NULL COMPLEMENT ANAPHORA IN ROMANCE:
DEEP OR SURFACE ANAPHORA?[*]

SONIA CYRINO & GABRIELA MATOS
UNICAMP - University of Lisbon

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 presents 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 context[1], while surface anaphora results from the deletion of a linguistic expression under identity (or non-distinctness) with a linguistic antecedent.

Based on its behaviour with respect to these properties, Hankamer and Sag characterized *Null Complement Anaphora* (NCA) in English as deep anaphora.

---

[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.

Extending this proposal to Spanish and Italian, Depiante (2000, 2001) argues that NCA in these languages 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.

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*. Yet, we do not take this as compelling evidence for rejecting the correlation between NCA and 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 doubt on the possibility of drawing a clear-cut distinction between proforms and ellipsis and suggests that Reconstruction should be kept in the grammar.

This paper is structured as follows: 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 describes the properties of NCA in Portuguese (EP and BP); 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 main verb, (1); while in VP Ellipsis in English an auxiliary or 'to' infinitive licenses the gap, cf. (2) and (3).[2]

(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 ellipsis 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)

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 (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).

---

[2] Examples like '*I asked Bill to leave, but he did not _*' suggest that the licenser of the elliptical verbal phrase is the sentence negation marker. Yet the ungrammaticality of '*I asked Bill to leave, but he not _.*' shows that a verbal element is required.

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

Finally, the null constituent in NCA does not present internal structure; hence, it does not sanction the Missing Antecedent construction (Grinder & Postal 1971), while it does in VP ellipsis: *it* in (7a) does not have an antecedent in the complex sentence, 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, these properties are not entirely accurate in determining the deep anaphora status of NCA. With respect to the first property, it has been shown that, in some cases, VP ellipsis is also recovered by the situational context, (8), (Williams 1977, 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)

Similarly, 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 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*. Firstly, she shows that NCA in Spanish allows for pragmatic antecedents:

(10) [Javier jumps into the icy cold sea]
Juan says: *Yo también puedo* __![4]
            I   too   can.1SG __
"I can, too!"
(Depiante 2001: 206)

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:

---

[3] As noted by one of the reviewers, the argument of the Missing Antecedent Pronoun seems to undermine Hankamer and Sag's assumption that pronouns do not require linguistic antecedents and may set their denoting contents through pragmatic control.

[4] Comparing Spanish and English, the example in (10) could, at first sight, be considered as a case of VP ellipsis. However, following most studies (e.g. Zagona 1988, Lobeck 1995, a.o.) Depiante (2000, 2001) tacitly assumes that Spanish lacks this construction.

(11) *Los pacientes del   tercero   tienen   que ser llevados   a terapia*
     the patients of.the   third   have.PRS.3PL to be taken   to therapy
     intensiva aunque   la enfermera con más fuerza   no pueda
     intensive even if   the nurse   with more strengh not can.PRS.3SG
     "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.

(12) a.   **Juan   no pudo   asesinar a Pablo con un cuchillo   pero*
          Juan   not could.3SG kill   to Pablo with a knife   but
          Pedro   sí pudo   y   pro estaba oxidado.
          Pedro   yes could.3SG __ and   *pro* was   rusted
     b.   Jack couldn't kill Peter with a knife, but John could __, and it was
          rusty.
          (Depiante 2001: 208)

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 conjunct[5].

(13) **A Maria,   Juan {quiere /puede}   dar=le   un libro,   y*
     To Maria,   Juan {want.PRS.3SG/can.3SG} give=her   a book,   and
     a Susana   también {quiere/puede }   __.
     to Susana   also   {want.PRS.3SG/can.PRS.3SG} __
     (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), that this is not a reliable test to distinguish deep from surface anaphora.

---

[5] Notice that the first conjunct of (12) exhibits Clitic Left Dislocation, not Topicalization.

