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Chapter One

Synchronic Syntax of the Passives and the Impersonal

Constructions of the type

1. vende-se esta casa this house for sale

have long been the subject of heated disputes among the philologists. Since such constructions are generally considered to involve the reflexive pronoun se it is appropriate to discuss the true reflexive before discussing ex. 1 itself.

1.1 The True Reflexive

In the case of transitive verbs like lavar, to wash, the subject may either execute an action upon itself or upon an entity distinct from itself. Thus one finds:

2i. eu lavei ele → eu lavei-o (a ele)

2ii. ele lavou eu → ele lavou-me (a mim)

and

3i. eu lavei eu → eu lavei-me (a mim mesmo)

3ii. ele lavou ele → ele lavou-se (a si mesmo)

where in exs. 3 the subject and object pronouns refer to the same person. However, if the two occurrences of ele in ex. 3ii were understood as referring to different individuals one would have:

4. ele lavou ele → ele lavou-o (a ele)
In order to differentiate cases like ex. 3ii from ex. 4 it is necessary to introduce a system of subscripts\(^3\). Thus, let all nouns having the same subscript, say \(i\), have the same reference and those having different subscripts, say \(k \neq i\), have different reference:

\[
\text{Maricota}_i \text{ and ela}_i \text{ refer to the same person}
\]

\[
\text{Maricota}_j \text{ and ela}_k \text{ refer to different people}
\]

In this notation exs. 3ii and 4 are, respectively:

\[
\text{êle}_i \text{ lavou êle}_i \rightarrow \text{êle}_i \text{ lavou-se}_i \text{ (a si}_i \text{ mesmo)}
\]

\[
\text{êle}_j \text{ lavou êle}_k \rightarrow \text{êle}_j \text{ lavou-o}_k \text{ (a êle}_k \text{)}
\]

Notice, however, that any reasonable grammar which generates sentences of the form:

\[
\text{ela}_i \text{ lava } \begin{cases}
\text{João} \\
\text{os pratos} \\
\text{eu} \\
\text{você} \\
\text{ela}_k
\end{cases} \rightarrow \text{ela lava-me} \\
\begin{cases}
\text{ela lava-o} \\
\text{ela}_i \text{ lava-a}_k
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\text{she}_i \text{ washes } \begin{cases}
\text{John} \\
\text{the dishes} \\
\text{me} \\
\text{you} \\
\text{her}_k
\end{cases} \rightarrow \text{ela}_i \text{ lava-a}_i
\]

will also generate

5. \[
\text{ela}_i \text{ lava ela}_i \rightarrow * \text{ela}_i \text{ lava-a}_i
\]

since, apart from this case, there is no reason to make such rules sensitive to reference subscripts.
In other words, in any system which generates sentences of the type in ex. 4, it would be necessary to set up complicated ad hoc restrictions of an unusual sort to rule out sentences like those in ex. 5'. Since this is obviously undesirable, it is preferable to allow the base rules to generate deep forms like ex. 5 and define the reflexive transformation, which adds the feature [reflex] to the second pronoun in such structures:

6. $\#NP_{1} X \#NP_{1}\#

\[1 \quad 2 \quad 3\]
\[1 \quad 2 \quad 3\]
\[\text{+reflex}\]

where \# indicates sentence boundary. For example,

\[\text{el}_{1}\text{ lava } \text{el}_{1} \rightarrow \text{el}_{1}\text{ lava } \text{el}_{1}\]

\[\text{+reflex}\]

(ela lava-se)

The rule as given above is, however, too general -- it must be restricted to operate within a single proposition, as is evident from examples like:

Maricota, wanted the boy, to wash (her, herself, himself, him)
In the second clause the reflexive can refer only to the subject of the second clause (rapaz) and the non-reflexive can refer only to the subject of the first clause (Maricota). Thus, in English and modern Portuguese, reflexivization occurs only between nouns which are in the same proposition, although this restriction is known to be invalid for some languages, such as Polish and Latin, in certain cases. Thus, for some languages, \( t \) must be restricted to operate only when both occurrences of \( NP \) are dominated by exactly the same occurrences of \( S \). Both medieval and classical Portuguese, unlike Latin have this restriction.

The emphatic long forms, enclosed in brackets in exs. 2 and 3, are derived by transformation from the deep object:

9. \[ NP \rightarrow V \rightarrow NP \]
\[ +\text{anim} \]
\[ 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \]
\[ 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow a \rightarrow 3 \]
\[ +\text{pro} \]

Thus, for example, one has

\[ \text{eu beije o João} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{eu beije-o (ao João)} \]

I kissed John

John, I kissed him

It is clearly preferable to derive the long forms by
a transformation like t9 rather than generating them
directly in the base since in the latter case one
would have to give ad hoc restrictions to account
for the absence of forms like
*eu beije-o (a elas)
*tu beijaste-as (a ti)
and so on.

In archaic, but not modern, Portuguese there
is also a late rule (after case-marking) which optionally deletes the original pronoun and the preposition a, leaving behind the deep object in the prepositional (rather than accusative) case:

10. \[ \text{NP}_1 \lor \text{NP}_2 \Rightarrow a \text{NP}_2 \]

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
1 & 2 & 3 \\
1 & \emptyset & 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

Thus, in the old language there are derivations like:

11i eu lavei tu
   eu lavei tu a tu \text{ t9}
   eu lavei tu a tu \text{ case-marking}
   \quad \text{+acc +prep}
   eu lavei tu \text{ t10}
   \quad \text{+prep}

which gives

\[ \text{eu lavei ti}. \]

In case the subject and object have the same reference
t6 will also apply:

1111. \( \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \ \text{l} \text{a} \text{v} \text{u} \ \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \)
\( \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \ \text{l} \text{a} \text{v} \text{u} \ \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \)
\( + \text{reflex} \)
\( \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \ \text{l} \text{a} \text{v} \text{u} \ \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \)
\( \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \)
\( + \text{reflex} + \text{reflex} \)
\( \text{case-marking} \)
\( + \text{acc} + \text{prep} \)
\( \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \ \text{l} \text{a} \text{v} \text{u} \ \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \)
\( + \text{reflex} + \text{prep} \)

which gives

\( \text{e} \text{l} \text{e}_1 \ \text{l} \text{a} \text{v} \text{u} \ \text{s} \text{i} \ \text{m} \text{e} \text{s} \text{m} \text{o} \).

Derivations like 111 and 1111 account for the presence in the old language of sentences of the following types:

121. Bibliæ/212
\( \text{assy} \ \text{c} \text{o} \text{m} \text{o} \ (\text{e} \text{u}) \ \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{e} \text{y} \ \text{e} \text{l} \text{e} \text{s} \) just as I killed them

Graal/51r
\( \text{E} \ \text{g} \text{a} \text{l} \text{u} \text{a} \text{m} \ \text{s} \text{a} \text{l} \text{u} \text{o} \ \text{e} \text{l} \text{l} \text{a} \) And Galvam greeted her

Graal/63v
\( \text{q} \ (\text{t} \text{u}) \ \text{m} \text{a} \text{t} \text{es} \ \text{m} \text{i} \) that you kill me

1211. Boosco/cxliii
& per esto (eu) entendi
\( \text{m} \text{i} \ \text{m} \text{e} \text{e} \text{s} \text{m} \text{o} \)
& through this I understood myself

Boosco/lvii
\( \text{E} \ \text{d} \text{a} \text{p} \text{o} \text{y} \text{s} \ \text{q} \text{ue} \ (\text{t} \text{u}) \ \text{c} \text{o} \text{n} \text{h} \text{o} \text{ç} \text{e} \text{r} \text{e} \text{s} \) ty meesmo
And after you have met yourself

Orto/193f-37
\( (\text{e} \text{l} \text{l} \text{e}) \ \text{f} \text{e} \text{r} \ \text{e} \text{e} \text{ssy} \ \text{m} \text{e} \text{e} \text{e} \text{s} \text{m} \text{o} \) he wounds himself

Aves/XI-2
\( \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \ (\text{e} \text{l} \text{l} \text{e} \text{s}) \ \text{a} \text{m} \text{á} \ \text{s} \text{i} \ \text{m} \text{e} \text{e} \text{m} \text{o} \text{s} \) but they love themselves
Boosco/cxxv & (ella) hordena si meesma
and she ordains herself
Lenda/28-7 e (ellas) enganassa si meesmas
and they deceive themselves

1.2 Reflexive Passives

1.2.1 The Passive - Impersonal Distinction

In constructions of the type of ex. 1 the verb may agree in number with the deep object. Thus, if casa is replaced by its plural, casas, there are two possibilities:

13a. vende-se estas casas these houses for sale
13b. vendem-se estas casas

The form in which the verb agrees with its logical object, ex. 13b, is in general preferred by the grammarians although both types are accepted by speakers, ex. 13a being slightly preferred.\(^6\)

Normative grammarians, who want to rule out ex. 13a on the grounds that it is a corruption of ex. 13b, consider the former to be a variant of the latter in which agree has not been applied. More recently grammarians have come to recognize two constructions, at least in some cases.\(^7\) Thus, while ex. 13a is still viewed with suspicion, it is admitted as an example of "impersonalization" while ex. 13b is called "passivization". The former is
said to extend to occurrences with intransitive verbs, such as

\[ \text{assim se vai aos astros} \]
\[ \text{thus one goes to the heavens} \]

which could not, of course, be said to be passive in the usual sense.

In generative terms, asserting that exs. 13 a and b are "variants of the same construction" amounts to claiming that both are derived by the same transformation, se-formation, from (roughly) the same deep structure and that the difference in number agreement is due to failure to apply the ordinary agreement transformation. Since casas is clearly the object in the deep structure this means that it will have to switch to subject at some point so that agree may (or may not) apply to derive ex. 13b (or ex. 13a).

Although I am unable to completely rule out a derivation of this sort, such a solution seems unlikely. Thus, it has been observed\(^8\) that ordinarily nouns within relative clauses which are themselves subjects cannot be relativized while those which are in object clauses may be relativized:

\[ \text{mencionaram que ela usou o chapéu} \]
\[ \text{they mentioned that she wore the hat} \]

\[ \text{eu vi o chapéu que mencionaram que ela usou} \]
\[ \text{I saw the hat that they mentioned that she wore} \]
but not

que ela usou o chapéu foi mencionado
that she wore the hat was mentioned

* eu vi o chapéu que que ela usou foi
mencionado
(I saw the hat that she wore
was mentioned)

nor (with inversion, the Portuguese version of
extra-position)

foi mencionado que ela usou o chapéu
it was mentioned that she wore the hat

* eu vi o chapéu que foi mencionado que
ela usou
(I saw the hat that it was mentioned
that she wore)

In the first case the noun chapéu may be relativized
because it is in a clause que ela usou o chapéu which
is the object of mencionar. In the second case it
is the subject of this same verb and cannot there-
fore suffer relativization. Notice then that relat-
ivization is permitted with the se-construction:

crê-se que ela usou o chapéu
it is believed that she wore the hat

eu vi o chapéu que crê-se que ela usou
I saw the hat that it is believed that
she wore.

This shows that que ela usou o chapéu, which is the
deep object of crêr, is still the object of the se-
construction (crêr-se), at least at the point when
the relative clause formation rule applies. How-
ever, as D. M. Perlmutter has shown, relative may
well be post-cyclical so that it would follow agree, as has in fact been assumed in most generative treatments. But since, as was seen above, the deep object must have switched to subject before agree, this is impossible. Thus, it seems clear that the two se-constructions are not a single construction with optional agreement but rather must be viewed as two separate constructions. Other features which differentiate exs. 13 a and b will be discussed later.

Nevertheless, the constructions do seem to have the same (deleted) deep subject. Although neither construction may have an expressed agent:

* vende-se casas por alguém (houses for sale by someone)

* vendem-se estas casas pelo dono (these houses for sale by the owner),

there is in both a strong intuition that a human logical subject is to be understood.10 Correspondingly neither se-construction may be used with verbs that do not admit human subjects:

* alguém implica as teorias de Einstein (somebody implies Einstein’s theories)

* estas teorias implicam as teorias de Einstein these theories imply Einstein’s theories

* implica-se (or implicam-se) as teorias de Einstein (Einstein’s theories are implied)
alguém chove muito no Rio
(somebody rains a lot in Rio)

chove muito no Rio
it rains a lot in Rio

chove-se muito no rio
(one rains a lot in Rio)

alguém mugiu no quintal
(somebody mooed in the yard)

a vaca mugiu no quintal
the cow mooed in the yard

mugiu-se no quintal
(one mooed in the yard)

alguém transcorreu
(somebody elapsed)

duas horas transcorreram
two hours elapsed

transcorreu-se or *transcorreram-se
(one elapsed)

This suggests that the underlying form of exs. 13 has alguém, somebody, as subject since the restrictions given above would follow automatically. This would, however, be incorrect since alguém can occur only in frames where a singular subject is possible:

15a. alguém saiu em diversas direções
(somebody left in different directions)

* eles saíram em diversas direções
they left in different directions.

saiu-se em diversas direções
people left in different directions
15b. * alguém trocou saudações
(somebody exchanged greetings)
êles trocaram saudações
they exchanged greetings
trocou-se (or trocaram-se) saudações
people exchanged greetings

This is not to say, however, that the se-constructions are possible in all cases where a plural human deep subject is possible:

16a. êles são amigos
they are friends
* é-se (or *são-se) amigos
(people are friends)

16b. êles falaram um após o outro
they spoke in order
* falou-se um após o outro
(people spoke in order)

Exs. 15 differ from exs. 16 in that the predicates of the former admit group-interpretation subjects while those of the latter do not. Since the indefinite group-interpretation pronoun is a gente one has:

17a. a gente saiu em diversas direções
people left in different directions
saiu-se em diversas direções

17b. a gente trocou saudações
people exchanged greetings
trocou-se (or trocaram-se) saudações

17c. * a gente é (or *sãos) amigos
(people are friends)
*é-se (or *são-se) amigos

17d.  * a gente falou um após o outro
      (people spoke in order)

      * falou-se um após o outro

Notice that if the se-constructions were somehow related to an underlying occurrence of a gente and/or alguém it would then not be necessary to set up an ad hoc feature [± se-construction] in order to specify which verbs may occur in these constructions. In addition, the intuition that the underlying subject is human would be explained.

However, if the Katz-Postal theory that transformations preserve meaning is correct then alguém cannot be the deep subject since

alguém fala muitas línguas
somebody speaks many languages

simply does not have the same meaning as

falam-se (or fala-se) muitas línguas
people speak many languages.

Another difference can be seen in the interpretation of compound sentences. Thus, the sentence

alguém fala muitas línguas e alguém as fala bem
somebody speaks many languages and somebody speaks them well

does not imply that the person referred to in the
first conjunct as a speaker of many languages is the same person referred to in the second conjunct as speaking them well. However, the interpretation of the corresponding se-constructions,

\[
\text{falam-se (or fala-se) muitas línguas e falam-se (or fala-se) bem}
\]

many languages are spoken and they are spoken well,

is that the same person (or people) who speak the many languages speak them well. Thus alguém must be ruled out as the deep subject of the se-constructions since it does not even meet the Katz-Postal conditions\(^\text{12}\).

On the other hand, the problems mentioned above do not arise in the case of a gente since the normal interpretation of sentences with a gente is the same as the corresponding se-sentence. Thus, if a gente is the deleted deep subject of the se-constructions not only will the Katz-Postal condition be satisfied but also the ad hoc feature[±se-construction] can be eliminated from the grammar and the intuition that the deep subject is human will be formally represented in the grammar.

1.2.2 The Se-passive

Consider now only the se-passive, ex. 13b. As noted above, it will be derived from roughly
the same deep structure as underlies

ga gente vende estas casas

and will have the effect of deleting the deep sub-
ject, a _gente_, making the deep object into the
surface subject and providing for the enclitic
reflexive particle _se_. Notice that this will
entail that _reflexive_ be ordered after the trans-
formation which forms the _se-passive_ in order to
disallow derivations like:

13. a gente viu retratos da gente _base_
people saw pictures of people

a gente viu retratos de si mesmo _reflex_
people saw pictures of themselves

* viram-se retratos de si mesmo _se-passive_
(pictures of themselves were seen)

In fact, the _se-passive_ and the ordinary reflexive
are mutually exclusive. But if tó, _reflex_, is
ordered after the deep subject is deleted by _se-
passive_ no reflexive will be possible since one of
the two identical noun phrases required by _reflex_
will have been deleted. _Agree_ will, of course, also
have to follow _se-passive_.

Since _se-passive_ must move the deep object to
subject position, the reflexive particle _se_ can be
obtained by leaving behind a pronominalized copy of
the deep object in its neutral position so that
_reflex_ will apply. Thus _se-passive_ has the form:
19. se-passive

The derivation of ex. 13b would then be:

After low-level morphological rules not considered here the last line results in:

In real usage inversion is almost always applied to shift the object back to its neutral position (as in ex. 13b) although the non-inverted form is perfectly acceptable.

Notice that in the above derivation the passivizing particle se is derived by the ordinary reflex transformation, that is, the reflexive pronoun se and the passivizing particle se are identified. This is made possible by the circumstance that reflex must follow se-passive in order to rule out derivations like 18. However, the passivizing se, unlike the reflexive se, does not have a long form (V. ex. 311):
*estas casas vendem-se a si mesmas

Although at first glance this seems to be evidence against the identification of the two se's, it can in fact be accounted for simply by ordering t9 before t19. Then if t9, which is optional, is applied the structural description of t19 will not be met since the extra element a NP will be present. Thus, the non-existence of a long form of the passivizing se is not counter-evidence to t19.

However, it might be argued that while the derivation of the passivizing se through reflex does no harm, it also does no good; that is, t19 could be replaced by:

19'.    a gente V NP

Then the derivation of ex. 13b would be:

a gente vender estás casas (base)
+ pres

estás casas vender-se t19'
+ pres

estás casas vender-se agree
+ pres
+ pl

This results in the same surface form as the first derivation.

Notice in the first place that both t19 and
t19' predict certain ungrammatical sentences in the case where the deep object is a first or second person pronoun. Consider for example the effect of t19 and t19' on the deep structure which underlies a gente lavou-me:

base: a gente lavar eu
  + past

1. derivation by t19:
   eu lavar eu
   + past
t19
   eu lavar eu
   + past + acc
   + 1st + reflex
   + sing
   (*eu lavei-me)\textsuperscript{15}

ii. derivation by t19':
   eu lavar-se
   + past
t19'
   eu lavar-se
   + past
   + 1st
   + sing
   (*eu lavei-se)

Both derivations result in ungrammatical strings. If t19' is adopted I can see no way of preventing the derivation of *eu lavei-se other than an ad hoc statement restricting the object NP to third person only. On the other hand, I believe that a more in-
sightful solution is available in the case of t19. In this connection, notice that a direct object may be moved to the front of the sentence for emphasis, leaving behind a pronominalized copy:  

\[ \text{eu beije} \text{i Maricota} \]  
I kissed Maricota  

Maricota, eu beije\-i-a  
Maricota is the one I kissed  
or  

\[ \text{eu beije\-i-a} \]  
I kissed her  

\[ \text{ela, eu beije\-i-a.} \]  
her I kissed  
The formal statement of this rule, called \textit{pleonasm}, is roughly:  

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}  
\text{NP} & \text{V} & \text{NP}  
\end{array} \]  

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}  
1 & 2 & 3  
3, 1 & 2 & 3  
\end{array} \]  
\[ \text{\textit{pro}} \]  

Notice, however, that in Portuguese \textit{pleonasm} is restricted to the third person:  

\[ \text{beijaste-me} \]  
you kissed me  

\[ \text{* eu, beijaste-me} \]  
(me you kissed)  
or  

\[ \text{eu beije\-i-te} \]  
I kissed you  

\[ \text{* tu, eu beije\-i-te} \]  
(you I kissed).
But pleonasm and t19 have almost the same form, that is, both move the deep object to the front of its sentence and leave behind a pronominalized copy. Since the two transformations have these features in common they might fall together into a generalized form or there might be some way of stating a general restriction in Portuguese that transformations which move object NP's to the left and leave behind pronominal copies apply only to the third person.¹⁸

There do not, however, seem to be any transformations other than the two mentioned above which are of this type. In any case, such a solution, based on these observations, would be far less ad hoc than simply restricting t19 to the third person, so that the formulation in t19 is to be preferred.

