ELLIPSIS AND RESTRUCTURING IN EUROPEAN PORTUGUESE

Abstract

In this paper we propose that, in European Portuguese, the complementary distribution between Null Complement Anaphora (NCA) and Restructuring (also noted by Brucart 1999 and Depiante 2001, for Spanish and Italian) results from the selectional properties of the verbs that accept these constructions: NCA corresponds to active T domains at the level of semantic interpretation, and is selected by verbs with intrinsic lexical content, while Restructuring involves a biclausal sentential structure, headed by a functional or a lexical verb occupying a T projection, and requires the embedded T to be syntactically inactive.
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1. Introduction

Null Complement Anaphora (NCA), illustrated in (1) for English and Portuguese, is assumed as a lexically-driven construction, occurring with verbs that do not seem to share any syntactic or semantic property underlying their aptitude to license the null complement (Brucart 1999, Depiante 2001, Cyrino & Matos 2006):

(1)  a. I play cards and shoot dice, and my wife doesn’t approve __.

    (Hankamer & Sag 1976:412)

b. Eu queria que eles ficassem em casa e eles concordaram __.

   I want-PST.1SG that they stay-PST.3SG at home and they agree-PST.3SG

“I wanted that they stay at home and they agreed (on staying at home).”
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Verbs presenting similar content vary in what concerns the licensing of NCA. For instance, in EP, not all modals expressing necessity allow this construction: *dever* ‘should’ accepts it, (2a), but *ter (de)* ‘have to’ does not, (2b). Likewise, *continuar (a)* ‘keep on’ is a NCA licensor, (3a), while *estar (a)* ‘be V-ing’ is not, (3b), although both verbs are durative aspectuals:

(2) a. *Ele trabalha muito, mas não devia___.  
he work-PRST.3SG much, but not should-3SG
‘He works hard, but he should not.’
b. *Ele trabalha muito, mas não tinha___.  
he work-PRST.3SG much, but not should-3SG

(3) a. *Ela já começou a estudar, e vai continuar___ amanhã.  
she already begin-PST.3SG to study, and will continue tomorrow
‘She already began studying and she will keep on doing it tomorrow.’
b. *Ela já começou a estudar, e vai estar___ amanhã também.  
she already begin-PST.3SG to study, and will be tomorrow too

From a syntactic point of view, identical contrasts show up: verbs selecting similar complements behave differently with respect to NCA — e.g., *concordar (em)* ‘agree (on)’, in (1b), contrasts with *pensar (em)* ‘think about’, in (4), despite the fact that both verbs take sentential prepositional complements:

(4) *Ela trabalha aos fins de semana, mas não pensava ___.  
she work-PRST.3SG during the weekends, but not think-PST.3G

This suggests that NCA constitutes an idiosyncratic property of some predicates and that each verb should be specified in the Lexicon as an NCA licensor or not. Such an approach is problematic since it relies on a loose conception of the Lexicon. In fact, following Chomsky (1995:6), the Lexicon should not be redundant and, in its optimal form, should only contain the information required for the computational system. Ascribing a specific construction to each lexical entry will overload the lexicon in an unwelcome way, since constructions are not computational entities of the system.

Attempting to devise some general properties underlying the distribution of NCA, Brucart (1999) claims that, in Spanish, this construction is licensed by verbs that do not accept the clitic *lo*, which denotes sentences or predicates (see the contrast in (5) between *olvidar* and *olvidar-se (de)*):

(5) *Habían quedado en ir a comer, pero {se olvidó/*olvidó}  
have stay.PST_PART on go for eat, but himself forget/forget
‘They have agreed on go out for taking a meal, but he forgot.’
Also, Depiante (2001) claims that NCA predicates are in complementary distribution with Restructuring (cf. (6)):  

\[(6) \quad *Juan \ las \ quiere \ ver, \ y \ Maria \ también \ las \]
\[
Juan \ \text{[CL them]} \ \text{want-PRST.3SG} \ \text{see, and} \ \text{Maria} \ \text{also [CL them]} \ \text{quieres} \ \text{want-PRST.3SG}.
\]

Correlating this property with Brucart’s generalisation on the ban of *lo, she claims that NCA is a Deep Anaphora in Spanish and Italian, as proposed for English by Hankamer and Sag (1976): the omitted constituent would be a null pronominal, the null counterpart of *lo. However, this correlation is challenged by EP, since in this language NCA occurs with verbs that admit the invariable clitic, *o ‘it’, (7b), but behaves like Spanish and Italian with respect to Restructuring, (8):

\[(7) \quad a. \ Ele \ viaja \ muito, \ embora \ não \ aprecie. \]
\[
\text{he travel-PRST 3SG much, although not enjoy-PRST 3SG}
\]
\[
\text{‘He travels a lot, although he does not enjoy (it).’}
\]
\[
b. \ Ele \ viaja \ muito, \ embora \ não \ \text{[CL it]} \ aprecie. \]
\[
\text{he travel-PRST 3SG much, although not [CL it] enjoy-PRST 3SG}
\]
\[
\text{‘He travels a lot, although he does not specially enjoy it.’}
\]

\[(8) \quad *Eu \ também \ \text{[CL them]} \ \text{want-PRST.1SG} \ \text{see, but not [CL them] can.1SG}.
\]

Thus, the main goals of the current study are: to isolate the selectional properties of NCA licensing verbs; and to understand how the above mentioned selectional properties account for the complementary distribution between NCA and Restructuring.

