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SUMMARY

The precise nature of the distinction between ser and estar in various constructions in Portuguese has long been a matter of dispute, though not so much has been written about it as has been written about the ser/estar distinction in Spanish, with which at times, it has been identified. Apart from the descriptive importance of the ser/estar distinction (its importance, that is, for the description of Portuguese), it is also of considerable theoretical interest, since similar distinctions are said to be lexicalized or grammaticalized in many languages.

As far as child-language acquisition is concerned the ser/estar distinction is once again of both descriptive and theoretical interest. It is a distinction which any child learning Portuguese comes to master as he comes to master the rest of the grammatical system. There have been many descriptive, longitudinal, studies of the way in which children learn the grammatical structure of their native language. So far there has been no work of this kind reported for Brazilian (or European) Portuguese. The theoretical importance of the ser/estar distinction, for language-acquisition studies, resides in the fact that, whatever its precise significance, it is clearly related to the notion of aspect, which, as has been argued recently, is cognitively more basic than, and ontogenetically prior to, tense.

The dissertation consists of two parts. Part I is devoted to the presentation and analysis of data from the adult language; Part II summarizes the development in children's acquisition of the ser/estar distinction, in so far as this is manifest in the recorded utterances of two Brazilian children, Luciano (recorded from age
1:6 to age 2:3) and Fernando (recorded from age 1:9 to age 2:4).

Part I opens with a chapter in which the scope of the work is delimited and justified, in particular, its concentration upon locative constructions as being of crucial importance to an understanding of the phenomenon.

Chapter 2 of Part I is devoted to a detailed study of locative constructions. Particular attention is given to the notion of the movability vs. non-movability of the referent of the subject-expression in a locative predication. As far as movables are concerned (cf. 2.1), the principal factor determining the selection of ser/or estar is shown to be, not the permanence vs. transitoriness of the location (as it is traditionally said to be), but normative vs. actual location. As for immovables (cf. 2.2), it is shown that, contrary to what is commonly said to be the case, both estar and ser are possible, and an explanation is provided in terms of location in relation to a deictic reference. This is criterial for the selection of estar with immovables is the observability, or presence in the immediate perceptual field, of the located entity; and this explanation is extended in a discussion of locative-demonstratives (cf. 2.4) and, more briefly, of existential constructions (cf. 2.5).

Chapter 3 of Part I contains a brief summary of the main theoretical and descriptive findings.

Part II is shorter than Part I and presents many of the findings on the basis of the discussion of theoretical points in Part I.

Chapter 1 of Part II gives an account of the data and deals with various methodological questions.

Chapter 2 deals with data from Luciano's speech in terms of three stages, going from the mastery of attention-drawing devices
and a basic two-term aspectual distinction of actuality (which is the source both of the definite article/demonstrative and estar), through the development of the distinction of prospective and retrospective, within non-actual, to the development of the generic use of the simple present.

Chapter 3 deals with data from Fernando, whose aspectual system at the earliest stage is identifiable in general with that of Luciano at the end of Stage 2. The main difference between the two developmental sequences is that Fernando has a non-generic use of the simple present.
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AIM OF THIS STUDY

The aims of this work are:

(1) to assign a semantic interpretation for the opposition between *ser* and *estar* in locative sentences in Brazilian Portuguese;

(2) to verify to what extent this interpretation can lead to the establishment of a general principle underlying the different types of occurrences of *ser* and *estar* both as copulas, with adjectival, nominal and locative complements, and as auxiliaries in the formation of the passive voice and of the progressive forms;

(3) to verify how this general principle can be related to the semantic category of aspect in the different ways in which it is manifest in Brazilian Portuguese;

(4) to relate our hypothesis about *ser* and *estar* and their aspectual nature to the emergence of *ser* and *estar* forms and of aspectual markers in the longitudinal data provided by two Brazilian children.

Given the aims of the work, it will be presented in two parts. Part I will comprise a study of the phenomenon of copula-differentiation in locative sentences and its relationships with other types of copulatives, as well as with the auxiliary functions of *ser* and *estar*. The second part will consist of the presentation and analysis of the order of emergence of *ser* and *estar*, and of tense forms in general, in the corpus of the two Brazilian children who have been recorded for the purposes of this study.
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I - On the selection of the copula in locative sentences and its implications for the study of the semantic category of aspect in Brazilian Portuguese
1.0 Introduction

1.0.1 Justification of the scope of the work

The use of *ser* and *estar* is common to different subsets of the so-called copulative sentences in Portuguese, i.e., to attributive sentences, locative sentences, and also to a subtype of possessive sentences. Moreover, the fact of both *ser* and *estar* acting as auxiliaries in the passive voice and of *estar* followed by the gerund forming the progressive tenses of the Portuguese verb, seem to indicate that this phenomenon is far more important than it has generally been considered. If one adds to the facts just mentioned that of the relationship between possessive and existential sentences, which are expressed with *ter* ('have') in Brazilian Portuguese and with *ter* and *haver*, respectively, in European Portuguese, and the auxiliary functions of these verbs in compound tenses, it becomes clear that the search for a general principle of explanation for the different occurrence-types of *ser*, *estar*, *ter* e *haver* is crucial for the understanding of the verbal categories of aspect and time in Portuguese.

Since it would be impossible to cover, within a single work, the different areas of the predication of Portuguese where *ser* and *estar* are present, the aim of this study is to explain copular selection by taking as basic the way it operates in locative sentences. There seem to be many points which justify this approach. First of all, the presence of an underlying locative as an explanatory hypothesis for the close relationship that holds among locative, possessive and existential sentences in so many languages, as
it was put forward by many linguists (cf. Lyons, 1968 and his references), seems to hold also for Portuguese as mentioned above. Furthermore, in many languages not only attributive sentences but also the progressive forms present strong similarities, with locative sentences, as was pointed out by Anderson (1973) as evidence for his localist interpretation of attributive sentences and of the category of aspect (cf. also Anderson, 1971; Miller, 1974; Jessen, 1973).

Secondly, data on the acquisition of many languages show that locative expressions precede not only the acquisition of attributive structures, but also possessive structures (cf. Brown, 1973) and, in the particular case of Brazilian Portuguese, which will be presented in the second part of this work, locative structures with estar precede immediately the first occurrences of progressive forms, and attributive sentences with estar make their appearance only after the emergence of estar with past participle, i.e., of resultative constructions.

In the third place, the cognitive priority of locative sentences with respect to other types of copulatives seems to have a historical support in Iberian Romance, where the Latin verbs stāre, sedēre, ficticāre or figicāre (frequentative form of figēre)ire, venīre, among other verbs of stationary location and movement seem to have developed copulative and auxiliary functions quite early (cf. Bouzet, 1953 and Spaulding, 1926). Bouzet, in his study of the development of estar in Spanish, points out that, from the XII to the XV century those which represent different grades or aspects of
stationary location within that group of verbs in Iberian Romance – ser, estar, seer (from Lat. sedere), remanir, restar (cf. French rester), quedar, fincar or ficar seem to have undergone a process of specialization of meaning. Estar and seer, according to that author, invade the semantic domain of ser (from esse), as is documented in the literature of the period.

'Mio Cid don Rodrigo en Valencia esta folgando.' (Mio Cid don Rodrigo is enjoying himself in Valencia)
(Poema del Mio Cid, 1234)

'De aquel rrey Yucef que en Marruecos esta.' (Of that king Yucef who is in Maroc.)
(Idem, 1622)

'Ca quiso a su padre obediente estar.' (Because he wanted to be obedient to his father.)
(Libro de Apolonio, 162d)
(Apud Bouzet, 1953: 45 and 50)

It is worth quoting Bouzet's words about the process illustrated by the above examples: '...Merced a estar y seer se va introduciendo el aspecto durativo, primero en el proceso de la acción, luego en la situación de los objetos, y, finalmente, en la noción de estado y en el resultado de la acción.' (Bouzet, 1953: 44)

As will be exemplified later, verbs of movement such as andar ('walk'), ir ('go'), vir ('come') and a verb of stationary location - ficar ('stay', 'remain') also represent, in Portuguese, alternatives to estar in the progressive form and in attributive sentences.

This fact, together with those which have been pointed out already and others which we shall present later, would seem to justify our view that the phenomenon of copula-differentiation in Portuguese and its relationships with the
aspectual functions of estar can be at least partially explained by the way it is manifested in locative sentences.

1.0.2 The extension of the phenomenon in Romance languages

Though this investigation has as its object the study of ser and estar in Brazilian Portuguese, it will be worthwhile considering briefly the extension and diversity of this phenomenon in the Romance languages.