1.2.3 The Se-impersonal

Consider now the se-impersonal, that is, the non-agreeing form, ex. 13a. As pointed out in section 1.2.1 the se-impersonal, like the se-passive, is derived from a deep form in which a gente is the subject. However, in this case there is no need to move the deep object into subject position since the verb does not agree with it. Furthermore, the se-impersonal occurs with verbs which cannot have any
object, as in the example

\[
\text{assim se vai aos astros}
\]

thus one goes to the heavens.

Thus, the \text{se-impersonal} transformation need only
delete the deep subject and provide for the enclitic
particle \text{se}:

20. \text{se-impersonal}

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a gente} \\
\hline
1 \\
\emptyset \\
2 \text{se} \\
3 \\
X
\end{array}
\]

The derivation from a deep occurrence of \text{a gente} will
obviate the necessity for a feature [\text{se-impersonal}]
in the lexicon, in just the same way as the corre-
sponding feature in the case of t19 and accounts for
the fact, noted in (Barreto, 27) p. 151, that a verb
in the \text{se-impersonal} has exactly the same regimes
as in the active. To account for the singular
verb in the surface form \text{agree} must be ordered
before t20. Notice also that since t20 does not
require the presence of a deep object, \text{se-impersonal}
forms will be generated for all appropriate verbs,
although if a deep object is present t20 will not
move it from its neutral position, as is correct.19

In all the published discussions on the \text{se-}
constructions it has always been assumed that the
passive and impersonal differ syntactically in only
two respects — agreement and occurrence with intransitives. Both of these features are satisfactorily treated by the transformations given above. However, there is another difference, which turns out to be quite crucial: reflexivization is permitted with the impersonal but not with the passive:

* geralmente não se pintam quadros de si mesmo
   (pictures of oneself are usually not painted)

* escreveram-se cartas a si mesmo?
   (were letters written to oneself?)

não se vota em si mesmo
   one does not vote for oneself

compra-se livros para si mesmo
   one buys books for oneself

As has already been seen, the result in the case of the se-passive follows naturally from the formulation of t19, which is justified independently. In the case of the se-impersonal, since the enclitic se is not derived through application of the reflexive rule, this rule may be ordered before t19, giving derivations like:

base:  a gente pintar quadros de a gente  
+pres

reflex: a gente pintar quadros de a gente  
+pres  +reflex
At this point a morphological statement of the type

\[ \text{a gente} \rightarrow \text{si mesmo}, \text{exactly parallel to \( \text{eles} \rightarrow \)} \]

\[ + \text{prep} \quad + \text{reflex} \]

\[ \text{si mesmo}, \text{will be required. The last line of the} \]

derivation will then give

\[ \text{pinta-se quadros de si mesmo} \]

\[ \text{one paints pictures of oneself,} \]

which is correct. The non-existence of the corresponding \text{se-passive} has already been treated in the last section.

It is important to realize that these results about the distribution of the reflexive are predictions which are entailed by t19 and t20 even though the transformations were not set up to account for these data. Thus the data give important empirical evidence in favor of the transformations as stated above.

It has already been seen that the \text{se-imper-sonal} transformation must follow \text{agree} and \text{reflex}. Since the transformation of the passive must precede
agree it follows that passive must also precede se-impersonal so that occurrences of a gente in object position in the deep structure will lead to se:

o diabo tenta a gente diariamente
the devil tempts people every day

a gente é tentado pelo diabo diariamente
people are tempted by the devil every day

é-se tentado pelo diabo diariamente

which is correct. Exactly the same argument can be given for replacement and also leads to the correct conclusion:

parece que a gente foge da realidade
it seems that people flee from reality

a gente parece fugir da realidade
people seem to flee from reality

parece-se fugir da realidade

Although the ordering of equi-NP deletion is not clear, it also must precede se-impersonal:

quer-se comer peixe
one wants to eat fish

*quer-se comer-se peixe

From these facts one concludes that se-impersonal is a late rule. In fact, no transformations, except late rules of clitic placement, are known to crucially follow it.

Notice, however, that t20 as formulated will
generate unacceptable strings if the deep object is pronominal:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{a gente viu ele} \\
& + \text{past} \\
& \text{(base)} \\
& \text{a gente viu ele} \\
& + \text{past + acc} \\
& + 3\text{rd} \\
& + \text{sing} \\
& \text{agree \& case-mark} \\
& \text{ver-se ele} \\
& + \text{past + acc} \\
& + 3\text{rd} \\
& + \text{sing} \\
& \text{se-imper}
\end{align*}
\]

which gives

21i. *viu-se-o
     (one saw him)

Similar derivations will give strings of the same sort:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{a gente vende-as} \\
& \text{one sells them}
\end{align*}
\]

21ii. *vende-se-as

21ii. *beijou-se-me

21iii. beijou-se-me

and so on. Although such combinations of enclitics are rejected by native speakers there is apparently no principled way to exclude them. In ex. 21i, for example, the combination of *se with the third person accusative enclitic is out. However, non-enclitic accusatives are allowed in this position,
viu-se [o rapaz]  
êle  
one saw [the boy]  
him  
as are non-accusative enclitics,

deu-se-lhe licença  
one gave him permission  

Recent investigations of D. M. Perlmutter and E. W. Browne have shown that in general such situations are best treated by output conditions which eliminate those strings which are unacceptable in surface structure but still must be generated by the transformational component. In standard written Portuguese the rule is that no more than two enclitics are permitted and must be in the order indirect object – direct object. However, if an indirect object is present the direct object may only be third person:

22. eu dei-to  
I gave it to you  
êle entregou-mas  
He gave them to me  
*êles entregaram-te-me  
(they gave you to me)  
*tu vendeste-lhe-nos  
(you sold us to him)

This output condition could not be represented in simple tabular form but would have to be expressed
by the \(<i_i^i\> notation, where elements inside brackets bearing the same index may co-occur. The rule is:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
<\ i_i^i > \\
< [\text{3rd pers}.] >
\end{array}
\]

This restriction is of a form which is rather unusual and complex compared to the more usual simple table. On the general principle that languages tend to change toward "simplicity" one might expect such a system to break down. This has in fact occurred -- in spoken Portuguese there may be only one enclitic in sentences of the type considered, so that one now has a table of one column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Considering now the combinations which are possible with the enclitic se it is found that it may co-occur only with indirect objects:

23. acrescenta-se-lhe a farinha
    one adds the flour to it
deu-se-me licença
    one gave me permission

*entregou-se-me ao Vietcongue
(I was turned over to the Viet Cong)

Notice, incidentally, that there was no need to state this restriction in the case of the se-passive. The fact that it also can occur only with
indirect objects follows from the fact that the deep object becomes the particle se by reflex. In any case, the restriction must be stated for the se-impersonal and it turns out to be quite complex, requiring the use of negative brackets:  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{written} & \quad \text{spoken} \\
{\langle se\rangle} & \quad {\langle se\rangle} \\
{\langle i\rangle} & \quad {\langle i\rangle} \\
{\langle d\rangle} & \quad {\langle d\rangle} \\
{\langle 3\text{rd pers} \rangle} & \quad {\langle 3\text{rd pers} \rangle} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The restriction for se is doubly complicated in that it requires the use of both brackets and negatives. Again, by the "simplicity" criterion, one would expect such a system to fall, leaving behind the systems:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{simplified written} & \quad \text{simplified spoken} \\
se & \quad se \\
{\langle i\rangle} & \quad {\langle i\rangle} \\
{\langle d\rangle} & \quad {\langle d\rangle} \\
{\langle 3\text{rd pers} \rangle} & \quad {\langle 3\text{rd pers} \rangle} \\
\end{align*}
\]

In the written language both systems are attested. They are, in the terms of footnote 21, dialects Barreto and Mello, respectively.  

The status of the simplified spoken system is not clear to me.

In the quotation from J. M. Rodrigues given in footnote 7 it is suggested that the se is the subject of the se-impersonal construction. This idea has been put forward by some grammarians and attacked by others. In general the attackers make two mistakes -- first, they make no distinction between deep and surface structure and second they
make no distinction between the se-passive and the se-impersonal. Consider as a typical example the arguments of Mello Carvalho, a Brazilian grammarian:

Se desempenhasse o se o mistér de sujeito, seria lícito dizer-se em português: se diz, se conta, ... , se sabe, se brinca, porque os sujeitos dos verbos a estes podem antepor-se; em todas as hipóteses, na língua portuguesa.

If se took on the duties of a subject it would be possible to say se diz, se conta, ... , se sabe, se brinca in Portuguese because the subject of a verb can always precede that verb in Portuguese.

(Carvalho, 21), p. 150. While this statement is no doubt true of the deep structure it is patently false in the surface structure. For example, in a passive like Maricota foi beijada por João, Maricota was kissed by John, João is the subject of beijar but could not precede it. It would certainly be possible for se to be the deep subject of the construction and be moved by a later obligatory rule to post-verbal position. In fact, se need only be marked as obligatorily undergoing the ordinary rule of clitic placement. Thus the surface position of se proves nothing about the deep structure.

The other argument usually given against considering se to be the subject is:
Se o se lograsse exercer função subjectiva
não teriam as linguagens verbais tomado a
forma do plural ... pois ... serviria o se,
por ser sujeito ... de manter a linguagem
no singular.

If *se* had managed to assume the function of
subject the verb would never have become
plural since *se*, being the subject, would
be sufficient to keep the verb singular.

(Carvalho, 21), p. 150. Here the author is referring
to cases like ex. 13b in which the verb is plural.
But this fact about ex. 13b is, of course, meaning-
less within the context of a discussion of ex. 13a
since it is exactly in this respect that the two
differ.

Since the traditional arguments against the
idea are apparently invalid it is important to
examine the possibility of making *se*, rather than
a *gente*, the deep subject. At first sight this
does in fact seem correct -- as mentioned above
one need only mark *se* as being an enclitic and
the ordinary rule of enclitic placement will
put it in the right place. Furthermore, it is
clear that *enclitic placement* is a late rule and
that it certainly follows all the rules which
must precede the one which forms the *se-*imper-

sonal.

However, the distribution of *se* and of the
reflexive in sentences containing it would be
extremely difficult to state in terms of a deep occurrence of *se*. Consider first the distribution of *se* itself. It occurs in the surface forms only if it was immediately in front of a given verb before clitic placement. However, in the deep structure it must have free privilege of occurrence for otherwise one could not generate such sentences as *é-se tentado pelo diabo* in which *se* must have been the deep object, moved into subject position by passive and correctly placed by clitic placement. Thus one must now give a method for ruling out:

* o diabo tenta-se
  (the devil tempts one)

* beijei-se
  (I kissed one)

while allowing

livros vendem-se
books are sold

comeu-se
one ate.

Since the *se* is in exactly the same position in both sets this could not be done by surface structure conditions, the surface structure being the same in both cases. Rather it would have to be done some time before clitic placement and would thus be a shallow structure condition, in
some unclear sense of shallow. Of course, none of these problems arise in the case of derivation by t20 since se's are never put into object position in the first place. The distribution of the reflexive would also have to be explained in some way. It is these difficulties which force the rejection of the hypothesis that se occurs as a subject NP in the deep structure.26

1.3 The Periphrastic Passive

Unlike the reflexive passives, the periphrastic passive has been discussed extensively in generative literature, although the results have been far from conclusive. Since this discussion has been mainly in and about English, that language (rather than Portuguese) will be used in most of the examples that follow.

Passives of the type

The fish was eaten by John

were once considered to be examples of the most obvious and clearly understood of all transformations. In Syntactic Structures (1957) Chomsky noted that if passives were to be generated directly in the base it would be necessary to include the element (be EN)
in the Aux:

241. Verb → Aux V

2411. Aux → (Modal) (have EN) (be ING) (be EN)

In conjunction with a rule to attach the affixes EN and ING to the following verbal the first three choices in rule 2411 provide for forms like have eaten, be eating, have been eating, may be eating, may have eaten, may have been eating and so on. The fourth choice would give passive forms like be eaten, have been eaten, may have been being eaten and so on. Chomsky then went on to observe that the fourth element of Aux was unlike the others in that there are heavy restrictions on its use. Thus, it cannot be selected if the following V is intransitive (*be occurred) nor if it is transitive and has an object (*be eaten fish). Furthermore if V is intransitive and is followed by the phrase "by NF" then the fourth element must be chosen in some cases (be eaten by John, but not *be eating by John) and cannot be chosen in others (*be gone by John).

Such simple facts, which carry over directly to Portuguese, show that the passive auxiliary cannot be generated directly in the base along with the other auxiliaries without the statement of many ad hoc restrictions. For this reason Chomsky
proposed excluding the passive from the base and
generating it instead by means of a transformation
of the form:

25.  NP₁  Aux  V  NP₂
     1  2  3  4
     4  2  be  EN  3  by  1

For example the base form

John  have  EN  eat  the  fish
       +pres

NP₁  Aux  V  NP₂

would be converted to

The fish  have  EN  be  EN  eat  by  John
       +pres

which, by application of the affix attachment rule
and certain morphological rules not considered here,
results in

The fish has been eaten by John.

If passives are generated by transformation the ele-
ment (be  EN) can be left out of the Aux constituent
and none of the problems mentioned above arise. In
addition the selectional restrictions will come out
correctly, although it is now known that this result
can also be achieved through lexical rules.

In the years after 1957 various previously
unnoticed facts about the passive were discovered.
Principal among these was the non-occurrence of
certain verbs (have, cost, weigh, etc) in the passive voice. In *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965) Chomsky attempted to explain these exceptions by postulating that passive sentences are to be derived from underlying strings of the form:

26. \[ NP_1 \text{ Aux } V \ NP_2 \text{ by } \triangle \]

where \( \triangle \) is a dummy (that is, "place-holder") and the phrase "by \( \triangle \)" is an adverb of manner. Passives would then be derived by stating a transformation to convert ex. 26 to

\[ NP_2 \text{ Aux (be EN) } V \text{ by } NP_1 \]

The essential difference between the *Aspects* and *Syntactic Structures* formulations is in the postulation of an underlying dummy agent-phrase which is used to trigger the passive transformation, which then becomes obligatory. In *Aspects* Chomsky made the claim that verbs that take manner adverbials freely and only these can be passivized and thus that the dummy agent-phrase, which must co-occur with all verbs which may appear in the passive voice and only these, must also be an adverb of manner. Lakoff and others objected to this analysis but the debate is not of interest here since some of the data of both sides do not carry over to Portuguese. What is important, however, is the idea that the passive
is not to be derived directly from the deep form underlying the corresponding active but rather from a similar form, with a dummy agent-phrase, as in ex. 26.

In his latest paper Remarks on Nominalization Chomsky again discusses the passive, this time in connection with several other issues which are not of direct interest here. In this formulation Chomsky proposes factoring the passive transformation into its components:

\[ ... \text{the underlying structure for passives is roughly } \text{NP-Aux-V-NP by } \Delta, \text{ where by } \Delta \text{ is an agent phrase related, in ways that are still unclear in detail, to adverbials of means and manner. The passive operation, then, is an amalgam of two steps: the first replaces } \Delta \text{ by the subject noun phrase; the second inserts in the position vacated by the subject the noun phrase that is to the right of the verb.} \]

He then goes on to suggest that each of the components of the passive is needed elsewhere in the grammar, namely, internal to the NP in order to derive forms like the destruction of the city by the Army and the city's destruction. Most of these arguments carry over to Portuguese, except that NP's of the second type occur only with pro-nominal deep objects.

The Remarks analysis of the passive may be
formalized as follows:

27. agent-postposing

1. agent-copying

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP}_1 \quad \text{Aux} \quad V \quad \text{NP}_2 \quad \text{prep} \quad \Delta \\
1 & 2 & 3 \\
1 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

ii. NP-dropping

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP}_1 \quad \text{Aux} \quad V \quad \text{NP}_2 \quad \text{prep} \quad \text{NP}_1, \\
1 \quad \Delta \\
2 \quad 2 \\
\end{array}
\]

followed by

28. NF-preposing

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\Delta \quad \text{Aux} \quad V \quad \text{NP}_2 \quad \text{prep} \quad \text{NP}_1, \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
4 & 2 & 3 & \emptyset & 5 \\
+ \text{pass} \\
\end{array}
\]

where prep is the preposition of the passive, in English by and in modern Portuguese por.

Although the analysis given above derives from a synchronic treatment of English, it had independently become apparent to me as early as the summer of 1967 that a two-part analysis of the passive was necessary to account for the diachronic facts treated in the next chapter. The fact that such an analysis is required for the diachronic study is strong evidence in its favor.

The formulations of t19, t20, t27 and t28 given here are intended to provide a rough outline for developments taken up later, where these formulations will be somewhat modified.
footnotes:

1. The type of analysis outlined here was first suggested in (Lees & Klima, 63).

2. Morphological rules of the type

   \[ \begin{align*}
   \text{êle} & \rightarrow o \\
   + \text{acc} & \\
   \text{eu} & \rightarrow \text{me} \\
   + \text{acc} & 
   \end{align*} \]

   and so on are assumed without discussion.

3. See, for example, (Chomsky, 65) p. 145.

4. Note that such sentences (like, ex. 5) must be ruled out for all three persons, not just the third. For example, one must distinguish the reflexive me from the non-reflexive me because the former and not the latter can have the expanded form:

   \[ \begin{align*}
   \text{eu me lavo a mim mesmo} \\
   \text{I wash myself} \\
   \star \text{você me lava a mim mesmo} \\
   \text{(you wash myself)}
   \end{align*} \]

5. See, for example, (Chomsky, 65) p. 146:

   The reflexivization rule does not apply to a repeated N dominated by an occurrence of S that does not dominate the "antecedent" occurrence of N.

   It is well known, however, that the two identical NP's need not start out in the same S in the deep structure:

   She thinks herself pretty ←

   She thinks that she is pretty
Ela se acha bonita

Ela acha que ela é bonita

The requirement is that the two NP's be dominated by the same S when reflex applies.

6. Most grammarians reject ex. 13a entirely. For example Mário Barreto wrote:

Pondo de lado discussões teóricas, complicadas e difíceis, todos, na prática, estamos de acordo, sábios e leigos, em que viu-se muitas desgraças,..., aqui se vende jornais, na passiva com se, são concordâncias absolutamente intoleráveis em português.

Setting aside all complicated and difficult theoretical discussions, in practice everyone, learned and unlearned, agrees that viu-se muitas desgraças,..., aqui se vende jornais, which are in the se-passive, are instances of absolutely intolerable concordances in Portuguese.

(Barreto, 27) p. 296. Despite this statement Barreto himself used the construction at least once in his own writings and publicly apologized afterwards (V. (Barreto, 44) p. 388). He approvingly quotes Rui Barbosa as having written that

...o emprego do se, partícula apassivadora, com o verbo no singular é das mais lastimáveis nódoas que podem macular o português.

...the use of se, a particle which has the effect of passivization, with the verb in the singular is one of the most deplorable blemishes which may defile the Portuguese language.

