

The loss of clitic climbing in Brazilian Portuguese revisited **Sonia Cyrino (Unicamp/University of Cambridge)**

As it is well-known, Brazilian Portuguese (BP) lost clitic climbing (cf. Pagotto 1992; Cyrino 1993). This change has affected not only “restructuring” (1) but also compound tense (2a-b) constructions. Since BP lost Faire+Inf constructions (3) as well, in this paper, I revisit the loss of clitic climbing and show that it is but one effect of a more general loss, the demise of Romance-type syntactic complex predicates (CPr).

Martins (2006) shows that, in the history of Portuguese, the causative/perceptive structures were the first to change with respect to clitic climbing, followed by control and raising ECM structures. Accordingly, Old Portuguese (OP) had both Faire+Inf (4a) and ECM constructions (4b) (the latter, not a CPr), and obligatory proclisis to the upper verb. The emergence of inflected infinitive complements to causative/perceptive verbs in the 16th century allowed for clitics and negation to occur as related to the lower verb, as in (5). Martins (and also Davies 1994) points out that this was a change from a more reduced to a less reduced structure in control, raising and ECM structures. I show that the change went further in BP, leading to the loss of the structural configuration that once permitted CPr structures, due to a change in the defectiveness of non-finite T.

I assume that inflected infinitive structures are non-defective: there should be at least [person] (perhaps also [number] features) allowing for nominative Case valuing. In BP, there was an extension of this non-defectiveness to all infinitives (as well as to the nonfinite Ts of compound tenses), and this change, consequently, made it possible for the former CPr either to be lost (Faire+Inf) or to become more “expanded” (in the restructuring and compound tense structures).

The loss of Faire+Inf was triggered by *intransitive* causative sentences as (6a): they were ambiguous between a Faire+Inf (a CPr) and an uninflected infinitive ECM structure (not a CPr) (for the potential ambiguity, cf. Gonçalves 1999:320; Martins 2006 has only unambiguous transitive sentences). However, there was also another causative option, (6b), the *inflected* infinitive ECM (not a CPr either), which provided the evidence for the child that nominative subjects (and non-defective infinitive T) could occur in a semantically similar structure. Due to the well-known concomitant loss of verbal morphology in BP, the extension of the inflected infinitives T’s feature make up to uninflected infinitives Ts (and to other non-finite Ts) became possible. Indeed, there are no Faire+Inf causatives in my 19th century data, but we find sentences as in (7).

As a consequence of the change in non-finite Ts, BP now allows for intervening subjects and negation between verbs in restructuring and compound tense configurations, as shown in (8), something which does not occur in previous data. Besides that, as we saw in (7), instead of Faire+Inf causatives, the only possible causatives in modern BP are the *make*-causatives, with the interesting fact that no ECM effect is observed (9), unlike English or European Portuguese (EP). This has been analyzed as an instance of *backward control* (cf. Farrell 1995, Hornstein 2003). In fact, this is clearer if a pronoun is present in the lower clause: it is nominative marked.

As for clitic climbing, my analysis shows why it became impossible in BP: the intervening non-defective non-finite T prevents clitic incorporation into the upper verb. The fact that non-finite T became non-defective also explains the possibility for overt non-ECM subjects to occur with infinitives in BP (cf. Pires 2002).

The loss of bare infinitives, complements to causative verbs, in English has been related to the rise of lexical subjects in other kinds of infinitival complements (cf. Fisher 1992, Tanaka 2007). The BP diachronic facts discussed here are remarkably similar, and they can certainly add to the current understanding of parametric change.

- (1) João pode/quer/vai te ver.
João can/ wants/goes you-CL see-INF
 `João can/wants to/is going to see you´.
- (2) a. João está te vendo.
João is you-CL see-PresPart
 `João is looking at you´.
- b. João tinha me visto.
João had I-CL see-PstPart
 `João had seen me´.
- (3) * João fez comer a sopa à Maria
João made eat-INF the soup to Maria
 `João made Maria eat the soup´.
- (4) a. que lhes fez quebrantar os mādados de seus senhores.
that them-DAT make-3SG break-INF the orders of their masters
 `that it made them disobey their masters´ orders´
- b. viu Galvam tal doo fazer.
saw-3SG Galvam such lament do-INF
 `He saw Galvam lamenting his faith´
- (5) Vejo, senhor, tambem nam me mamdardes armas...
see-PRES-1SG lord also not me-ACC send-INFL.INF-2PL weapons
 `I regret to see, my lord, that you also do not send me weapons...´
- (6) a. A menina mandou-o sair.
The girl ordered he-ACC leave-INF
 `The girl ordered him to leave him leave´
- b. A menina mandou ele sair.
The girl ordered he-NOM leave-INF.INF
 `The girl ordered him to leave´
- (7) a. nhanhã Carlotinha não quer deixar ela ir. (*O Demônio Familiar*, 19th century)
Nhanhã Carlotinha not want let she-NOM go-INF
 `Miss Carlotinha doesn´t want to let her go´.
- b. Por que não mandou eu ensaiar com ele? (*Querubim Trovão*, 19th century)
Why not ordered I-NOM rehearse.INF with him!
 `Daddy, who is this lad? Why haven´t you ordered me to rehearse with him?´
- (8) a. ...eu tentei **eu** enviar meu convite... (rvsants.multiply.com/)
I tried I to-send my invitation
 `...I tried to send my invitation...´
- b. ... eu estou **não** trabalhando com meu servidor... (xoops.eti.br/newbb+viewpostuid+2077.htm)
I am not working with my server
 `... I am not working with my server...´
- (9) A menina fez o pai/ele/eu comprar o doce.
The girl made the father/he-NOM/I/NOM buy.INF the sweet
 `The girl made her father/him/me buy the candy´

References:

- Cyrino, S. 1993.** Observações sobre a mudança diacrônica no português do Brasil: objeto nulo e clíticos. In I. Roberts & M. Kato (eds.) *Português Brasileiro*. Campinas: EdUnicamp. **Davies, Mark. 1994.** Parameters, Passives, and Parsing: Motivating diachronic and synchronic variation in Spanish and Portuguese. *CLS* 30.. 46-60. **Farrell, P. 1995.** Backward Control in Brazilian Portuguese. *ESCOL. CLC Publications*. 95: 116–127 **Fischer, O. 1992.** Syntactic change and borrowing: The case of the accusative-and-infinitive construction in English. In M. Gerritsen & D. Stein (Eds), *Internal and external factors in syntactic change*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 17–88. **Gonçalves, A. 1999.** *Predicados Complexos Verbais em Contextos de Infinitivo não Preposicionado do Português Europeu*. PhD diss. University of Lisboa. **Hornstein, N. 2003.** On Control. In R. Hendrick (ed) *Minimalist Syntax*. Malden, Blackwell. **Martins, A. M. 2006.** Aspects of infinitival constructions in the history of Portuguese. In R. S. Gess & D. Arteaga (Eds), *Historical Romance Linguistics: Retrospective and Perspectives*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 327-355. **Pagotto, E. 1992.** *A posição dos clíticos em português: um estudo diacrônico*. MA thesis, Unicamp. **Pires, A. 2002.** Cue Based Change: Inflection and Subjects in the History of Portuguese Infinitives. In D. Lightfoot, ed. *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*. Oxford, OUP. **Tanaka, T. 2007.** The rise of lexical subjects in English infinitives. *Journal of Comp German Linguistics*. 10:25-67.