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1. Introduction

Hankamer and Sag (1976) and Sag (1980) proposed a distinction between two types of elliptical constructions based on the two ways anaphoric elements could be assigned interpretations: surface and deep anaphora. While deep anaphora would be inserted in the underlying syntactic representations, surface anaphora would be originated by the deletion of syntactic structures resulting from the application of previous operations.

Two properties, taken as related, were assumed to crucially distinguish these two types of anaphora: deep anaphora might be recovered by the situational context and not exhibit internal structure in Syntax, as opposed to surface anaphora, which requires a linguistic antecedent and present internal structure. Hankamer and Sag attributed these differences to the interpretative devices involved: a deep anaphor would be assigned interpretation by a rule of semantic interpretation relating it to a salient situational or linguistic context¹, while surface anaphora results from the deletion of a linguistic expression under identity (or non-distinctness) with a linguistic antecedent.

Based on its behavior with respect to these properties, Hankamer and Sag characterized Null Complement Anaphora (NCA) in English as deep anaphora. Extending this proposal to Spanish and Italian, Depiante (2000, 2005)...

* We acknowledge the audience of the Going Romance Conference 2004, for valuable comments on this paper. We are particularly indebted to Ana Bartra, Denis Delfitto, Ana Martins Martins, Jairo Nunes and Carme Picallo, and especially to two anonymous reviewers of a previous version of this paper.

¹ Hankamer and Sag (1976) suggest that deep anaphora phenomena are inserted in deep structure and assigned a semantic interpretation by a projection rule, or alternatively, that they are inserted in more abstract structures that represent semantic interpretation. Sag (1980), reviewing this analysis in terms of Chomsky’s (1976) framework, claims that deep anaphora is interpreted by an interpretative rule applying at LF.
2001) argues that NCA is a case of deep anaphora: the non-overt constituent is a null proform, not ellipsis, in whatever approach to ellipsis one chooses to adopt – deletion at PF or copy at LF.

In addition, following a proposal by Brucart (1999), Depiante (2000) explores the hypothesis that NCA is the null counterpart of overt sentential pronominals, which she claims to be in complementary distribution with this construction.

In this paper, we will show that, in Brazilian and European Portuguese (= EP and BP), NCA, in spite of allowing for pragmatic control, exhibits internal structure, and, thus, behaves as a surface anaphor. However, we do not take this as compelling evidence for rejecting the correlation between NCA and the overt sentential pronouns in Portuguese, since there are overt cases of surface anaphora.

Hankamer and Sag (1976) conceived overt surface anaphora as a remnant of deletion. Although tempting, this approach is challenged by the fact that there are sentential and predicative overt surface-anaphoric constructions, both in English and Portuguese, which behave as proforms, in view of their inability to co-occur with the constituents they stand for.

This fact has some consequences for the theory of ellipsis, because it casts (some) doubt on the possibility of drawing a clear-cut distinction between proforms and ellipsis: as we will show below there are instances of overt surface anaphora, behaving as proforms, which require reconstruction at LF. This suggests that Reconstruction should be kept in the grammar.

This paper is structured as follows: section 1, that is, this section, presents the topic to be studied; section 2 introduces the core properties of NCA in English; section 3 mentions the main arguments Depiante 2000, 2001 uses to characterize NCA in Spanish as a deep anaphor; section 4 deals with NCA in Brazilian and European Portuguese: we seek to define NCA clearly in view of other constructions that look similar and we argue for a distinction, moreover, between NCA in Portuguese and in other languages in which it occurs; section 5 deals with the characterization of surface anaphora and its consequences for the theory of ellipsis. Finally, section 6 presents some concluding remarks.

2. Null Complement Anaphora in English

Hankamer and Sag (1976) and Sag (1980) distinguish the constructions of NCA and VP ellipsis in English, on the basis of empirical evidence, and they claim that NCA, in opposition to VP ellipsis, is a deep anaphor.
In NCA, (1), the null constituent presents either sentential or predicative content, whereas in VP Ellipsis, (2), the elided constituent corresponds only to the predicate:

(1) a. I asked Bill to leave, but he refused __.
    (___ = to leave)                      (H&S 1976:411)
    b. He said one of us had to give up his seat, so Sue volunteered __.
        (___ = to give up her seat)             (H&S 1976:412)

(2) I repeatedly asked Bill to leave, and he finally did __.
    (___ = leave)

Also, in NCA the null constituent is licensed by a specific main verb; in VP Ellipsis, in English, an auxiliary verb or the ‘to’ infinitive licenses the gap (cf. (1) vs. (2) and (3)):

(3) He said one of us had to give up his seat, so Sue volunteered to __.
    (___ = give up her seat)                (Sag 1980:326)

Besides, NCA contrasts with VP ellipsis because in the former construction, the null constituent may be recovered by a pragmatic context (4), while in the latter the elided constituent must be recovered by a linguistic antecedent, (5).

(4) [Situation: indulgent father feeds baby chocolate bar for dinner]
    Mother: I don’t approve __!
        (___ = that you feed him chocolate bar for dinner)   (H&S 1976:411)

(5) [Hankamer attempts to stuff a 9-inch ball through a 6-inch hoop]
    Sag: # It's not clear that you'll be able to __.    (H&S 1976:392)

---

2 Examples like (i) apparently suggest that the licenser of the elliptical verbal phrase is the sentence negation. Nevertheless, the ungrammaticality of (ii) shows that the presence of the verbal element is required:

(i) I asked Bill to leave, but he did not __.
(ii) *I asked Bill to leave, but he not __.
In addition, in NCA the null constituent may denote a linguistic antecedent structurally different from the one selected by the licensing verb. In VP Ellipsis, however, the linguistic antecedent must be lexically and structurally parallel to the elided constituent. Thus, in the examples in (6), where the omitted constituent must be recovered in the active voice although its antecedent is in the passive, NCA is grammatical, (6a), but VP ellipsis is marginal, (6b).