According to their behaviour relatively to copulative sentences and to verbal auxiliaries, it is possible to distinguish three groups of Romance languages. The first one, represented by French, comprises those where only one verb is used with copulative functions in attributive, locative and a subset of possessive sentences, as well as being the auxiliary for the passive and the past tense of a subset of verbs.1

In the second group of languages, represented by Italian and Rumanian, stare is in opposition to the copula derived from esse in some types of sentences, though the phenomenon does not cover the whole range of copulatives. In Italian essere is the only copula used in attributive sentences, but this is not so in locative sentences, where stare also appears. So sentences such as:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Sandro è a casa.  
  \item Sandro sta a casa. (Sandro is at home.)
\end{itemize}

and:

1. However, it should be pointed out that, in the formation of the 'être' paradigm, basically from esse, stare had a suppletive role, which, in Iberian Romance, was performed by sedere.
Il libro è sul tavolo.  
Il libro sta sul tavolo. (The book is on the table.)

are acceptable, their selection being considered by some native speakers as a matter of stylistic or dialectal variation.¹

As far as the auxiliary functions are concerned, essere is used in the formation of the passive and of the past tense of a subset of verbs, and stare constitutes with the gerund the progressive form. It is also worth noticing that stare, as in French, had a suppletive role in the formation of the paradigm of essere.

According to Copceag & Scudero (1964), a process similar to that which occurred in medieval Iberian Romance seems to be taking place in Rumanian at the present time. That is, the Rumanian representative form of the Latin stare - 'a sta' - is being used to replace 'a fi' (from the Perfectum of Latin esse) in attributive sentences with a locative adverbial modifier. Some of the examples presented by the authors are the following:

Fata era veselă (past tense of 'a fi').  
(The girl was happy.)

Fata stațea veselă in prag (past tense of 'a sta').  
(The girl was happy at the door.)

Ion e bolnav (present tense of 'a fi').  
(John is ill.)

Ion staț bolnav in pat (present tense of 'a sta').  
(John is/lies ill in his bed.)

(Apud Copceag & Scudero, 1964: 344-345)

Also mentioned by the authors is the use of 'a sta' in attributive sentences without locative adverbials, such as:

¹. This seems to be an aspect of Italian which has not been studied, as far as I could gather from the bibliographies consulted.
De ce est trist?
(Why are you sad?)
De ce stai trist?

According to these authors, the fact of 'a sta' occurring as an alternative to 'a fi' in this kind of sentences could be considered a stylistic device to emphasize the static or inert position which characterizes some negative emotional states, or the existence of an implicit locative adverbial, since 'a sta' is also an alternative to 'a fi' in locative and attributive sentences with durational adverbs, as the following sentences show:

Am fost la teatru (past tense of 'a fi).
(I have been in the theatre.)
Am stau doua ore la teatru (past tense of 'a sta').
(I have been in the theatre for two hours.)
Am fost amețit.
(I have been sick.)
Am stau amețit citiva minute.
(I have been sick for some minutes.)


Also mentioned by Copceag & Scudero is the use of 'a sta' with negative past participles in Rumanian in constructions which could be called negative short passives. Examples of this construction are:

Casa stă nelocuită.
(The house is not inhabited.)
Mincarea stă neantisă.
(The food is untouched.)
Fata stă nemaritată.
(The girl is not married.)

(Apud Copceag & Scudero, 1964: 347)

According to the authors, those sentences are expressions of abnormal situations which cannot be seen as lasting, i.e., whose duration is limited. Based on this interpretation and on the requirements for the use of 'a sta'
in the other types of sentences mentioned above, i.e., the co-occurrence of a locative or temporal (durational) adverbial modifier, Copceag & Scudero conclude that 'a sta' in Rumanian is optional in expressions of relations viewed by the speaker as projected in space or in time.

The Iberian Romance languages - Spanish, Catalan and Portuguese - constitute the third group in this attempt at classification based on copula-differentiation, since the three languages present a wide range of uses of ser and estar, both in their copulative functions and as auxiliaries.

Since it has not been possible so far, for us to get enough data from Catalan, we will try to list in the following item the main occurrence-types of ser and estar in Spanish and in Portuguese.

1.0.3 Ser and Estar in Spanish and in Portuguese

Many authors among those who have studied the phenomenon of copula-differentiation in Spanish have emphasized the importance of this feature in Spanish and have claimed that it operates to a lesser extent in Portuguese. This statement, which to us seems untenable, could perhaps be explained by the fact of Portuguese having been so far a practically unexplored language. As will be demonstrated below, the main dissimilarities of the two languages in this respect lie in the expression of spatial location, since there seems to be far more restrictions on the use of estar in Portuguese than in Spanish. This is illustrated by examples such as:
Those sentences seem to demonstrate that *estar* occurs in all types of spatial locatives in Spanish, while Portuguese presents *ser* to express location of immovables. Portuguese seems to reflect the situation found in Spanish locative sentences up to the XVI century, when, according to Bouzet, *ser* was used '...in localizationes de objetos que excluyen toda posibilidade de mudanza.' (Bouzet, 1953:46).

However, it is not the case, as most grammarians have said it is, that only *estar* may be employed in locative sentences in Spanish. Not only *ser* alternates with *estar* in expressions like *es lejos/está lejos* ('it is far'), but also sentences such as:

```
Donde *es* el Teatro Bolivar?
(Where *is* the Teatro Bolivar?)

Allí *es* la casa que buscas.
(There is the house you are looking for.)
```

in contrast to:

```
Allí *está* el libro que buscas.
(There is the book you are looking for.)
```

(Apud Bolinger 1947: 366)

are acceptable and seem to be indicative of the existence of more complex rules governing the selection of *ser* or *estar* in locatives.
As for the location of events in space and in time, both languages have *ser* as a copula, as the following examples illustrate:

(Sp.) La fiesta fue en el club.
(P.) *A festa foi* no clube.
(The party was in the club.)

(Sp.) La huelga *será* mañana.
(P.) *A greve vai ser* amanhã.
(The strike will be tomorrow.)

*Ser* is also the copula used in the so-called impersonal expressions of time, both in Portuguese and in Spanish.

(Sp.) Es viernes.
(P.) *E* sexta-feira.
(It is Friday.)

(Sp.) Son las ocho y un cuarto.
(P.) *São* oito e um quarto.
(It is a quarter past eight.)

Both languages also admit personal constructions with the subject in the first person plural and *estar* as a copula which are semantically equivalent to the ones above.¹

(Sp.) *Estamos en* viernes.
(P.) *Já estamos* na sexta-feira.
(We are already in Friday.) (lit. tr.)

(Sp.) *Estamos en* Noviembre.
(P.) *Estamos* em Novembro.
(We are in November.) (lit. tr.)

Impersonal constructions with *estar* occur in both languages in some types of statements about the weather, but although Portuguese can have either a noun or an adjective following the copula, Spanish presents obligatorily a noun.

(Sp.) *Está calor/*caliente.
(P.) *Está* calor/quente.
(It is hot.)

¹ One does not find this construction-type in expressions referring to intervals of 'public' time smaller than a day.
As for possessive expressions or constructions, Portuguese and Spanish, like many other languages, present two types: one with the verb corresponding to English 'have' - tener in Spanish and ter in Portuguese -, which can be characterized by the fact of having the possessor in subject position and of the possessed object being an indefinite noun phrase in object position. The second type, in which the possessed object comes to subject position and is a definite noun phrase, presents ser as its copula followed by the preposition de. The sentences below are illustrative of this:

(Sp.) Juan tiene un libro.
(P.) João tem um livro.
(John has a book.)

(Sp.) El libro es de Juán.
(P.) O livro é de João.
(The book is John's.)

These two types of possessive sentences have been traditionally considered as expressions of permanent possession, temporary possession or availability being usually associated with the presence of a definite noun phrase in object position in sentences with tener or ter.

(Sp.) El libro lo tiene Juán.
(P.) João tem o livro.
(John has the book.)

It is interesting to notice that in Brazilian Portuguese one has constructions which are semantically equivalent to these, built up with estar, which are not fully acceptable in European Portuguese and do not seem to occur in Spanish.

(B.P.) O livro está com João/João está com o livro.
(The book is with John/John is with the book)
Among the copulative sentences, those which have been mainly studied by Spanish grammarians are the so-called attributive. Both in Portuguese and in Spanish the presence of a noun in predicative position is considered as a condition of the selection of *ser*. However, to the following examples with *ser*:

(Sp.) Juan es abogado.
(P.) João é advogado.
  (John is a lawyer.)

(Sp.) El león es un animal.
(P.) O leão é um animal.
  (The lion is an animal.)

(Sp.) Maria es aquella señora.
(P.) Maria é aquela senhora.
  (Mary is that lady.)

one can oppose:

(Sp.) Juan está un hombre.
(P.) João está um homem.
  (John has become/is a man.)

(Sp.) Maria está una señora.
(P.) Maria está uma senhora.
  (Maria has become/is a lady.)

which are acceptable in contexts which allow for considering *man* or *lady* as stages in a developmental process.