(Rui Barbosa in Réplica, apud (Barreto, 44) p. 389)
All this aside, however, Barreto did admit (in a parenthetical remark):

(contudo, na fala vulgar, usa-se a-míduo impessoalmente o verbo com se: compra-se livros, onde livros é objecto, em vez de compram-se livros)

(However, in popular speech the se construction is often used as an impersonal: compra-se livros, where livros is the object, instead of compram-se livros.)

(Barreto, 44) p. 294. The situation with most other grammarians, on both sides of the ocean, is the same. Only one grammarian, as far as I know, has come to the defense of the non-agreeing form and even his conclusions are somewhat weak:

Em conclusão: as construções do tipo vê-se sinais aparecem, embora com muita parcimônia, em alguns dos nossos melhores escritores ... Não devem, portanto rejeitar-se in limine. Mas o seu uso, que aliás é dispensável, deve ser muito restrito.

In conclusion, constructions of the type vê-se sinais occur, although very infrequently, in some of our best writers. Therefore they should not be rejected in limine. But since they are non-essential their use should be severely restricted.

(Rodrigues, 13) p. 186. This is one of the classic cases in which grammarians are a few centuries behind the facts.

7. For example,

Mas, além destas orações passivas de agente indeterminado ... outras há em que o se tem antes o valor de um pronome indefinido, a servir de sujeito.
But, aside from the passive sentences with indefinite agent ... there are others in which se is rather like an indefinite pronoun, serving as subject.

(Rodrigues, 13) p. 182

O pronome se pode funcionar numa frase como: ... e) partícula apassivadora, f) índice de indeterminação do sujeito.

The pronoun se can function in a sentence as: ... e) a passivizing particle, f) an indication of an indeterminate subject.

(Ribeiro, 28) p. 39

8. (Ross, 66) pp. V-1 to V-3

9. personal communication

10. Thus, speaking of the se-constructions Said

Ali says:

...se tem em mente o conceito de alguém como agente, como sujeito psicológico.

...one has in mind the concept of somebody as the agent, as the psychological subject.

(Ali, 64) p. 179. Other grammarians have made similar remarks:

...se tomarmos para sujeito ... o indefinido a gente, ou qualquer equivalente, como, por exemplo, alguém, qualquer, homem, não briga a gramática com a lógica.

...if we take as subject ... the indefinite a gente (people) or any other equivalent, say, alguém (somebody), qualquer (anyone at all), homem (man, one) then grammar will not do violence to logic.

(Carvalho, 21) p. 157

11. By this term I mean substantives which, while singular, denote a set of objects. Examples are group, set, platoon, pack, flock and so on. Some
verbs allow only group-interpretation or plural subjects:

\* John disbanded
\{ they \ \the \ group \} disbanded

12. One could give a syntactic argument by finding a transitive verb which cannot take a plural or group-interpretation subject and also does not occur in the se-passive. Unfortunately, I do not know of any verbs which meet the requirements of the first conjunct. There are, however, some verbs which usually take strictly singular (non-group) subjects and these sound very strange in the se-construction:

\{ alguém \ \* a gente \} casou com a Maricota
\* casou-se com a Maricota
\{ alguém \ \* a gente \} sucedeu ao rei
\* sucedeu-se ao rei

where usually only one person "marries Maricota" or "succeeds the King" and so on.

13. Inversion is a transformation which inverts the subject NP around the VP. In some cases it is obligatory, in others optional. The reason why inver-
sion is almost always applied in actual speech will be discussed later.

14. This problem and its solution emerged in discussion with E. W. Browne III and D. Perlmutter.

15. This form, of course, exists but only with the true reflexive meaning. Since it cannot have the passive meaning predicted by t19 it must be considered ungrammatical in this connection.

16. R. de Rijk has pointed out that this rule is similar to left dislocation. V. (Ross, 67) p. 422 ff

17. Pleonasm results in sentences of the type

i. o João, beije-o

while t9 gives sentences like

beije-o ao João

which, by optional fronting of the prepositional phrase can become

ii. ao João, beije-o.

Thus while i may seem to be derived from ii by deletion of the preposition a, this cannot be true since ii exists for all three persons while i exists only for third person.

18. This is, however, not true of other languages, nor is it true of right dislocation.

19. It is, perhaps, due to the influence of the much more idiomatic se-impersonal that the object also
occupies its neutral position in the se-passive.

20. The sentence

pinta-se quadros da gente

is also correct but then the understood deep subject cannot have the same reference as the occurrence of a gente in the surface form; that is, a gente, like the other pro-forms, must bear reference indices.

21. The "standard" dialect, which has been treated so far, allows a pronominal (deep) object to occur in the surface structure only in the nominative case:

vende-se a casa

ela vende-se or vende-se ela

*vende-se-a

There is, however, another dialect which allows an object in the accusative case:

vende-se a casa

?ela vende-se or ?vende-se ela

vende-se-a.

Let these two dialects be called Barreto and Mello, respectively, in honor of two early twentieth century grammarians who maintained a sustained polemic on their relative merits. The status of the nominative in dialect Mello is not clear to me. Dialect Barreto is far more popular; in fact dialect Mello has been condemned in print by no fewer than 14
grammarians (for a partial list see (Barreto, 21) p. 90), one elder statesman (Rui Barbosa), one cardinal (Saraiva), and one surgeon (Pedro Pinto). It really does sound pretty bad. None the less, examples can be found in the best modern authors:

Temo que se me argua de comparações extraordinárias
I am afraid that people will accuse me of making unusual comparisons

(M. de Assis in Esaú e Jacob, apud (Silveira, ) p. 53)

Parece um rio quando se o vê escorrer mansamente
It looks like a river when one sees it flowing tamely

(Lima Barreto in Vida e Morte de Gonzaga de Sá, apud ibid)

...e se ouvem violinos e flautas de todas as partes e se os vêem falando alto e rindo
...and one hears violins and flutes everywhere and one sees them talking in loud voices and laughing

where os (them) is the pronominalization of os cegos
(the blind ones). (J. Ribeiro in Coração, apud (Carvalho, 21b) p. 153.

This is not to say, however, that the Barreto camp is without examples, sometimes from the same authors:

...mandado de prisão...se é a primeira vez que êle se expede...
...an arrest warrant...if it is the first time it is issued...
Um crime ... pode unir-nos ... E porque não se cometerá ele?
One crime can unite us. And why should it not be committed?

(A. Herculano in Eurico, apud (Barreto, 21) p. 99)
Also cited in (Silveira, 60) p. 154.

...não percamos o tempo. E perde-se ele, quando...
...let us not waste time. And it is wasted when...

(Heitor Pinto in Imagem, apud (Silveira, 60), p. 154.
It is important to realize that it is the
Barreto dialect which most closely approximates
real speech. The Mello dialect sounds strange and
would not occur in popular speech. Barreto's ex-
planation of the opposing dialect is not too enlight-
ening:

A origem do tremendo dislate que só consegue acolhimento por parte dos maus literatos brasileiros de hoje em dia ... devemos ir buscar-la, por variar, na ignorância dos que vertem para péssima linguagem portuguesa novelas francêssas.

The origin of this tremendous folly, which manages to gain acceptance only from charlatan men of letters in modern Brazil ... must, for a change, be credited to the ignorance of those who translate French novels into cheap Portuguese.

(Barreto, 21) p. 101. Thus he claims that such
ignorant types would translate on le sait by sabe-
se-o, etc. Although I do not doubt that this is true it is difficult to see how such ignorance could be attributed to Machado de Assis, Lima Barreto, and João Ribeiro, among others. Rather I believe that the cause of the new construction's use by such people is due precisely to the fact that it is fairly close to perfectly good sentences but still sounds a bit strange and would not occur in everyday writing. Therefore its use serves as a sort of a mark of separation from the popular dialect.

22. See (Perlmutter & Browne, to appear)
23. See (Barreto, 11) p. 135 for a typical statement of this rule. It is generally accepted in standard Portuguese and is not the subject of dispute. In exs. 22 to and mas are bi-morphemic.
24. The notation $<i; x ; > <j; y ; >$ is interpreted to mean "if $x$ is chosen, $y$ may not be chosen". Both versions given below rule out strings with two se's since the second one would be a direct object.
25. Notice that the formalization of dialect Mello predicts that ternary combinations should be possible, provided only that the direct object be third person. This prediction is correct -- Mello did in fact give such examples:

Notou-se-lh'o na discussão....
One noticed about him in the discussion....
(Filinto Elysio, apud (Carvalho, 21a) p. 91. He also approvingly quotes J. Ribeiro’s remark that:

Alguns escritores usam a combinação terciaria ou de três pronomes: Dê-se-lh’á, a esmola.
Some writers use a ternary combination: Dê-se-lh’á, may it be given to him, a esmola, the alms.

Barreto was quick to reply that the example from Filinto was ruim, lousy, (Parreto, 21) p. 91, and went on to say:

A língua repugna estes grupos de três pronomes.
The tongue abhors these groups of three pronouns.

(ibid, p. 99)

26. The situation may not really be as bad as all that since the facts are quite easy to state in an ad hoc manner. Se, like man in German, comes through to the surface in only two instances:

either
1. it is the nominative of its sentence.

or
2. it is reflexive.

Thus, the sentences given below are bad because se and man are non-nominate non-reflexive:

• eu beijei-se  • ich habe man geküsst

• nós demos-se o livro • wir haben man das Buch gegeben

• tu falaste de si  • du hast von man gesprochen

while the following sentences are good since se
and man meet at least one of the requirements:

- comeu-se               man hat gegessen
- beijou-se-se           man hat sich geküsst
- dá-se livros a si mesmo
- falou-se de si mesmo   man hat von sich gesprochen

The second Portuguese sentence above is ruled out because two se's cannot occur, a condition which has nothing to do with conditions i and ii and is therefore not a counter-example to them. See the surface conditions of pp. 25-28.

27. See (Lakoff, 65) p. F-1.

28. See (Chomsky, to appear). The quotation given below is from the mimeographed "uncorrected" version (MIT, Nov. 1967).
Chapter Two

Diachronic Syntax of the Passives and the Impersonal

2.0 Introduction

2.0.1 Limitations

Before beginning the historical section it may be well to warn the reader of some of the limitations inherent in any study based on texts. In the first place texts are only imperfect records of items of performance so that they contain at least two layers of mistakes - performance mistakes and recording mistakes. The latter type is usually of considerable magnitude since most of the presently extant texts are only copies of earlier ones, which are in turn copies of still earlier ones and so on. At best there is at least one more layer of mistakes on each step. At worst the copier might have completely modernized the texts, with the exception of a little archaic spice. In practice most texts seem to have fared better than might be expected but it is unquestionably true that, perhaps inadvertently, each copier introduced some contemporary constructions in older texts. This is not
to mention the opposite process, the introduction of so-called "archaisms" by later writers, a particularly striking example of which will be discussed in section 2.1.2.

Such considerations lead to the conclusion that not all sentences found in a text can be accepted as evidence as to the state of the language at the time the text was written, or at any other time for that matter. Thus there are certain inherent difficulties in obtaining half the data necessary for a generative study, namely, the grammatical sentences. The other half of the data, the ungrammatical sequences, is nearly unobtainable since there are no native speakers and, in the case of Portuguese, no contemporary grammatical treatises of any use. All one can do is to make guesses based on knowledge of the modern language and putative universals and then look for counter-examples. Furthermore, as anyone who has worked in generative grammar knows, the grammatical judgments required for a syntactic study are often so fine that even linguists are unable to agree as to just what are the data in their own native languages. The situation is of course many times worse when one is dealing with a dead language. I might also point out that in
the case of Portuguese there is an almost total lack of reference works of any sort. The only dictionary of archaic Portuguese ever published only got halfway through the letter A! The only text for which there is an acceptable concordance is the Lusiadas of Camões and that was not available to me until the end of 1967. In general all my studies have therefore been carried out using the original texts, which are at best a mass of unorganized data.

The moral to be drawn is that until the texts are better organized it will be unthinkable to obtain enough data to support an analysis which attempts to settle disputed points in the theory of grammar. Furthermore, it is doubtful that such an analysis would be possible even if the texts were organized because of the difficulties mentioned above, especially the unobtainability of ungrammatical sequences. None the less, it is possible to obtain certain interesting results concerning the nature of syntactic change.

2.0.2 Diachronic Linguistics

Language, unlike old clothes, is not handed down more or less intact from father to son nor
is it entirely innate to each child. Languages must be "learned" by the people who eventually come to speak them. The rapidity and uniform success with which children learn languages make it quite evident that language acquisition is not a wholly random, haphazard process; that is, children must be in some way innately predisposed to learn languages. Proponents of empiricist and rationalist philosophies have traditionally held differing opinions about the extent and type of predisposition which is brought into play in language learning (as well as in other processes of knowledge acquisition) but its existence has never been seriously questioned.

Thus children learn languages by applying their innate predisposition to the primary data, which consists of the speech samples they happen to hear (and perhaps some samples of non-grammatical sentences in the form of corrections). Evidently the predisposition must include information of at least two sorts: 1) a general linguistic theory which distinguishes human language from other possible systems and 2) a heuristic method for practical grammar construction. Traditionally rationalists have tended to emphasize 1 while empiricists have emphasized 2 and, occasionally,
denied existence of 1.

Although children are able to learn languages with
truly astounding efficiency, adults find it almost im-
possible to do so, that is, the innate predisposition
to language acquisition is lost as one grows older. In
other words, the channels leading inward to the adult's
language control center (presumably in the brain some-
where) are blocked and, even with determined effort,
what is stored there cannot be significantly added to
or changed. Thus, the adult's language knowledge is
relatively static.

Despite this relative stability of adult language
it has often been observed that languages change, which
is to say that the "received" grammar of a language at
a certain time $t_1$ may differ from the "received" gram-
mar of the same language at another time $t_2$. Kiparsky
(see (Kiparsky, 67)) has noted that all linguistic
change is of two basic types: addition of new rules
and simplification, the first of which he attributes
to changes in adult language and the second of which
he attributes to the learning process. The relative
stability of adult language suggests that rule addition
will play a minor role and this is indeed true of the
changes to be studied in this chapter.

If it is true that most change occurs during
acquisition, there should be two basic causes for this change — the predisposition and the primary data. Generative grammarians have tended to emphasize the former, or at least I can see no other way to understand such statements as "languages tend toward simplicity" or "the feeding order is preferred", which usually carry with them the proviso "all other things being equal". It seems to me that these are really statements about the heuristics of language learning, for example that the learner will always set up the "simplest" rules to account for the data he knows about or that he will always heuristically assume rules to be in the "feeding order". The proviso mentioned above is necessary because these heuristic assumptions may be contradicted by the facts at some later stage of learning.

On the other hand, generative grammarians have tended to ignore changes in language which may be introduced through changes in the primary data, that is, changes in linguistic performance which do not themselves imply a change in the grammar of the speaker, where both of the terms "performance" and "grammar" are used in the senses they currently have in the generative literature. In particular stylistics has always been assumed to be a matter of performance, although it is quite clear that the
former is quite different from, say, false starts or mistakes. Presumably the learning mechanism is pre-
disposed to ignore such gross performance factors; otherwise hiccups, sneezes, half sentences and the
like would eventually enter at least some human lan-
guages.

As an idealized example, consider a language in
which two constituents A and B can always occur either
in the order AB or BA, with only a slight stylistic
difference. It might well happen that one of the orders,
say AB, falls out of use, say because it comes to be
considered by the community as a sign of lack of ed-
ucation. Although it would be very interesting to
inquire into the reasons for such stylistic changes,
it seems to me that this is outside of the domain of
linguistics and is probably closely related to such
matters as general social behavior. Whatever the
reason for such a stylistic change might be, the net
result would be a decrease in the frequency of AB and
a corresponding increase in that of BA. Depending on
the extent to which this occurs a child learning the
language might not hear AB at all, or only infrequent-
ly, so that it would not enter significantly into his
primary linguistic data. Unless some feature of the
linguistic predisposition predicts AB on the basis of
the rest of the primary data, this construction would not enter the child's grammar; that is, it would disappear from the language. Although this example is overly simple, it does suggest that generative grammarians have neglected an important aspect of language change.

In discussing change it has become customary to speak in terms of "generations", although the notion has never been used in a linguistically critical way. Thus, quite typically linguists speak of generation $i$ as having grammar $G_i$, in which there occur innovations in $i$, leading the next generation to have grammar $G_{i+1}$ and so on. The validity of this terminology has occasionally been questioned but the issue has, so far, been largely academic. However, for performance based change there seems to be no other terminology possible. In the hypothetical AB-BA case given above, for example, there must be a time when almost all the language learners do not have AB in their primary data. They constitute a new "generation", the one which does not have AB in their grammars. Furthermore, if generalizations of the "simplicity" or "feeding order" type are to be understood to be a result of the heuristics of language learning then here too the generation concept is appropriate. In fact, the underlying reason for the
use of this terminology by so many linguists is probably the intuition that linguistic change arises in the learning process. I shall therefore continue to use the concept of generation in the traditional way, except that I shall understand by the term "the innovated grammar of generation $i$, $G^i_1$, the grammar $G^i_1$ with inn$_i^1$ added as a sort of appendage. Note that since inn$_i^1$ may be a stylistic innovation $G^i_1$ may not really be a grammar, in the technical sense.

2.1 Per-agents

The aim of the next sections is to give a diachronic account of the syntax of the periphrastic and reflexive passives. Since both constructions involve agent phrases headed by the prepositions de or per$^1$ it is necessary to discuss these prepositions before taking up the passives.

2.1.1 Syntax of Active Per-agents

Said Ali considered per to be a "means" preposition:

Tinha per, como em latim, o valor de "através de"

Per, as in Latin, meant "by means of"

He gives several examples, a typical one being:

1. Esopo/53 Nom devemos cãostranger nenhũa perssoa que digua nenhũa cousa per força nem per medo.
   We should not make anyone say anything, using either force or fear.

Similarly Epifânio says:

Por (per) designa o meio em algumas combinações

Por (per) designates the means in some combinations
and gives as an example:

2. Esopo/23

Per este examen esto doctus nos
amostra que as cousas d’este mundo
nom ssom estaues.
By this example the doctor shows us
that the things of the world are
not durable.

Typically, both philologists consider *per* to be a preposition
of means which occurs with inanimate objects. Ruber
apparently went a little further when he observed that *per*
is used:¹

...zur Angabe des Mittels (durch, mit); *per force*
mit Gewalt; *per quem*? durch wen?

Thus he obviously permitted animate nouns as *per*-agents
although it is not clear just what type of construction he
had in mind since there are no examples given. However the
translation by *durch* as well as the reference to "means"
suggest that he accepted the usual statements as correct
and was referring to examples in which an animate entity
fulfils the same sort of function as the inanimate ones
do in exs. 1 and 2, that is, they serve as an instrument or
tool of the subject. Compare, for example, exs. 3 i and 11
below:

3i. Fuero/I-46

...e esta sanca trijda ante da
incarnaçô de nostro Senhor ihesu
christo deu lee e ensinamento a seu
poboo *per movê* e *per llos outros seus*
prophetas e *per seus santos*.
...and this holy trinity, before the
incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ
gave laws and instruction to his
people through Moses, the other pro-
phets and the saints.
311. Fuero/I-615  Se alguém der outro por seu pessoal no per carta...
If someone names someone else as his proxy in a letter...

Here one can really sense the meaning of durch or through —
the prophets are viewed as mere instruments or tools which
the trinity used in its teachings, quite in the same way as
the letter is used in ex. 311.

The only other mention of animate per-agents that I
know of refers to a presumably different type of construction
in which the agent is reflexive, as in the English expressions
by myself, yourself, himself or the modern Portuguese ex-
pression por si (third person only). Thus Epifânio says:¹⁵

E de notar a locução por mim, por ti, por si,
falando-se do que se faz sem cooperação alheia.