(6) The oats had to be taken down to the bin, (H&S 1976:413)
   a. so Bill volunteered __. (__ = to take the oats down to the bin)
   b. *so Bill did __. (__ = take the oats down to the bin)

Finally, the null constituent in NCA does not present internal structure, since it does not sanction the Missing Antecedent construction (Grinder & Postal 1971), while it does in VP ellipsis: the pronoun it in (7) does not have any overt antecedent in the complex sentence; since (7b) is grammatical, it is claimed that in the elliptical constituent there is structure serving as antecedent to the pronoun, contrary to what happens in (7a):

(7) a. *He said one of us had to give up his seat, so Sue volunteered __, because it was too narrow for her anyway. (H&S 1976:412)
   b. He said one of us had to give up his seat, so Sue did __, because it was too narrow for her anyway. (H&S 1976:413)

Three of these properties have been taken by Hankamer and Sag (1976) as the hallmark of deep anaphora: the ability of the null constituent to be recovered from the situational context; the possibility of the antecedent to be structurally different from the null constituent and its inaptitude to license the Missing Antecedent construction. These properties have been correlated with the absence of the internal structure of the omitted constituent in NCA.

However, it has sometimes been noted that some of these properties are not entirely accurate in determining the deep anaphora status of NCA. In fact, with respect to the first property, it has been noticed that in some cases, VP ellipsis may also be recovered by the situational context, (8), (Williams 1977, Chao 1987, Fiengo and May 1994).

(8) [Situation: someone, knocking at the door, asks:]
   Q: May I __?
Likewise, active-passive mismatches may occur in VP ellipsis, as noticed by Chomsky:

(9) This can be presented in an informal way and I often do __.  
    ( __ = present this in an informal way)

In addition, it has been mentioned that the Missing Antecedent criterion is a rather delicate test, which often produces non-consensual judgements among speakers (Bresnan 1971, Sag 1980, Depiante 2001).³

In sum, Hankamer and Sag’s arguments are not as sharp as they intended to be in distinguishing constructions presenting omitted (or overt) constituents with vs. without internal structure.

However, we believe that, taken together, these criteria may contribute to outline the distinction among superficially closely related constructions. In Principles and Parameters framework, constructions do not have a theoretical status. However, they may be understood as descriptive entities that allow us to pre-theoretically delimit the scope of the research. This implies that although they should be characterized as accurately as possible, the criteria used to distinguish them may only capture preponderant properties.

Thus, in the next two sections, we will keep using Hankamer and Sag’s criteria to set the main properties of NCA in Spanish and Portuguese.

3. **NCA as deep anaphora in Spanish**

Relying on the tests presented above, Depiante 2000, 2001 argues that NCA in Spanish (and Italian) is also a *deep anaphor*. Thus, she shows that NCA in Spanish allows for pragmatic antecedents:

(10) [Javier jumps into the icy cold sea] (Depiante 2001: 206)

> Juan says: *Yo también puedo__!*  
> I too can.1SG __
> “I can, too!”

Comparing Spanish and English, the example in (10) could, at first sight, be considered as a case of VP ellipsis. However, following most studies...

---

³ Notice that, as mentioned by one of the reviewers, the argument of the Missing Antecedent Pronoun (Grinder and Postal 1971) seems to undermine Hankamer and Sag’s basic assumption that pronouns do not require linguistic antecedents and may set their denoting contents through pragmatic control.
Depiante (2000, 2001) tacitly assumes that Spanish lacks this construction.\(^4\)

Besides that, the recovery of the null constituent is not subject to strict parallelism. In (11), the gap corresponds to *take them*, a sequence not present in the preceding clause:

\[\text{(11)}\]

Los pacientes del tercero tienen que ser llevados a terapia intensiva aunque la enfermera con más fuerza no pueda __.

“The patients of the third floor have to be taken to intensive therapy even if the strongest nurse can’t (take them).” (Depiante 2001: 207)

Depiante also claims that NCA in Spanish does not sanction pronouns with Missing Antecedents, contrasting the unacceptability of (12a) with the well-formedness of (12b), the VP ellipsis corresponding to (12a), in English.

\[\text{(12)}\]

a. *Juan no pudo asesinar a Pablo con un cuchillo pero Pedro sí pudo y pro estaba oxidado.*

   “Juan couldn’t kill Peter with a knife, but John could __, and it was rusty.” (Depiante 2001: 208)

b. Jack couldn't kill Peter with a knife, but John could __, and it was rusty.

\(^4\) As we will see (cf. 4.1), Portuguese contrasts with Spanish in presenting VP ellipsis.

In fact, while in Spanish the occurrence of the omitted constituent is limited to a subset of the quasi-auxiliary verbs (as well as to some verbs of complementation), in Portuguese, all the auxiliary verbs may occur in VP ellipsis, as shown in (i) vs. (ii) and (iii) vs. (iv):

\[\text{(i)}\]

Ele tinha já lido o jornal e ela também tinha __.

“He had read the newspaper and she had, too.”

\[\text{(ii)}\]

*Juan ha leído ese capítulo, y Marta ha _ también.

“Juan read that chapter, and Marta did, too.” (Zagona 1988)

\[\text{(iii)}\]

Ele está [a ler /lendo] e ela também está.

“He is reading, but she is not.” (Zagona 1988)

\[\text{(iii)}\]

*Juan está leyendo y Marta está también.

“Juan is reading and Marta is too.” (Zagona 1988)
The unavailability of extraction of constituents out of the omitted constituent in NCA also indicates that the latter lacks internal structure. Thus, Depiante (2000, 2001) considers that the unacceptability of (13) is due to the presence of Topicalization in the second conjunct5.

(13) *A Maria, Juan quiere/puede darle un libro, y a Susana también quiere/puede ___. (Depiante 2001: 200)

She notices, however, that NCA, both in English and in Spanish, allows for sloppy identity readings, (14), but argues, based on Bach et al. (1974), a.o., that this is not a reliable test to distinguish deep from surface anaphora.