As for attributive sentences with an adjectival predicative, the selection of *ser* and *estar* has been traditionally considered as dependent on the character of permanency or inherence vs. temporariness or contingency, assigned to the state or quality predicated of the subject. Thus, sentences such as:

(Sp.) Maria es guapa.
(P.) Maria é bonita.
  (Mary is pretty.)

are said to differ semantically from:

(Sp.) Maria está guapa.
(P.) Maria está bonita.
  (Mary is looking pretty.)
by the fact of the latter being a statement about the girl's actual physical appearance, while the former expresses it as the girl's inherent feature or permanent quality. Since it would be hardly possible to apply that interpretation to sentences such as:

(Sp.) Mario es rico.
(P.) Mario é rico.
(Mario is rich.)

(Sp.) Mario es jóven.
(P.) Mario é jovem.
(Mario is young.)

since youth and wealth are not qualities which can be assigned permanently to a person, this principle was rejected by most of the authors which have produced specific works on the subject. Since their alternative proposals and the various types of counter-examples they have presented will be reviewed subsequently, there is no need to go further on this point for the moment.

About the functions of ser and estar as auxiliaries in the formation of the so-called analytic passive in Portuguese and in Spanish it has been said that the passive with ser focuses the action, while the passive with estar expresses the state resulting from the action.

(Sp.) La casa ha sido abandonada (por sus habitantes).
(P.) A casa foi abandonada (por seus habitantes).
(The house was abandoned (by its inhabitants).)

(Sp.) La casa está abandonada.
(P.) A casa está abandonada.
(The house is in a state of abandonment)

As was pointed out before, estar also functions in both languages as the auxiliary of the progressive form, which is the only occurrence-type where it is not in opposition with ser. It is worth noticing, relatively to the
progressive form, the fact of European Portuguese having developed the use of the infinitive form preceded by the preposition a ('at') to replace the gerund in that compound tense.

(Sp.) Maria está cantando.
(B.P.) Maria está cantando.
(E.P.) Maria está a cantar.
(Mary is singing.)

It remains to be said that the substantive or existential use of *ser* did not survive in Spanish and in Portuguese other than in some stereotyped formulas such as:

(Sp.) Era una vez una princesa...
(P.) Era uma vez uma princesa...
(Once upon a time there was a princess...)

and in literary uses. Existential statements equivalent to 'there to be' in English present impersonal *haber* in Spanish, *haver* in European Portuguese and formal Brazilian Portuguese, and *ter* in Standard Brazilian Portuguese.

(Sp.) Hay leones en África.
(E.P. & B.P.) Há leões na África.
(B.P.) Tem leões na África.

At this point, it is necessary to make clear that the facts just presented are far from representing a full account of the phenomenon of copula-differentiation and its relationships to other grammatical features of Spanish and Portuguese. We would like it to be considered as a mere listing of the main types of occurrences of *ser* and *estar* in both languages, leading to the conclusion that the main general dissimilarity

1. It is worth mentioning the non-occurrence of *ser* without predicatives in the meaning of 'to exist'. The translation of Descartes' axiom demonstrates it: 'Penso, portanto existo.' And not: 'Penso, portanto, sou.'
between them lies in expressions of spatial location. Obviously, there must be other differences which would become explicit in a contrastive analysis of Spanish and Portuguese. Since this is not the aim of our work, which has as its object Brazilian Portuguese, more data on Spanish will appear almost exclusively in the following section, which consists of a critical survey of the literature on the selection of the copula in Spanish and in Portuguese.

1.1 Review of the literature

1.1.1 The traditional grammars' approach to ser and estar in Spanish

The number of studies devoted to ser and estar in Spanish is extremely large by comparison with the paucity of the works dealing with the same topic in Portuguese and even with the number of works that treat of other aspects of Spanish grammar. That is the reason why, though it is our aim to deal with the use of ser and estar in Portuguese, this review includes works on this topic relative to Spanish.

We will first of all recapitulate the different accounts of the use of ser and estar provided by traditional grammars of Spanish, starting from the Gramática de la Real Academia, and covering the works of Bello, Salvá, Hanssen, Gili Gaya, García de Diego, Bouzet and Alonso-Ureña. Apart from Bello's grammar and from the Gramática de la Real Academia, our view of those authors will be based on the review of them as presented by Navas Ruiz in his book on 'Ser y Estar' (1963).
The Gramática de la Real Academia, whose first edition dates from the beginning of the nineteenth century,\(^1\) is most representative of the traditional view on \textit{ser} and \textit{estar} in Spanish. It distinguishes three uses of \textit{ser}:

i. a predicative use with the meaning of 'exist' and 'take place', which corresponds to what we have called locations of events (or second-order entities) in space and in time (cf. 1.0.3).

ii. an attributive use, when the attribute is denoted by a noun, a determinative adjective, a possessive noun, a noun preceded by \textit{de} or an adjective. With an adjective, \textit{ser} is used only to assign a quality conceived as permanent or inherent, and \textit{estar} is used to express a transitory or accidental quality or condition.

iii. a secondary attributive use with the past participle (considered as an attribute) to form the passive voice. \textit{Estar} with past participle denotes the state or disposition consecutive to the action expressed by the participle.

Since the Gramática de la Real Academia's approach to the problem consists of a set of informal rules, contradicted by the counter-examples presented above (apart from those which refer to the obligatory use of \textit{ser} with possessive pronouns and what is referred to as determinative adjectives, i.e., demonstrative pronouns, in possessive and equative sentences, respectively), there is no general principle to be discussed or criticized. However, it is

\(^1\) The text used by us is the 1931 edition (cf. Bibliography).
worth noticing its view on the relationship between the aspectual meaning of the passive with *ser* and that of *estar*, i.e., that the imperfective tenses of *estar* with past participle correspond to the perfective tenses of *ser* in the passive. Thus,

La casa *está* edificada.
(The house is built) (resultative reading)

does not entail:

La casa *es* edificada.
(The house is being built.)

but:

La casa *ha sido* edificada.
(The house has been built.)

As for Bello's grammar,¹ the originality of its contribution to the study of *ser* and *estar* lies in the classification of verbs in 'desinentes' and 'permanentes', which seemed to have been the basis for later proposals about the use of *ser* and *estar* in Spanish (cf. Bull, 1949, which will be subsequently discussed and Bull, 1963, on systemic properties of events.). Desinent verbs, according to Bello, are those which denote actions which are cyclic, i.e., whose completion (or perfection) coincides with their termination, e.g., *levantarse*, ('get up'). Permanent verbs, then, are those which express non-cyclic events, such as *ser*, *ver* ('see'), *oír*, ('hear'). (cf. Bello, 1918: 625).²

---

1. André Bello's Gramática Castellana was first published in Chile in the first half of the nineteenth century. The text consulted by us was the 19th edition, published in Paris, in 1918. (cf. Bibliography).

2. Bello's view on those verbs of perception as denoting events can be justified by the fact of those verbs co-occurring normally with the progressive in Spanish (as well as in Portuguese).
Despite his interesting proposal concerning the aspectual characteristics of events, Bello did not relate it to the copula selection in Spanish, which is explained by him as representing the opposition between essential and accidental states or qualities, that is a sort of philosophical equivalent to the 'Gramática de la Real Academia's notion of permanent vs. transitory states. As for the use of *ser* and *estar* with past participles, i.e., in passive constructions, he also makes a statement similar to the one presented by that traditional grammar: the participle expresses an action which is simultaneous to the time referred to by the auxiliary in the passive with *ser*, while it expresses an action which is previous to the consequent state expressed by the auxiliary in the passive with *estar*.

Salvá, according to Navas Ruiz, is the first grammarian to point out the fact of *estar* being used not only to express temporary states, but also permanent ones. He presents as an alternative view that of the copula-differentiation in Spanish attributive sentences being based on the opposition state vs. quality, from which he deduces the following rules:

a) *ser* is used to express possession, destination, origin, substance and existence, as in:

   - Este vino es de Canarias.  
     (This wine is from the Canary Islands.)
   - La rosa es para Mariquita.  
     (The rose is for Mariquita.)

Esta copa es de oro.  
(This goblet is (made) of gold.)

Mañana serán las exequias.  
(The funeral will be tomorrow.)

(Apud Navas Ruiz, 1963: 119)

b) **estar** is used to express the situation or state of an entity: with an infinitive preceded by a preposition; with a gerund; and in attributive sentences, it can be replaced by **hallarse** (cf. French **se trouver**).

Salamanca está junto al Tormes.  
(Salamanca is by the Tormes.)

Mi criado está para salir.  
(My servant is about to leave.)

Dios está sufriendo nuestras faltas.  
(God is suffering (paying for?) our faults.)

Juán está/hallase enfermo.  
(John is/finds himself in a state of/ill/illness.)

(Apud Navas Ruiz, 1963; 119)

According to Navas Ruiz, though some of these rules seem to account for some uses of **ser** and **estar** in Spanish, the state vs. quality opposition proposed by Salvá is easily contradicted by the fact of physical states, such as illnesses, being expressed by **ser** and **estar**. The examples presented by Navas Ruiz are:

Juán está tuberculoso.  
(John got consumption/is ill with consumption.)

Juán es tuberculoso.  
(John is a man which is ill with consumption.)