(14) a.   John refused to talk to his mother and Peter also refused __.
     b.   *Juan   quiere   hablar   con su   madre   y   Pedro*
           Juan   want.PRS.3SG talk.INF to her   mother and Pedro
           también quiere   __.
           also   want.PRS.3SG __.
           "Juan wants to talk to her mother and Pedro wants (to talk to her
           mother, too.)"
           (Depiante 2000: 39)

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

**4.   *NCA as surface anaphora: the case of Brazilian and European
       Portuguese***
       NCA exhibits a different behaviour in Portuguese, both in Brazilian and in
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, (15), VP Ellipsis,
(16), and Null Object, (17). Moreover, since Portuguese exhibits Generalized
Verb Movement, VP Ellipsis occurs both with auxiliary, (16a), and main verbs,
(16b), (Raposo 1986, Matos 1992, Cyrino 1997).

(15) *Pedi   ao Pedro   que saísse,   mas   ele*
     ask.PST.1SG   to.the Pedro that leave.SBJV.3SG   but   he
     recusou=se   __ .
     refuse.PST.3SG=REFL   __
     "I asked Pedro to leave, but he refused."   (__ = to leave)
(16) a.   *João disse   que tinha   comprado   o   jornal*
           Joãosay.PST.3SG   that had   buy.PART.PST the newspaper
           e,   com efeito,   tinha __!
           and,   indeed,   had __
           "John said that he had bought the newspaper and he had, indeed!"
           (__ = (have.PST.3SG) buy.PTCP the newspaper)

b.   *Ele não comprou   o jornal   hoje   e   ela também*
     he   not buy.PST.3SG   the newspaper today   and   she too
     não comprou   __.
     not buy.PST.3SG   __
     "He did not buy the newspaper today and she did not either."
     (__ = (buy.PST.3SG) the newspaper today)

(17) *Ele viu   o   CD na montra   e   comprou   __.*
     He   see.PST.3SG the CD in.the shop window   and buy.PST.3SG__
     "He saw the CD in the shop window and bought (it)."

Other Romance languages, e.g. Spanish and French, do not exhibit VP ellipsis
(Zagona 1988, Lobeck 1995) or Null Object, and only present NCA.

However, NCA differs from VP ellipsis and Null Object in Portuguese. In
particular, NCA, (18), in contrast with VP Ellipsis, (19), does not require
lexical nor structural parallelism between the verb in the antecedent sentence
and the verb locally licensing the omitted constituent.[6]

(18) a.   *Ele comprava   o   jornal   pois precisava   __ para*
          he   buy.PST.3SG the   newspaper   for need.PST.3SG __ to
          estar   informado.
          be.INF   inform.PTCP
          "He bought the newspaper since he needed (it) in order to get
          informed."
     b.   *Ele não lê   o jornal   mas   devia__.*
          he   not read.PRS.3SG the newspaper   but   should.3SG__
          "He does not read the newspaper but he should."

(19) a.   **Ele comprava   o   jornal   pois tinha   __ para*
          he   buy.PST.3SG the   newspaper   for have.PST.3SG __ to
          estar   informado.
          be.INF   inform.PTCP
          "He bought the newspaper since he had (to) in order to get
          informed."
     b.   **Não comprei   o   jornal   ontem,   mas   agora*
          not buy.PST.1SG the   newspaper   yesterday,   but   now
          estou   __.
          be.PRS.1SG   __
          "I did not buy the newspaper yesterday, but I am now."

---

[6] Accordingly, 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.

This strong parallelism requirement for the verbs in VP ellipsis is one of the distinguishing properties between Portuguese, (18), and English, (20a). In the latter language this requirement only applies to *be* and, to a smaller extent, to *have* (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 *has*n't a driver's license, but Mary should __.

We take this different behaviour 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.[7] On the 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.[8]

NCA also differs from VP ellipsis in Portuguese because, while the elliptical constituent in VP ellipsis may be licensed by all classes of verbs, NCA only occurs with quasi-auxiliaries and some verbs selecting sentential complements. Thus, (18) contrasts with (19) and (21),[9] since the latter may not be interpreted as VP ellipsis, due to lack of parallelism of the verbs in the antecedent and in the elliptical sentence, nor as NCA, because the verbs in (19) and (21) do not accept this construction.