(14) a. John refused to talk to his mother and Peter also refused __.

b. Juan quiere hablar con su madre y Pedro ___.

(14) (Depiante 2000: 39)

Summarizing, empirical evidence shows that NCA in Spanish is arguably a deep anaphor.

Turning now to Portuguese, we will see that this construction exhibits a different behavior, both in Brazilian and European Portuguese.

4. **NCA as surface anaphora: the case of Brazilian and European Portuguese**

4.1 **NCA, VP Ellipsis and the Null Object**

First of all, a clarification is in order. Brazilian and European Portuguese allow for different constructions that look very similar: NCA, VP Ellipsis and Null Object, as exemplified in (15), (16) and (17), respectively. Furthermore, since Portuguese is a language with Generalized Verb Movement to Inflection, VP Ellipsis occurs both with auxiliary (16a) and main verbs (16b) (Raposo 1986, Matos 1992, Martins 1994, Cyrino 1997, Cyrino & Matos 2002):

5 Notice that the first conjunct of (12) exhibits Clitic Left Dislocation, not Topicalization.
(15) *Pedi ao Pedro que saísse, mas ele recusou-se.*

“I asked Pedro to leave, but he refused.”

( = to leave)

(16) a. *João disse que tinha comprado o jornal e, com efeito, tinha!*

“John said that he had bought the newspaper and he had, indeed!”

b. *Ele não comprou o jornal quando saiu de casa e ela também não comprou*.

“He didn’t buy the newspaper when he left home and she didn’t either.”

( = (buy.PST.3SG) the newspaper when leave.PST.3SG of the house)

(17) *O Luís viu o CD na montra e comprou.*

“Luís saw the CD in the shop window and bought (it).”

Other Romance languages do not exhibit VP ellipsis (cf, for instance, Spanish and French (Chao 1987, Zagona 1988, Lobeck 1995)) nor (definite) Null Object, and only present NCA.

However, NCA differs from VP ellipsis and Null Object in Portuguese in several respects. In particular, NCA does not require either lexical or structural parallelism between the verb in the antecedent sentence and the verb locally licensing the omitted constituent, as it happens in VP Ellipsis in Portuguese — see the contrast between NCA in (18) and VP ellipsis in (19):
(18) a. Ele disse que ia comprar o jornal.  
   He said that he would buy the newspaper.
   pois precisava __ para estar informado.  
   for need.PST.3SG__ to be inform.PTCP
   “He said that he would buy the newspaper since he needed (it) in order to get informed.”

b. Ele não lê o jornal mas devia __.  
   He does not read the newspaper but he should.3SG__
   “He does not read the newspaper but he should.”

(19) a. *Ele disse que ia comprar o jornal.  
   He said that he would buy the newspaper.
   pois tinha __ para estar informado.  
   for have.PST.3SG__ to be.INF inform.PTCP
   “He said that he would buy the newspaper because he had (to) in order to get informed.”

b. *Ele não comprou o jornal esta manhã,  
   He did not buy the newspaper this morning
   mas agora está __.  
   but now is.PRS.3SG__
   “He did not buy the newspaper this morning, but now he is.”

Notice that this strong parallelism requirement for the verbs in VP ellipsis appears to be one of the distinguishing properties between Portuguese (cf. (18)) and English (cf. (20a)). In fact, in the latter language this requirement only applies to be and, to a smaller extent, to have (e.g., Warner 1986, Roberts 1998, Lasnik 1999).

(20) a. John can buy those tickets, but he won’t __.  
   b. *John was here and Mary will __ too.  
   c. ?* John hasn’t a driver’s license, but Mary should __.

We take this different behavior as a consequence of the interaction between Verb Movement in these languages and the identity condition on ellipsis. In Portuguese, all kinds of inflected verbs raise into sentence functional projections. In order for the elliptical constituent to be licensed by the raised verb, this verb must be identical to one of the verbs in the antecedent predicate or, otherwise, its copy would prevent ellipsis from obtaining.6 On the

6 For some speakers this parallelism requirement is only a tendency with have.
contrary, in English, *be* and *have* move out the VP, but many auxiliary verbs are assumed to be directly merged into the sentence functional projections, and do not count as an element of the predicate to be elided.  

Another property distinguishes NCA from VP ellipsis in Portuguese: while the elliptical constituent in the latter construction may be licensed by all (sub)classes of verbs, this does not happen in NCA, which only occurs with some quasi-auxiliary verbs and some verbs selecting sentential complements. Thus, the examples in (18) contrast in acceptability with those in (19) and (21), since the latter may not be interpreted as cases of VP ellipsis, due to lack of parallelism of the verbs in the antecedent and in the elliptical sentence, nor as instances of NCA, because the verbs in (18) and (21) do not accept this construction.

(21) *Ele vai ver esse espectáculo em breve e ela também espera.*

“He will see that show soon and she also hopes (to do so)”

NCA also differs from Null Object: the omitted constituent in the former constructions has propositional or predicative content, (22), while in the latter it denotes an entity, (23):

(22) *Ela não sabe Italiano, mas gostava/gostaria_.*

“She does not know Italian, but she would like (to)”

(23) (__ = to know Italian)

---

8 Recent studies correlate the parallelism constraint on VP ellipsis with *be* and *have* in English with their morphological inflectional structure (see Lasnik 1994, 1999a, Roberts 1998, Potsdam 1997). Lasnik 1994, 1999, for instance, assumes that languages differ with respect to the component of Grammar where verbal morphology is generated, Lexicon or Syntax. English is a hybrid language: while *be* and *have* are already inflected in the Lexicon and raise in the syntactic derivation to check their features, main verbs are bare in the Lexicon and are associated with the inflectional affixes in the syntactic derivation.