It is however worth noticing that, contrary to the oddness of the rules Salvá proposed for **ser** - by which notions like possession and destination are looked at as qualities - those formulated for **estar** are quite insightful. He seems to have related through them the basic locative meaning of **estar** to a possible localist interpretation of **estar** plus
gerund (i.e. the progressive form) and **estar** plus adjective. In this respect his proposal that **hallarse** is synonymous with **estar** in attributive sentences is particularly significant.

Hanssen, though primarily assigning to **ser** the expression of inherent or characteristic qualities, as opposed to **estar**, which expresses acquired or accidental ones, in attributive sentences, is thought to have shed a new light on the problem of copula-selection in Spanish by having related the aspectual opposition imperfectivity vs. perfectivity assigned to the passive forms with **ser** and **estar** to the use of these verbs in copulative sentences.

Thus, according to Hanssen, **estar** sentences, both with past participle and with adjectives, would express perfective states and **ser** sentences imperfective ones. It is not very clear from Navas Ruiz' account of Hanssen's ideas whether he meant by 'perfective state' a state resulting from the completion of a process or one which results from the completion of the initiative phase of a process.

Gili Gaya is considered by Navas Ruiz mainly as a follower of Hanssen's ideas on **ser** and **estar** of which he seems to have given a subtler interpretation by emphasizing the meaning of 'devenir' entailed by **estar**. Furthermore, he has linked his view that **estar** expresses a quality of state resulting from a process to the necessity of the


speaker experiencing or perceiving the change undergone by the entity referred to by the subject. According to Navas Ruiz, the inchoative interpretation Gili Gaya gives to estar, is contradicted by sentences such as:

La fruta está verde.
(This fruit is green/unripe.)

which rather expresses the absence of a process. He also points out the inadequacy of the view that estar is used to express perceived states or qualities, to which sentences such as:

El paisage es maravilloso.
(The landscape is beautiful.)

are counter-examples, since it can be uttered in contexts of appreciating a view or a landscape. In my opinion, this criticism represents a misinterpretation of Hanssen's ideas. The pragmatic condition Hanssen proposes for estar-utterances is better interpretable as the necessity of the speaker having experienced at least two successive stages or states of an entity. It is this that is involved in the notion of change that Gili Gaya thought was conveyed by estar. We will turn later to the opposition conceptual vs. perceptual (or experiential) when dealing with the pragmatic presuppositions of estar-utterances in Portuguese.

One should also mention Gili Gaya's point that the opposition between ser and estar is weakened and, sometimes, almost neutralized, when they co-occur with perfect tenses. Most treatments of the subject have been based on their use in the simple present.

As far as general works on Spanish syntax are concerned, among those of Keniston, Bouzet, Garcia de Diego and
Alonso-Ureña, according to Navas Ruiz, only the last one seems to have brought new insights to bear on the problem. Keniston\(^1\) is well known for the exhaustive list of examples he presents and Bouzet's grammar\(^2\) is said to provide a list of 'practical rules' for the selection of the copula, directed to French students. He is also the author of a historical treatment of *estar*, whose main lines have been already presented (cf. 1.0.1).

Alonso-Ureña\(^3\), though having proposed an interpretation similar to Hansen's, have given some relevance to the inceptive meaning of *estar* with adjectival predicatives: 'estar no significa una cualidad que va a pasar, sino que se ha adquirido. No se allude al final sino al principio. *Está gordo* no significa "luego adelgazará", sino "se ha puesto gordo".' (apud Bull, 1942: 435). Thus, they reject the opposition inherent vs. accidental and prefer to look at the selection of the copula with some adjectives as representing the opposition normal vs. abnormal states, which is, according to them, implied by the notion of change. That is, the fact that with *estar* a change of state is expressed implies the existence of a norm relative to that state. (Cf. Bull, 1942 and our discussion of Bull's theory in 1.1.2). According to Navas Ruiz, the concept of normality is too subjective and vague to be taken as an explanation for a syntactic device, besides being contradicted

---

by the use of ser to express states which are considered as abnormal, such as blindness:

- *Él es ciego.*
  (He is blind.)
- *Él está ciego.*
  (He got/is blind.)

In my opinion, Navas Ruiz' counter-examples do not provide a sufficient basis to reject Alonso-Ureña's view, since the notion of normal state in cases such as the one illustrated above, can apply, not to the physical conditions of human beings in general, but to the previous physical conditions of a specific man. In other words, to be blind is a normal state for a man born blind, since the norm in this case is based on a comparison within an individual range, not within the 'species'. There are other grounds in which one can argue against looking at the normal vs. abnormal opposition as a general principle underlying the selection of the copula; and we will return to it later and try to demonstrate that this is one of the derived meanings depending on semantic features of the predicative adjectives in attributive sentences containing ser and estar.

1.1.2 Specific studies of ser and estar in Spanish: the main proposals

Before looking at specific studies of ser and estar in Spanish, it is worth mentioning that the majority of them have been produced for pedagogic purposes and represent attempts to provide an operative principle to be used in the teaching of Spanish as a second language. Many of the authors have mentioned the failure of the permanence vs.
transitoriness opposition in the classroom situation and have directed their search for new rules on the basis of a somewhat informal contrastive analysis. This applies particularly to the innumerable papers on the subject which appeared in American journals during the forties.

This search for new principles does not, however, extend beyond attributive occurrences of ser and estar and their use with the past participle. Few authors mention their use in locatives and the auxiliary function of estar in the progressive. The alternative proposals they offer are, as well, not really different from the views one finds in some of the traditional grammars already discussed, since they converge to the above presented notions of change, norm and experience or perception of a state or quality.

1.1.2.1 Bull's and Bolinger's treatment of ser and estar

Bull's main contributions to the study of the copula selection in Spanish are his accurate criticism of the traditional view of the subject, and his attempt to find an explanatory principle based on the types of adjectives which co-occur with ser and estar.

1. Exceptions to this position were the work of Morley (1925) who includes the principle of inherence vs. non-inherence in one of the rules of a rather long list of rules, and a paper by Moeller (1944) in which he claims that that principle could be maintained but should be given a psychological interpretation, i.e., ser is used to express states 'conceived as inherent' and estar those 'conceived as accidental'.

According to him, the inconsistency of the traditional approach to the subject lies in the conflicting interpretations given to the occurrence of *estar* with adjectives and past participles. That is, if, on one side, *estar* with past participle is said to express a state resulting from the action denoted by the participle, i.e., to a previous process, *estar* with adjectival predicatives is said to express temporary states, or states subject to change under other conditions. Therefore, the interpretation of the former constructions as expressing a change which has already taken place is contradictory to the implication of future change which is involved in the notion of temporariness.

His proposal is, thus, to replace the principle of temporariness or accidentalness by that of *change*, which eliminates the notions of *duration* and *future states*, as was proposed before by Alonso-Ureña.¹

The importance of Bull's paper lies, in my opinion however, more in his attempt to give a systematic account of the restrictions on the co-occurrence of *ser* and *estar* with adjectives and to use it as evidence for his hypothesis. According to him, the adjectives which can co-occur with *ser* and *estar* present different semantic characteristics from those which admit only *ser*. The former group, to which for example belong adjectives such as *limpio-sucio*, *hermoso-feo*, *sano-enfermo* are those which cover, with their antonyms, only one semantic range, those of cleanliness,

beauty and physical conditions, in the case of the examples above. In spite of it, the negation of one does not imply the assertion of the other, as he shows with the sentence 'El cuadro es hermoso', which does imply 'El cuadro no es feo', but in his negative form - 'El cuadro no es hermoso' does not imply 'El cuadro es feo'. (cf. Lyons 1968: 10.4.2 for antonymy and complementarity.) Therefore, according to Bull, those adjectives allow change of concept dealing with the same range, which is not the case when only one adjective, 'by means of the negative or affirmative of the positive, comparative or superlative, measures or qualifies the whole extension of the range...' (Bull 1949: 437).

As examples of the second class, i.e., of those which admit only ser as a copula and do not allow change of concept dealing with the same range, he presents modal adjectives such as preciso, posible, necesario, probable. According to him, in the case of probable, for instance, the zero degree of probability is not expressed by another adjective, but by the negative form improbable, and the maximum degree of probability enters another semantic range — that of certainty. His conclusion is that 'the fundamental differentiation between the use of ser and estar with predicative adjectives is based on the change of concept dealing with the same range'. (Bull 1949: 438).