The paper is structured as follows: section 2 re-examines the arguments for and against the status of NCA as a Deep Anaphora; section 3 analyses the selectional properties of the verbs that admit NCA in EP; section 4 focus on the correlation between NCA and Restructuring and on the structures required by these constructions; finally, section 5 presents the concluding remarks.

---

1 Brucart (1999:2841) presents examples that illustrate the complementarity between NCA and Restructuring, but does not correlate the two constructions. He provides evidence for the incompatibility between NCA and Long Object Movement (with the passive clitic, *se) but claims that the resulting marginality is due to the passive effects, (iB):

\[(i) \quad \text{A: } Se \ \text{deben pagar estos trabajos?} \quad \text{B: } *Se \ \text{deben.}
\]
\[
\text{Passive CL should pay these works?} \quad \text{B: Passive CL should}
\]

The fact that in EP the passive clitic, in (iiaB), contrasts with the verbal passive, in (iibB), leads us to impute the marginality of (iB) and (iiaB), not to passive, but to Restructuring:

\[(ii) \quad a. \ \text{A: } Devem-se \ \text{pagar estos trabajos?} \quad \text{B: } *Devem-se
\]
\[
\text{Should=Passive CL pay these works?} \quad \text{B: Should=Passive CL}
\]
\[
b. \ \text{A: } Estes trabalhos devem ser pagos. \quad \text{B: } \text{Mas podem?}
\]
\[
\text{these works should be paid} \quad \text{but can?}
\]
\[
\text{These works should be paid} \quad \text{But can they (be paid)?}
\]
2. NCA as a Deep or Surface anaphora and the distribution of Restructuring

The main questions about NCA concern the structure and recovery of the omitted constituent. Depiante (2001) assumes that in Spanish and Italian it is a pronominal, the null counterpart of the clitic lo, which denotes sentences or predicates. She argues that, in these languages, NCA is a Deep Anaphora (Hankamer & Sag 1976), i.e., a null constituent with no internal structure that picks up its denotation from a prominent linguistic or situational context.

In favour of her claim, Depiante shows that in Spanish (and Italian) the content of the omitted constituent can be pragmatically recovered, (9); there is no requirement of strict parallelism between a linguistic antecedent and the structure of the recovered constituent (see (10), where the antecedent in the passive form is recovered by an active sentence); and the construction shows Missing Antecedent effects — cf. (11), which, according to Depiante, is marginal, because the null subject pronoun, pro, can not find an antecedent in the NCA gap, since this one is a sentence denoting pronoun and has no internal structure:

(9) [Javier jumps into the icy cold sea]
Juan says: Yo también puedo __!
(I also can.1SG)

(10) 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 although the strongest nurse can’t (take them).” (id:207)

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

*Juan not could.3SG kill to Pablo with a knife but Pedro yes could.3SG and pro was rusted (id:208)

According to this approach, the complementary distribution between NCA and Restructuring derives from the pronominal nature of the null complement — since Restructuring operates on verbal or sentential complements — and its lack of internal structure, which would prevent the moved constituents to be related to their copies in Clitic Climbing, (12a), and Long Object Movement, (13a):  

(12) a. *Juan las quiere ver, y Maria también
Juan [cl them] want-PRST.3SG see, and Maria also
las quiere __.
[cl them] want-PRST.3SG

---

2 Long Object Movement (cf. Rizzi 1982) captures the agreement relation between the embedded object and the matrix verb. Thus, in (13a), this verb occurs in the 3PL (cominceranno). In contrast, in (13b), it is the Nominative clitic that triggers agreement on the verb, 3SG (si comincerà).
Juan quiere verlas, y Maria también quiere __.

"Juan wants to see them, and Maria also wants (to see them)."

(13) a. *Le nuove case si cominceranno a costruire e
the new houses [CL PASS] begin-FUT.3PL to build and
anche i nuovi appartamenti si cominceranno.
also the new flats [CL PASS] begin.FUT.3PL
b. A Roma si comincerà a costruire le nuove case
in Rome[CL NOM] begin-FUT.3SG to build the new houses
ma a Milano non si comincerà.
but in Milano not [CL NOM] begin-FUT.3SG

“In Rome one will begin building the new houses but in Milano one will not begin (building the new houses).”