The expressions por mim, por ti, por si, which
denote that which is done without external co-
operation, should be noted.

As he gives no examples it is once again unclear what was
meant but presumably he had in mind examples like the
following:

4. Esopo/41  E quando o elle pode fazer per ssy ...
And when he can do it by himself ...

In short, the philologists viewed per as having two
separate roles, the primary one being "means", as exemplified
in exs. 1, 2 and perhaps 31 above. Secondarily it also
occurred in certain fixed reflexive expressions, as in ex. 4.

It seems to me, however, that this view is incorrect
in several respects. In the first place it fails to
recognize the full generality of the per-agents in the active voice. There are many examples with non-reflexive per-agents in which the agent could in no sense be said to be an instrument or tool of the subject:

51. Greg/51-1 Como o speritu maa9 saya d'uã homã demoniado per Sã Ffortunado
On how the evil spirit came out of a bewitched man through (the agency of) Saint Ffortunado

5ii. CV/186-10 esporã creede p mi que nã ey de uos bã fazer
and therefore believe (because of me) that I shall not do your will

5iii. Biblia/340 e os seus gaados pereceram per serpentes
their cattle perished because of the serpents

In these examples the per-agent is actually working against the subject.

Furthermore the traditional view is wrong in implying that the agent phrases in exs. 1 and 2 are not the same construction as those in exs. 4 and 5. In English, for example, one has

he notified Mary \{by himself\}

but not

* he notified Mary by himself and by letter.

The conjunction of the two by-agents is ruled out by the general principle that only like constituents can conjoin.\(^6\)

However, such conjunctions are quite common in medieval Portuguese:

61. Fuero/II-636 mandamos que nenhum escomungado nõ possa per sv nã per outrã demandar
nenhũa cousa en juyzo
we order that no excommunicate shall bring suit in court, either personally or through someone else.

6ii. Fuero/I-437 E sse algüa cousa entregar ou penhorar per sy ou per seu mãdado...
And if he gives or takes anything, either personally or by means of an order.

6iii. Orto/49-15 E muytas uezes o leedor engenhoso perde per sy mesmo e per sua negligencia a sabedoria.
And often the clever reader loses wisdom, either on his own account or through negligence.

6iv. Fuero/II-725 ...aprazeo per sinal que lly pare ou per carta do alcalde ou per seu onças conhecudo ...and cite him by means of an indication or a letter from the mayor or through his acknowledged agent.

6v. Boosco/cxi O señor ds ... ensinou pollas suas santas escrituras; & pollos santso homeśs The Lord God taught by means of his holy scripture and through his saints.

These examples cover the three possibilities - reflexive and non-reflexive (i), reflexive and inanimate (ii,iii) and non-reflexive and inanimate (iv,v) - and show that they are all like constituents.

As far as I can tell the per-agents occur quite freely with all types of verbs. In particular they can be found with both non-stative (any of the verbs in exs. 6) and stative verbs (ex. 7 below) and with passivizable (again, any of exs. 6) and non-passivizable verbs (ex. 8 below):

7. Orto/231-10 Oo, Basyllio ... per ty creo ẽ hũ Deus todopoderoso.
Oh, Basyllio ... through you I believe in one omnipotent God.

8. Orto/277-34 ...e depois ouuerom per ella muyta riqueza.
...and afterward they had many riches, through her intervention.
The general semantic content of the *per*-agent is that it *intervenes* in the action or state described by the predicate and has some effect on it. Correspondingly, in the case in which the *per*-agent is reflexive the semantic content is that there is no intervention other than that of the subject, which is to say that there is no "external cooperation". The philologists' notion of "means" is entirely inadequate because it is correct in only part of the cases, namely, in examples like exs. 1, 2, 311 and perhaps 31. The notion is entirely irrelevant to cases like exs. 5, which the philologists ignored.

It is important to realize that although any given intervention may be viewed as being either causative or non-causative there is no basis for introducing a causative predicate in the deep structure of sentences containing *per*-agents. Whichever way one might choose to introduce "cause" into such a derivation it would require having different derivations for sentences of the type of exs. 1, 2 and 3 versus the type of exs. 5, which therefore ought to have different syntactic and semantic properties. There is no evidence to suggest that this is true; quite to the contrary there seem to be no syntactic differences at all and the meaning given above seems to be correct in all cases.

The fact that the *per*-agent is reflexive when it is identical to the subject implies that these two nouns must
be in the same proposition when reflex applies. Since there is no reason to derive the agents transformationally this requirement can be met simply by generating them in the base as one of the adverbials. Given that the per-agents occur freely with all verbs, Chomsky's principle of strict subcategorization implies that they are outside of the VP. Thus, modifying the illustrative fragment given by Chomsky in Aspects one has:

\[ S \rightarrow NP \quad Fred-P \]
\[ Fred-P \rightarrow Aux \quad VP \quad (per-agent) \]
\[ VP \rightarrow \left\{ V \quad (NP) \quad (de \: \Delta) \right\} \]
\[ per-agent \rightarrow per \quad NP \quad etc. \]

The grammar in 9, which is a fragment of the grammar of Portuguese in the medieval period, will be called G₂. It generates structures of the form:

```
    NP
   /\    /
S   Fred-P
   /
  /\    /
Aux VP per-agent
   /
  /\    /
V. (NP) per NP
```

For an extensive list of examples of this type see the appendix.
The system represented in 9 suffered various changes at the close of the medieval period, as did many other parts of the grammar. The changes which occurred in the per- phrases can best be understood intuitively as a three way split; that is, the animate reflexive, animate non-reflexive and inanimate agents became disassociated with each other and the conjunctions of the type in ex. 6 disappeared from the language. Upon examination of late medieval texts it is found that there is a marked decrease at around this time in the frequency of occurrence of per-agents in the case when the agent's intervention is not direct, or in slightly more formal terms:

13. innovation: animate per-agents which are not identical to the deep subject decrease in frequency of occurrence.

Thus the innovated medieval grammar \( G' \) is \( G_2 \) plus the innovation in 13. In it sentences of the type of exs. 5 and 31 are severely restricted in occurrence, although those of the type of exs. 1, 2 and 4 continue to occur as before. Since conjoined sentences of the type in ex. 6 were always less frequent than the non-conjoined ones, the former become vanishingly infrequent if either per-agent is of the type of 13.
Furthermore, the combination of reflexive with inanimate always had a very small frequency.

Thus a language learner confronted with the output of G₁ would conclude that some form of agent phrase with per existed but there would no longer be any reason to associate the three types into one constituent, exs. 6 having vanished. Consider first the case of animate agents not identical to the deep subject. The learner will hear such agents now and again, each time with a particular verb. Since these agents will therefore not appear to be any more generalized than any of the other verbal governments (with a, com, etc.) the learner may come to associate them with particular verbs. In the long run, then, the per-agent would have a better chance to survive with verbs with which it occurred frequently.

In fact this is exactly the situation one finds in the classical language, where the agents are in close association with the verb and are generally considered to depend on it. Because of this dependency the classical descendants of the per-agents are called regimes of the verb and are said to be governed by it. Although meaningful frequency studies are out of the question at the moment, the prediction of the last paragraph seems to me correct. At least it is true that the verbs which appear most often in the appendix are amongst those
that retained the agent, as for example *saber*.

I shall return to inn 13 in more detail below, but in the meantime it should be noted that since the per-regime induces a subcategorization of verbs in the classical language, Chomsky's strict subcategorization principle implies that it must be a member of the VP. Thus the base of $G_3$ consists, in part, of:

14. \[ S \rightarrow NP \quad Fred-P \]
   \[ Fred-P \rightarrow Aux \quad VP \]
   \[ VP \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array} { c c c } { V } & (NP) & (de \Delta) \\ { ser } & Adj \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{(per-regime)} \]
   \[ \text{per-regime} \rightarrow \text{per} \quad NP \quad \text{etc.} \]

2.1.2 Comments on João de Barros and Active Per-agents

The reader who is familiar with Portuguese literature will notice that the vast majority of the examples given in the appendix are taken from texts dating from before the classical period. It is therefore interesting to note that the per-agents appear in the (first decade of) the *Asia* of João de Barros. This text, which was written in 1549 and published in 1552\(^1\), is about a century later than the texts of the appendix.

João de Barros was the official historian of Portugal and his *Asia* was intended to be the official account of the Portuguese discovery of India. It is written in the pompous style typical of the sixteenth century; in fact, it
is so full of constructions modeled after the "belas formas da idade áurea do latim"\textsuperscript{12}, beautiful constructions of the golden age of Latin, that it earned for its author the title of "Pontifice dos classicos de mil e quinhentos"\textsuperscript{13}, Pope of the sixteenth century classicists. Having been born in 1496, Barros was 53 years old when he wrote the \textit{Ásia}, his \textit{opus magnum}. In his youth he wrote the \textit{Crónica do Imperador Clarimundo} (1520), a purely imaginary and fanciful novel which claims to be a history of the descent of the first royal house of Portugal from the lineage of the emperors of Hungary. The \textit{Clarimundo}, quite unlike the \textit{Ásia}, is written in a clear and simple style, as the philologists have remarked:\textsuperscript{14}

But the most remarkable feature of this work, written in eight months when the author was little over twenty, is its inexhaustible flow of clear, smooth, vigorous prose, entirely free from awkwardness or hesitation. (Aubrey Bell in \textit{Portuguese Literature}). Now, although the active animate \textit{per}-agents are used with alarming frequency in the \textit{Ásia} (1549), there are no examples of it in the rather voluminous \textit{Clarimundo} (1520). This is certainly a strange situation since it is already known that the \textit{per}-construction is old and one might therefore expect just the opposite of what is in fact found.

Barros' most famous predecessor as historian of Portugal was Fernão Lopes, who is noted for his simple, straight-forward style:\textsuperscript{18}
A artística espontaneidade de Fernão Lopes é o seu supremo título de glória.

The artistic spontaneity of Fernão Lopes is his claim to glory

(Alvaro J. da Costa Pimpão in *Idade Média*). The exact date of the composition of Lopes's works is not known but the philologists have concluded that he flourished between 1435 and 1450, that is, at the very end of the medieval period. They consider him still "medieval" whereas Barros is considered "classical". It therefore seems strange that the per-agents, which are found only very infrequently in the "medieval" Lopes, occur so frequently in the "classical" Barros. When texts dating from the period 1450-1550, such as the *Livro de Marco Polo* (1502) and *Ho Preste Joam das Indias* (1540), are examined it is found that these do not have active per-agent constructions. The last text (with the exception of the *Ásia*) that I know of which still makes fluent use of the per-agents is the *Livro de Vita Christi*, published in 1495 but written in 1445.

One can explain all these facts by postulating that by about 1450 the animate per-agents occurred very infrequently in the speech of the vast majority of cultured speakers - the unpretentious Fernão Lopes (flourished: 1435-1450) can serve as a paradigm example. Despite this the construction continued to be used in religious treatises, written by con-
servative old priests, for some time — the Livro de Vita Christi (1445) serving as the paradigm example. Therefore, since the construction did not exist at the time of João de Barros' childhood (1500), it did not enter his grammar and is not used in the Clarimundo (1520). However, when he was appointed to his official position Barros began to read through old documents, as would be required for his researches, and mistook the vulgar per-phrase construction for one of the "belas formas da idade áurea do latim" and took to using it in later works, such as the Asia (1549). This is a very neat explanation of the construction's reappearance after a century's absence and, incidentally, throws some light upon the style and technique of João de Barros. It might be added that the per-agents enjoyed a certain popularity with such sixteenth century supersophisticates as Frei Amador Arrais.

2.2 De-agents

Having already investigated one of the prepositions of the passive it is appropriate now to turn to the other: de. In this connection a very interesting statement is found in the Gramática Histórica of Said Ali:16

O conceito de procedência dá à locução de si o sentido "sem causa exterior", "sem influência vinda de fora", "espontaneamente" e pode algumas vezes interpretar-se como "pessoalmente".

The concept of origin gives the expression de si the sense "without exterior cause", "without outside influence", "spontaneously" and it can sometimes be interpreted as "personally".
He then gives the following examples:

161  Asia/171  E de sv elrey a entregou a Pedraluarez...
     And (of his own volition) the King
gave it to Pedro Álvarez

1611. Asia/170  o negócio de sv na dáua outro conselho
    the business (itself) did not suggest
    any other course of action

1611i Asia/142  ...& de sv chegou-se ao zambuco delrey
    ...and (of his own volition) he approached
    the King's boat

First notice that since all of these examples are
taken from the Asia they cannot be accepted as evidence
of the true state of the language. It has been shown in
section 2.1.2 that João de Barros was trying to cultivate
a "Latin" style in this work and there is no telling what
unnatural constructions he may have invented in his en-
thusiasm.

Second, even if one were to accept the Asia as a
reliable source of evidence, the de sv of at least two
of the examples, exs. 161 and 1611i, is probably merely
a mistake for des i, an archaic expression meaning "after"
or "since" which was written desy, dessy, des hy, dess hy,
etc. in other books. Said Ali himself mentions this ex-
pression:17

Como sinónimo de depois e alternando com este termo
se usou em português antigo o advérbio desi (grafado
também deshi e dessi), resultante da combinação da
preposição des com o advérbio i (hi ou ahi). En-
contra-se ainda com frequência em João de Barros...
As a synonym of after and alternating with it the adverb dessi (also written deshi and dessi), which resulted from the combination of the preposition des with the adverb i (hi or ahi), was used in Old Portuguese. It is still found frequently in João de Barros...

He then gives examples from the Demanda do Santo Graal, from the Crónica de Dom João I of Fernão Lopes and from the Clarimundo. The first of these is:

17. Graal/32r  

...ferio aqi meu filho ... Edepois ao couto dessi ao terceyro dessi ao quarto dessi aoquito.

...it wounded that son of mine, and then another, and then the third, then the fourth, then the fifth.

This is a particularly well chosen example, showing clearly the sequential meaning of des i. However, when Said Ali says that it is found in João de Barros he must be referring to the Clarimundo, from which he gave an example, because the expression does not occur in the Asia, except with the spelling de sy, which he interpreted as de si. Typical examples are:

18. Asia/52  

O capitam Lançarôte em dous dias ... fez sua aquáda & matança de câbras: & de sy passouse & terra firme...

Captain Lancelot in two days took on water and killed some goats and then moved to the main land...

19. Asia/76  

...acabáda a fála, pregou os olhos no chão per hif pequeno espaço, & de sy disse:...

...the speech finished, he nailed his eyes to the floor for a little while and then he said:...

In these examples it seems clear from context that Barros...
is describing a sequence of events in time, one after the other, so that de sy should be read as dés i. If one refuses to accept the possibility that de sy stands for dés i one reaches the conclusion that the latter does not occur at all in the Asia since the spelling des hy or anything like it is never found. But such a conclusion would be unacceptable since there was no reason for Barros to have excluded this expression - it occurs in the old documents which he read and continues to be used for some time after his death.

Although the above considerations show that de sy is written for dés i, one also finds examples where it must stand for de si:

20. Asia/51

...o negro...levou Esteuam Afonso debaixo de sy: the black man...pushed Estêvão Afonso underneath himself

Since Said Ali did not recognize the ambiguity of the spelling de sy it is necessary to go back and re-examine his examples more carefully:

161' Asia/171

...estando no altar em quanto se disse a missa aruoráda hūa bandeira ... ã no fim da missa o mesmo bispo benzeo. E de sy elrey a entregou a Pedraluarez Cabral... while the mass was being said there was flying from the altar a flag, which, at the end of the mass, the same bishop blessed and then the King gave it to Pedro Álvarez Cabral...

1611' Asia/142

Perô sentindo Vásco da Gāma a toruçaçam delles, mādou fazer sinal com que cessou aquelle tom que os asombráua, & de sy
che goue ao zambuco delrey...
But, Vasco da Gamma, noticing that they were uneasy, ordered a signal to be given, at which the sound which frightened them stopped and then he approached the King's boat...

Considering these more extensive versions of Said Ali's examples it is seen quite clearly that Barros actually is describing a time sequence of events so that dés 1 fits the context perfectly.

The remaining example, ex. 1611, would not make sense if its occurrence of de sy were read dés 1 since there is no time sequence of events. It is therefore necessary to examine clear occurrences of de si in other texts and compare these with ex. 1611. Typical examples are:

21. Vita/44b

Ex ã fogo xpo & de nocte fogo portal ã afugida aql dessy he defiqiel ou maa de fazer. fosse ajnda mais deficel por aazo de nocte escura. Lo! Christ does flee. He flees at night so that the flight, which is in itself difficult and of evil doing, be yet more difficult because of the darkness of night.

22. Pere/III-118

...cascas de laranjas secas, que servem para nas tavernas se cozerem cã carne do caã, para lhe tirar o mao cheyro que de sy tem...
the rinds of dried oranges, which they boil with dog meat in the taverns in order to remove the bad smell which the meat alone has...

23. Ciceram/59-11

...empero que elle de ssi meesmo nom seja bom
...even if he himself is not good
Although these three examples (plus the three in the appendix) are not sufficient evidence for firm conclusions, it seems that the de-agents occur only with stative verbs and adjectives and then only in the third person, that is, one does not find:

* eu resolvi de mim mesmo
* tu foste de ti mesmo

and so on. The semantic content of the de-agent is difficult to state but it apparently involves the idea that the noun in question be considered in and of itself, without any outside intervention or modification. Apparently ex. 1611 has these general properties (dar conselho is stative, at least with inanimate subjects) so that it must be accepted as a valid example. However, this is not true of exs. 161 and 111 since their verbs are not stative. Thus there are three reasons for rejecting these examples:

1. they do not have the same properties as clear occurrences of de si

2. they describe time sequences of events and thus fit the meaning of des a perfectly

3. they are from the Asia

For the purposes of the discussion which follows it is important to note that in the valid examples the de-agents occur only with a restricted class of verbs and only in the third person. Thus they do not have anywhere near the generality of the per-agents.
3.1 The Periphrastic Passive

Not very much is known about the history of the passive in Portuguese, aside from the fact that it used to occur more frequently with de. Typical examples are:

27. Vita/70b (osenhôr) ... quis seer bauptizado de johanne (the Lord) ... wanted to be baptized by John

28. Vita/56c ...recebia os pera seerem bauptizados per x̌o. ...he received them in order that they might be baptized by Christ

The circumstance that the passives with de are more frequent in the old language, combined with the apparent synonymy of sentences like exs. 27 and 28, has led the philologists to the conclusion that both de and per were passive voice agent prepositions and continue to be, the frequency of occurrence having changed amongst other things. Thus, Said Ali writes:¹⁹

Estando o verbo na pasgiva, o nome do agente se dizia, quer em português antigo, quer em linguagem da Renascença, de ordinário com a preposiçao de... sendo relativamente poucas as vezes em que se deu preferência à preposiçao por. No falar hodierno aparece invertida a situação; predomina por, ao passo que de ou é de uso ocasional, ou se reserva para certos e determinados verbos.

In the passive voice, in both medieval and classical Portuguese, the agent ordinarily took de, the instances in which preference was given to por being relatively infrequent. In present day speech the situation turns out to be just the opposite - por is dominant while de is either used infrequently or only with certain determined verbs.
In generative terms this amounts to saying that agent-postposing was and continues to be exactly as in the modern case with por replaced by \{ de / per \} and that the change from old to modern Portuguese is in certain restrictions on the choice of preposition in agent-postposing.

3.2.1 The Medieval Period

In investigating the ser-passive with de-agents I have been unable to find any respect in which it differs significantly from the modern passive with por. Typical examples are:

Graal/32v
Como júf foy chagado do cauadeiro da besta
Of how John was wounded by the Knight of the Beast

Graal/33r
Como ocauadeiro da besta chagou Gilfret
Of how the Knight of the Beast wounded Gilfret

Greg/40-8
...aquelas cousas que nô forô ordinadas nô sabudas de nostro senhor
...those things which were neither ordained or known by our Lord

Greg/41-15
...aquelas cousas que Deos ordinou e soube
...those things which God ordained and knew

In such cases the de-agent is always the deep subject, the
deep object is always the nominative of the sentence with which the verb agrees and so on.