Many points, however, arise from Bull's classification of adjectives. First of all, it is unclear the way he relates 'change of concept within the same range', which concerns the lexicalization of grades of the same quality, with the notion of change or 'inchoativity' he presents in the
first part of his paper and which is the linguistic reflex of the fact that some states are resultative relative to a previous process. Secondly, many adjectives other than those which are related by antonymy can co-occur with ser and estar in Spanish and a series of examples can be provided by expressions of physical states such as sordo, ciego, etc. As for the second class, his view on modal adjectives covering each a semantic range seems to us to obscure the net of implications through which they are interrelated and to relegate to a secondary level, which, seems to us very important, the fact that they are predicable only of events and not of entities denoted by first-order nominals. In fact, if the use of estar with adjectives like the ones Bull assigns to his first category, implies the notion of change, i.e., an inchoative derivation, and this interpretation can only be assigned to 'entities enduring some time-span' (Lyons 1968: 8.1.10), it seems that the semantic characterization of adjectives is not enough to explain the copula selection. That is, the notion of 'changeability' is dependent both on the possibility of looking at a state or quality as one that is possible to change and on the possibility for the entity of which the state is predicated of undergoing change (or being viewed by the speaker as capable of undergoing change). This does seem to be the case of entities such as those denoted by second-order nominals which have a 'punctual location in time and space' (Lyons 1968: 8.1.10). In some way, Bull came near to this point when, in the same article, he says about sentences like estar pobre (to be poor/to be in a state of poverty): 'Such
statements indicate only one stage in a series of concepts, for the man who has become poor may soon be considered without putting him into relation with his past, and, then, it is said of him that he es pobre (Bull 1942: 441). This point could lead him to the conclusion that ser with adjectives of the first category as well as with those of the second category is used to express states or qualities which are attributed to entities, regardless of whether they are either 'punctually located in time and space' or viewed as 'punctually located in time and space'.

However, instead of it, he took the notion subjectivity, which underlies the consideration of an enduring entity as non-enduring and, in this sense, is opposed to objectivity, or to objective reality, as the basis for the formulation of a derived or secondary rule, which he expresses as follows: 'Ser expresses a first impression or a normal concept; estar a change or deviation from the average or normal concept' (Bull 1942: 441). In spite of Bull having made clear that he was using norm in the sense of norm relative to an individual or an entity's previous states (which again implies the consideration of its duration, conceived as a series of ordered states), not norm relatively to the class it belongs, this semantic opposition is hardly applicable to sentences such as:

'La fruta está verde.
(The fruit is unripe.)

which seems to imply the negative counterpart of the inchoative of its antonym:
La fruta está madura.
(The fruit is ripe.)

that is, to the sentence:

La fruta todavía no ha madurado/todavía no está madura.
(The fruit did not ripen yet/is not ripen yet.)

To interpret this relationship as a deviation from a norm which applies to the whole class of fruits, i.e., that fruits are expected to ripe or to grow ripe, would be equivalent to a shift from the individual range to the class-range, and would, therefore, contradict the author's view on inchoativity as a feature of estar. Furthermore, there seem to be counter-examples for Bull's hypothesis, as we will show subsequently in the discussion of Bolinger's development of Bull's idea.

Bull's view on estar in attributive sentences as expressing objective change or change/deviation from a state conceived as normal was taken up by Bolinger in a paper in defense of Bull's theory against Crespo's attack (cf. 1.1.2.2). In spite of his intentions, Bolinger not only shows in this paper how Bull's hypothesis is not enough to account for some uses of ser, but also introduces modifications which endanger its validity.

First of all, based on sentences such as:

El agua está caliente.
(Apud Bolinger 1947: 363)

he proposes the substitution of the term change from a norm

---

1. The relationship between estar sentences and inchoatives will be further discussed in our review of Roldán's generative approach to copula selection in Spanish (cf. 1.1.2.3) and in the item concerning this problem in Portuguese.

to non-norm, since '...no particular temperature is a norm for water (except in the unusual aspect of water versus ice or steam), but one does have a non-norm.' (Bolinger 1947: 363).

The elimination of the concept of change consequent to Bolinger's revision of Bull's terminology deserves some consideration. First, because it involves the rejection of the basic principle from which Bull derived the notion of norm vs. change from a norm. Secondly, and this is the crucial point concerning the semantic interpretation of ser and estar sentences generally, because this rejection implies the denial of the relationships between estar sentences with inchoatives which holds not only in attributive with estar with adjectives expressing irreversible states but also with estar with past participle. Therefore, if Bolinger's principle of norm vs. non-norm is derived from that of Bull's, which is, on the other side, derived from the notion of inchoativity, the rejection of the latter seems to involve the rejection of the former. Or to indicate that none of them is powerful enough to account for all types of estar occurrences.

Moreover, the sentence presented by Bolinger as a counter-example to Bull's notion of change from a norm, is in itself illustrative of Bull's principle of objective change, since

'El agua está caliente'.
(The water is hot.)

can, in many ordinary contexts, be related to:

El agua se calentó.
(The water was/is heated).
i.e., to an inchoative process.

A second interpretation of the same sentence could also be an example, instead of a counter-example of Bull's principle of change from a norm. This seems to be the case when the change from a norm is considered relatively to previous states experienced by the speaker of the substance as contained or present in a specific place. Thus, in one's second week at the seaside, after swimming in the sea, one can say:

Hoy el agua está caliente.
(The water is hot today.)

In my opinion, both interpretations confirm Bull's theory and only a third one would show its insufficiency, i.e., that which does not imply either an objective change or a change from a norm. This seems to be the case when the speaker has no previous experience of the entity, as, in the context above, in the first day of the holidays, and, in uttering that sentence, is only making an assertion about the 'actual' state or temperature of the water. The fact that adjectives denoting reversible states in attributive sentences with estar are unmarked relatively to an inchoative interpretation is basic for the understanding of the ser/estar opposition, as will be later demonstrated. In fact, the common feature between expressions of irreversible states and of reversible states with estar is that they express an actual state of an entity, or a state obtaining at or around some point of reference, and which is one of the possible states of that entity.

Bolinger seems to have been very close to this inter-
pretation when discussing the following sentence:

'La carne está buena hoy porque este pedazo de carne que compré es bueno.'
(The meat is good today because this piece of meat I bought is good.)

(Apud Bolinger 1947: 363)

He starts by distinguishing the collective use of carne in the first clause, whose reference is 'the meat sold at this store' from its singular reference in the second clause and concludes:

'The está then comes along and cuts a cross-section out of this day to day meat. In other words, when the meat is pictured as a continuing phenomenon and the speaker has, at the back of his mind, something like "The meat sold at that store is generally indifferent (or poor, or variable) as to quality", he may then express today's sale as a non-norm (departure from the norm "poor" or one of the many non-norm variables).'

(Jolinger 1947: 363)

The way Bolinger defines norm, i.e., by allowing it to be different or variable, seems contradictory to his explanation of the use of estar, since any condition of the meat could be considered as fitting the norm, and, therefore, require ser. But his looking at estar as 'cutting a cross-section' out of a 'continuing phenomenon' is indeed the notion which is necessary to account for the presence of ser in the second clause. In fact, the presence of ser in that context should not be regarded as determined by the tendency to treat first impressions as norms, as Bull has said and Bolinger seems to agree with, but by the fact that, in the circumstances specified above, it is not possible for a piece of meat to be experienced
or seen as a 'continuum'.

In my opinion, Bolinger treated the notion of non-norm as more relevant for the selection of the estar than that of expressing the actual state of an entity viewed as a continuing phenomenon, while the reverse should be the case. This view has led him to conclusions or statements such as: '...estar is used in comparison with a given genus: comparisons of a thing with its archetype or with previous or succeeding states of itself' (Bolinger 1947: 365), which are misleading. Indeed, most of the qualifying adjectives he uses as examples belong to Bull's first category and imply a norm, or a comparison within a genus or the archetype, independently of having ser or estar as a copula. Moreover, sentences such as:

Juan es alto para su edad.
Juan está alto para su edad.

(John is tall for his age.)

are illustrative of the fact that assertions on non-norm states can be expressed with either ser or estar, if the violated norm is a norm concerning the class (genus or archetype). What the presence of estar in the second sentence implies is the actual state of John 'in comparison with previous or succeeding states' of himself.

1. Since bueno/buena are adjectives whose content is dependent on the semantic features of the noun they modify, and, which can even undergo a change of meaning according to the copula selected (as we will exemplify later), in the discussion of Bolinger's example we have considered them as denoting, among the possible qualities which can be assigned to 'meat', those which are intrinsic or non-variable, leaving aside, consequently, that of 'freshness' which would allow for the use of estar in the second clause. (cf. Vendler 1967: 7, for 'the grammar of goodness').
From what has so far been discussed, the opposition norm vs. non-norm proposed by Bolinger seems to be better considered as secondary or derived from the aspectual opposition presented above.¹

One last point regarding Bolinger's paper should be mentioned: it represents one of the few exceptions to the rather general neglect of the fact that ser also appears as a copula in Spanish locative sentences (cf. 1.0.3). Based on the acceptability of sentences such as:

Aqui es donde vivo.
(Here is where I live) (lit.tr.)

Aqui es mi casa.
(Here is my house.)

Mi trabajo es aquí.
(My work is here.)

and on the unacceptability of:

"Allí es el libro que buscas.
(The book you are looking for is there.)

in contrast with:

Allí es la casa que buscas.
(The house you are looking for is there.)

Allí está el libro que buscas.
(The book you are looking for is there.)