Yet, this approach is not adequate for Portuguese. Cyrino & Matos (2006) show that in EP NCA occurs with verbs that accept the clitic o ‘it’— see, in (14), the free variation between the omitted constituent and the clitic pronoun. Besides, in Portuguese, the omitted constituent in NCA exhibits internal structure: it co-occurs with Antecedent Contained Deletion, (15), and wh- extraction, (16), and does not show Missing Antecedent sensitivity, (17):

(14) Só sairás , se {desejares __ / o desejares}.
Only go-FUT.2SG out, if wish-FUT.2SG/[CL.it] wish-FUT.2SG

“You will only go out, if you {wish / wish it}”

(15) Eu não me recuso a fazer qualquer coisa
I not [CL me] refuse-PRST.1SG to do anything

Op que ele mande __. ( __ = fazer (Op) )
Op that he order-PRST.3SG ( __ = to do (Op) )

“I do not refuse to do anything he orders (me to do).”

(16) O amigo [a quem tu querias telefonar __ mas não
the friend to whom you want-PST.2SG phone __ but not
conseguiste __ ] chegou.
 succeed-PST.2SG __ arrive-PST.3SG ( __ = to phone (to whom))

“The friend to whom you wanted to phone but did not succeed arrived.”

(17) Ele ainda não escreveu nenhum livro e a Ana só agora
he yet not write-PST.3SG no book and the Ana only now
começou __, mas [pro] está a ficar óptimo.
start-PST.3SG __, but pro is to become great

“He has not yet started to write any book and Ana has just started (to write a book), but is becoming great.”

3 In (15), the causative mandar ‘order’ should not be confused with its homonymous, synonymous of enviar ‘send’, a plain transitive verb that selects a DP as direct object. Thus, in (15) the relative constituent is not the direct object of mandar but of the omitted verb, fazer ‘do’, its antecedent being qualquer coisa ‘anything’. If the relative constituent were the direct object of mandar, the right interpretation would not obtain, since the infinitival verb would not be recovered.
Cyrino & Matos (2006) impute the internal structure of NCA in Portuguese to the properties of the null constituent and of the correlated pronominal. They propose that the gap in NCA may result from two different categorial sources: a pronominal complement, (14), or a sentential projection, as it is clearly shown in (18a) by ousar ‘dare’, a complementation verb that has lost its ability to select a pronominal complement, (18b):  

(18)  

\[ \text{Elle tencionava ajudar-me, mas não ousou -- }} \]  
\[ \text{she intend-PST.3SG help=[CL.me], but not dare-PST.3SG} \]  
\[ \text{“She intended to help me, but she did not dare (to help me).”} \]  

b. *Elle nunca o ousou.  
\[ \text{She never [CL.it] dare.} \]  

They provide evidence that in EP the invariable clitic o ‘it’ is a Surface Anaphora, i.e., a proform that must be replaced by the relevant internal structure, through Reconstruction; thus, in the adversative clause in (19), the interpretation of the subject of the passive, the reports, as an internal argument of put depends on this Reconstruction:  

(19)  

\[ \text{O livro foi posto na pasta, mas os relatórios} \]  
\[ \text{the book be-PST.3SG put on the.SG briefcase, but the reports} \]  
\[ \text{não o foram.} \]  
\[ \text{not [CL.it] be.PST.3PL} \]  
\[ \text{“The book was put in the briefcase but the reports were not.”} \]  
\[ (o = \text{put (the reports) in the briefcase}) \]  

Hence, the internal structure of NCA is predictable: the gap is either a null sentential constituent or the null propositional clitic reconstructed as a sentential domain at the level of semantic interpretation. Yet, in spite of the internal structure of the omitted constituent, NCA in Portuguese, as in Italian and Spanish, is in complementary distribution with Restructuring (cf. (20a) vs. (20b)):  

(20)  

\[ \text{Ela não as podia ver, e ele não queria --} \]  
\[ \text{she not [CL them] could see and he not want-PST.3SG} \]  
\[ \text{“She could not see them and he did not wanted (to see them).”} \]  

b. *Ela não as podia ver e ele não as queria --  
\[ \text{she not [CL them] could-SG see and he not [CL them] want-PST.SG} \]

---

4 Notice that this verb is a full predicate, since it does not present the properties that characterise auxiliary verbs: it keeps its thematic greed and its infinitival complement behaves as an autonomous sentence, since it exhibits sentence negation (cf. Ele ousou não os ler ‘he dar not to read them’) and does not allow Clitic Climbing (cf. *Ele não os ousou ler, he not [CL them] read).
The fact that NCA in Spanish, Italian and Portuguese behave alike with respect to Restructuring, but differ in what concerns the structure of the omitted constituent, indicates that its lack of internal structure is not the relevant factor for the complementary distribution between NCA and Restructuring.