The set of verbs which may appear with de-agents seems to me to be the same as in the modern case.

Epifânio, however, implies that there is a restriction in certain instances:\textsuperscript{22}

O agente da passiva designa-se com \textit{por}; todavia com um grandíssimo numero de verbos - pode dizer-se que se exceptuam unicamente os que exprimem a idea de \textit{construir} e \textit{fabricar} - pode empregar-se \textit{de}...

The passive agent takes \textit{por} but with a very large number of verbs -- one may say that the only exceptions are verbs of constructing and fabricating -- \textit{de} may be used.

Although I have not been able to check thoroughly on this point, it seems to me that this statement is not correct:

\textit{Orto/287-13} todo he criado e geérado de Deus everything is created and generated by God

It will therefore be assumed that there are no restrictions, other than the expected ones, on the \textit{de}-passive and that it is to be derived by the analogues of t27 (combined) and t28, chapter 1:

29. \textbf{medieval agent-postposing}

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
1 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

30. \textbf{NP-preposing}

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
1 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]
Although ex. 28 has the same surface form as ex. 27, the two constructions are actually quite different. Note in the first place that the so-called past participle has a strictly adjectival sense in addition to its verbal use in the passive:

311. João foi aborrecido pela presença da sua sogra
John was annoyed by the presence of his mother-in-law

3111. João está aborrecido
John is angry

Intuitively the participle in 311 is a form of the verb aborrecer, to anger, which in turn is related to the meaning "to cause to be angered", in which the adjective is considered basic. There is also a corresponding resultative aborrecer-se, to get angry, which has the same meaning as ficar aborrecido, with the resultative ficar, to get or wind up, and the adjective. Lakoff has proposed that in series of this type it is the adjective that is basic, the causative verb and the resultative reflexive being transformationally derived from the adjective. Notice that there is a similar series based on true adjectives, except that in this case the resultative is not reflexive: rico, rich; enriquecer alguém, to enrich someone; enriquecer, to get rich. Although (for lack of proof) one may not accept Lakoff's contention that the relationship is a true syntactic
one, it none the less seems correct that the adjective enters in the base, rather than being syntactically derived from the verb since the adjective can have none of the verbal complements:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a roupa está lavada} & \quad \{\text{todo dia} \} \\
& \quad \{\text{na pia} \} \\
& \quad \{\text{com sabão} \} \\
& \quad \{\text{rápidamente} \}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{the clothes are washed} \quad \{\text{every day} \} \\
\quad \{\text{in the sink} \} \\
\quad \{\text{with soap} \} \\
\quad \{\text{quickly} \}

If the adjective were to be transformationally derived from the verb (regardless of its deep subject) it would be necessary to give some form of \textit{ad hoc} restriction to account for the lack of verbal complements, as has been pointed out by Lakoff in the article cited above. Thus it will be assumed in what follows that participial adjectives are to be entered directly in the lexicon, although it will not be necessary to assume any particular derivation for the causative or resultative (reflexive) verbs. In more intuitive terms this amounts roughly to claiming that there is one class of adjectives, which has two subclasses -- participial (\textit{lavado}) and true (\textit{rico}).

Recall that in section 2.1.1 it was shown that in the medieval period active \textit{per}-agents did not induce a subcategory-
ization of the verb and it is therefore not surprising that they can be found with the substantive verb *ser*:

32. Boosco/58-2  nom som nobres per sy nė per sua geeraqom
they themselves are not noble nor are their families

Orto/296-10  Asy foj liure pella bēsta Uirgē da morte do corpo e da alma
Thus he was free from corporal and spiritual death, through the agency of the Blessed Virgin

Since participial as well as true adjectives are found with *ser* it would not be surprising to find examples of the type of exs. 32 with participial adjectives. However such sentences would have the same surface form as the presumed passive, ex. 28, and in fact this example might be considered a case of exs. 32. There is strong evidence to support this conclusion in at least some instances. In the first place the presumed passive appears conjoined with true adjectives even when agents are present:

33. Orto/18-25  soon ēquyada e fea e corrupta e chea de desonrra pellos maos prelados
I am dirtied and ugly and corrupt and full of bad fame, through the agency of the evil priests

Virgeu/29-61  E assy como son gabādos e sobervos per suas gabānas...
They are flattered by their own praise and are therefore made proud...

These conjunctions show quite clearly that in the medieval language a participle could be adjectival even when followed by an agent phrase. Furthermore, consider only the first conjunct of each of exs. 33:
soom _svgada pellos maaos prelados
son gabados per suas gabanças

in which the forms *soom* and *son* are first singular present
and third plural present of *ser*, respectively. Seemingly
these have passive form. But notice that quite generally
the real passive is entirely unacceptable with a present
tense auxiliary, except if it is understood as generic\(^\text{23}\)
and this is true, in particular, of the modern English
and Portuguese passives:

Maricota is seen by John  *at this moment
every day at 5:00

Maricota é vista por João  *neste momento
todos os dias às 5:00

This also seems to be the case for the archaic *de*-passive.
Thus, since exs. 33 have a present tense auxiliary and are
clearly not intended to be generic, it is clear that they
are not passives. Rather they are constructions of the type
of exs. 32 with participial adjectives and are generated
directly in the base by the categorial rules 9.

With this sort of a derivation it does not make sense
to talk about the "logical subject of the Participle", that
is, "the Verb" since it starts out as an adjective in deep
structure. In fact there is no reason to expect the *per*-agent
to bear any particular relation to the participle and there
are examples in which the agent clearly cannot be understood
to be the logical subject. One such example is:
Lenda/38-19

...e sô achado per ti
...and I am found through thee

Notice in the first place that ex. 34 is not a passive since
the auxiliary is present tense. Although it is not known
precisely which version of the Barlaam legend served as a
basis for the Portuguese translation, from which ex. 34 is
taken, there can be no doubt that it is, more or less directly,
connected with the Greek text attributed to St. John of
Damascus because the Portuguese translator mentions him
in the text:

(Lenda/49-9) Ora diz Joã Demaçeno que esta estoria
escreveo & lingoagê grego...
Now John of Damascus, who wrote this
story in Greek, says...

Although the Portuguese and Greek do differ substantially
in certain passages, it happens that they agree quite
closely in the passage of which ex. 34 is a part. The
original of ex. 34, thus, seems to have been:

StJD/538 καὶ εὕρεθας θνής διὰ σου
and I am found through thee

where διὰ is unambiguously not the passive agent preposition
so that thou is not the logical subject. Inspection of con-
text shows that the meaning of the sentence is quite clearly:

I am found, you having intervened in this

It makes as much sense to ask "who found me?" concerning
ex. 34 as it would to ask "who lost me?" concerning "I am
lost"! Thus since both the Greek original and the context
require readings in which τί in ex. 34 cannot be understood
to be the deep subject, it may be assumed that it indeed is
not. Notice that this example destroys the assumption that sentences of the forms of exs. 27 and 28 were synonymous.

Despite this it is perfectly clear that a real passive with per exists even in the same texts in which exs. 33 occur, although very infrequently:

35. Orto/112-29 Outrossy, o Šperador Julio Cesar foy morto a treyçõ pellos seus... Even so, the emperor Julius Caesar was treacherously murdered by his own men...

in which the participle could not be adjectival since it occurs with the complement a treyçõ. The meaning of the sentence is clearly the normal passive one and differs from exs. 33 and 34, which describe a state rather than a process.

Thus sentences of the form of ex. 28 were presumably ambiguous between the constructions of exs. 33-34 and ex. 35. However exs. 33-34 quickly disappeared from the language and were certainly lost by the beginning of the classical period. Since there is no reason to believe that the normal development from Latin to Portuguese would give a per-passive like that in ex. 35 directly, exs. 33-34 are probably earlier. It is reasonable to postulate then that there was a stage of Portuguese, pre-medieval, in which only rules 9, 129 and 130 existed, that is, a stage at which the per-passive, ex. 35, had not yet been formed. At such a stage the derivations would be as represented below:
36. **pre-medieval**

```
per                           de
NP_4 ser adjpp per NP_5       NP_1 v NP_2 de Δ
base                          
NP_1 v NP_2 per NP_3          Δ v NP_2 de NP_1

Δ v NP_2 de NP_1              NP_2 v de NP_1

*pass
```

where the third line under **de** and the first line under **per**
would have similar surface forms since the passive of the
auxiliary is **ser** followed by the participle.  

25 Sentences of
the following types would be allowed:

37.  sou
    fui
    era
    ser ei
en suj ada
fe ia
pel os pre la dos

38. *sou
    fui
    era
    ser ei
en suj ada
*fe ia
dos pre la dos

Choosing the preterite of the Aux and the participle these
would mean, respectively:

I was dirtied (adj), the prelates having intervened
in this

I was dirtied (verb) by the prelates

where the adjective describes the result of the process
described by the verb. Notice that this is the only
difference in meaning between the two sentences in the case
where the prelates intervention is direct. Thus, since both
the meanings and shape of exs. 37 and 38 are quite close it
would be expected that they might become confused. In fact this seems to have happened, the passive meaning has been extended to ex. 37 as was seen above in ex. 35, in which the deep subject appears as the per-agent. The question of whether the per-agent in such examples really is the passive agent is a very difficult one to answer for a dead language. None the less there are some bits of evidence. The first of these is given by sentences in which the per-agent is not the deep subject, despite the fact that the participle is clearly not adjectival.

Consider, for example, the following two sentences, which are found less than ten lines apart in the Fuero Real:

39. Fuero/I-48 (esta sancta trijdade) ... deu lee e ensinamento a seu poboo per moysê ... (this holy trinity) ... gave laws and teaching to its people through Moses ...

40. Fuero/I-54 ...a ley que foy dada primeyramête per moysê ...the laws which were first given through Moses

The fact that these two sentences are found so close together and that they refer to exactly the same event shows that in ex. 40 it would be wrong to assume that Moysê is the deep subject of dar. The sentence is, however, quite clearly passive rather than adjectival.

Another bit of evidence is given by passive sentences like the following:
41. JoãoI/270  

esto nunca foi falado per nos, nem per noso mamado

such a thing was never said by us, nor did we order that such be said

where the animate agent, which is the deep subject, is con-joined with an inanimate one which could not possibly be the deep subject. Thus if per nos really were the passive agent ex. 41 would be ungrammatical since passive agents cannot conjoin with adverbials.

Examples 40 and 41 together show that the analogy went only so far as the participle and did not reach the per-agent, which retains the same status as in the active voice. Thus the innovation from pre-medieval to medieval is, apparently, that in sentences of the form "NP ser adj pp per NP" the participial adjective becomes passive, as in the de-passive. The innovated language contains sentences of the types in exs. 37 (including exs. 33 and 34) and ex. 38, plus exs. 35, 40 and 41. The speakers of the next generation must then construct maximal grammars $G_2$ which generate this language.

The key to $G_2$, that is, the grammar of the medieval texts, is in the observation that the participle may be passive while the agent is of the type of the normal active animate per-agents discussed in section 2.1.1. However,
it would be wrong simply to allow per-agents to occur in the base form of passives thereby deriving double agents:

Deus deu lei per Moisés →

* a lei foi dada per Moisés de Deus

because such double agents are never found in the texts and for this reason an ad hoc deletion rule would be required.

Recall that agent-postposing consists of a combination of two subparts, agent-copying and NP-dropping, as formulated in t27 of chapter 1 (p. 37). Since it has been shown that the per-agent is not a passive agent it is clear that agent-copying applies only to de, not per. However, if NP-dropping were to apply with both prepositions a derivational stage \( \Delta V NP_2 \per NP_3 \), parallel to \( \Delta V NP_2 \de NP_1 \), would be generated. If then NP-preposing were also allowed to apply with both de and per the forms \( NP_2 V \per NP_3 \) and \( NP_2 V \de NP_1 \) + pass would be generated, as is correct. Thus, in order to include the per-construction one need only modify t29 and t30:

43. agent-postposing (medieval)

i. agent-copying

\[
\begin{align*}
& NP \quad Aux \quad V \quad NP \quad de \quad \Delta \\
& 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 1
\end{align*}
\]

ii. NP-dropping

\[
\begin{align*}
& NP \quad Aux \quad V \quad NP \{ de \} \quad NP \\
& \Delta \quad 2 \quad 2
\end{align*}
\]
44. **NP-preposing (medieval)**

Δ Aux V NP\{de per\} NP

1 2 3 4 5
4 2 3 Ø 5
+ pass

The grammar of the medieval period, G₂, will then consist of:

medieval
base: rules 9
transformations: agent-copying, t431
NF-dropping, t431i
NF-preposing, t44

The derivations provided by the above system will be of the types:

45. **medieval**

per de

NF₄ ser adj pp per NP₅

base and NP₁ V NP₂ de Δ

NP₁ V NP₂ per NP₃
t431 ---- NP₁ V NP₂ de NP₁
t431i Δ V NP₂ per NP₃ Δ V NP₂ de NP₁
t44 NP₂ V per NP₃ NP₂ V de NP₁ + pass
+ pass

Sentences of the type of ex. 37 (including exs. 33 and 34) and ex. 38 are derived as before and those of the types of exs. 35 and 40 by t43 followed by t44.²⁷ It is worthwhile to follow the latter derivations carefully. Notice that
since NP-dropping is a deletion the universal deletion conditions will apply to limit its operation to two cases: either NP₁ is an indefinite or it is repeated elsewhere in the sentence, namely, as the per-agent, NP₃. The first case will give derivations like:

base: alguém dar a lei per Moisés
  + past

    t₄₃i: does not apply

    t₄₃ii: △ dar a lei per Moisés
          + past

    t₄₄: a lei dar per Moisés
         + past
         + pass

After agree and other low-level rules not considered here this will give:

a lei foi dada per Moisés.

Derivations like this one will account for passive sentences of the type of ex. 40 in which the per-agent is not the deep subject.

On the other hand, the second case will apply to deep structures which underlie sentences having reflexive per-agents, such as:

base: Brutus matar César per Brutus
  + past

If NP-dropping did not apply this deep structure, after reflexive and other rules, would give:

Brutus matou César per si
which is of the form of exs. 4, 61, 611, and 6111. Applying the transformations indicated below one gets, successively:

\[
\begin{align*}
t431 : & \quad \text{does not apply} \\
t4311 : & \quad \Delta \text{matar } \text{César per Brutus} \\
& \quad + \text{past} \\
t44 : & \quad \text{César matar per Brutus} \\
& \quad + \text{past} \\
& \quad + \text{pass}
\end{align*}
\]

which gives

\[
\text{César foi morto per Brutus.}
\]

Such derivations will account for sentences of the types of ex. 35, in which the \textit{per}-agent is the deep subject.

The system illustrated in table 45, which is the one attested in the medieval texts, is quite complex and involves several minimal semantic distinctions represented by little or no difference in the surface structure. Thus each example (except in the present) is ambiguous between the passive and adjectival senses and the agent itself may or may not be the deep subject, leading to four minimally distinct readings for one surface structure. On the other hand, the \textit{de}-construction, whose surface form differs from that of the \textit{per}-construction only in the choice of preposition is unambiguously a true passive so that corresponding to each surface structure there is only one reading.
3.2.2 The Classical Period

Consider now the effect of inn 13 on the medieval grammar. As pointed out above it caused the reduction of the *per*-agent to a verbal regime and thus necessarily eliminated the participial adjective with agent construction (exs. 33, ex. 34) since such adjectives do not occur with verbal regimes. In the case of the passive inn 13 removes the possibility of agents which are not the deep subject of the verb (ex. 40), making the *per*-passive equivalent to the already established *de*-passive, as is empirically correct.

The innovated grammar of the medieval period, $G_2$, consists then of rules 9, and t43, t44 and the innovation in 13. $G_2$ is quite obviously not a maximal grammar since it requires the generation of forms which are not used. In fact it generates only sentences of the type:

```
* sou
fui
era
serei
```
```
ensujada
feia
```
```
dos
pelos
prelados
```

in which the choice of preposition is immaterial. The next generation, that is, the speakers of the classical language with grammar $G_3$ seeing such data will of course conclude that there is only one passive construction which happens to involve a choice of preposition. This requires a change from the base of $G_2$ in order to allow for the choice of *de* or *per* in
front of $\Delta$. Thus the new base will be:

47. $S \rightarrow NP \text{ Pred-P}$

$\text{Pred-P} \rightarrow \text{Aux VP}$

$\text{VP} \rightarrow \{V (\text{NP}) \ (\{\text{de} \ \text{per}\} \ \Delta\) \ (\text{per-regime}) \}$

$\text{per-regime} \rightarrow \text{per NP}$

This will be followed by a version of agent-postposing which allows for the choice between de and per in both parts. No such modification is necessary for NP-preposing since this choice was already established in the medieval period.

48. agent-postposing (classical) combined

$NP_1 \rightarrow \{V (\text{NP}_2) \ (\{\text{de} \ \text{per}\} \ \Delta\}$

1 2 3 4
4 2 3 1

49. NP-preposing (classical)

$\Delta \rightarrow \text{Aux V NP} \ (\{\text{de} \ \text{per}\} \ NP$

1 2 3 4 5
4 2 3 $\emptyset$ 5
+ pass

Consider once again inn 13. Notice that in the surface structure there is no way to distinguish sentences of the type of ex. 40 from those of ex. 35 so that if inn 13 is to be expressed within $G_2$ the restriction must be on base forms. Then it will eliminate
the underlying forms necessary for derivations of the type in 46 and sentences of the type of ex. 40 will not be generated. Putting aside for the moment the issue of frequency, this means that inn 13 must be restated as follows:

50. innovation animate per-agents which are not identical to the deep subject are eliminated from the base.

Intuitively inn 50 is exactly correct in that the animate per-agents, which it removes, are the essential elements of which the base forms are made. Once the base form vanishes, so does the transformed version.

However, there is no way that inn 50 can be expressed as a rule of the base or a restriction thereon because the base consists of context-free rewriting rules. Furthermore there is obviously no way to state frequency restrictions with a formal grammar.

After the reflexive constructions have been discussed in the next paragraph I will return to this problem.
4. The Reflexive Passive

4.1 Introductory Comments

In the first chapter it was shown that modern Portuguese has a reflexive passive as well as a reflexive impersonal, neither of which may appear with a surface agent. The only fact about the se-constructions in the old language which was noted by the philologists is that the latter restriction did not apply:\(^29\)

(o pronomne se) ... forma a voz passiva, mas com uma diferença notável entre o português moderno e antigo: neste podia expressar-se o agente da voz passiva pronominal, no português moderno é obrigatório callá-lo.

(the pronoun se) ... forms the passive voice, but with one notable difference between Old and Modern Portuguese: in the old language the agent of the reflexive passive could be expressed while in Modern Portuguese it must be left out.

Two more or less standard examples, taken from Os Lusíadas were given by Epifânio:\(^30\)

52. Lus/I-52

...o Mar remoto nauegamos,/que so
dos feos Focas se nauega... ...we navigate the distant sea, which
is navigated only by the ugly seals

53. Lus/VII-55

Aquí se escreuerão novas historias,/ por gentes estrangeiras... Here new stories will be written by
foreign people...

Such examples have led the philologists to the conclusion that, no matter what its status in the modern language may be, the se-construction was once a true passive, in the same sense
as the modern ser-passive. This conclusion is made more plausible by the (alleged) fact that the non-agreeing case (as in ex. 13a, chapter 1) is not found in the oldest texts. In general it is assumed that the true passive gradually lost its agent and agreement, leading thus to the se-impersonal.