---

[7] See Cyrino and Matos 2002, 2004 for an analysis of VP ellipsis in Portuguese.

[8] Recent studies correlate the parallelism constraint on VP ellipsis with *be* and *have* in English with the verbal inflectional morphology (Lasnik 1994, 1999a, Roberts 1998, Potsdam 1997). Lasnik 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. In Portuguese all kinds of verbs raise to Inflection in overt syntax. So, their behaviour patterns the one of *be* and *have* in English. This corroborates the requirement of parallelism on the verbs in VP ellipsis in this language.

[9] Notice that the modal verbs *ter de* (´have to'), in (19a), and *dever* ('shall', 'should'), in (18b), have a closely related meaning.

(21) *_Ele vai   ver   esse espectaculo   em breve e   ela_
     he   go. PST.3SG   see.INF   that show   soon   and she
     _também espera   __._
     also   hope. PST.3SG   __
     "He will see that show soon and she also hopes (~~to do so~~)"

NCA also differs from Null Object, since in the former construction the null constituent has propositional or predicative content, (22), while in the latter it denotes an entity, (23).

(22) _Ela não sabe   Italiano, mas gostava[10]/gostaria   __ ._
     she   not   know. PRS.3SG   Italian   but like.COND.3SG   __
     "She does not know Italian, but she would like (to)."
     (__ = to know Italian)
(23) _Ele viu   o CD   na   vitrine   e   comprou __._
     he   see. PST.3SG   the CD   in-the   shop window and buy. PST.3SG
     "He saw the CD in the shop window and bought (it)."

Additionally, as mentioned above, NCA is lexically determined (cf. (21) vs. (22)), while Null Object in Portuguese, like VP ellipsis, is not.

4.2   _The core characterizing properties of NCA_

As is the case of English and Spanish, NCA in Portuguese is lexically determined, being licensed by some main and quasi-auxiliary verbs (see 4.1.). Similarly, the omitted constituent of NCA in this language presents propositional or predicative value.

(24) a.   _Pedi   ao   Pedro   que saísse,   mas ele_
           ask. PST.1SG   to.the   Pedro   that leave.SBJV.3SG   but he
           _recusou=se   ___
           refuse. PST.3SG=REFL   __
           "I asked Pedro to leave, but he refused"   (__ = to leave)
     b.   _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 __
           "Luís has finished writing his thesis; however, Ana has started just now."   (__ = writing her thesis)

---

[10] In EP the Imperfect Past form of the verb is used with conditional value.

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!"

Similarly, when there is a linguistic antecedent, NCA in Portuguese does not require lexical or structural parallelism. 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; in (27), the NCA antecedent is in the active voice, but the omitted constituent is recovered in the passive.

(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 __
     "He would like to make a dinner for all the family and I volunteered."
(27) *A*   *mãe*   *queria*   *lavar*   *a*   *criança*, *mas*   *ela*
     the mother   want. PST.3SG   wash   the child,   but   she
     recusou-se __.
     refuse. PST.3SG=REFL
     "The mother wanted to wash the child, but he/she refused."

Finally, together with English and Spanish, NCA in Portuguese admits pronouns with sloppy readings:

(28) *José$_i$*   *ainda*   *se=recusou*   *a*   *conversar*   *com (a)* *sua$_i$*
     José   still   REFL=refuse. PST.3SG to talk.INF   to (the) his
     mãe   *mas*   *Pedro$_j$*   *concordou*   __.
     mother but   Pedro   agree. PST.3SG   __
     "José$_i$ still refused to talk to his$_i$ mother, but Pedro$_j$ agreed."
     (__= to talk to his$_{i,j}$ mother)

So, NCA in English, Spanish and Portuguese share several properties.

4. 3 *NCA in Portuguese exhibits internal structure*

However, in contrast to what happens in English and Spanish, NCA in Portuguese is not a deep anaphor.