Assuming Cyrino & Matos’s (2006) proposal for NCA in EP, we will extend their analysis in two ways: we will show that at least as far as EP is concerned the distribution of NCA can be deduced from the selectional properties of the verbs, and that the same kind of properties will be crucial to explain the complementary distribution between NCA and Restructuring, a fact not explored by these authors.

Thus, in the remainder of this paper we will mainly concentrate on answering to the following questions: which are the relevant selectional properties of the NCA licensing verbs to predict the occurrence of this construction? How do they explain the complementary distribution between NCA and Restructuring?

3. The selectional properties of NCA licensing verbs

3.1. The lexical content of NCA licensors

Following Bosque (1984), Brucart (1999) claims that, from a semantic point of view, NCA in Spanish tends to occur with predicates that may be included in the following meaning classes: modal and aspectual verbs, predicates that express predisposition or purpose, causatives of permission or influence, and verbs that express psychological attitudes or states of the subject. In EP, NCA occurs with the same kind of predicates – see table 1 –, as illustrated in (21)-(26):

Table 1: Predicates accepting NCA in EP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modals</th>
<th>Aspectuals</th>
<th>Verbs of predisposition or purpose</th>
<th>Causatives and influence verbs</th>
<th>Verbs denoting psychological states</th>
<th>Verbs denoting psychological attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
(21) *Ele trabalhava muito, mas não {precisava /devia}.__
    he work-PST.3SG much, but not need-PST.3SG /should-3SG
    ‘He worked hard, but he did not need it/ he should not.’

(22) *Ela estava a estudar, e vai {continuar/parar} __ amanhã.
    she be-PST.3SG to study, and will continue/stop tomorrow
    ‘She is studying and she will continue/stop (studying) tomorrow.’

(23) *Como ninguém tinha feito o jantar, eu ofereci-me __.
    since nobody had made the dinner, I offer-PST.1SG myself
    ‘Since nobody had cooked the dinner, I volunteered.’

(24) *Ele queria ver TV, mas eu {não deixei/dissuadi-o} __.
    he want-PST.3SG watch TV, but I not allow/dissuade-PST.1SG-him
    ‘He wanted to watch TV, but I did not allow him to do it/dissuade him.’

(25) *Ele adora viajar, mas ela {odeia/não gosta} __.
    he adore-PRST.3SG travel, but she hate/not like-PRST.3SG
    ‘He loves to travel, but she hates it/she does not like it.’

(26) *Ele come demasiado, o que eu {lamento /não aprovo} __.
    he eat-PRST.3PL too much, which I regret- /not approve-PRST.1SG
    ‘He eats too much, which I regrets (it) /do not approve.’

However, the inclusion in one of these classes, by itself, does not constitute a
decisive factor for NCA licensing. As we pointed out in section 1, predicates with
close content vary in their ability to accept this construction. This is what happens
with the necessity modals *dever ‘should’ vs. ter (de Vinf ‘have to’(see (21) vs.
(27a)); with the durative aspectuals *continuar (a) ‘keep on’ and estar (a Vinf) (cf.
(22) vs. (27b)), or with the inceptive aspectual *começar (a) ‘begin/start’ and near
future auxiliary verb, *ir (Vinf) ‘go=will’, (cf. (28)):

(27) a. *Ele trabalhava muito, mas não tinha __.
    he work-PST.3SG much, but not should-3SG
b. *Ela já começou a estudar, e vai estar __ amanhã também.
    she already begin-PST.3SG to study, and will be tomorrow too
    ‘She already began studying and she will be studying tomorrow too.’

(28) a. *Ele está a aprender Sueco e ela começa __ amanhã.
    he be-PST.3SG to learn Swedish and she start-PST.3SG tomorrow
b. *Ele quer aprender Sueco e vai __!
    he want-PST.3SG learn Swedish and go-PST.3SG

We take these contrasts as an evidence that NCA is licensed by verbs with
intrinsic lexical content. This is the case of *dever, *continuar, or *começar, whose
modal or aspectual meaning is supplied by the verb stem, but not of *ter (de Vinf ),
estar (a Vinf ) or *ir (Vinf ).5 In fact, the modal and aspectual values of the latter kind

5 The fact that this construction in English is licensed by full predicates and not by auxiliary verbs
(in opposition to VP ellipsis) seems to corroborate this claim.
of verbs are compositionally obtained. For instance, the aspe
tual \textit{estar} (a \textit{V}_{\text{inf}}) exhibits a durative value only when it combines with the particle \textit{a} plus the infinitival complement, (29a); in other environments he behaves like a copular verb, (29b); in contrast, \textit{continuar} keeps its durative value, independently of the nature of its complement, (30):