9 I recall that Portuguese is a language with Generalized Verb Movement to Inflection.

10 Notice that the modal verbs *ter de* in (19a) and *dever* (18b) have a closely related meaning.

11 In EP the Imperfect Past form of the verb is used with conditional value.
(23) a. Ele viu o CD na vitrine e comprou.
   He saw the CD in the shop window and bought (it).
   “He saw the CD in the shop window and bought (it).”

b. Ele comprou isso para os filhos, mas guardou para lhes oferecer mais tarde.
   He bought that for his children, but he kept (it) in order to give (it) to them later.
   “He bought that for his children, but he kept (it) in order to give (it) to them later.”

Additionally, NCA is lexically determined, while Null Object in Portuguese, like VP ellipsis, is not.

4.2 The core characterizing properties of NCA

What are the properties of NCA in Portuguese? While it shares with English and Spanish some properties, NCA in Portuguese cannot be considered as a deep anaphor, as we will show below.

As is the case of English and Spanish, NCA in Portuguese is lexically determined, being licensed by some main and quasi-auxiliary verbs selecting sentential complements. Similarly, the omitted constituent of NCA in this language presents propositional or predicative value.

(24) a. Pedi ao Pedro que saísse, mas ele recusou-se.
   I asked Pedro to leave, but he refused
   (“I asked Pedro to leave, but he refused”)

b. Ela gosta de passear, sempre que pode.
   She loves to go for a walk whenever she can.
   (“She loves to go for a walk whenever she can.”)

In order to avoid ambiguity between NCA and VP ellipsis, our examples will present a NCA licensing verb different from the one that occurs in the antecedent sentence. As mentioned in the previous section, one of the distinguishing properties of these constructions in Portuguese is that NCA does not require identity between its licensing verb and the one of its antecedent.
c. O Luis acabou de escrever a sua tese;
    the Luis finish.PST.3SG of write.INF the his thesis
porém, a Ana só agora começou __.
    however, the Ana only now start.PST.3SG __
“Luis has finished writing his thesis; however, Ana has started just
now.”
    (__ = writing her thesis)

Likewise, NCA in Portuguese may have pragmatic antecedents:

(25) [Situation: indulgent father feeds baby chocolate bar for dinner].
 Mother: Não aprovo __! 
    not approve.PRS.1SG __
“I do not approve!”

As with the other languages described in the previous sections, when
there is a linguistic antecedent, NCA in Portuguese does not require lexical or
structural parallelism.

(26) Ele gostaria de fazer um jantar para toda a família
    he like.COND.3SG of make a dinner for all the family
e eu ofereci-me __.
    and I offer.1.SG.PST=REFL.1.SG __
‘He would like to make a dinner for all the family and I volunteered.’
    (__ = para fazer um jantar para toda a família)
for make a dinner for all the family

(27) A mãe queria lavar a criança, mas ela
    the mother want.COND.3SG wash the child but she
reousou-se __
    refuse.PST.3SG=REFL __
“The mother wanted to wash the child, but she refused.”
    (__ = to be washed by her mother)

Thus, in (26), the antecedent of NCA is introduced by the preposition de ‘of’,
but in the omitted constituent para ‘for’ is the recovered preposition. Similarly,
in (27), although the NCA antecedent is in the active voice, it is recovered in
the passive.

Finally, together with English and Spanish, NCA in Portuguese admits
pronouns with sloppy readings:
José ainda se recusou a conversar com (a) sua mãe.

José still refused to talk with his mother.

Mas Pedro concordou.

But Pedro agreed.

“José still refused to talk to his mother, but Pedro agreed.”

So, there are some shared properties between NCA in English, Spanish and Portuguese.

4.3 NCA in Portuguese exhibits internal structure

In this section we will show that NCA in Portuguese behaves differently from deep anaphors. First of all, contrary to the case of English and Spanish, NCA in Portuguese allows for pronouns with Missing Antecedents, as we can see in (29):

(29) a. Ele não queria comprar nenhum dicionário, mas nós precisámos __ e pro era muito pesado.

“He did not want to buy any dictionary, but we needed (it) and it was very heavy.”

( __ = to buy a dictionary)

b. Ele não pôde matar o assaltante com uma faca, mas o Mário conseguiu __ e pro estava enferrujada.

“He could not kill the burglar with a knife, but Mário succeeded and it was rusty.”

( __ = to kill the burglar with a knife)

Furthermore, NCA in Portuguese admits WH-extraction (30) and topicalization (31), which indicates that there must be internal structure to the gap, so that we can explain the extraction:
(30) O amigo a quem tu querias telefonar
the friend to whom you want.COND.2SG telephone.INF
mas não conseguistes acabou de chegar.
but not manage.PST.2SG __ finish.PST.3SG of arrive.INF
“The friend to whom you wanted to phone but did not succeed has just arrived.”
( __ = to phone (to whom))

(31) Esta novela, o João começou a escrever mas este conto,
this novel  the João begin.PST.3SG to write.INF but this tale,
(ele) nunca acabou __.
(he) never finish.PST.3SG __
“This novel, João has began writing but this tale, he has never finished.”
( __ = writing (this tale))

NCA in Portuguese also allows for Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD), (32):

(32) a. Eu não me recuso a fazer qualquer coisa que ele mande __.
I not REFL1SG refuse.PRS.1SG to do any thing that he order.SBJT. 3SG __
“I do not refuse to do anything he orders (me to do).”
( __ = to do __)

b. Ele tem ajudado todos os amigos que tu lhe pediste __.
he have.PRS.3SG helped all.PL the.PL friend.PL that you CL ask.PST. 2SG __
“He has helped every friend that you asked him (to).”
( __ = to help __)

Notice that whatever treatment we give to ACD,\(^{13}\) the null constituent is interpreted as having internal structure, due to the Operator-variable chain in the relative clause, as shown in (33) for the example in (32a):