(Apud Bolinger 1947: 366)

he interprets the presence of ser in these sentences as a 'mere sign of equivalence', due to the fact of locative

¹Bolinger himself, at the end of his paper, points out the difficulty of sustaining the norm vs. non-norm principle with respect to attributive sentences with non-stative or behavioural adjectives, such as cortes (polite), cruel, etc. This point deserves further discussion or a detailed treatment, which will be undertaken, in so far as it is relevant to Portuguese, in the item on attributives.
expressions occurring in both sides of it. He distinguishes, however, the use of *trabajo* as a process from that of *locale* of a process, assigning to *ser* in the first case, the meaning of 'occur' or 'develop'. Therefore, he does not seem to relate this latter type of occurrence to the copula selection in attributive sentences.

1.1.2.2 Other approaches to *ser* and *estar* in Spanish

Among other studies on *ser* and *estar* in Spanish, it is worth discussing those by Andrade (1919), Crespo (1946, 1949) and Fernandez (1963), which have in common the fact of relating the use of *estar* in modern Spanish to its original locative meaning, in spite of the different criteria utilized in the treatment given to the data.

Andrade¹ starts by rejecting the principle of relative duration which underlies the opposition permanent vs. transitory, on the basis of *ser* occurring with adjectives such as *joven* and *enfermo* leading to a definition of permanence as an indefinite ratio between variables. Though his main proposal is that of *estar* being associated with immediate perceptions and its representations and *ser* with concepts and judgements, he also points out the importance of considering *estar* in modern Spanish as retaining its previous locative meaning in the abstract sense of existing in a particular state or condition.

As one kind of evidence for his view that *estar* expresses experienced or immediately perceived states of an

¹. Andrade, M. 'The distinction between *ser* and *estar*' In *Hispania* (Baltimore) II, 1919 (19-23).
entity he points out the fact that, in some types of sentences, the English equivalents of estar are verbs of perception such as 'taste', 'look' and 'feel', as in:

La sopa está buena.
(The soup tastes good.)

María está guapa.
(Maria is looking pretty.)

Él está enfermo.
(He feels ill.)

However, the importance of Andrade's paper lies more in the link which could be established between the two interpretations he gives to the selection of estar. That is, a locative interpretation of estar sentences, which can be more clearly expressed by the periphrasis 'being in a particular state or condition at/around a reference-point in time' implies either its observability or its being conceived as obtaining.

Crespo is the author of two papers on ser and estar. The first1 represents his criticism of Bull's principles (cf. 1.1.2.1) which he proposes to replace by that of estar expressing a state as compared to other states of the same entity or to other entities of the same class.

As we have seen in our review of Bolinger's paper, comparison is implicit in the use of 'polar' adjectives such as those Crespo utilizes as examples for his hypothesis, independent of the copula selected, and since he puts forward a different view in his second paper, we do not need to

go further in criticizing the earlier one.

Crespo's approach to the selection of the copula in the second paper is basically syntactic. Based on some obligatory contexts of *ser*, such as predicative nominals, and on the fact that adjectival predicatives are semantically equivalent to an indefinite NP with an adjective in attributive function, which is illustrated by:

*La nieve es blanca.*
(Snow is white.)

*La nieve es una materia blanca.*
(Snow is a white substance.)

*Carlos es calvo.*
(Charles is bald.)

*Carlos es un hombre calvo.*
(Charles is a bald man.)

Crespo defines *ser* as a 'sign of substantivity'. As for *estar*, since it occurs with locative adverbials, manner adverbials such as *bien* ('well') and in attributive sentences which can be answers to the question 'How is X?' and 'Where is X?', it is, according to him, a 'sign of adverbiality'.

Apart from the counter-examples to his view that *ser* occurs obligatorily with predicative nominals (cf. 1.0.2) and that *estar* is the locative copula in all types of locative sentences (cf. Bolinger's examples in 1.1.2.1), the circularity of his hypothesis seems to obscure the problem he intended to solve. Indeed, instead of *ser* and *estar* being definable by their contexts, it becomes very

---

clear from his paper that their contexts are defined by copula selection, i.e., estar gives to its complement the 'status' of an adverb and ser turns every expression which follows it into a nominal.

Nevertheless, Crespo's paper is one of the few treatments of the phenomenon which brings into the discussion the relationship between attributive and locative sentences and also the use of estar with the gerund in the progressive form, which he considers as an adverbial phrase. It is mainly on this relationship that he bases his semantic interpretation of ser and estar sentences. That is, a ser sentence expresses 'to be something' and estar, 'to be in some manner, state, condition, position or place'.

Fernandez, in his work on estar as the auxiliary of the progressive, relates its original locative meaning to its use in expressions of states or qualities which are seen as changeable or subject to change. According to him, the semantic opposition between the Latin verbs stāre and sedēre as verbs of posture is in a way alive in estar and ser (cf. 1.0 on the suppletive role of sedēre in the formation

1. Similar to Crespo's view is that of Muella (1961) which also assigns to the copula selection the function of defining the predicative, grammatically and semantically. Based mainly on the auxiliary function of ser in the formation of the passive, and on the adjectival function of the past participle in this particular case, he concludes: 'Lo que viene detrás de 'ser' toma categoría gramatical de adjetivo (en sentido lato); lo que viene detrás de 'estar' toma categoría de adverbio (en sentido lato).' (Muella 1961:5). But he does not provide further evidence for this point, most of the paper focusing on the adverbial value of estar predicatives.

of the paradigm of *ser* since '...en el *estar* en pie se halla también en potencia el movimiento que su concepto excluye, mucho más que en la posición inerte de *estar sentado*, expresado por el *sitzen* alemán y el *to sit* inglés y el *sedere* latino de donde procede nuestro verbo *ser*.' (Fernandez 1963: 511).

Also worth mentioning is the way he relates his view of *estar* expressing changeable states to the use of the progressive to express singular acts, in contrast with the simple imperfective forms of the verb which indicate habitual activities. In fact, he goes even as far as to say that *estar* sentences express basic propositions or 'Protokollsätze', as Russell defines them: 'Una proposición básica, dice Bertrand Russell, es una proposición que surge con motivo de una percepción que es la evidencia de su verdad.' (Fernandez 1963: 513).

Apart from the works which deal with copula differentiation within a generative framework and which will be discussed in the following section, there remains to be discussed Navas Ruiz's book on *ser* and *estar*, which represents the most extensive treatment given to their occurrence in attributive sentences. In my opinion, its importance lies mainly in its exhaustive review of the literature on the topic and in the number of counter-examples presented to the explanatory principles and/or practical rules proposed by the authors which have preceded him. However, on

the basis of what he calls a functional criterion, which, according to him, does not allow generalizations based on formal identity outside grammatically identical contexts, he explicitly rejects the possibility of relating the phenomenon of copula selection in attributive sentences, i.e., with adjectival and nominal predicatives, with the functions of ser and estar as auxiliaries of the passive, and of estar in the progressive form, as well as with their occurrence as 'main verbs' in locative sentences.

Based on data extracted from literary texts of the XIXth and XXth century, and on his own counter-examples to other proposals, Navas Ruiz comes to a conclusion which is only partially similar to those put forward by Alonso-Ureña and Bull (cf. 1.1.1 and 1.1.2.1) in that he considers estar as expressing states or qualities not as resultative from a change (or an inchoative process), but as changeable or viewed by the speaker as having the potentiality of undergoing change. In his own words:

'Pero ser... situía los fenomenos en la no-duración y por lo tanto en la immutabilidad: la mutabilidad sólo es concebible dentro de la duración temporal. Por el contrario estar, además de situar lo atribuido en el tiempo verbal presente, pasado o futuro, aporta la idea de duración breve o larga—esto dependerá de lo atribuido—, permanente o transitoria, pero, en definitiva transcurso de tiempo, duración temporal dentro de la cual va implícita la noción de mutabilidad, de cambio.'

(Navas Ruiz 1963:148-9)

In order to provide evidence for his view (other than that represented by his counter-examples to other proposals), he draws up a classification of adjectives according to the 'quality' they denote, such as 'colour', 'physical conditions',
'emotional states', 'moral qualities', etc., each class having some of their members examined for their potentiality of co-occurrence with *ser* and *estar*. Nevertheless, the results of this procedure are rather inconclusive, since Navas Ruiz fails in determining the semantic properties shared by the adjectives or classes of adjectives which show the same behaviour relatively to copula selection. In fact, what he puts forward is a series of 'ad hoc' interpretations of the use of *estar* and *ser* with each class, interpretations which he tries to relate to the principle of changeability in a somehow vague way.

An example of this is his interpretation of the rejection of *estar* by adjectives of a 'marcada naturaleza verbal', as he designates them, such as those in -ible (e.g. *imposible*, *incurable*, *plausible*) as well as in -oso (e.g. *peligroso*, *contagioso*), as consequent to their verbal nature, which makes impossible '...su unión a cualquier otro verbo que no sea el de la mera relación atributiva'. (Navas Ruiz 1963:192). First of all, it is not clear from his discussion what he means by the verbal character of those adjectives. Secondly, he does not

---

1. There seem to be many contexts which allow for the use of *estar* with these adjectives. *Peligroso*, for example, can have *estar* in sentences such as:

   El tráfico está peligroso hoy.
   (The traffic is dangerous today.)