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{a. Ele está a ler o livro.} \\
he be-PRST.3SG to read the book \\
“He is reading the book.”
\item \textit{b. Ele está preocupado.} \\
he be-PRST.3SG worried \\
“He is worried.”
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{a. Ele continua a ler o livro.} \\
he continue-PRST.3SG to read the book \\
“He continues reading the book.”
\item \textit{b. Ele continua preocupado. / Ele continuou o trabalho.} \\
he continue-PRST.3SG worried / he continue-PST.3SG the work \\
“He is still worried.” / “He continued the work.”
\end{enumerate}

In the same way, the modal value of \textit{ter} (\textit{de V}_{\text{inf}}) derives from the combination of the verb with the particle \textit{de} plus the infinitival complement and does not occur in other selection contexts of \textit{ter} ‘have’, while \textit{dever} keeps its modal value. Likewise, the temporal value of \textit{ir} arises when it selects an infinitival complement; in other environments, \textit{ir} ‘go’ is a motion verb.

In sum, the data analysed lead us to the following generalisation:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{NCA licensors must exhibit inherent lexical content.\textsuperscript{6}}
\end{enumerate}

This predicts that most auxiliary verbs exclude NCA. As we will show, not only meaning factors, but also syntactic properties determine this exclusion.

3.2. The categorial nature of the gap in NCA constructions

On the basis of examples like (32), Brucart (1999) suggests that, in Spanish, the NCA licensing verbs can not co-occur with the propositional clitic \textit{lo} ‘it’:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{a. Vendrá si puede __.} (\textit{__ = venir})
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{6} Still, a residual problem remains: How to explain that some verbs with lexical content do not license NCA (e.g., \textit{pensar} ‘think’, see (4))? Tentatively, we raise the following hypothesis: verbs presenting an epistemic reading do not allow NCA. An argument in favour of this hypothesis is presented by the modal verbs \textit{poder} ‘can’ and \textit{dever} ‘shall’: they only license NCA when they display deontic modality and exclude this construction when they present an epistemic reading. The same contrast shows up in Spanish (López 1994: 350; Depiante 2001: 201) and Italian (Depiante 2001: 201). We will explore the Portuguese data in future work.
**a.** Essa lei aumentará o desemprego e os sindicatos não aceitam __.
- that law increase-FUT.3SG the unemployment and the unions not accept-PRST.3PL

**b.** Essa lei aumentará o desemprego e os sindicatos que ela aumente o desemprego.
- that law increase-FUT.3SG the unemployment and the unions that it increase-PRST.3SG the unemployment.

**c.** Essa lei aumentará o desemprego e os sindicatos não {o / aceitam isso}.
- that law increase-FUT.3SG the unemployment and the unions not [it] accept-PRST.3PL / accept-PRST.3PL it.

**35**

**34**

**33**) Habían quedado en ir a comer, pero {se olvidó/*olvidó}
- have stay.PST_PART on go for eat, but himself forget/forget

‘They have agreed on go out for taking a meal, but he forgot.’ (id:2841)
“The students do not go often to the library, but they need to go often to the library.”

c. *Os alunos não vão frequentemente à biblioteca, the students not go-PRST.3PL often to.the library mas precisavam disso. but need-PST.3PL of.that
“The students do not go often to the library, but they need it.”

(36) a. Eles não gostam de ler, mas deviam __.
they not like-PRST.3PL of read, but should-3PL
“They do not like reading, but they should.”

b. *Eles não gostam de ler, mas deviam \{(de) isso/(n)o\}
they not like-PRST.3PL of read, but should-3PL (of) that/it

Still, this description does not provide an answer to our major question: which are the selectional properties of NCA licensors? Since the data show that these licensors in EP have distinct subcategorization properties (CP, Prep+CP and TP complements), we, apparently, have to maintain that NCA is a lexically-driven construction, not clearly determined by any specific lexical property.

However, all the above mentioned verbs have a common subcategorization property: in all their complements, at least TP projects. In other words, in NCA the omitted constituent must correspond to a proposition, not to a single predicate. Therefore, we propose the following generalisation:

(37) NCA licensors select a complement where T projects.

This would account for the fact that the NCA gap is always interpreted as a T domain. If we adopt Cyrino & Matos’s (2006) proposal that the null pronominal in NCA is reconstructed as a CP, all the instances of the omitted constituent in this construction count as complete T domains, at the level of semantic interpretation.