\(^{13}\) May (1985), Fiengo and May (1994) admit that ACD may be accounted for by Quantifier Raising (QR) of the DP containing the relative clause, (i), plus Reconstruction of the omitted constituent (ii):

(i) Eu não me recuso a [ [qualquer coisa que ele mande __]₁ [fazer t] ]
4.4 NCA in Portuguese is not in complementary distribution with an overt proform

Extending Hankamer & Sag (1976)’s analysis to Spanish (and Italian), Depiante (2000, 2001) proposes that NCA be represented in the Syntax as a null proform without internal structure. Depiante (2000) also assumes that NCA would be the null counterpart of the sentential proform *it* or *so* in English and *lo* in Spanish (34):

(34) a. Mary believes that Anne is a liar but I don’t believe *it/so*

b. *Maria sabía que Susana era una mentirosa*  
   Maria know.PST.3SG that Susan be.PST.3SG a liar  
   pero yo no *lo sabía.*  
   but I not CL knew  
   “Maria knew that Susan was a liar but I didn’t know it.”  
   (Depiante 2000:44)

Assuming, along with Brucart (1999), that the clitic *lo* in Spanish is in complementary distribution with NCA, Depiante proposes the following generalization:

(35) A predicate that selects NCA cannot take an overt predicative/propositional proform.

Depiante claims that whenever a verb admitting NCA takes the clitic *lo* in Spanish or *it* in English, these pronouns do not show sentential content, but

(ii) *Eu não me recuso a* [qualquer coisa Op que ele mande fazer t [fazer t]]

However, as noticed by Fox (2002), adopting the copy theory of movement, QR produces infinite regress. Alternative approaches to ACD have been proposed, e.g. Fox (2002), Chomsky (2004). Chomsky proposes that the QP or the DP containing the relative clause will be merged as an adjunct in apposition to the clause presenting the antecedent of the relative.
present a nominal interpretation. This would explain the unacceptability of (36):

(36) *Joe wanted to dance all night and I tried it.  (Depiante 2000:51)

However, the contrast between (36) and (37) suggests an alternative explanation to the unacceptability of (36).

(37) a.  Joe wanted me to dance all night and I tried it.
    b. Joe wanted to dance all night and he tried it.
    c.  Joe wanted to dance with me all night and I tried it.

In (36), the verbs want and try are obligatory control verbs; hence, they require their subject to be the controller of the embedded sentence subject. As a consequence, the coordination in (36) is pragmatically odd.

Moreover, the generalization (35) is not borne out for Portuguese (both in BP and EP), since in this language NCA is not in complementary distribution with the invariable clitic o, the close correlate of the Spanish lo, (38b), nor with the pronoun isso ‘that’, (39b), in their sentential interpretation:

(38)  a.  Ainda que queiras __, não podes resolver
    although that want.SBJT.2SG __ not can.PRS.2SG solve.INF
    esse problema.
    that problem
    “Although you want (it), you may not solve that problem.”
    (__ = to solve that problem.)
    b.  Ainda que o queiras, não podes resolver (EP)
    although that CL want.SBJT.2SG not can.PRS.2SG solve.INF
    esse problema.
    that problem
    “Although you want it, you may not solve that problem.”

    we ask.1PL.PST to.the boys for us visit.INF.3PL
    e todos se recusaram __.
    and all REFL refuse.PST.3PL __
    “We asked the boys to visit us, and they all refused.”
b. Nós pedimos aos rapazes para nos visitarem, (BP, EP)
we ask.1PL.PST to.the boys to us visit.INF.3PL
e todos se recusaram a isso.
and all REFL refuse.PST.3PL to that
“We asked the boys to visit us, and they all refused that.”

Considering these data, we conclude that the complementary
distribution between NCA and the sentential proforms is not a characterizing
property of this construction, but a side effect of the selectional properties of
the verbs taken into account by Brucart and Depiante.

4.5 The NCA licensors and the distribution of sentential proforms
Bosque (1984), Brucart (1999) and Depiante (2001) show that verbs
from different semantic classes allow for NCA in Spanish: verbs of
predisposition, attitude or purpose, modals, aspectuals, causatives of
permission, collaboration or influence on the attitude of others. Formally, these
verbs fall into two classes: they constitute a subset of the restructuring verbs, or
they are main verbs selecting sentential complements (Depiante 2000, 2001).
Depiante restricted her analysis of NCA to the Restructuring cases.

In EP, NCA also occurs with these classes of verbs (Matos 2003). The
restructuring verbs select defective sentential complements below CP, in the
case of modal (40) and aspectual (41) verbs, usually TP (Matos 1992,

(40) Os alunos não vão frequentemente à
the.PL student.PL not go.PRS.3PL often to.the
biblioteca, mas deviam __.
library but should.3PL __
“The students do not often go to the library, but they should __.”
(__ = to often go to the library)

(41) A Maria ainda não escreveu a sua comunicação,
the Maria yet not write.PST.3SG the her paper
mas já começou __.
but already start.PST.3SG __
“Mary has not yet written her paper, but she has already started (to do
it).”
(__ = writing her paper)
In this context NCA does not alternate with the sentential pronouns *o* or *isso*, (42):

(42) a. *Os alunos não vão freqüentemente à biblioteca, mas deviam-no / isso.*

b. *Maria ainda não escreveu a sua comunicação, mas já o começou / começou a isso.*

Yet, when NCA is licensed by main verbs requiring CP complements, as in (43), its alternation with sentential proforms is possible, (44).