Thus, it licenses a Missing Antecedent pronoun, as in (29).

(29) *Ele não   queria   comprar nenhum dicionário,   mas nós*
he   not   want. PST.3SG   buy   no   dictionary   but we
precisámos   __   e pro era muito   pesado.
need. PST.1PL   __   and *pro* was very   heavy
"He did not want to buy any dictionary, but we needed (it) and *it* was very heavy." (__ = to buy a dictionary)

Furthermore, NCA in Portuguese admits WH-extraction and topicalization of constituents out of the omitted complement (cf. (30) and (31)) and allows for Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD) (cf. (32)):

(30) *O   amigo   a   quem   tu querias   telefonar*
the   friend   to   whom   you want. PST.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*
this novel   the Joãobegin. PST.3SG   to   write.INF but this
conto, (ele) nunca   acabou   __.
tale,   (he) never   finish. PST.3SG   __
"This novel, João has began writing but this tale, he has never finished."   (__ = writing (~~this tale~~))

(32) *Eu não me=recuso   a   fazer qualquer   coisa   que ele*
I   not REFL=refuse. PRS.1SG   to   do   any   thing   that he
*mand*e   __.
order. SBJT.3SG   __
"I do not refuse to do anything he orders (me to do)."   (__ = to do __)

Notice that whatever treatment we give to ACD,[11] the null constituent is

---

[11] May (1985) and Fiengo and May (1994) admit that ACD may be accounted for by Quantifier Raising (QR) of the DP containing the relative clause plus Reconstruction of the omitted constituent inside the relative clause. However, as noticed by Fox (2002), adopting the copy

interpreted as having internal structure, due to the Operator-variable chain in the relative clause, as shown in (33) for the example in (32):

(33) a. *... qualquer   coisa que ele mande*   __.
         any   thing that he order. SBJT.3SG   __
     b. anything op$_i$ that he orders ~~to do op$_i$~~

Thus, considering the criteria for detecting the internal structure, NCA in Portuguese is better characterized as a surface anaphor.

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 Syntax as a null proform without internal structure, the null counterpart of the sentential proform *it* or *so* in English and *lo* in Spanish (Depiante 2000), (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 that a predicate that selects NCA cannot take an overt predicative or propositional proform. She also 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 present a nominal interpretation. This would explain the unacceptability of (35). Yet, the contrast between (35) and (36) suggests an alternative explanation. In (35), 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 (35) is pragmatically odd.

---

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.

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

(36) 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.

Moreover, the generalization proposed for Spanish is not borne out for Portuguese, since in this language NCA is not in complementary distribution with the invariable clitic *o*, the close correlate of the Spanish *lo* (37), nor with the pronoun *isso* 'that' (38), in their sentential interpretation:

(37) *Ainda   que* {*queiras   __ /o queiras*},   *não*   (EP)
although that {want. SBJT.2SG /CL want. SBJT.2SG}, not
podes   resolver   esse   problema.
can. PRS.2SG solve.INF   that   problem
"Although you want (it), you may not solve that problem."
(38) *Nós pedimos   aos   rapazes para nos=visitarem*,   (BP, EP)
we   ask.1PL.PST to.the   boys   for us=visit.INF.3PL
e   todos   se ={*recusaram   __ /recusaram   a   isso*}.
and all   REFL={refuse. PST.3PL __ /refuse. PST.3PL   to   that}
"We asked the boys to visit us, and they all refused (that)."

Thus, we conclude that the complementary distribution between NCA and the sentential/predicative proforms is not a characterizing property of NCA, but a side effect of the selectional properties of the verbs taken into account by Brucart and Depiante.

4.5 *The NCA licensers 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, they 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 Portuguese, NCA also occurs with these classes of verbs (Matos 2003). Restructuring verbs select complements below CP, in the case of modals, (39),

and aspectuals, (40), TP complements (Matos 1992, Gonçalves 1999, Cyrino & Matos 2002). In this case NCA does not alternate with *o* or *isso,* as shown in (39) and (40):

(39) *Os   alunos   não vão   frequentemente   à   biblioteca*,
  the.PL   student.PL not go. PRS.3PL   often   to.the   library,
  "The students do not often go to the library,"
  a. mas *deviam*   __ .
    but   should.3PL   __
    "but they should."
  b. **mas deviam=no   /*deviam isso*}.
    but {should.3PL=CL   / should.3PL that}
    "but they should it/so."