The fact that verbs that select vP or AspP, such as Perfect Tense and Passive auxiliaries, do not license NCA, (38), confirms the adequacy of the generalisation in (37):

(38) a. *Ele não costumava ir ao teatro, mas agora tem __.
he not use-PST.3SG go to.the theatre, but now has

b. *Ela nunca repreende os filhos, mas hoje eles foram __.
she never blame-PRST.3SG the children, but today they be-PRST.3SG

In sum, the distribution of NCA is not entirely unpredictable: it occurs with verbs with inherent lexical content which select sentential complements with T.
4. NCA and Restructuring

Although the generalisations in (31) and (32) accommodate the data analysed in section 3, a problem remains unsolved: why do Restructuring verbs license NCA only when Restructuring does not operate (cf. the contrast in (39))?

(39) *Ela cumprimentou-os, porque queria / *os. She greet-PST.3SG=[CL them], because want-PST.3SG / [CL them]

want-PST.3SG

‘She greeted them, because she wanted (to greet them).’

In the next subsections, we will briefly examine Restructuring structures in EP (section 4.1.), and the interaction of this construction with NCA (section 4.2.).

4.1. Restructuring in EP

Since Rizzi (1978, 1982), Restructuring is a term that applies to structures where an infinitival complement does not count as a boundary to such phenomena as Clitic Climbing, (40a), and Long Object Movement, (40b), which suggest that the verbs involved form a verbal complex and that there is a single sentential domain. Still, restructured sentences have full sentential correlates clearly exhibiting a bi-sentential structure (cf. (41)):  

(40) a. *Todos os jornalistas o quiseram entrevistar. all the journalists [CL him] want-PST.3PL interview

“All journalists wanted to interview him.”

b. *Começaram-se a construir as novas casas. begin-PST.3SG=[CL se.PASS] to build the new houses

“The new houses began to be built.”

(41) a. *Todos os jornalistas quiseram entrevistá-lo. all the journalists want-PST.3PL interview=[CL him]

“All journalists wanted to interview him.”

b. *Começou-se a construir as novas casas. begin-PST.3SG=[CL se.NOM] to build the new houses

“Someone began building the new houses.”

The transparency effects of these infinitival complements were captured in the late seventies by Rizzi’s Restructuring rule, which collapses the infinitival and the embedding sentences into a single sentential domain. In Principles and Parameters Theory, alternative explanations have been devised, relying on the categorial

---

7 Rizzi (1982) also presents Auxiliary Change in Italian as evidence for Restructuring. Yet, in EP this phenomenon does not show up: composed tenses always use the auxiliary verb ter ‘have’.

According to Wurmbrand (2001, 2004, 2006) and Cinque (2004, 2006), T does not project in Restructuring infinitival complements. This hypothesis captures the fact that the embedded infinitive temporally depends on the tense specifications of the higher domain (Stowell 1982, Raposo 1987, Ambar 1992, Gonçalves 1999), which would account for the marginality of (42), where two antonymous time adverbials co-occur within the Restructuring domain, one affecting the finite domain and the other the infinitival complement. Yet, this hypothesis fails to explain (43), where Clitic Climbing (hence, Restructuring) has applied, despite the fact that the infinitival domain exhibits its own temporal features, as indicated by the scope of the first instance of amanhã ‘tomorrow’:

(42) *Eles, ontem, quiseram entrevistar esse candidato hoje.
they, yesterday, want-PST.3PL interview that candidate today
(43) Hoje ele não te quer [ver amanhã].
today he not [CL you] want-PRST.3SG see tomorrow
"Today he does not want to see you tomorrow."

The example (43) shows that, from a semantic point of view, two distinct situations are involved in the Restructuring construction: one is denoted by the embedding clause, and the other by the infinitival complement. So, in a sentence like A Maria não os queria ver ‘Mary did not want to see them’, two time intervals can be recognized: the one where the situation denoted by want and its arguments is located, and the one where see and its arguments takes place.

Taking into account that tense heads are not only syntactically but also semantically relevant, in the sense that they are the locus of the tense/event structure (Chomsky 2001:9), we propose that, in EP, T projects even when Restructuring effects are visible. However, based on Gonçalves (1999), we consider that the following properties must be met:

---

8 The main difference between Wurmbrand’s and Cinque’s proposals is that the former argues that Restructuring verbs may be lexical or functional, thus, heading lexical or functional projections, whereas the latter claims that these verbs are always functional and head functional projections of a single sentential domain. In EP, Restructuring verbs may be lexical verbs. This is why we do not classify Restructuring as a case of the Serial Verb Construction, as proposed by Aboh (to appear).
9 This is one crucial difference between Restructuring and auxiliary verbs, which are partly identical in what concerns the clitic position.
10 For the semantic relevance of T, see Zagona (1990), Stowell (1996), Pesetsky & Torrego (2004).
11 Bok-Bennema (2006) also shows that Restructuring involves two sentential domains in the initial step of the derivation, presenting arguments against the VP nature of the infinitival complement.
(44) *T* in Restructuring infinitival complements

