro: Presença, 1976. 1st edition: 1950.

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

Tarallo, Fernando (1988), Discussing the alleged creole origin of Brazilian Portuguese. *Caderno de Estudos Linguísticos*, Campinas, (15):137-161.

Tavares, Maria Alice (2008), Perífrases [V1 (*E*) V2] em gêneros escritos: propostas para um ensino de gramática baseado no texto. *Linguagem & Ensino,* v.11, n.2, p.329-347.

Torres-Morais, Maria Aparecida (2001), Resenha de Kato/Negrão 2000. *D.E.L.T.A.* [online] vol.17, n.1, pp. 155-168.

Sanderléia Roberta Longhin
Maria Clara Paixão de Sousa