(40) A Maria   ainda   não escreveu   a   sua comunicação,
  the Maria   yet   not write. PST.3SG the her paper
  "Mary has not yet written her paper,
  a. *mas   já   começou   __*.
    but   already   start. PST.3SG   __
    but she has already started (writing her paper)."
  b. ** mas   já   começou   a   isso*.
    but   already   start. PST.3SG   to   that

Yet, when NCA is licensed by main verbs requiring CP complements, its alternation with sentential proforms is possible, as in (41) and (42).

(41) *Essa lei aumentará   a   precariedade de   emprego*,
  that law   increase. FUT.3SG   the   uncertainty   of   employment
  "That law will increase the uncertainty of employment,"
  a. *e   os   sindicatos   não aceitam   __*.
    and the.PL   union.PL   not {accept. PRS.3PL   __
    "and the unions do not accept (it)."
  b. *e   os   sindicatos   não o=aceitam.*
    and the.PL   union.PL   not   CL=accept. PRS.3PL}
    "and the unions do not accept it."

(42) *Os   alunos   não vão   frequentemente à   biblioteca*,
  the.PL student.PL   not go. PRS.3PL   often   to.the library
  "The students do not often go to the library,"

a. *mas precisavam   __.*
    but   need. PST.3PL __
    "but they needed (it)."
b. *mas precisavam   disso.*
    but   need. PST.3PL   of.that
    "but they needed it."

If NCA is the direct object CP of the verb, the omitted constituent may be substituted in EP by the pronoun *o*,[12] (41), or *isso*, in EP and BP. If NCA corresponds to a prepositional CP complement of the verb, the CP alternates with 'isso', thus resulting in the sequence 'P+isso', (42).

The contrasts between (39)-(40) and (41)-(42) are related to case: restructuring verbs are not case assigners; in opposition, the verbs in (41) and (42) assign accusative or select prepositional complements, where the preposition assigns case to the complement. Hence, the pronominals are excluded from restructuring contexts but allowed in the latter case.

In addition, the sentential proforms in NCA only alternate with a CP, possibly due to the fact that they can only denote full phases: 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 case assigning properties of the NCA licensing verbs as well as the defectiveness vs. non-defectiveness of the complement they select.[13]

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

In Portuguese, although the instances of NCA corresponding to restructuring verbs may be easily conceived as cases of surface anaphora, i.e., according to Hankamer and Sag, as the result of ellipsis, the same does not happen to the NCA occurrences that enter in free variation with the pronouns *o* and *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 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 pre-theoretical descriptive entities that permit to correlate structures sharing a significant amount of descriptive

---

[12] Brazilian Portuguese (BP) has lost the invariable clitic *o* (cf. Cyrino, 1997).
[13] Some verbs occur both in restructuring and in non-restructuring contexts, e.g., *querer* 'want'.

properties; however, these properties do not need to be exhaustively shared.[14] This is what happens with NCA, with respect to the alternation with *o* and *isso*.

The answer to the second question is positive: the cases of NCA that alternate with overt pronouns, as (43a) and (44a), present surface anaphora properties ─ see (43b) and (44b), which exhibit WH-extraction out of the gap.