(43) a. *Essa lei aumentará a precariedade de emprego, e os sindicatos não aceitam* __.

b. *Os alunos não vão freqüentemente à biblioteca, mas precisavam __.*

(44) a. *Essa lei aumentará a precariedade de emprego, e os sindicatos não o aceitam / aceitam isso.*

b. *(?)Os alunos não vão freqüentemente à biblioteca, mas precisavam disso.*
As (44) shows, if NCA is the direct object CP of the verb, the omitted constituent may be substituted by the pronouns o (in EP), or isso (in EP and BP), as in (44a). If NCA corresponds to a prepositional CP complement of the verb, the CP alternates with ‘isso’, thus resulting in the sequence ‘P+isso’, (44b). The contrasts in grammaticality between the examples in the verbs in (41) and (43) are related to case: the restructuring verbs in (41) do not have the ability to assign case to their internal argument. In opposition, the non-restructuring main verbs in (43) either assign the accusative case (cf. (43a)) or select prepositional complements, where the preposition assigns case to its complement. Thus the pronominal element is excluded from restructuring contexts but allowed in the latter cases.

Summarizing, these data indicate that the sentential proforms in NCA only alternate with a CP, possibly due to the fact that they can only denote full phases (Chomsky 2000, 2001): either CP phases or, as we will see in the next section, vP phases. Thus, we assume that what determines the complementary distribution or free variation between NCA and the pronouns with propositional content is the stage of defectiveness vs. non-defectiveness of the complement of the NCA licensing verb.14

4.6. The invariable clitic in Spanish and Portuguese: neuter personal pronoun vs. demonstrative pronoun

In the previous section we have seen that in Portuguese, although the instances of NCA corresponding to restructuring verbs may be easily conceived as cases of surface anaphora, that is to say, as the result of ellipsis (be it assumed as a PF deletion operation or an LF interpretative operation), the same does not happen to the NCA occurrences that enter in free variation with the clitic pronoun o or the demonstrative isso.

Three questions are in order: (i) is it possible to maintain that in the first case we are dealing with NCA? (ii) do the cases that alternate with the overt pronouns exhibit surface anaphora properties? (iii) if they do, how can NCA in Spanish and Portuguese display such different properties?

The first question has already been answered in section 2. In Principles and Parameters Theory, constructions are not objects produced by the computational system, but pre-theoretical descriptive entities. Although they permit to correlate structures sharing a significant amount of descriptive

14 Notice, that there are some verbs that occur both in restructuring and in non-restructuring contexts, e.g., querer ‘want’. We admit that whenever the sentential pronoun substitutes the clausal complement of the verb, the non-restructuring construction has been selected.
properties, these ones may be not exhaustively shared. This is what happens with the restructuring cases of NCA, with respect to the occurrence of the pronouns _o_ and _isso_ (see section 2).

The answer to the second question is apparently positive, if we rely on examples like those in (45c) and (46c), which exhibit _wh_-extraction out of the gap — the cases of NCA that alternate with overt pronouns present surface anaphora properties.

(45) a. Ele pediu _me para fazer o relatório e eu_  
    _he ask. PST. 3SG me for do the report and I accept.PST.1SG_.  
    “He asked me to do the report and I accepted.”

b. Ele pediu _me para fazer o relatório e eu só o_  
    _he ask. PST. 3SG me for do the report and I only CL accept.PST.1SG because not had choice_.  
    “He asked me to do the report and I only accepted it because I had no choice.”

c. O _relatório que ele me pediu para fazer_ e eu  
    _the report that he me ask. PST. 3SG for do accept.PST.1SG_.  
    “The report that he asked me to do and I accepted was the activities one.”

(46) a. Ela assistiu _ao colóquio, mas nós_  
    _she attend.PST. 3SG to the.SG colloquium, but we refuse.PST.1PL us_.  
    “She attended the colloquium, but we refused.”

b. Ela assistiu _ao colóquio mas nós_  
    _she attend.PST. 3SG to the.SG colloquium, but we refuse.PST.1PL us to that_.  
    “She attended the colloquium, but we refused it.”

---

15 It is in this sense that we include in VP ellipsis in English the cases where the elliptical category is identified by an auxiliary verb, which selects a VP complement, and the copulative main verb be, which selects a non-VP complement.
c. A que colóquio (é que) ela assistiu e nós recusámos.

"Which colloquium did she attend and we refuse to do so."

As for the third question — how can NCA exhibit a distinct behavior in Spanish and Portuguese —, we believe that these differences are related to the properties displayed by the invariable clitics o and lo in each of these languages, assuming that, at least in some contexts, these clitics are the correlates of the null complement in NCA, in both languages. In fact, as we will see in the next section, overt proforms may also behave either as deep or surface anaphora.

Both forms of the invariable clitic come from the Latin neuter demonstrative illud, since the demonstratives are at the origin of the 3rd person personal pronouns, clitics or non-clitics, in Romance (e.g., Williams 1938, Sorián 1999).16

However, the stage of evolution of the invariable clitic is different in Portuguese and in Spanish. In Spanish, this clitic, which can denote sentences or predicates (47), still corresponds to the tonic non-clitic form of the neuter personal pronoun ‘ello’, as shown in (48):

(47) a. Me dijó que no iba a venir y no lo creí.
me say.PST.3SG that not go to come and not CL believe.PST.1SG
“He told me that he was not coming and I did not believe it.”
(Sorián 1999:1216)

b. Juan es ágil pero María no lo es.
Juan be.PRS.3SG agile but María not CL be.PRS.3SG.
“Juan is agile but Maria is not.”

(48) a. Me dijo que no iba a venir y me enfadé por ello.
me say.PST.3SG that not go to come and me bore.PST for it
“He told me that he was not coming and I got bored because of that.”
(Sorián 1999:1216)

16 As it is well known, Latin did not have third personal pronouns and used the demonstratives to make up for their absence (Ernout and Thomas 1951).
b. Paris es muy cosmopolita y es famosa

Paris PRS.3SG very cosmopolitan and be.PRS.3SG famous

por ello.

by it.

“Paris is a very cosmopolitan city and it is famous because of that.”

(Soriano 1999: 1242)

Soriano (1999) notices that *ello* in Spanish is in a process of disappearance, being replaced by the demonstratives *esto* and *eso*. However, *ello* still has specific uses, and there are contexts in which the alternation *ello/eso* is impossible, as in (47):

(49) \[Venga, vamos a ello /# eso!\] (Soriano 1999: 1242)

“Come on, let’s do it!”