As for *imposible*, Navas Ruiz himself mentions, in another section of his book, the sentence:

   El está imposible.
   (He is/has become impossible).

in which this adjective has a non-stative meaning, that of 'behaving in a way which is impossible to bear, or to control'.
mention in which way their verbal nature is incompatible with the notion of changeability. Apart from this and from the fact that he does not take into account the presence of tense-markers in the data he has examined in spite of his proposal being based on notions such as duration and temporality, the principle of changeability as applied to estar, and the unmarkedness of ser, seems to cover more types of occurrences of these copulas with nominal and adjectival predicatives than the previous ones.

1.1.2.3 Transformational generative approaches to ser and estar in Spanish

We will discuss briefly in this section two different accounts of copula-selection in Spanish within the framework of generative grammar. The first is to be found in Chapter 7 of the book by Stockwell, Bowen and Martin,¹ which is a contrastive study of Spanish and English with the specific purpose of solving some problems in the learning of Spanish by native-speakers of English, through the application of a transformational model (i.e., a 'Syntactic Structures' model) to the description of both languages.

The main points to be stressed in their treatment of the topic arise from the consideration of the two sub-sets of rules which are formulated for the auxiliary constituent of the VP and for ser and estar as constituents of the VP.

Those rules are:

1. \( \text{AUX} \rightarrow \text{ASP} \) (haber + -do) (estar + -ndo)
2. \( \text{ASP} \rightarrow \text{Imperf} \) (Imperf
3. \( \text{Imperf} \rightarrow \text{past} \) (past

(Stockwell, Bowen & Martin 1963:143)

and:

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{AUX} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{ser} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{TM} \\
\text{LOC} \\
\text{PRED}
\end{array} \right. \\
\text{est} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{ADJ} \\
\text{LOC}
\end{array} \right.
\end{array} \right. \\
\text{VP}_1 (\text{ADV})
\]

(Stockwell, Bowen & Martin 1963:169)

They also give a simplified version of the latter, which is:

\[
\text{VP} \rightarrow \text{AUX} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{ser and its dependencies} \\
\text{est and its dependencies} \\
\text{VP}_1 (\text{ADV})
\end{array} \right.
\]

Though the position of the constituent AUX in the latter rule is probably due to the need to account for the fact that ser and estar can both receive tense-inflections in Spanish, the consequences of a rule which assigns those verbs to a node which is not dominated by AUX, but, instead, is a sister-node to it, are:

a) to leave unexplained the presence of estar in (1) above, or to postulate the existence of two unrelated verbs est and est, which makes predictable a form such as *está estando, unacceptable in Spanish (as well as in Portuguese);
b) to assign to \textit{ser} and \textit{está} a dubious status, i.e., on one hand, that of main verbs, which contradicts the author's own statement on their being, in most of the cases, in complementary distribution, as it is clear from:

"Contrasting sentences such as (2) and (12)\textsuperscript{1}...are not contrasts between \textit{ser} and \textit{está}, but between the environments of \textit{ser} and \textit{está} - that is, event nouns vs. non-event nouns as subjects, and adverbs of time vs. adverbs of place. Similarly, \textit{NP}'s can follow \textit{ser}, but not \textit{está}."  

(Stockwell, Bowen & Martin 1963:170)

On the other hand, since they are not dominated by \textit{VP\textsubscript{1}}, this is also not the case, which leads the authors to say that 'the formula places \textit{ser} and \textit{está} in unique categories...'

(op.cit., 169)

Those consequences demonstrate the inadequacy of the rules proposed, which is, in fact, implicit also in their having to appeal to Bull's modified version of the principle of norm vs. change of norm\textsuperscript{2} in order to handle a point which is obscured by their grammar, i.e. that \textit{ADJ} follows both \textit{ser} and \textit{está}, since, according to them, \textit{PRED} can be rewritten as \textit{ADJ} and \textit{NP} (cf. op.cit.: 168). Therefore, the rules are supplemented by additional information on the use of \textit{ser} and \textit{está} with adjectives, the former said to be a classifier of the subject, '...whereas an

\textsuperscript{1} The sentences they refer to are:

(2) La sinfonía \textit{será} mañana.
(The symphony will be tomorrow.)

(12) La sinfonía \textit{está} en la mesa.
(The symphony is on the table.)

\textsuperscript{2} The modified version of Bull's principle they refer to is found in: Bull, W. \textit{A Visual Grammar of Spanish}. Los Angeles: University of California Extension Division, 1961.
adjective after estar is used to comment upon its subject without regard to classification. (op.cit.: 168)

In spite of the fact that some of the generalizations they make on the use of those verbs in Spanish, mainly that concerning the obligatory presence of ser with predicative NP are empirically ill-founded, a positive point in their presentation of the data is the mention of the unclear status of ser and estar relative to locative sentences with subjects referring to immovable entities, due to the divergent opinions of native-speakers on the acceptability of ser in this case.

Roldán's brief paper1 on ser and estar is based on Lakoff's proposal about the relationship between stative and inchoative sentences in English.2 Thus, by considering the way sentences, such as those below, are semantically related,

"10.3.
Juan es viejo.
John is old.

10.4.a.
Juan está viejo.
John is old.

10.4.b.
Juan ha envejecido.
John has aged."

and also:

"10.8.a.
La selva Amazónica todavía está virgen.
The Amazonic (sic) forest is still virgin.

10.8.b.
*La selva Amazónica se ha vuelto virgen.
The Amazon (sic) forest has turned virgin.*

(Roldán 1970:19)


she comes to the conclusion that lexical items such as *viejo* and *envejecer* above should be identified in the grammar, their semantic differences being '...explained as the consequence of two different derivations: the verb has gone through an "inchoative transformation, this transformation failed to apply to the adjective" (op.cit.: 19). This is, indeed, her argument for proposing that *estar* sentences have a potential inchoative derivation (i.e., that they are the sentences from which inchoative sentences are derived) and that, unlike *ser*, which is a mere inflection-holder, *estar* is a full-fledged verb with a semantic content; i.e., that it indicates 'state'.

In my opinion, Roldán's hypothesis is hardly defensible due to the weakness of the arguments on which she tries to found it. In fact, if only *estar* sentences meet the structural conditions for the inchoative transformation to be applied, e.g. *viejo* above, appearing in a *ser* sentence such as 10.3. That is equivalent to saying that it would be necessary to have two lexical items corresponding to this adjective in the lexicon: one, whose relationship with *envejecer* would be accounted for by some feature, and another whose non-inchoative interpretation would be, accordingly, discriminated.

There is, certainly, a semantic relationship between a subset of *estar* sentences and inchoative sentences which should be captured by the grammar, but in such a way as to explain also the presence of *estar* in 10.8.a. above, which Roldán handles by saying that '...a change, a defoliation is expected, the virginity of the Amazon is viewed as an
almost defiled earth...' (op.cit.:19). It would be, however, more consistent with her own proposal to postulate that, from sentences such as 10.8.a there would derive sentences such as:

La selva Amazónica todavía no ha sido devastada.
(The Amazonian forest has not yet been devastated.)

or:

La selva Amazónica todavía no se ha vuelto no-virgen.
(The Amazonian forest has not yet become non-virgin.)

But, if this is so, sentences such as:

Juan está flaco.
(John is thin.)

which are expressions of reversible states, have to be considered as ambiguous between two different inchoative readings:

Juan se ha puesto flaco.
(John has become thin.)

and:

Juan todavía no se ha puesto gordo.
(John has not become fat yet)

which is not the case (cf. our discussion of Bull's first class of adjectives and also our review of Bolinger's paper in 1.1.2.1).

Roldán's view would, then, allow for the estar sentences above to be taken as the underlying structure of an inchoative sentence and its negative counterpart, which shows that:

a) her proposal that a estar sentence is a basis to which an 'inchoative transformation' can be applied needs reformulation in order to explain not only the semantic
differences between statives and inchoatives, but also between expressions of reversible and irreversible states;

b) the fact that *estar* sentences imply, but do not assert, a state as resulting from a process (for this is perhaps what she means by the expression 'potential inchoative derivation') is rather obscured by the ambiguous status given to the notion 'transformation' throughout her paper, in which, for instance, on one hand, statives and inchoatives are said to be related as actives and passives, and on the other hand, the difference in meaning between statives and inchoatives is also mentioned at different points.

1.2 Review of the literature on *ser* and *estar* in Portuguese

If one looks at the studies which have been done on Portuguese, from the earlier philological approaches to the language, through the traditional grammars, to more recent descriptions of the language, it seems that the problem of copula-selection has been left practically untouched.