(43) a. *Pediram* =*me para* *fazer* *um relatório e* *eu só*
ask. PST.3PL =me for   make.INF a   report   and I   only
{*aceitei* ___ */o=aceitei*}   *porque não tinha*
accept. PST.1SG ___   /CL=accept. PST.1SG} because not had
alternativa.
choice
"They asked me to make a report and I only accepted (it) because I had no choice."

b. *O relatório que ele me=pediu para fazer* ___ *e*
the report   that he me=ask. PST.3SG for   make.INF ___ and
eu aceitei ___ *era o de actividades.*
I   accept. PST.1SG ___ was the of activities
"The report that he asked me to do and I accepted was the activities one"

(44) a. *Ela assistiu ao colóquio, mas nós*
she attend. PST.3SG   to the.SG colloquium, but we
{*recusámo=nos* ___ */recusámo=nos* *a isso*}.
refuse. PST.1PL=REFL ___ /refuse. PST.1PL=REFL   to   that}
"She attended the colloquium, but we refused (it)"

b *A que colóquio (é que) ela assistiu* ___ *e nós*
to which colloquium (is that) she attend. PST.1SG ___ and we
nos=recusámos ___.
REFL=refuse PST.1PL ___
"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 of the clitics *o* and *lo*, assuming that, at least in some contexts, these clitics are the correlates of the null complement in NCA, in these languages.

---

[14] It is in this sense that we include in VP ellipsis in English the cases where the licensing verb is an auxiliary selecting VP and those with the copulative *be*, which selects a non-VP complement.

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).[15] Yet, the stage of evolution of the invariable clitic is different in Portuguese and in Spanish. In Spanish, *lo*, denoting sentences or predicates (cf. (45)), still corresponds to the tonic form of the neuter personal pronoun *'ello'*, (46):

(45) a. *Me=dijo   que no iba   a   venir   y   no*
         me=say. PST.3SG that not go. PST.3SG to   come.INF   and not
         lo=creí.
         CL=believe. PST.1SG
         "He told me that he was not coming and I did not believe it."
         (Soriano 1999:1216)

    b. *Juan   es   ágil   pero Maria   no lo=es.*
        Juan   be. PRS.3SG   agile   but Maria   not CL=be. PRS.3SG.
        "Juan is agile but Maria is not."

(46) a. *Me=dijo   que no iba a   venir   y   me enfadé*
         me=say. PST.3SG that not go to   come   and me get mad PST
         por ello.
         for it
         "He told me that he was not coming and I got mad because of that."
         (Soriano 1999:1216)

    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*. Yet, *ello* still has specific uses, and there are contexts in which the alternation *ello/eso* is impossible, as in (47). 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 (48), the close equivalent of (47):

---

[15] As it is well known, Latin did not have third person personal pronouns and used the demonstratives to make up for their absence (Ernout and Thomas 1951).

(47) *Venga,   vamos   a   ello   /# eso*!
     come   go. PRS.1PL.SUBJ   to   it   /# that
     "Come on, let's do it!"
     (Soriano 1999: 1242)
(48) *Vamos   a   isso!*   (BP/EP)
     go. PRS.SUBJ.1PL   to   that
     "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 (49a) the direct object clitic alternates with *isso* and is substituted by this pronoun in passive subject position, (49b).

(49) a. *O   presidente   declarou=o   / declarou isso}   em*
        the   president   declare. PST.3SG=CL   / declare. PST.3SG that} in
        entrevista à   TV.
        interviewto.the   TV
        "The president claim {it/that} in an interview for the TV."
     b. *Isso foi   declarado   pelo   presidente   em entrevista*
        that be. PST.3SG   declare.PRTC by.the president   in   interview
        à   TV.
        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.[16]

---

[16] 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, which occur in object position (cf. (i)).

(i) *Non   pensavo   [di tornari]ᵢ.(...) ₌loᵢ₌credevo   impossibile*
    not   think.PST.1SG   to come back   ; CL=believe. PST.1SG   impossible
    "I did not think to come back; I considered it impossible."   (C&C 1988: 545)

Still, Calabrese (1988) also shows that the demonstrative *ciò*, may substitute the propositional clitic *lo,* as well as *questo* and *quello*, the core demonstratives in current Italian.

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. These proforms can occur in sentences inducing *Sloppy Identity* readings, (50), or presenting the *Antecedent Contained Deletion* construction, thus showing an Operator-variable configuration, (51).