(i) *T* has non-valued uninterpretable T-features (Pesetsky & Torrego 2001, 2004; Duarte *et al.* 2005; Ambar 2007), whose value depends on the value of the matrix *T*;

(ii) *T* is syntactically inactive, so it can not delete the uninterpretable features of the goal, since for Agree to hold both the goal and the probe must be active (Chomsky 2001:6).12

This proposal correctly captures the fact that Restructuring may apply, when the matrix verb fixes the temporal location of the embedded event as posterior, (45a), or simultaneous, (45b), to the matrix one (Stowell 2004), but it does not apply when the embedded infinitival sentence has a free temporal location w.r.t. the matrix: overlapping, (46), anteriority, (47), or posteriority, (48).

(45) a. *O João não os quis fazer.*
   the João not [CL them] want-PST.3SG do
   “John did not want to do them.”

   b. *O professor não os estava a corrigir.*
   the teacher not [CL them] be-PST.3SG to correct
   “The teacher was not correcting them.”

(46) *Ele não afirmou conhecê-la* vs. *Ele não a afirmou conhecer.*
   he not claimed know[CL her] He not[CL her] claimed know
   “He did not claim that he knew her.”

(47) *Ele não afirmou tê-la visto* vs. *Ele não a afirmou ter visto.*
   he not claimed have[CL her]seen he not[CL her] claimed have seen
   “He did not claim that he had seen her.”

(48) *Ele não afirmou ir vê-la* vs. *Ele não a afirmou ir ver.*
   he not claimed go see[CL her] he not[CL her] claimed go see
   “He did not claim that he will see her”

In our proposal, temporal dependence means that the situation expressed in the embedded clause is temporally interpreted w.r.t. the matrix event time, not to the utterance time. This explains the contrast in (49): although in both cases the embedded domain is interpreted as a future w.r.t. the matrix, only in (49b) this future is related to the event time; in (49a), the adverbial *amanhã* ‘tomorrow’ denotes a future w.r.t. the utterance time, thus the sentence is ungrammatical.

(49) a. *Ele quis entrevistar o candidato amanhã.*
   he want-PST.3SG interview the candidate tomorrow

   b. *Ele quis entrevistar o candidato no dia seguinte.*
   he want-PST.3SG interview the candidate in.the day after
   “He wanted to interview the candidate the day after.”

---

12 The way the subordinate external argument gets Case seems to be unproblematic, if we assume that obligatory Control is raising to the matrix [Spec, T], as in Hornstein (1999).
For the same reason, the example in (43), above, is grammatical, although the two time adverbials (*hoje* ‘today’ and *amanhã* ‘tomorrow’) are antonymous: in (43) the matrix event time and the utterance time overlap, so the adverbial *amanhã* ‘tomorrow’ expresses a future w.r.t. the matrix event time.

Still, there is a subset of verbs, such as *prometer* ‘promise’, that also fix the temporal location of the embedded domain, but do not allow Restructuring, (50). The contrasts in (50) find an explanation in (44ii): *prometer* ‘promise’ only takes an embedded CP/TP with active T. In opposition, Restructuring verbs (e.g., *querer* ‘want’) take infinitival complements headed by active T or inactive T (see the examples without and with Restructuring, respectively, in (51) and (52)):

(50) \[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Ele não prometeu vê-la} & \text{vs. *Ele não a} \text{prometeu ver.} \\
\text{he not promised see=[CLher] he not [CLher] promised see}
\end{array}\]

(51) a. \[\begin{array}{l}
O \text{ João não quis comprá-lo.} \\
\text{the João not want-PST.3SG buy-[CL it]}
\end{array}\]  
“John did not want to buy it.”

b. \[\begin{array}{l}
Quis-se\text{ votar várias propostas.} \\
\text{want-PST.3SG=[CL se.NOM] vote several proposals}
\end{array}\]  
“One wanted to vote on several proposals.”

c. \[\begin{array}{l}
O \text{ Pedro só quis não o magoar.} \\
\text{the Pedro only want-PAST.3SG not [CL him] hurt}
\end{array}\]  
“Peter just wanted not to hurt him.”

(52) a. \[\begin{array}{l}
O \text{ João ainda o quis comprar.} \\
\text{the João still [CL it] want-PAST.3SG buy}
\end{array}\]  
“John still wanted to buy it.”

b. \[\begin{array}{l}
Quiseram-se votar várias propostas. \\
\text{want-PST.3PL=[CL PASS] vote several proposals}
\end{array}\]  
“They wanted to vote on several proposals.”

c. *\[\begin{array}{l}
O \text{ Pedro só o quis não magoar.} \\
\text{the Pedro only [CL him] want-PAST.3SG not hurt}
\end{array}\]  
“Peter just wanted not to hurt him.”