In Portuguese, there is no corresponding strong pronoun *ello*, which is exhaustively replaced by the demonstrative pronoun *isso* (or, less often, *isto*), as illustrated in (50), the close equivalent of (51):

(50) \[Vamos a isso!\]

“Let’s do it!”

Since the non-clitic form of the personal pronoun has disappeared, the demonstrative pronoun *isso* is the non-clitic counterpart of *o* in EP (Matos 1985). Thus, in (51a) the direct object clitic alternates with *isso* and is substituted by this pronoun in passive subject position, (51b).

(51) a. \[O presidente declarou-o /isso em entrevista à TV.\]

the president declare.PST.3SG=CL/that in interview to.the TV

“The president claim it / that in an interview for the TV.”

b. \[Isso foi declarado pelo presidente em entrevista à TV.\]

that be.PST.3SG declare.PRTC by the president in interview to.the TV

“That was claimed by the president in an interview for the TV.”
Therefore, *o* in EP and *lo* in Spanish are distinct clitics: they have a different behavior and eventually different features.  

5. **Surface anaphora and the theory of ellipsis**

5.1 **Phonetically overt surface anaphora**

In Portuguese, unlike what happens in Spanish, the clitic *o* and the pronoun *isso* behave as surface anaphora when they have a propositional or predicative content, apparently exhibiting internal structure, at least at a certain point in the derivation. In fact, these predicative and sentential proforms can occur in sentences inducing *Sloppy Identity* readings, (52), or presenting the *Antecedent Contained Deletion* construction, thus showing a Operator - variable configuration (cf. (53), where (53b) contains a verb that admits NCA)

```
José aceita conversar com a sua mãe, e só Ana recusa a isso.
```

“José accepts to talk to his mother, and only Ana refuses that.”

(isso = pro to talk to her mother) 

(BP, EP)

17 The clitic *lo* in Italian also differs from the invariable clitic in EP. Cordin and Calabrese (1988) assume that *lo* denoting sentences and predicates is a case of the personal pronoun paradigm. The sentential clitic *lo* occurs in direct object position (i) and has as its closest correlates the null subject in subject position (cf. (ii)), and the clitics *ci* and *vi*, for the complements of certain verbs introduced by the preposition *a* (cf. (iii) and (iv)):

(i) *Non pensavo [di tornar], (...) lo, credevo impossibile* (C&C 1988: 545)
   not think.PST.1SG to come back; CL believe.PST.1SG impossible

(ii) *Non pensavo [di tornar], (...) ∅ mi pareva impossibile* (C&C 1988: 545)
   not think.PST.1SG to come back; ∅ me appears.PST.1SG impossible

(iii) *Mario mandò Sandro a comprare il latte / Mario ci mandò Sandro.* (C&C 1988: 579)
   Mario order Sandro to buy the milk / Mario CL order Sandro.

(iv) *Ha acconsentito a parlare / Vi ha acconsentito.* (C&C 1988: 580)
   has consed.PST.3SG to talk / CL has consed.PST.3SG

Still, Calabrese (1988) also shows that the demonstrative *ciò*, may substitute the propositional clitic *lo* and *ci* (as well as *questo* and *quello*, the core demonstratives in current Italian).
(53) a. Os livros foram postos em todas as estantes.
   - the.PL book.PL be.PST. 3PL put.PRTC in all the.PL shelves
     in which the.PL magazine.PL CL be.PST. 3PL
   “The books have been put on every shelf in which the magazines CL
   have been.”
   \(o = \) in which the magazines were put \(in\) which

b. Essa criança só faz aquilo que tu lho permitas.
   - that child only do.PRS.3SG that that you allow.SBJ.PRST.3SG
   “That child only does what you allow him/her to do.”

\(o = \) fazer \(do\) INF

(cf. ..., OPi que tu lhe permites fazer_i)

OPi that you CL.DAT allow.PRS.2SG (to) do_i

The characterization of some overt proforms as surface anaphora was
proposed by Hankamer & Sag (1976) in order to capture the distribution of so-
anaphora, as opposed to do it and sentential-it, which were characterized as
deep anaphora. So-anaphora substitutes a VP, (54), or Sentence, (55).

(54) a. If you have not yet changed your socks, please do so immediately.
   \(\text{(H&S } 1976:415)\)

b. They all changed their socks, and I did so too.
   \(\text{(H&S1976:416)}\)

(55) a — Is the moon out?
   \(\text{— I believe so.} \)
   \(\text{(H&S1976:415)}\)

b. I thought he was wrong, and Sue thought so also.
   \(\text{(H&S1976:416)}\)

Hankamer and Sag argue that so-anaphora is a surface anaphor because
it licenses pronouns in Missing Antecedent contexts, (56), and cannot be
pragmatically recovered, (57).

(56) I didn't ride a camel, but Ivan must have done so and now the office is
infested with its fleas.

---

\(^{18}\) The predicative clitic \(o\) presents 'an old-fashioned literary' flavour with copulative verbs or
with the passive auxiliary. Current EP mostly uses VP Ellipsis in these contexts.
(57) [Sag succeeds in ripping phone book in half]  (H&S 1976:418)

Hankamer: # I don’t believe so.

Thus, they claim that *so-anaphora*, like other null instances of surface anaphora, results from deletion at a late stage of the sentence derivation, leaving the adverbial element *so*, as a remnant.

However, Hankamer and Sag’s proposal faces one problem: *so-anaphora* cannot co-occur with the linguistic expression that it denotes, (58):

(58) *I believe so the moon is out.*  (cf. I believe so.)

This fact seems to favor the idea that *so-anaphora* is a proform, as proposed by Ross (1972), and not a case of ellipsis.