(50) *José$_i$ aceita   conversar   com a   sua$_i$ mãe,   e   só*
         José   accept. PRS.3SG   talk.INF   to   the his mother, and only
     Ana   se=recusa   a   isso.
         Ana   REFL=refuse   to   that
     "José accepts to talk to his mother, and only Ana refuses that."
     (*isso* = *pro$_k$* to talk to *her$_k$* mother   )   (BP, EP)

(51) a. *Os   livros   foram   postos   em todas as   estante*
             the.PL   book.PL   be. PST.3PL   put.PRTC in   all   the.PL   shelves
         em que   as   revistas   o=foram.[17]
             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~~)   (EP)

     b. *Essa criança só   faz   aquilo   que tu*
             that child   only   do. PRS.3SG   that   that you
         lho =permitas.
             CL.DAT_CL.ACC=allow. SUBJ.PRST.3SG
         "That child only does what you allow him/her to do."

     c.   OP$_i$ …(o =   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* as predicative or propositional contents: it substitutes a VP, (52), or a sentence, (53).

(52) a.   If you have not yet changed your socks, please do so immediately.
             (H&S 1976: 415)

---

[17] 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.

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

(53) a Q: — Is the moon out?
A: — I believe *so*.
(H&S1976:415)

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

Hankamer and Sag argue that *so-anaphora* is a surface anaphor because it licenses pronouns in *Missing Antecedent* contexts, (54), and cannot be pragmatically recovered, (55).

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

(55) [Sag succeeds in ripping phone book in half]   (H&S 1976:418)
Hankamer: # I don't believe *so*.

They claim that *so-anaphora*, like other null instances of surface anaphora, result from deletion at a late stage of the derivation, leaving *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, (56). This fact favours the idea that it is a proform, as proposed by Ross (1972), and not a case of ellipsis.

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

The same happens with the pronouns *isso* and *o* in Portuguese, which cannot co-occur with the linguistic material they stand for, cf. (57) and (58).

(57) *Eles   aceitaram   conversar com   as mães   e   só
they   accept. PST.3PL   talk.INF to   the.PL mother.PL and only
ela   se=recusa   a   isso conversar   com   a   mãe.
she   REFL=refuse PST.3SG   to   that talk.INF   to   the mother
"They accepted to talk to their mothers and she was the only one who refused to do it talk to her mother."

(58) *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, an overt surface anaphor may enter into the computation as a proform, 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 anaphora has consequences for the theory of ellipsis, as shown by (59):

(59) a.   *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.
           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]$_i$ the magazines$_k$ have been [$_{VP}$ put$_j$ [~~the magazines~~]$_k$
           [V$_j$ [~~in which~~]$_i$]]

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; the same happens to *em que* 'in which', which is the prepositional complement of the verb ─ see (59b).

       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.

       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 2003, 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 as 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[18], proposed by Merchant's (2001) to deal with ellipsis.

References:

Bach, Emon, Joan Bresnan & Thomas Wasow. 1974. Sloppy Identity: un unnecessary and insufficient criterion for deletion rules. *Linguistic Inquiry* 5, 609-614.

Bosque, Ignacio. 1984. "Negación y elipsis". *Estudios de Linguïstica*. 2: 171-199.

Bresnan, Joan. 1971. A note on the notion of 'Identity of Sense Anaphora'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2, 589-597.

Brucart, José Maria. 1999. "La elipsis". Bosque & Demonte. 2787-2863.

Calabrese, Andrea. 1988. "I dimonstrativi: pronomi e aggettivi". Renzi 1988. 617-631.

Chomsky, Noam. 1976. "Conditions on Rules of Grammar". *Linguistic Analysis*, l2:4. Reprinted in Chomsky 1977. *Essays on Form and Interpretation.* Amsterdam: Elsevier North-Holland, Inc..

——— 1995. *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

——— 2001. "Derivation by Phase". *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1-152.

——— 2004. "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy". *Structures and Beyond: the Cartography of Syntactic Structures.* vol. 3., ed. by Adriana Belletti. New York: Oxford University Press, 104-131.