The traditional analysis outlined above is inadequate in several respects, perhaps the most important of these being that the agent phrase in ex. 53 may not be the passive agent at all, as was shown in sections 2.1.1 and 3.2.2. The analysis is, however, also based on inadequate knowledge of the facts. Thus it has never been clearly established whether the non-agreeing case was indeed ungrammatical in both periods and correspondingly it is also unclear when exs. 52 and 53 became grammatical. Thus, before discussing the grammar of the se-construction it is necessary to establish clearly the data to be accounted for.

4.2 the data

4.2.1 agreement

Even the philologists themselves have questioned the supposed non-existence of the non-agreeing case. In point of fact sentences of this type can be found, although only infrequently. J. M. Rodrigues\(^{31}\) has given examples covering the period 1552-1665 to which can be added examples from much earlier times:
e passarão pelo Mar Royuo, per que se entendas as deleitações carnaes and they went by the Red Sea, which signifies carnal delight

aquellas cousas que se pode uender aquellas se possa apanhorar those things which may be sold, may be pledged

Exs. 54 and 55 are from ca. 1375 and the thirteenth century, respectively. Since, however, there seem to be very few such occurrences in the earlier texts the philologists have come to the conclusion that the non-agreeing _se_-construction was not acceptable in the old language.

My own view is that the issue is undecidable given the present state of knowledge of Old Portuguese. In the first place, in order for examples like exs. 54 and 55 to be taken seriously it would have to be shown that their frequency of occurrence is greater than that which could be expected if they were pure and simple mistakes. The two main components of the mistake frequency would be ordinary linguistic mistakes, as when one utters sentences with incorrect concordances, and recording (and re-copying) mistakes. The latter factor would, of course, be much greater in the hand written medieval texts. As an example of the first kind of mistake consider the following string taken from the _Orto_:

*E foy-lhe dados muitos cabellos ãnas sollas dos pees,
And they were given a lot of hair on the soles of their feet.
This string is ungrammatical because the surface subject *muvtos cabellos* is plural while the finite verb *foy* is singular, precisely the same sort of mistake in concordance which might account for the occurrence of sentences of the type of ex. 13a, chapter 1 when only ex. 13b, chapter 1 was grammatical. It is interesting to note that this patently obvious error is present in the two manuscripts of the Orto which survive. Professor Bertil Maler has established the following family tree for the Orto:

```
                      O
                        |
                        X
                      /   \
                     A     B
```

lost original

lost copy

two extant copies

The fact that the mistake is found in both A and B suggests that it goes back at least to X. In fact it probably goes back to O since ex. 56 is a translation of:

Anglico/LXV: Data est etiam sub pedibus multa pillorum villositas

Data est etiam sub pedibus multa pillorum villositas

Apparently the writer of the Orto first translated the *est* of *data est* as *foy* (singular for singular) and then looked ahead and realized that *pillorum villositas* would have to be plural in the translation and then finished the rest of the sentence with plural concordances. Thus it seems that this obvious error twice survived at least two successive copyings. All of which shows that, quite independently of any peculiarities of the *se*-construction blatant errors in
concordance were established and transmitted in the texts of the medieval period. Such mistakes seem to have been less frequent in the classical period.

The second component of the mistake frequency is given by recording and copying mistakes. Notice that for most tenses the difference between the agreeing and non-agreeing cases is simply the absence or presence of nasalization of the final vowel, represented in the present orthography by a final -m. In the texts, however, any nasalization could be represented by m, n or the diacritic til, "~, a slightly wavey line written above the nasalized vowel. The latter was quite frequently used in the earlier hand written texts since it is easier to write. However, the til is often "missing" or "erased by time" in the presently available texts. There are two possible explanations for this. First, like the dot on the i and the cross on the t they might simply sometimes have been omitted because of sloppiness or forgetfulness on the part of the scribe or, second, they might have faded away. Whatever the reason may be, the absence of a mark of nasalization is not at all unusual and indeed one of the favorite pastimes of modern day editors is adding n or m in appropriate places. Typical examples are:

Virgo/64-543 e el no deu logo o juizo

which was emended by the editor to read

e el nö deu logo o juizo.
Similarly the phrase

Orto/206-21 e a rrazom asy lho coselha

was corrected to

e a rrazom asy lho conselha.

Naturally there are cases in which it is impossible to tell whether one is dealing with an incorrect concordance or a missing til:

Graal/56r ...atodos aqlles q se fazem afora da carreira do pecado & torna adirita carreira
...to those who leave the road of sin and return to the road of righteousness

Here the subject aqlles is plural so both verbs should be also. However, the lack of agreement might simply be a missing til.

I have tried to show above that the mere presence of sentences of the non-agreeing type cannot be sufficient evidence to conclude that they were grammatical and that, in fact, such examples cannot even be taken seriously until it is shown that they occur more frequently than the corresponding mistakes do. It seems to me that this is the correct way to understand the philologists' notion of "arbitrariness", which arose because of their failure to make the langue-parole distinction. Thus since they noticed that sentences like ex. 56 above occurred in the texts they concluded that grammar used to be a part-time affair:33

O português arcaico apresentava, com frequência, falta de concordância entre o predicado e o
sujeito ... A língua moderna, sobretudo na sua modalidade popular, ainda revela vestígios dessa antiga arbitrariedade.

The old language frequently showed lack of agreement between the predicate and the subject ... The modern language, especially the popular dialect, still reveals traces of this archaic arbitrariness.

However, it is clear that in the modern language, even in the literary dialect, the non-agreeing case is firmly established as an independent construction with its own properties, as was seen in chapter one. The question then is: when did the non-agreeing se-construction become acceptable? A partial answer could be provided by detailed frequency studies to determine when its frequency came to exceed the mistake (or "arbitrariness") frequency. Since such studies are out of the question at the moment, one must rely on more intuitive criteria, such as noting when the construction was first used regularly by respected authors who are believed to have used natural prose in their works. For example, the construction is used so often by Pe. António Vieira in letters dated between 1665 and 1680 that it would seem to have been quite natural at that time, as has been shown by J. M. Rodrigues. The same is probably true for Palmeirim (1567) in which such examples are used quite freely. Typical examples are:

Palm/I-70  ...destes assinalados principaes, de que se então não sabia nenhumas novas.

...of these illustrious magnates, about whom no news was known at that time.
Palm/III-392 No sentimento de sua morte se fez mais sinalados estremos
In sorrow caused by his death people went to remarkable extremes

I do not believe that these examples can be passed off as mistakes since errors in number concordance between subject and verb are vanishingly infrequent in Palmeirim.

On the other hand, I know of no occurrences of the non-agreeing construction in the Clarimundo (1520), which, as was shown in section 2.1.2, is written in an extremely flowing natural style and can probably be taken as faithfully representative of the language Barros (b. 1497) learned as a child. The fact that the construction is not found in Clarimundo suggests that if it existed at the turn of the sixteenth century it still sounded a bit strange. It does, however, occur in Barros's later works, in which he used all sorts of constructions (see section 2.1.2) in an attempt to achieve a "Latin" style. This circumstance leads to the conclusion that although the non-agreeing se-construction was probably minimally present at the turn of the sixteenth century, it did not become fully acceptable until the middle of that century. Thus, some authors who were born at the turn of the century, for example Fernão Mendes Pinto (b. 1510), did not participate of the change and thus do not use the construction, as would be expected.
Although I have thus fixed the date of entry of the non-agreeing construction at about 1550 it should be borne in mind that for any particular period before this one can find a few examples in most texts and, in fact, some enthusiastic philologists have even claimed that the construction goes back to Vulgar Latin. As I can see no basis for such claims I have discounted them.

Notice that it is quite important to distinguish between true occurrences of the non-agreeing construction, like those given above, from verb-complement (or aux-complement) constructions such as:

Marco/49r  
...e fazem ymagãês de lyçes e de dragoães e de aues muy sotilmente... as quaaes som assi firmes na pelle que nunca se pode tirar
...and they make very delicate drawings of lions, dragons and birds, which are so fixed on the skin that they can never be removed

where as quaaes (ymagãês) is the object of tirar.

Simplifying the rather long citation given above, one has:

57. pode-se tirar as imagens

where the proposition tirar as imagens is the deep object of poder. It is this whole proposition which is the surface subject of poder, which is therefore
singular. Notice, however, that Portuguese has a rule of verb-raising, after which the se-passive rule may apply to give:

58. podem-se tirar as imagens.

Many philologists, noting exs. 57 and 58 seem to have concluded that ex. 57 is a case of the non-agreeing construction, despite the fact that it involves only the ordinary se-passive rule. Sentences of the type of ex. 57 are relatively easy to find, even in the early texts.

It is, incidentally, typical of the present state of knowledge of Portuguese of the medieval and classical periods that such simple facts should still be in doubt and that a construction which appears very clearly and quite regularly in the texts as early as 1550-1650 is still considered bad by some grammarians, who persist in insisting on the agreeing construction.

4.2.2 Nominative vrs. Accusative

In the first chapter it was seen that there is considerable confusion about the case of the deep object
in the modern language. There is no such confusion in the archaic language, however, where only the nominative is found:

Clar/I-211
a valentia ... nem se fez ela para os fracos.
valour ... nor was it made for the weak.

Pere/II-50
fazer fazenda ... aquele lugar onde estávamos não era o onde ella se fazia.
to trade goods ... the place where we were was not where they were traded.

Naturally this is exactly the result one would expect for a period when only the agreeing construction was acceptable, since in Portuguese verbs do not ordinarily agree with nouns which are accusative. The absence of accusatives in the later period will be discussed later.

4.2.3 Intransitives

Another property of the modern se-constructions which does not seem to hold in the earlier periods is the occurrence of intransitive verbs. Thus, in the medieval period the se-construction seems to be permissible only for transitive verbs and apparent exceptions to this statement can be accounted for by deletion of a deep object. This is not surprising since, as was seen in section 4.2.2, the deep object occurs in the surface only in the nominative and could therefore be deleted by the
ordinary rules of subject ellipsis. A typical example is:

João I/433  
...a paz simplez, diziam elles, 
posto que se arrazoe por algúns...
...simple peace, they said, even 
though it may be defended by some 
people...

where the pronoun ela, referring to a paz, has been deleted.

There are also some apparent counter-examples involving 
asso como, as is, but these are merely cases in which the 
sentential object has been moved forward:

Orto/84-33  
...e porem caee o honé em muytos 
peccados, de que o múdo he cöprido; 
asv como se mostra ê este recostameto...
...and therefore man falls into 
many sins, of which the world is 
full, as is shown in this story...

where the proposition caee .... cöprido has been preposed.

The first occurrences of the se-construction
with intransitives that were noticed by the philologists
date from around 1550, although I happen to have found
one from 1532:

Ropica/8  
Onde se trata de pecoiao e vígios...
Where sin and vice are treated

Even though there may be a few such examples before 1550
the philologists' conclusion is probably basically correct.

Thus the facts are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>medieval</th>
<th>classical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intransitives in se-cons.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>before 1550</th>
<th>after 1550</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.4 agent prepositions

Although it is quite true that in the classical period both de- and per-agents could occur with the se-construction, the de-agents do not seem to occur in the medieval period, or at least not until the very end of this period. The earliest example I know of is from a text written in 1445 but published in 1495, nearly a half century into the classical period:

Vita/13c

odia da sua nações nã soo se festeja & honra dos xpaços,
mas dos mouros & doutros.

the day of his birth is celebrated
and honored not only by the Christians but also by the Moors and others.

The next earliest example is from 1520:

Clar/III-70

... a Ilha das Maias ... nunca
se verá de ninguem senão por este dia.

... Maya Island ... will never
be seen by anyone except on this day.

Thus, the most important point in the traditional analysis, the occurrence of the se-construction with passive agents, is entirely invalid for the medieval period since de-agents do not occur and per-agents were not necessarily passive.

The data, then, are:

61.               classical
          medieval     de-agents  no     yes
          per-agents  yes     yes
4.3 The Medieval Period

In section 4.2 it has been shown that the medieval se-construction had the following properties:

i. the verb agrees with the deep object
ii. the deep object is in the nominative
iii. only transitive verbs occur
iv. only per-agents are permissible

Since the deep subject does not appear in the surface form it is rather difficult to determine if it is restricted as in the modern language. Although I have been unable to find any of the critical examples of the types discussed on pp. 10 - 13 there are examples in later periods, when the deep subject could appear as an agent, in which these restrictions do not hold. For this reason it will be assumed that there were no special restrictions on the deep subject, although there is really little evidence either way.

The fact that the subject is deleted suggests that NP-dropping has applied. This must be followed by an object fronting rule in order to account for i, ii and iii above. As in the case of t19, chapter 1, a pronominal copy of the object is left behind so that the reflexive particle may be derived by application of reflex. The argument given in chapter 1 for this type of derivation in the modern case also applies to the medieval one.
In addition, it accounts automatically for the lack of accusatives in the se-construction, without statement of surface conditions, since the non-agreeing form did not exist in this period. Thus the statement of the medieval se-passive rule is:

63. \textbf{medieval se-passive}\\
\begin{array}{cccc}
\Delta & \text{Aux} & \{V \ NP_2\} & \text{VP} \ (\text{per} \ NP_3) \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
4 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{+pro} & & & 5 \\
\end{array}

As in the modern case t63 would be followed by agree, reflex and so on. Thus the grammar of the medieval period, $C_2$, will include:

64. \textbf{medieval grammar}\\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{base: rules 9} \\
\text{transformations: medieval agent-copying, t43i} \\
\text{medieval NF-dropping, t43i1} \\
\text{medieval NP-preposing, t44} \\
\text{medieval se-passive, t63} \\
\end{array}

These rules give derivations of the following types, where the derivations of table 45 are repeated for convenience:

65. \textbf{medieval derivations}\\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{per} \\
\text{de} \\
\end{array}

\begin{array}{c}
\text{base:} \ NP_1 \ V \ NP_2 \ \text{per} \ NP_3 \\
\text{and} \ NP_4 \ \text{adj}_{pp} \ \text{per} \ NP_5 \\
t43i \\
\end{array}

\begin{array}{c}
\text{de} \ NP_1 \ V \ NP_2 \ de \ \Delta \\
\end{array}

\begin{array}{c}
\text{de} \ NP_1 \\
\end{array}
where the ser-passive derivations are unchanged. Just as in the case of the ser-passive, 4311 will be limited by the universal deletion conditions to two cases: either NP₁ is indefinite or it is identical to NP₃. It is worthwhile to follow the derivations carefully in each case. Consider first a simple instance of the former type:

66. Boosco/65-2 as cousas que se pode compreender pellos quinque sentidos do corpo... the things which can be understood by (means of) the five senses...

where the meaning is clearly that people (one, somebody) understand things through the agency of the five senses.

Thus the derivation of ex. 66 is:

base: a gente compreender as cousas pelos cinco sentidos

\[t_{4311}: \Delta \text{ compreender as cousas pelos cinco sentidos}\]

\[t_{63}: \text{as cousas compreender as cousas pelos cinco sentidos} \quad +\text{pro}\]

\[\text{agree & reflex}: \text{as cousas compreender as cousas pelos cinco sentidos} \quad +\text{pl} \quad +\text{pro} \quad +\text{reflex}\]

which gives, after re-ordering:

Compreendem-se as cousas pelos cinco sentidos
Derivations like this one will account for *se*-passives in which the *per*-agent is not the deep subject. Examples of this type are not uncommon, even with human *per*-agents. A typical example is:

67. Ciceram/48-10 ...assy como se mostrou per Marco Catom na terceira guerra que ouvemos com os de Cartago ...as was shown in the case of Marcus Cato in the third Punic War

If *Marco Catom* were the deep subject of *mostrar* ex. 67 would mean "as was shown by Marcus Cato...". It can be seen, however, that this is not correct by consideration of the Latin original:

68. Cicero/80-78 ...ut M. Catonis bellum tertium Punicum

Evidently, the verb *mostrar* was added by the translator in the sense shown by the English gloss, so that *Marco Catom* cannot be the deep subject in ex. 66. Another example of this type with an animate, although not human *per*-agent is:

Aves/xvi ...assistes luxuriosos & see entendes pelo mioto...
thus these lustful men, who are meant by the buzzard...

where *mioto* is clearly not the deep subject of *entender*, (literally) to understand or represent.

The second case in which t^43^11 can operate is when the subject is identical to the *per*-agent. As pointed out earlier, a deep structure of this type would lead to an active with reflexive *per*-agent if other
transformations were not applied. Consider for example:

69. JoSOL/393 a primeira cousa que se fallou per Micer Ambrosio
    the first thing that was said by Mister Ambrosio

where it is quite clear that it is Mister Ambrosio who
does the saying so that ex. 69 is derived from

**base:** Micer Ambrosio fallar a cousa per Micer Ambrosio
    + past

which would give

Micer Ambrosio fallou a cousa per si

if no passive rule applied. Applying t4311 and t63 one
gets, successively:

**t4311:** △ fallar a cousa per Micer Ambrosio

**t63:** a cousa fallar a cousa per Micer Ambrosio
    + pro

agree & a cousa fallar a cousa per Micer Ambrosio
    + past + pro

reflex + sing + reflex

which gives, after **inversion**:

fallou-se a cousa per Micer Ambrosio.

Such derivations account for **se-passives** in which the
per-agent is the deep subject.

**NP-preposing**, t44, and **se-passive**, t63, are
strikingly similar. They both move the object into sub-
ject position and reduce the original subject, either by
pronominalizing it or deleting it entirely. Intuitively
it seems that t44 and t63 could be generalized into some
form of object fronting or at least that this component,
which the two transformations seem to have in common, should be factored out and stated separately. Any such proposal will run into one fundamental problem: the conditions on the object-subject change are different in the two cases. In the se-passive only third person objects may be fronted and, as was pointed out in chapter 1, this restriction is shared with pleonasm, a transformation which is of the same general type as se-passive. For this reason I have not attempted to generalize t44 and t63 into one transformation.

4.4 The Classical Period
4.4.1 before 1550

The main development in the se-passive at the beginning of the classical period was the introduction of de-agents, which are always equivalent to the deep subject. Simultaneously with this development se-passives in which the per-agent is not the deep subject, as in ex. 67, vanished from the language, thus making de- and per-agents equivalent as in the classical ser-passive. The latter change is already implied by innovation 50 since it eliminates the deep structures necessary to generate sentences of the type of ex. 67. The former is simply the result of a slight generalization of t63 to allow for a choice of de or per in the agent phrase,
so that it will be applicable to the second derivational stage in the de column of table 65, a change which may be related to Kiparsky's "feeding order" generalization.

Thus G²', the innovated grammar of the medieval period, consists of the grammar in 64, the innovation in 50 and the generalization in t63 mentioned above. It generates reflexive passives of the types:

\[ NP_1 \text{ se verb} \{ \text{de} \} \{ \text{per} \} \text{ NP}_2 \]

in which de and per are equivalent. Clearly G²' is in no sense an optimal grammar, either in respect of the ser-passive or the se-passive.