The same happens with the sentential and predicative pronouns *isso* and *o* in Portuguese. As shown in (59) and (60), they cannot co-occur with the linguistic material they stand for.

(59) *Eles aceitaram conversar com as mães e só*  
*they accept.PST. 3PL talk.INF with the.PL mother.PL and only*
*ela se recusa a [isso] [conversar com a mãe].*  
*she REFL refuse PST. 3SG to[that] [talk.INF with the mother]*

“They accepted to talk to their mothers and she was the only one who refused to do it talk to her mother.”

(60) *Os livros foram postos em todas as estantes*  
*the.PL book.PL be.PST. 3PL put.PRTC in all the.PL shelves*
*em que as revistas [o] foram [postas].*  
*in which the.PL magazine.PL CL be.PST. 3PL. put.PRTC.PL*

“The books have been put on every shelf in which the magazines CL have been put.”

In sum, overt surface anaphors may enter into the computation as proforms, i.e., as a feature bundle that specifies a single unit that substitutes the whole denoted constituent.

5.2 *Consequences for the theory of ellipsis*

The existence of overt and null proforms behaving as surface anaphors has consequences for the theory of ellipsis, as shown by (61):
(61) a. _Os livros foram postos em todas as estantes_  
the.PL book.PL be.PST.3PL put.PRTC in all the.PL shelves  
in which the.PL magazine.PL CL be.PST.3PL  
“The books have been put on every shelf in which the magazines CL  
have been.”

b. ... [in which] the magazines\(k\) have been [VP put\(j\) [the magazines\(k\)  
[ V\(j\) [in which], ] ]]

Accepting that the subject of the passive clause is the internal argument  
of the main verb, there has to be a copy of this argument inside the VP for  
convergence at the interpretation interface level, as in (59b). The same happens  
to _em que_ (‘in which’), which is the prepositional complement of the verb _pôr_  
to put).

Since the pronominal and the linguistic expressions required for  
interpretation may not overtly co-occur with the clitic pronoun, we have to  
admit that Reconstruction operates at LF, substituting the proform for the  
expression it denotes.

Likewise, Reconstruction of overt pronouns with propositional or low  
referential content seems to be required, as suggested by the sloppy identity  
readings of the pronoun _it_ in sentences like those in (62) (see, for instance, the  
proposal in Cyrino 1997):

(62) a. John\(_i\) advertised [his\(_i\) son] and Bill tried _it_ too.  
    (Kitagawa 1991)  
    (it = NP\(_j\) to advertise [his\(_j\) son])

b. The man who gave his paycheck to his wife was wiser than the man  
who gave _it_ to his mistress.  
    (Kartunnen 1969)  
    (PF: it; LF: his paycheck)

Given the correlation between the overt sentential proforms and NCA  
in Portuguese, the same analysis can be proposed for this construction, at least  
when the omitted constituent alternates with these pronouns. In this case the  
null constituent is a proform that is substituted at LF for the linguistic  
expression that it denotes. As noticed by Fiengo & May (1994), this linguistic  
expression is not always linguistically verbalized, but may virtually arise as an  
adequate linguistic antecedent.

6. **Concluding remarks**

Within the Minimalist Program, the treatment of ellipsis as Deletion at  
PF has been rehabilitated (e.g. Chomsky 1995, Lasnik 1999a, 1999b, Depiante
2000, 2001); as a consequence, it is assumed that at LF, the non-elided form is present and a Reconstruction operation is not necessary (Chomsky 1995: 202). As noted by Depiante (2000:6), in the present Minimalist scenario the phrase structure is obtained from the lexical items themselves, and so the possibility of having a structure with null terminal nodules is precluded.

Yet, the Distributed Morphology proposal (Halle and Marantz 1993, Harley and Noyer 2002, a.o.) allows for an alternative approach to ellipsis: the terminal elements that enter the derivation are bundles of features that receive phonological features at the level of Morphological Structure, which operates after Syntax. Therefore, there is no need for a deletion rule at PF.

However, both of these approaches do not account for the overt cases of surface anaphora, in which the proforms cannot overtly co-occur with the constituents they denote. In these cases the feature bundle that entered the computation specifies a single unit, the proform, independently of the level where its phonological features are inserted: in the Lexicon or post-syntactically, in Morphological Structure.

For these cases, as well as for those of NCA which commute with the sentential proforms, Reconstruction at LF, conceived as a substitution of the proform by the linguistic expression it denotes, is needed to establish the content and the structure required for semantic interpretation.

This does not imply that Reconstruction should be extended to all kinds of omitted constituents exhibiting internal structure, that is, to those that are admittedly taken as instances of ellipsis. Nevertheless, the existence of overt and null surface anaphora shows that the border line between proforms and ellipsis is not so clear as it is often assumed and raises the hypothesis that not all cases of ellipsis arise through the operation of the same devices.

Moreover, the need for Reconstruction exhibited by surface anaphora proforms, like NCA in Portuguese which do not require strict structural parallelism with respect to a linguistic antecedent, suggests that this operation should not be conceived as a strict copying device (e.g., Kitagawa 1991), nor as a relationship between structurally isomorphic structures, taken as a set occurrences of a given (sub)phrase marker over terminal vocabulary (Fiengo and May 1994). In fact, what overt anaphora proforms seem to require is an operation of Reconstruction satisfying a general semantic condition to capture the non-distinctness of the proform with respect to its potential antecedent, perhaps along the lines of the condition of e-GIVENness\(^{19}\), proposed by Merchant’s (2001) to deal with ellipsis.

---

\(^{19}\) Merchant (2001) defines e-GIVENness as in (i):

(i) e-GIVENness
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An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo ∃-type
shifting,

(i) A entails F-clo (E), and

(ii) E entails F-clo (A). (Merchant 2001: 26)

Where F-clo (=Focus-closure): is the result of replacing F-marked parts of α with the ∃-
bound variables of the appropriate type (modulo ∃-type shifting). (Merchant 2001: 14).