Cordin, Patrizia & Andrea Calabrese. 1988. "I pronomi personali". Renzi 1988. 535-592.

Cyrino, Sonia 1997. *O Objeto Nulo no Português do Brasil — um Estudo Sintático-diacrônico*. Londrina: Editora da UEL.

——— to appear. "Null Complement Anaphora and Null Objects in Brazilian Portuguese.". *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.

——— & Gabriela Matos 2002. "VP Ellipsis in European and Brazilian Portuguese: a comparative analysis". *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics,* 1:2.177-214.

---

[18] Merchant (2001) defines *e-GIVENness* as: "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).

——— (2004). Local Licensers and Recovering in VP Ellipsis Construction: Variation across Languages and Language Varieties. Ms.

Depiante, Marcela. 2000. *The Syntax of Deep and Surface Anaphora: a Study of Null Complement Anaphora and Stripping/Bare Argument Ellipsis*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

——— 2001. "On Null Complement Anaphora in Spanish and Italian". *Probus* 13: 193-221.

Fiengo, Robert & Robert May. 1994. *Indices and Identity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. The MIT Press.

Grinder, John & Paul Postal. 1971. "Missing Antecedents". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 2:3. 269-312.

Gonçalves, Anabela. 1999. *Predicados Complexos Verbais em Contextos de Infinitivo não Preposicionado do Português Europeu*. Doctoral dissertation. Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa.

Ernout, Alfred & François Thomas. 1951. *Syntaxe Latine*. 2ª ed, Paris: Éditions Kincksieck.

Fox, Danny. 2002. "Antecedent-Contained Deletion and the Copy Theory of Movement." *Linguistics Inquiry* 33: 63-96.

Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. "Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection". In *The view from Building 20*, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Hankamer, Jorge and Ivan Sag. 1976. "Deep and Surface Anaphora". *Linguistic Inquiry* 7:3, 391-426.

Harley, Heidi & Rolf Noyer. 2003. "Distributed Morphology". *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book*, ed. by Lisa Cheng & Rint Sybesma. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1991. Copying identity. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 9: 497-536.

Lasnik, Howard. 1999a. *Minimalist Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

——— 1999b "On Feature Strengh: Three Minimalist Approaches to Overt Movement". *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:2: 197-217.

Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis ─ Functional Heads, Licensing and Identification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matos, Gabriela. 1985. *Clítico Verbal Demonstrativo*. Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa.

——— 1992. *Construções de Elipse do Predicado em Português – SV Nulo e Despojamento*. Doctoral dissertation. Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa.

——— 2003. "Construções Elípticas". Mateus et al 2003, *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Editorial Caminho. 869-913.

May, Robert. 1985. *Logical form*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence — Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Potsdam, Eric. 1997. English Verb Morphology and Ellipsis. *Proceedings of the 27th Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*. Amherst, Massashusetts: GLSA, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 353-368.

Raposo, Eduardo. 1986. "On the Null Object in European Portuguese". *Studies on Romance Linguistics*, ed. by Osvaldo Jaeggli & Carmen Silva-Corvalán. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Renzi, Lorenzo, ed. 1988. *Grande Grammatica Italiana di consultazione* vol.I. Bolonha: Il Mulino.

Roberts, Ian. 1998. Have/Be Raising, Move F and Procrastinate. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:1, 113-125.

Ross, John. 1972. "Act". *Semantics of Natural Language,* ed. by Gabriela Harman & Donald Davidson. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Sag, Ivan. 1980. *Deletion and Logical Form.* New York & London: Garland Publishing Inc.

Soriano, Olga. 1999. "El pronombre personal. Formas y distribuciones. Pronomes Átonos y Tónicos". Bosque & Demonte, 1209-1273.

Williams, Edwin B. 1938. *From Latin to Portuguese: Historical Phonology and Morphology of the Portuguese Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Edwin. 1977. "Discourse and Logical Form". *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 101-139.

Zagona, Karen. 1988. *Verb Phrase Syntax: A Parametric Study of English and Spanish*. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.