It has already been postulated that the grammar of the classical period, G₃, consists in part of the categorial rules in 47 followed by t48 and t49. In order to derive the se-passive one need only add a version of t63 generalized to include both de and per:

70. classical se-passive

\[ \Delta \text{ Aux V NP}_2 \{ \text{de} \} \{ \text{per} \} \{ \text{NP}_3 \} \]

\[ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \]
\[ 4 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \]
\[ \text{pro} \]

G₃ will then consist of

71. classical

base:

rules 47
classical agent-postposing, t48
classical NP-preposing, t49
classical se-passive, t70
The grammar in 71 will give derivations of the types:

72. classical

\[ \text{base: } \quad \text{NP}_1 \lor \text{NP}_2 \begin{cases} \text{de} \\ \text{per} \end{cases} \Delta \]

\[ \text{t48: } \quad \Delta \lor \text{NP}_2 \begin{cases} \text{de} \\ \text{per} \end{cases} \text{NP}_1 \]

\[ \text{t49: } \quad \text{NP}_2 \lor \begin{cases} \text{de} \\ \text{per} \end{cases} \text{NP}_1 \]

\[ \text{t70: } \quad \text{NP}_2 \lor \text{NP}_2 \begin{cases} \text{de} \\ \text{per} \end{cases} \text{NP}_1 \]

or

Consider as a typical example the derivation of the sentence

Clar/III-70 a Ilha das Maias ... nunca se verá de ninguém
Maia Island ... will never be seen by any one

The derivation is:

\[ \text{base: } \quad \text{ninguém nunca ver a Ilha das Maias de } \Delta \quad \lor \text{fut} \]

\[ \text{t48: } \quad \Delta \text{ nunca ver a Ilha das Maias de ninguém } \lor \text{fut} \]

\[ \text{t70: } \quad \text{a Ilha das Maias nunca ver a Ilha das Maias de ninguém } \lor \text{fut} \quad \lor \text{pro} \]

which, after reflex, agree and so on gives

\[ \text{a Ilha das Maias nunca se verá de ninguém} \]

as required.

4.2.2 after 1550

As was noted in section 4.2.1 there was always a small number of cases in which the verb did not agree with the deep subject although it was not until the
second part of the classical period that such sentences became grammatical. Simultaneously intransitive verbs began to appear in the se-construction. These two properties alone represent a rather radical departure from the se-passive since the former suggests that the deep object should no longer be moved into subject position (if it were the verb would agree with it) and the latter shows that an object is no longer even necessarily present in the deep structure. Thus classical se-passive, t70, could not have any connection with the new construction. These considerations do not, however, show anything about the relationship of agent postposing to the non-agreeing construction. Thus, although such forms as

\[ *\text{vê-se as ilhas pelas marinheiros} \]
\[ \text{(the islands are seen by the sailors)} \]

\[ *\text{navega-se os mares dos focas} \]
\[ \text{(the seas are navigated by the seals)} \]

\[ *\text{foi-se}^\{\text{pela} \text{ da}\} \text{ rainha} \]
\[ \text{(there was a going}^\{\text{by} \text{ of}\} \text{ the Queen)} \]

are imaginable and could be easily generated they simply do not occur and in fact seem completely wild. Thus, agent postposing, t48, also has no connection with the new construction.

In Portuguese the passive is marked either by a
process of agentization or by a process of object fronting or both. Formally, as has just been seen, the new se-construction does not involve either part of the passive. Correspondingly the new construction is no longer felt to be a passive but simply an active with an indefinite subject, as in the modern se-impersonal. Thus the acceptance of the non-agreeing form into the language does not represent a modification of the se-passive but rather the introduction of an entirely new rule into the grammar.

It is difficult to determine if the new construction differed in any way from the modern se-impersonal discussed in section 1.2.3 (chapter 1) since the critical examples are not of the type which one would expect to occur frequently in texts. In particular I have been unable to find data of the type given on pp. 10-14 for the modern case which force a decision as to which indefinite or what type of indefinite occurs in the deep structure. The data on reflexivization and occurrence with passives given for the modern case on pages 22 and 24, respectively, are also unavailable to me at this time. However, in reading the texts of the period one is not struck by odd sounding se-impersonals and indeed the old construction seems to occur in exactly the same way and with exactly the same meaning as the modern one. Thus it seems reasonable
to assume that the old rule was of the same form as the modern one, namely:

73. **classical se-impersonal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ind</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>se 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where Ind is one of the indefinites, perhaps a *gente* as in the modern case or the archaic *homen*, which is similar to modern French *on*. This case would seem to be one in which the innovation is identical to the change.

As was noted in chapter 1, a rule of the type of t73 leads to the generation of *se*-impersonals with pronominal objects, not all of which are acceptable. In fact, no pronominal direct object may occur with *se* in the archaic language, as was shown in section 4.2.2. However, just as in the modern case, pronominal indirect objects are allowed:

**Lus/9-6**

O dano, sem razão, que se lhe ordena, pela maligna gente Sarracena

The harm, without reason, which is prepared for them by the evil Sarracens

**Vieira/29-6-65**

Não se me tira da memória as muitas vezes que...36

One cannot rip from my memory the many time that...

Thus the surface conditions for the archaic language are exactly the same as the system under "written" on p. 28.
notes:

1. It should be mentioned that there is some confusion in the texts between *per* and *por* (not to mention the extra confusion added by modern editors, who seem to feel called upon to change that which the centuries have preserved). In general it is plain that in the vast majority of cases the "means" preposition is *per*, not *por*. In fact, it is not at all clear to me that the confusion is linguistic; that is, it might be a performance feature (of scribes or printers). Or again, there might have been a vowel reduction rule which made the two sound alike in unstressed position. Here are two examples of the confusion:

   Fuero/IV-660   ...que tenha que a perdeo *per* furto ou *por* outra cousa qualquer

   Vita/75r       Quarenta se fazem d Ḟatro vezes dez .
                   *por* quatro se entende onouo testamento que he de Ḟatro euangelhos . *per* dez se entende otestamento antijgo porque se contem em dez mandamentos.

2. (Ali, 64), p. 215

3. (Epifânio, 59), p. 152

4. (Huber, 33), p. 236

5. (Epifânio, 59), p. 153

6. This principle was established in (Chomsky, 57), p. 35.

The argument is based on the fact that constituents and only constituents can conjoin:

   eu - falei - com Maria
   eu - falei - com João
   eu falei com Maria e com João
but not:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\circ\text{ rapaz conhece a - moça} \quad \circ\text{ rapaz conhece e filósofo ama a moça} \\
&\circ\text{ filósofo ama a - moça}
\end{align*}
\]

The reason the second conjunction is not allowed is that \textit{rapaz conhece a} and \textit{filósofo ama a} are not constituents.

Chomsky then went on to note that only like constituents can conjoin, that is, one has

\[
\begin{align*}
&\circ\text{ filósofo - caiu - no Leblon} \\
&\text{the philosopher fell in Leblon}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\circ\text{ filósofo - caiu - no chão} \\
&\text{the philosopher fell on the floor}
\end{align*}
\]

but not

\[
\begin{align*}
&\times\text{ o filósofo caiu no Leblon e no chão.}
\end{align*}
\]

The latter sequence is not allowed since \textit{no Leblon} is an adverb of place while \textit{no chão} is an adverb of direction. Thus, they are not like constituents.

7. \textit{pollos} is the contraction of \textit{por} with the article \textit{os}.

The \textit{Boosco} was published about one hundred years after it was written and therefore shows a relatively higher percentage of \textit{por} over \textit{per}. \textit{santso} is an obvious misprint for \textit{santos}.

8. (Chomsky, 65) p. 96
9. (Chomsky, 65) p. 102
11. (Baião, 32) p. lvi
12. (Braga, 53) p. xxxi
13. (Baião, 32) p. xlvii
14. (Bell, 22) p. 192
15. (Pimpão, 59) p. 301
16. (Ali, 64) p. 207
17. (Ali, 64) p. 193
18. Mr. E. Wayles Browne III has called to my attention several similar cases, e.g., Middle English a neute (newt, a small salamander) from an eute and Old French orenge (orange, a fruit) by faulty separation from une norenge (cf. Spanish naranja)
19. (Ali, 64) p. 205
20. See (Ali, 64) pp. 176-180
21. See (Lakoff, 65) pp. IV-4 to IV-17
22. (Epifânio, 59) p. 129
23. Or, as a "historical present", as in stage directions
24. In this example "found" is used in a spiritual sense, as when one speaks of sinners as being "lost".
26. I have not formulated this innovation in formal terms because it is not attested in the texts, sentences like ex. 35 being found even in the oldest texts.
27. A comparison of tables 45 and 36 shows that the net result of the postulated change from pre-medieval to medieval is increased applicability of some of the components of the passive, a change which may be related to Kiparsky's "feeding order" observation.
29. (Sousa, 60) p. 264
30. (Epifânio, 59) p. 106
31. (Rodrigues, 13)
32. (Maler, 64) p. 12
33. (Sousa, 60) p. 218
34. (Rodrigues, 13)
35. The deep structure is:

```
S
  NP  Pred-P
    a gente V NP
      poder S
        NP Pred-P
          a gente V NP
tirar as imagens
```

to which *equi-NP deletion* applies to delete the embedded occurrence of a *gente*. This deep structure is necessary in order to account for sentences like the one below in which the pro-*S o* stands for the underlined embedded proposition:

João consegue comer *certos peixes fritos*, embora eu não o consiga.
John manages to eat certain fried fishes, although I can't manage it.

As mentioned in the text, t19 may apply after equi-NP del., with the observation that the proposition behaves like the neuter pronoun under reflex.

There is also a rule of verb-raising which Chomsky-adopts the verb of the embedded S to that of the top S. This gives structures like:

b.

```
S
  \_ NP
    \_ a gente
  \_ Pred-F
    \_ V
      \_ poder
      \_ tirar
    \_ NP
      \_ as imagens
          \_ S
```

Such structures are necessary to account for the deletion of both verbs in certain cases:
João escreve espanhol melhor do que eu russo
John writes Spanish better than I do Russian

parallel to

João consegue escrever espanhol melhor do que eu russo
John manages to write Spanish better than I do Russian,

as well as for rules of clitic placement:

i. não poder visitá-los
   not to be able to visit them

ii. não podê-los visitar
    not to be able to visit them

iii. não os poder visitar
     not to be able to visit them

The first case, in which the pronoun is enclitic to the verb of its own proposition, is derived from structure a. However, if verb-raising has applied the pronoun can be enclitic to the auxiliary (ii) or proclitic to it (iii), depending on the usual conditions.

Notice that if verb-raising has applied, t19 can then apply to structure b to derive ex. 58.

36. apud (Rodrigues, 13) p. 179
Appendix

A2.1 Active voice per-agents

acabar
fazendo per outrem o que de acabar per mý entonçes era embargado (Virtuosa/2)

achar
per ti achamos folgança de todos nossos males (Lenda/41-7)

acusar
nô possam acusar outrî per si nê per outrî (Fuero/158-1012)

alimpar
atees q venha aqîle q laue as almas & as alimpe p ospû sctô (Vita/63b)

alumear
assi alumeou o infante Josaphate pello Santo Espirito (Lenda/15-18)

Sam joham nem os sanctos nom sam luz &feitiua & que per sy allumee (Vita/59c)

ameaçar
quando o ameaçou Deus pelo profeta (Bíblia/296)

Onde o Senhor Deus ameaça pello propheta Ysayas (Orto/327-27)

aprazar
ou aprazeo per sinal que lly pare ou per carta do alcalde ou per seu omô conoçudo (Fuero/72-725)

aprender
aquelas cousas que eu aprendi per mî meesmo (Greg/4-27)

Moyses no deserto polo angeo aprendeu aquelas cousas que depois amostrou aos filhos d'Israel e nô per homê (Greg/8-25)

arreferir
e nostro Senhor arreferia pelo Ango todos os bôas (Bíblia/170)

aviir
Esta coyta ... me aueeo em huã ora p aqîla besta (Dem/32r)

ja p uos nom auera tam fremossa auent-a (Dem/68r)
batizar & asy paulo baptizou poucos p sy (Vita/88c)
(&restaua aly & bauptizaua) p seus discipolos
(Vita/88c)
coitar nô p ti quero coytar mînha morte (Dem/15r)
comer E ia az ora o astroso / Mui doante mui
noioso / E cómendo p ssy caga (CCB/413-14)
comprar pero se molher for que uenda e que compare
per si (Fuero/126-1561)
conhecer jamais coração mortal nom as podera conhecer
se pîsto santo spû nom he (Dem/56r)
per ti conhecemos o Nosso Senhor Deus
(Lenda/41-6)
crecer e creceu muy aginha o moço per Deus (Bíblia/183)
crer epors créées p mí que nô ey ûdeusô bêrfazer
(CV/186-10)
per ty creo ê hûû Deus todopoderoso (Orto/231-10)
dar Deus deu a nos victoria per Jhesu Christo
(Orto/80-26)
e per si meesmo de o juyzo e nô per outro
(Fuero/75-805)
defender e glorificawa muito Nosso Senhor Deus
que defendia a sua verdade pello inmigo
da verdade (Lenda/28-17)
Nosso Senhor que queria defender a nossa
parte pellos seus contrairos (Lenda/27-21)
demandar e demandou-lhe conselho per Abyatar
Sacerdote (Bíblia/223)
mandamos que nenhuu escomungado nô possa
per sy nô per outô demandar nenhûa cousa
en juyzo (Fuero/70-636)
derribar o diaboo prouou de o derribar da sancta
vida que fazia per molher (Orto/308-15)
dizer Desta consolaaçaom diz osenhor per nahû
propheta (Vita/79b)
Onde diz nosso senhor Jêsu Cristo per
Moyses (Virgeu/55-174)
onde ella mesma diz per Salamã (Orto/40-16)

embargar e quando virom que elles per sy nom podiam embargar (Biblia/356)

embrazar Se o alcalde per querella dalgua ome embrazar outro, quer per si quer per carta ou per sello ou per seu home conoquido (Fuero/58-237)

ensinar e ensinou pollas suas santas escrituras: & pollos sants homeês (Boosco/oxi)

entregar E sse algua cousa entregar ou penhorar per sy ou per seu madao torneo tudo dobrado (Fuero/40-437)

enviar e enviou outrossy Rey Dario os vasos do templo a Jerusalem per Zoroabel (Biblia/358)

Entam lh enviou diz p douos caualeiros (Dem/35v)

escrever e escreuas as palavras que disserê pello scriuã da uilla (Fuero/66-500)

espedir-se ata que se espeça de seu senor quer per sy quer per outrã madaeyro filho dalgo (Fuero/110-995)

falar onde diz Salamã ãno Cantar do Amor, falando pello Spiritu Sancto (Orto/21-18)

segundo falou per Helyas profeta (Biblia/297)

fazer E esto nom faz elle senam per sy mesmno (Vita/59d)

cb nom fez elle saluo ho múdo per messegeyro mays elle soo fez saluo ho seu pobllo (Boosco/lxxxiii)

ficar Per deo senhor poys per uos nó ficou / de mi fazer bê eficou per mi (CV/154-1)

nom ficou per mõ (Dem/71v)

honrar os santos & nobres homeês & onrrarõ per sy mesmos ho hermo (Boosco/lxi)
ir
se tu per ty meesmo nom fores ante nós, nom nos tyres deste logar (Bíblia/118)
Ca assi como ocorpo uay pelo homē hu quer (Aves/v)
levar
per si meesmo leva os livros sanctos em que estudava (Greg/24-8)
livrar
ha graça de ds per jhū xpo te liurara (Boosco/11)
mendar
mandou-lhe muitas dōas pelo seu filho (Bíblia/236)
mover-se
que se nō podia mouer senō per outrem (Orto/347-9)
nembrar-se
aqlles ő per ella se nōbram e pēsam ő ha groria ő am dauer (Boosco/lxv)
obra
nem se obrares per ti meesmo (Ciceram/9-17)
o padre todallas cousas obrou per oseu vnigenito filho (Vita/8c)
passar
p mī núca tall cousa passou (Dem/88r)
pensar
ora jmːamom pensa ő ty meesmo (Boosco/1xxx)
perder
ő pdi ő ella meus ffilhos (Dem/42v)
pois perdeu o ffilho per aquel que recebera (Greg/51-21)
o leedor engenhoso perde per ssy meesmo e per sua negligencia a sabedoria (Orto/49-16)
perecer
todals verças do seu orto pereciā per aqueles bestos que o comiam (Greg/49-8)
e os seus gaados pereciam per serpentes (Bíblia/340)
prender
pndér desonrra p huū caualeiro soo (Dem/27r)
prometer
Esta consolāçōes promete ds per ysayas (Vita/79c)
provar
segundo de my aprêderê & prouarêm per sy meesmo (Boasco/xiii)

quebrantar
os de Cartago quebrantassem a ffe per o cruel Aníbal

remiar
cia per ty de remijo omùdo (Vita/16c)

reynar
e os Reys per el reynâ (Fuero/34-251)

saber
E quâdo ujrô ã nô podiam p ssy saber rren chamarô morgaym (Dem/98r)

 Como soubera nouas de sa vî pada p huû seu ompanheiro (Dem/67r)

aquel laurador ... soube per aqueles que o conhociâ quê era (Greg/32-14)

sair
Como o speritu maa ao sayá d'úã homê demoniado per Sê Ffortunado (Greg/51-1)

satisfazer
& se ohomê p sy nô pode satisfazer por os pecados (Vita/68c)

seguir
nen seguir o alçamento per si ou per seus persoeysros (Fuero/78-898)

ser
nom som nobres per sy nê per sua geeragom (Boasco/11)

 asy fo y liure pella bêstã Uirgê da morte do corpo e da alma (Orto/296-10)

speratar-se
spouse pîto cauallo de lionel (Dem/60v)

tornar-se
E se peruentura per mädeyero se quiser tornar uassalo (Fuero/110-984)

ver
Besto ueras p ti ë esta demanda (Dem/14r)

vingar-se
& cujdaau se ende uingar p ssi (Dem/39v)

 se eu a deo mal mereci ben se uinga per uos en mi (CV/132-5)
vir e dano user a alguma das partes per el, peyteo todo (Fuero/42-505)
E conhece q todo vem p ds (Vita/54Ab)

A2.2 De-agents

Pere/I-61 & náo duvidão cometer cousas que de sy saõ arduas & difficultosas
Pere/IV-138 o repouso que o tempo & o estado em q estavamos de sy nos davão
Ciceram/33-29 E o primeiro he a natureza humanal que de ssi meesma tal companhia requere

A2.3 Se-passives with de-agents

Pere/VI-98 aquelle Senhor que com verdade se deve conhecer de todos por senhor
Pere/III-12 pelo qual de todos se julgou q devia isto...
Pere/V-127 as brallas dos seus pagodes se frequentarão de penitentes
Clar/II-238 fama, quanta se nunca alcançou de ninguem
Clar/III-70 a Ilha das Maias ... nunca se verá de ninguem
Vita/13c odiad sua nacencia no soo se festeja & honrra dos xitaos, mas dos mouros & doutros
Preste/lxxiiij & que isto se fizera por servir a deos & honrar as festas, & asi por de hos panos nã danarem & comerem de bicho

A2.4 Se-passives with per-agents

Bíblia/70 Como Josep se conheceu pelos irmãaos
Orto/68-24 aquel deus por que se fezerõ aquellas treeuas

Fuero/89-288 e nõ se possa desfazer pellos mays poucos a partiçõ

Fuero/124-1464 ueera se a demanda se pode iuygar per ele o nõ

Fuero/47-675 ca nõ e razõ que nenhun preyto se razõe per muitos uozeyros

Fuero/29-73 come sacrificio de nostro senhur ihesu christo que se faz subello altar pello sacerdote

Greg/41-11 o acoreçameto do liagõ d'Abraõo se avia de fazer per Isaac

Greg/6-6 d'uuõ homẽ muito onrrado per que se regia a vila de Roma

Dem/21r Eel disse õ a honrra do seu linhagem nõ se pderia p elle

Ciceram/154-18 Mas quando se faz algũa cousa pellos meos officios

Vita/14c Onde xpo cõçebido foy na .vj. ydade . porõ per elle se auiã de acabar todas as cousas

Vita/17a porõ asaude do linhagem humanal aua de se fazer per jesu

Vita/81d cree-se empero p algũuõ que era sam johã euãgelista

Vita/37d E esto se tem comunmente per os doutores

Lenda/29-22 E o santo saçerdote entendeo que aquelo se fazia per Deos

Joãol/393 a primeira cousa que se fallou per Micer Ambrosio

Joãol/326 se fizeram roubos e malles per hũs naturaes de hũ Regnno ao outro
JoãoI/395  os lugares que estavam no cabo dos
Regnos podyamse pesuir e perescrever
per tall pesoa

JoãoI/408  salvo se se por elles torvase a paaz

Marco/xiij  e aynda pellos jograes e nigromantes se
fazem grandes joguos e solazes ante ho
rey

Preste/xxxix  Esta igreja he como anexa da grâde de
Aguarumo, & seruese pellos coneguos della

Clar/III-277  e dentro no ventre traz uma espada ... e
não se pode de ali alcançar senão per vós

Clar/III-273  Tanto que a Ilha Perfeita se ganhar por
um cavaleiro

Theo/85  muitas prisões, que cada dia se fazião
pelo sancto officio

Theo/31  & pedindo ao dito Dom Nuno por sua carta,
quizasse em pessoa na forma do Concilio
examinarse pellos examinadores synodaes

Theo/30  por ver que se gastauão os fructos da
igreja per pessoas que a não serviuão
actualmente

Theo/48  para o que se tinha feita diligencia pellos
Curas das igrejas

Pere/III-95  se fundou esta cidade & se povou este
emperio Chim por este príncipe filho da
Nanca

Pere/I-7  & se determinou por todos que ...