In sum, the properties of the embedded T have consequences on the licensing of the elements internally to the embedded domain: when the embedded T is active, it qualifies as a probe for checking the ϕ-features of clitics, forbidding Clitic Climbing, (51a). Since it is a complete domain, accusative Case is checked, by \(T_0\) (Pesetsky & Torrego 2004), excluding Long Object Movement, (51b), and the embedded negation is licensed as in Zanuttini (1996) and Matos (2001), (51c).

In contrast, when the embedded T is defective, the expected Restructuring effects show up – see the examples in (52): given the defectiveness of the embedded T, Agree holds between the matrix complete T and the embedded T, under c-command, and the temporal features of the latter are fixed by those of the former. Then, a single tensed phase obtains and the complex predicate is formed.
Assuming that Restructuring is actually the formation of a T-chain, Clitic Climbing and exclusion of the embedded negation (often in correlation with Neg Raising effects) are correctly predicted: they have to be licensed by the head of the chain – the matrix T –, which is active. As far as Long Object Movement is concerned, we hypothesise that the well-known effects of the passive clitic (inhibition of the external theta role and of the accusative Case) also affect the embedded domain, so To is absent in this domain, thus preventing the DP object of the embedded verb to check accusative case.

Notice that neither Clitic Climbing nor Long Object Movement violate the Minimal Link Condition, because Move is internal to the same phase; the intervening T is not active, so it is not an appropriate probe, that is, it can not value the features of the moved elements.

4.2. The complementary distribution of NCA and Restructuring

Since the NCA gap is always interpreted as a T domain, i.e., NCA licensors select at least a TP complement (section 3.2.) and Restructuring verbs select a TP even when Restructuring effects show up, how to account for the marginality of (54)?

(53) *Ela cumprimentou -os porque os queria __.
    she greet-PST.3SG=[CLthem] because [CLthem] want-PST.3SG

We claim that the explanation relies on the properties of T. Since, for Restructuring to apply, the embedded infinitival complement must have inactive T, the complementary distribution of these constructions leads us to propose the generalization in (54), which reformulates (37):

(54) NCA licensors must select a sentential complement with active T.

If a verb is marked in the Lexicon as selecting an active TP, Restructuring is forbidden, (55), and NCA is possible, (56). In turn, when the verb selects a TP with inactive T, it bans NCA, (53), but licenses this construction when Restructuring effects are not visible, i.e., when it selects a TP with active T (57).

(55) Elas {odeiam visitá-lo /*odeiam - no i visitar [-]i}.
    they hate-PRST.3PL visit=[CLhim] /hate-PRST.3PL=[CLhim], visit.
    “They hate to visit him.”
(56) Não gosto muito de sair à noite, mas não odeio __.
    not like-PRST.1SG much of go out at the night, but not hate-PRST.1SG
    “I do not like much to go out at night, but I do not hate (to go out at night).”
(57) Ela cumprimentou -os, porque queria __.
    she greet-PST.3SG=[CLthem], because want-PST.3SG
    ‘She greeted them, because she wanted (to greet them).’
In sum, the analysis developed in this paper shows that NCA is not randomly associated to verbs and explains the complementary distribution between the NCA and Restructuring: the more defective the sentence domain is, the weaker is the chance of NCA to occur, and the stronger is the chance of Restructuring to occur. The table 2 below synthesises the complementary distribution between Restructuring and NCA in EP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs selecting active T</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>NCA</th>
<th>VERBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with lexical content</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without lexical content</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Verbs selecting defective T | Yes | No | querer ‘want’, conseguir ‘manage’, tentar ‘try’, poder ‘can’, dever ‘shall’, costumar ‘use to’, continuar a ‘continue’, começar a ‘begin’, ir, vir, haver de, ter de, estar a V_{inf} |

| Table 2: Restructuring (REST)/Null Complement Anaphora (NCA) licensing verbs |

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have argued that NCA is not a property randomly associated to some verbs. Rather, it occurs under semantic and formal conditions: the licensing verb must have intrinsic lexical content and select an active T. We have also claimed that Restructuring effects occur when the embedded T is defective and, hence, the matrix T and the embedded T form a single tensed Phase. This analysis explains why NCA and Restructuring are in complementary distribution: this is not because NCA is a null proform with no internal structure (Depiante 2001), but due to the properties of the infinitival constituent, that is, the more syntactically defective this domain is, the less NCA occurs and the more Restructuring effects show up.

The fact that in Portuguese NCA exhibits internal structure (Cyrino & Matos 2006) is compatible with its complementary distribution with Restructuring: Restructuring effects only occur with a syntactically inactive TP, while NCA corresponds either to active TP complements or to propositional DP proforms that reconstruct as CPs.
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