Pere/VI-143  & fazendose assento do voto de cada hú
per Baltesar Ribeiro escrivão da alfandega

Pere/IV-140  com grandes assentos que se fizeraõ sobre
isco por esrivaõs publicos

Pere/III-61  pena daçoutes de q logo se fez nelles
execução pelos ministros do braço da ira
João III/64-9 consentiu que de novo se visse a antiga delineação por fidalgos, honrados e matemáticos d'ambas as coroas

João III/127-21 Assinaram-se estas condições por el-rey e D. Luís e o governador Xarafo

A2.5 **Ser**-passives with de-agents

**Vita/82b** pőrã milhor & mais perfeitaamẽte poderessem delle seer enseignados

**Orto/335-38** hũũ monge dũũ mosteyro era desprezado do abbade

**Orto/178-18** carreyras ... que som trilhadas dos homẽes

**Virgeu/56-214** son-lhes outorgadas do fisico as cousas que cobiçam

**Virgeu/95-903** reprehender o seu amigo e del ser reprehendido

**Greg/20-25** quando foy cõvidado do rey

for more examples see the standard references

A2.6 **Ser**-passives with per-agents

**Vita/65a** por tal que seendo elle julgado per sy nom seja julgado per deus

**Vita/69c** amjinha vida ... se com dilligência he per mim scoldrinhada

**Orto/152-2** o homẽ pella vista dos olhos he roubado

**Greg/1-5** ca este livro foy feito pelo nobre San Gregorio

for more examples see the standard references
Chapter Three
Conclusions

5.1 Received Doctrines

5.1.1 Philological Explanations

Of all the examples of linguistic change discussed in the last chapter the only one which was noticed by the philologists was the appearance of the se-impersonal (V. section 4.4.2, chapter 2), a construction whose existence they were more interested in disproving than explaining. This negative attitude led them to view the construction as a deplorable error which was the result of arbitrariness, aided by the circumstance that the deep object often remained in post-verbal position. Their explanation for the appearance of singular verbs with plural deep objects in the se-construction is exactly parallel to that given for ex. 56 on pp. 97-98:

...quando o sujeito do plural vem depois do predicado: tende este a ficar no singular como se, empregando primeiro o predicado, a pessoa que fala o deixasse no singular por ainda não ter pensado em que número vai dizer o respectivo sujeito ... Ora, entre as construções em que o sujeito vem posposto ao predicado, as mais comuns são as de verbo na voz passiva sob a forma reflexa: daí o encontrarem-se alguns exemplos de verbo no singular e sujeito no plural.
...when the plural subject comes after the verb the latter tends to remain singular as if, having used the predicate first, the speaker left it in the singular since he had not yet thought about the number of the subject. Now, amongst the constructions in which the subject is post-posed to the verb the most common one is the reflexive passive. Thus it is that one can find a few examples of a singular verb with a plural subject in this case.

There are several things wrong with an explanation of this type, not the least of which is that there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the actual performance description of parole will be left-to-right generation. In other words, even for individual acts of parole, there is no reason to assume that first one chooses the verb, utters it and only then chooses the subject. The only possible validity for explanations of this type is in left-to-right translation when it is quite literally true that one does not know what the subject is until one reaches it.

However, even if the hypothesis of left-to-right generation is accepted, still the idea that verbs do not agree with following subjects is patently false since in ordinary Portuguese sentences in the active voice this order is found quite frequently with no consequent lack of agreement. For example, "long" subjects almost always follow the verb, as in:
The girls whom I met last year in the city of Gladbach-Rheydt are here.

There is almost never any mistake in agreement in such sentences. The final proof of the matter lies, of course, in the comparison of the frequency of mistakes in agreement in all types of constructions in which the surface subject is post-posed to the verb with the frequency of occurrence of the *se*-impersonal. There is no reason to doubt that the former will turn out to be many times smaller than the latter.

Moreover, arbitrariness can offer no explanation of two further crucial facts: the use of intransitive verbs and the lack of agentization in the *se*-impersonal. Thus, if the appearance of the non-agreeing case were really simply the result of a degeneration of the agreeing case one would expect to find examples of the type

\[
\text{escreve-se histórias pelos poetas}
\]

(there was a writing of stories by poets),

derived by arbitrariness from the corresponding agreeing *se*-construction. Such examples are not found.\(^2\) Notice also that there simply is no *se*-passive source for sentences of the type *foi-se*, one went, so that they could not possibly be derived by arbitrariness.
Thus the arbitrariness derivation is not only based on an unacceptable theory (left-to-right generation); even accepting this theory there are still three reasons for rejecting the derivation anyway. This ought to bury once and for all the idea that the \textit{se}-impersonal is merely an erroneous form of the \textit{se}-passive.

5.1.2 Structural Explanations

Although the structuralists never discussed any of the historical facts of the last chapter, their explanation for these facts would quite evidently have to be "analogic change" since they had no other appropriate mechanisms of syntactic change. Bloomfield, after noting that "our" descriptive technique in syntax has been retarded by "philosophical habits of approach", gives the following example, which he apparently regarded as defining analogic change in syntax:\textsuperscript{3}

> From the sixteenth century on, we find English subordinate clauses introduced by the word \textit{like}. We can picture the innovation in this way:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{to do better than } & \quad \text{to do better than } \\
\text{Judith} & \quad \text{Judith did} \\
\text{to do like Judith} & \quad x \\
\text{where the outcome is the construction } & \quad \text{to do like Judith did.}
\end{align*}
\]
Sources of analogy for the changes discussed above are relatively easy to find. For the lack of agreement the obvious source is an opposition of the type in exs. 58 and 59 of chapter 2:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pode-se tirar as imagens} & : \quad \text{pode-se tirar as imagens} \\
\text{tiram-se as imagens} & : \quad x
\end{align*}
\]

where the outcome would be the non-agreeing se-construction, i.e., \textit{tira-se as imagens}.

Unlike arbitrariness, analogic change can even take care of the occurrence of intransitives in the se-construction:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{algum vê a ilha} & : \quad \text{vê-se a ilha} \\
\text{somebody sees the island} & \quad \text{the island is seen} \\
\text{algum vai aos astros} & : \quad x \\
\text{somebody goes to the stars} & \quad \text{x}
\end{align*}
\]

where \(x\) would be \textit{vai-se aos astros}, as required.

However, analogic change also predicts agent-phrases in the non-agreeing construction, even with intransitives:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{o marinheiro viu a ilha} & : \quad \text{viu-se a ilha \{pelo\} marinheiro} \\
\text{the sailor saw the island} & \quad \text{the island was seen by the sailor} \\
\text{o marinheiro foi \à ilha} & : \quad x \\
\text{the sailor went to the island} & \quad \text{x}
\end{align*}
\]
where \( x \) would be *foi-se à ilha \( \{\text{pelo} \over \text{do}\} \text{ marinheiro} \), which
never occurs. In fact, it is generally true of analogic
change that it predicts many changes which never occur.
For example,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{as palavras foram escritas} & : \text{as palavras foram escritas} \\
\text{pelo escrivão} & : \text{do escrivão} \\
\text{the words were written by} & : \text{the words were written by} \\
\text{the scribe} & : \text{the scribe}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{o juiz escreveu as palavras} : x \]
\[\text{pelo escrivão} \]
\[\text{the judge wrote the words} \]
\[\text{through} \ (\text{the agency of}) \]
\[\text{the scribe} \]

where the result should be *\( x \) \text{ o juiz escreveu as palavras} \]
\[\text{do escrivão} \] (with agent meaning). Many similar examples
are easily imaginable.

Analogic change also fails in the opposite way,
that is, not only does it predict changes which never
occur, it is also powerless to explain some of those
which do occur. For example, it fails in the case of
any syntactic change which does not involve a change
in surface form. The changes in the *ser*-passive from
the pre-medieval to the medieval period and from the
medieval to the classical period are exactly such cases.
Thus it seems that analogic change does not explain in
any way the diachronic facts of Chapter 2.

5.1.3 Insertion

In previous diachronic generative studies, mostly
in the fields of phonology and morphology, it has become apparent that insertion and dropping of rules is one of the principal types of syntactic change. The introduction of the se-impersonal seems to be a typical example of insertion. As has been seen above, the se-impersonal cannot in formal terms be viewed as the modification of some construction previously extant in the grammar but must be described as the addition of t73 of chapter 2 to the grammar. The addition of rules to the grammar seems to be a fairly common phenomenon which occurs both globally, resulting in a change in language, and individually, resulting in a change in idiolect.

The changes which occurred in the ser-passive at the close of the medieval period cannot, however, be satisfactorily accounted for in this way. If insertion-deletion is the only mechanism allowed at least the following statements would have to be made:

1. in the expansion of Pred-P in the base "per-agent" is deleted
2. in the expansion of VP in the base "per-regime" is added in brackets
3. in the expansion of VP "(de Δ)" is replaced by "({per de} Δ)"
iv. in t431 *de* is replaced by \{per\}

v. in t63 *per* is replaced by \{de\}

Notice, however, that this description of the facts is entirely unacceptable since it gives no explanation of why i-v, which are intuitively related, occurred at the same time, that is, it misses the generalization that each of i-v is part of the same change. This would remain true even if iii-v could be combined under the heading of replacement of *per* or *de* by \{per\} \{de\} since i and ii would not be covered. In any case, there are other uses of both *per* and *de* in which this change did not occur.

5.1.4 Feeding Order

In a paper cited earlier Kiparsky has examined several types of phonological change and has shown that insertion and deletion of rules does not lead to an understanding of the data considered. He argues that re-ordering of rules must be admitted as a possible phonological change and postulates that the direction of the re-ordering is given by the following principle:

1. **feeding order principle**:5 rules tend to shift into the order which allows their fullest utilization in the grammar.
Although the changes in the ser-passive do not involve re-ordering, a modified version of 1 is applicable. Consider in this connection table 65 (p. 109), which gives a summary of the derivations of the medieval grammar, 63. In this period agent-copying applied only to de and se-passive applied only to per, while NP-dropping and NP-preposing were applicable to both per and de. In effect, part of the change to the classical period was the extension of the first two transformations to apply to both prepositions (V. t47 (p. 93), t70 (p. 114)), thus allowing a "fuller utilization" of the rules by providing more input for them. This accounts for iv and v directly and implies iii since the latter change was necessary in order to make iv effective. However, principle 1 can in no way account for i and ii, the change of the per-agent into a verbal regime, and thus fails in the same way as insertion-deletion, although not quite as badly since it does at least group together iii-v.

6.1 Re-analysis

6.1.1 The Se-impersonal

It has been argued above that none of the recognized mechanisms of change are adequate to
understand the change in the *ser*-passive from the medieval to the classical language. Notice also that although insertion-deletion is descriptively adequate for the introduction of the *se*-impersonal, it offers no explanation for the change and no insight as to why the change occurred at the time it did, nor in the way it did (lack of agent, etc.).

It seems to me, however, that this change can be understood when considered from the point of view of the language learner. Recall that the philologists had observed that during the late medieval and early classical periods there arose a tendency for the deep object to remain in post-verbal position. Thus, while in the early medieval period *se*-passives are often of the form "NP₂ *se* V (per NP₁)" in the later periods they tend to be of the form "V-*se* NP₂ (per NP₁)" where NP₂ is the deep object. Thus a typical example of a *se*-passive (without agent) in the later period would be:

2. Vita/88a & porem *se* lee este euçelho na festa da trindade and therefore one reads this Gospel on the Feast of the Trinity

Such examples have exactly the same surface form as an ordinary active sentence. For example, if
ex. 2 had an expressed subject, it would take the form:

3. & porem *opadre* leem este eu*ágelho*
na festa da *trijndade*
and therefore the priest reads
this Gospel on the Feast of the Trinity

Since ex. 2 differs from ex. 3 only in that *se* occupies
the position of the subject in ex. 2, it would be
possible for the language learner to mistake ex. 2
for an active construction. Note also that the tend-
ency for *se*-passives with lack of agreement to appear
as spontaneous errors in the earlier language (exs. 54
and 55) would fit in perfectly with this conclusion
since in these cases the learner would have no reason
at all to conclude that the deep object was the sur-
face subject.

Thus, a language learner in the early classical
period, given the data observed, would quite naturally
postulate the existence of the *se*-impersonal. The net
result is that while the surface form of the *se-
construction remains more or less unchanged (in *langue*)
its structure changes from that of the *se*-passive to
that of the *se*-impersonal. This type of change, in
which the surface structure of a form remains fixed
while its analysis changes has recently been discussed
by Kiparsky under the name re-analysis and he has postulated that it is one of the basic types of allowable change.

Notice that the re-analysis of the se-passive as an active would be blocked if an agent-phrase were present since it would then be obvious that there had indeed been a subject-object switch. This accounts for the absence of an agent-phrase in the non-agreeing construction. Notice also that this blocking means that only se-passives with deleted deep subject are eligible for re-analysis as actives. According to the universal deletion conditions, the deletion could occur only if the deep subject were an indefinite since there is no other NP in the sentence to which the deep subject is in general identical. These observations explain all the facts of the se-impersonal which are known to me at this time. None of other mechanisms of change have this much power.

The form of change implied by the above considerations is a re-analysis caused by factors of parole. It is only by consideration of the facts of the actual output of the previous generation that the direction, timing and type of the re-analysis can be understood.
6.1.2 The Ser-passive

It has already been noted in inn 13 (p. 65) that in the late medieval period there was a marked decrease in the frequency of occurrence of active per-agents not identical to the deep subject and it was shown how this led to the re-analysis of the per-agent as a verbal regime. This in turn implies the disappearance of the adjectival pseudo-passive since adjectival participles do not occur with verbal regimes. This same innovation, extended to the passive voice, explains the re-analysis of the per-phrase as the passive agent (implying the disappearance of conjoined agents of the type of ex. 41, p. 87) since it requires the agent-phrase to be the deep subject, that is, it makes the agent-phrase completely equivalent to a passive agent-phrase (v. p. 92).

The changes in the reflexive passive at the close of the medieval period are also a consequence of this innovation. In the medieval period the surface form

4. \( \text{NP}_1 \text{ se } V \text{ per } \text{NP}_2 \)

was derived by se-passive with no process of agentization, that is to say, the NP in the agent-phrase in ex. 4 could either be identical to the deep subject (as in ex. 69, chapter 2) or different from it
(as in ex. 67, chapter 2). The innovation eliminates the latter possibility so that ex. 4 becomes a passive in the sense that the deep subject and object are interchanged in the surface form. Then the learners of the next, that is the classical, generation will conclude that there is a process of agentization involved in the surface form in ex. 4 in the same way as they would for the ser-passive. However, the only other construction in the language which involved agentization was the ser-passive, which allowed de-agents in addition to per-agents. Since there was no evidence to the contrary the learners identified the two processes of agentization and thus extended the de-agents to the ser-passive.

Thus, the re-analysis mechanism not only satisfactorily accounts for each of the changes but, since they all follow from the same performance factor, it also explains why they are intuitively parts of the same change. Since it has already been shown that, even frequency aside, the innovation (in the form of inn 50) cannot be stated within the medieval grammar, it follows that either the fact that i-v are a single change must go unexpressed or the idea that change arises solely internal to the innovating grammar must be given
up.

Although performance based re-analysis is quite different from the received philological and structural doctrines, it is not entirely without precedent in traditional grammar. Writing in 1913 J. M. Rodrigues, who has been cited above as one of the early defenders (or, more accurately, "accepters") of the se-impersonal, explained the construction's unpopularity by stating:8

...elas não são, por assim dizer, um produto primário da língua, mas resultam de um processo mental um pouco longo. Foi preciso que o pronome reflexo se passasse a partícula apassivativa e que depois a oração assim tornada passiva se considerasse transposta para a activa, ficando o se a servir de sujeito indeterminado.

...it is not, so to speak, a primary product of the language but is the result of a rather drawn-out mental process. It was necessary for the reflexive pronoun to become a passivizing particle and that the sentence thus made passive be considered active, se then serving as an indefinite subject.

The notion of performance-based re-analysis also underlies many other types of historical explanations. Notice that although before the re-analysis of the per- phrases, per was a preposition with its own lexical meaning and relatively free privilege of occurrence, after the re-analysis it became an essentially meaningless grammatical marker with restricted occurrence9, namely, in the two passives. This sort of process, i.e.,10

...le passage d'un mot autonome au rôle d'élément grammatical
has been called "grammaticalization" by Meillet, who viewed it, together with analogy, as the only types of linguistic change. Meillet had in mind such examples as the negative pas or the future tense in French and viewed grammaticalization as a sort of linguistic degeneracy brought about by constant repetition: 10

La constitution de formes grammaticales par dégradation progressive des mots jadis autonomes est rendue possible par les procédés ... qui consistent ... en un affaiblissement de la prononciation, de la signification concrète des mots et des groupes de mots.

At first glance the grammaticalization of per seems to be quite different from what Meillet envisaged since it was not brought about by repetition or phonological weakening of any sort. None the less, the two cases are really quite similar: a change in performance causes a re-analysis, as a result of which a previously autonomous word becomes a grammatical marker. In the case of the future tense in French, for example, the performance factors which Meillet cites led to the re-analysis of an autonomous verb as a conjugational ending, resulting in its grammaticalization. Thus the essential difference between the case of per and what Meillet had in mind is the performance cause of the re-analysis. In fact, grammaticalization can be viewed as a special case of re-analysis.
1. (Sousa, 60) pp. 218-219

2. The only (apparent) exception to this general rule is:

   Asia/Dec 3  ...se nota pelos mercantes, que
   as descobrem, os perigos do mar.

   (apud (Rodrigues, 13) p. 176) However, since this example is from the Asia (V. section 2.1.2) it should probably be viewed as just one more indication of the unreliability of this text.

3. (Bloomfield, 33) p. 407

4. See (Kiparsky, 67)

5. (Kiparsky, 67) p. 33

6. In lectures in course 23.756T (second term, 67-68) at MIT

7. I have not considered here the question of whether the deep subject of the se-impersonal is necessarily [human] and [group-int] as in the modern case since the data are not available at this time.

8. (Rodrigues, 13) pp. 184-185

9. Only the "agency" meaning of per is considered here.

10. (Meillet, 38) p. 131

11. (Meillet, 38) p. 139
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