The philological treatments of the Portuguese copula (and Williams' book\(^1\) exemplifies this well) are mainly concerned with the morphological aspect of the problem and consist, generally, of a historically documented account of the suppletive role performed by *sedere* relatively to *esse* in the establishment of the *ser* paradigm and of *stare* being highly influenced by *ser* forms in its development (cf.

\(^1\) Williams, E.B. *From Latin to Portuguese*. Philadelphia, 1938.
Williams 1938: 220 and 232). Some authors, such as Ali, also point out the loss of concrete meaning undergone by some verbs of motion and location, such as estar, tornar-se (‘turn’), andar (‘walk’), ir (‘go’) and vir (‘come’), in their collocation with nouns and adjectives (cf. Ali 1964 ed.:157).

As for traditional grammars of Portuguese, such as those by Rocha Lima, Bechara and Cunha, among others, apart from looking upon the opposition between ser and estar as one of permanency vs. temporariness (cf. 1.0.2 for counter-examples to this view), there are brief references to the fact that both verbs are used as auxiliaries in the formation of the ‘analytical passive’, in contrast with the so-called ‘synthetic passive’ built up with the ‘reflexive’ se.

A more recent study on the Portuguese language by Mattoso Câmara contains only a note on the modern use of estar to express ‘...concrete situations that come about as the result of an actual change, or a supposed change in the

1. This view of the formation of the ser paradigm differs from Bouzet’s on ser and ssér in Spanish, cf. 1.0.
future' (cf. Mattoso Câmara 1972: 207 fn 1), in opposition to the semantic unmarkedness of *ser*.

An exception to this rather general neglect of the phenomenon of copula differentiation in Portuguese is the book by Thomas,¹ whose object is the study of Brazilian Spoken Portuguese. Despite the fact that the author's basic aim was to describe the language in an informal way and in traditional terms, he presents a large list of examples of *ser*, *estar* and *ficar* sentences, not only with adjectival and nominal complements, but with locative and temporal complements. As for the interpretation Thomas gives to the opposition between *ser* and *estar*, it is worth mentioning that, though following the traditional view, he also suggests, in passing, its inadequacy, by saying that *ser* is used '...when the predicate adjective indicates a quality which, though not necessarily permanent, is not thought of by the speaker as changing...' and that *estar* is used '...to inform about a new condition or state, which can even be permanent.' (Thomas 1969:227).

As for specific works on *ser* and *estar* in Portuguese, there is only one author to be mentioned, Schnerr,² whose dissertation covers the different types of occurrences of *ser* and *estar* and is based on data extracted from the work of Portuguese writers of the nineteenth and of the twentieth

centuries. Though the main value of his work seems to lie in the very extensive list of examples he provides for each occurrence type, it was perhaps the lack of a theoretical framework which prevented him from finding what he calls a 'convenient formula'. This is, in my opinion, what some of his interpretations and of his conclusions suggest. The fact, for instance, that he points out the difficulties of reaching an 'all-embracing formulation' due to the semantic distinctions between *ser* and *estar* sentences: '...being largely distinctions which lie within the semantic patterns of individual words and phrases involved...' (Schnerr 1947:160) shows that he has recognized that none of the derived meanings which result from the interaction of the meaning of the different elements of the sentence could be taken as a general principle. And this is a rather original position within the literature on copula-selection.

Schnerr is also the author of two articles, which are abbreviated, though modified, versions, of the sections on locatives and on *estar* with nominal predicatives of his dissertation. Since we will be presenting Schnerr's examples and ideas throughout Part I of this work, there is no need to discuss them at this point.

Another work which, though not being specifically concerned with copula-selection in Portuguese, will be

---

discussed later, is the insightful treatment given by Kahane & Hutter\(^1\) to the semantic role of \textit{estar} as an auxiliary in the progressive and in the passive, in contrast with non-\textit{estar} forms.

1.3 \textbf{Summary}

Since we will discuss in this section the main points which are common to the proposals on \textit{ser} and \textit{estar} both in Spanish and in Portuguese reviewed above, it seems necessary, first of all, to make clear that this does not imply any commitment to the idea that a single principle would account for the phenomena in both languages, nor that the dissimilarities between them, with respect to those verbs, have been ignored. Our aim, at this point, is only to show that extensive and less extensive treatments of the phenomena in both languages have resulted in similar general hypotheses due to the use of similar methodological procedures and their application to the same subset of occurrences.

Indeed, as far as the data are concerned, there is an almost complete neglect of occurrence-types other than those represented by copulative sentences with adjectival predicatives and by the two periphrastic passives. Authors like Crespo (cf. 1.1.2.2) who have related those types to locative sentences and to the presence of \textit{estar} in the

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{1. Kahane, H.R. & Hutter, Harriet S. 'The Verbal Categories of Brazilian Portuguese'. In Word 9, 1953 (16–44).}
\end{flushleft}
progressive have treated the latter systematically and as secondary sources.\(^1\)

Another point, which shows the discrepancy between the nature of the hypotheses which have been formulated and the data on which they have been based is the following: despite the temporal and aspectual implications of principles such as inherence, permanency, changeability, most of the examples discussed have the copula inflected in the simple present. In my opinion, the unmarkedness of this tense as for temporal and aspectual restrictions favoured interpretations such as those just mentioned, which would not be given to *ser* sentences, for instance, if the preterite had been considered. Thus, sentences such as:

\[
(\text{Sp.}) \text{ Mario fue rico.} \\
(P.) \text{ Mario foi rico.} \\
\text{ Mario was rich)
\]

where 'pastness' is not obligatorily predicated of the existence of the entity denoted by the subject, but of the state of 'being rich', would lead to the rejection of concepts such as inherence, permanency and non-changeability.

The same objection could be made with respect to the fact that no consideration has been given to temporal (and

---

1. Attention had been already drawn to the controversial status of the data some authors have used as evidence for rules concerning the obligatory presence of *estar* in locative sentences in Spanish and that of *ser* with nominal predicatives.
aspectual adverbials\(^1\) which may co-occur with *ser* and *estar*, apart from a few references to their occurring in predicative position in *ser* sentences with second-order nominals as subjects (cf. Bolinger and Stockwell, Bowen; Martin in 1.1.2.1 and 1.1.2.3 respectively).

As for the treatment given to the data, most proposals derive from semantic interpretations of examples chosen with apparently no systematic criterion, so that the by-products of the interaction between the semantic properties of the adjective and of the subject NP are often undistinguishable from the particular contribution of the verb to the meaning of the sentence. Exceptions to this kind of approach are the distributional criterion employed by Crespo (cf. 1.1.2.2) and Bull's (and, to some extent, Navas Ruiz's) attempts to validate their hypotheses by defining the semantic properties of adjectives which may occur with *estar*.

Briefly, it seems that the lack of methodological principles both in the selection and in the handling of the data have prevented most of the authors of specific studies on *ser* and *estar* from reaching a more comprehensive solution. However, many aspects of the phenomenon have remained obscure even in transformational treatments of it, that is, in works produced within a theoretical framework and, consequently, with more precisely defined scope and aims.

One of these aspects is the categorial status of *ser* and *estar* which we have been treating so far as copulas

---

and auxiliaries, following the traditional terminology. Indeed, the position of the authors whose work has been discussed seems to vary according to the type of occurrences they have dealt with and, to a less extent, to their implicit or explicit theoretical assumptions. Most of them, including Bull and Bolinger, seem to follow the traditional view of *ser* and *estar*, i.e., that they are copulas, when followed by nouns and adjectives; auxiliaries, when followed by verbal forms like the gerund and the past participle; and main verbs when followed by adverbials or prepositional phrases. On the other hand, those who have discussed the question, agree in considering *ser* as a copula, tense-carrier or *mere sign of equivalence* (not taking into account its auxiliary function with the passive), but take different positions in relation to *estar*. Some, like Crespo and Fernandez, who have dealt with the form *estar + gerund*, tend to see it as an auxiliary in all its occurrences. Others, like Roldán and Navas Ruiz, give to *estar* the status of a main verb, due to the fact that it has *more semantic content* than *ser*. Only Stockwell, Bowen & Martin put both verbs in a unique category. But this is a rather vacuous solution, because they do not relate it to their function as auxiliaries.

The second point which is not clear in the literature we have reviewed is the nature of the semantic opposition between *ser* and *estar* sentences, i.e., to which semantic category of the predicate (or of the sentence) it should be related. In fact, though notions such as inherent state,
permanency vs. temporariness, as well as that of change of state or changeability, concern basically the duration of a state relatively to the duration (= existence) of the entity of which the state is predicated, apart from Hanssen and Gili Gaya, none of the authors have related those notions to the category of aspect. That is, in spite of having dealt with the durative meaning of tense-markers in event-predications - and that applies to those who have included estar + gerund in the set of occurrence-types they have worked on and to Bull's work on the semantic classification of verbs¹ - they have treated the above notions as marginal or unrelated to other manifestations of the category of aspect.

As for Hanssen's and Gili Gaya's view of ser expressing imperfective states and estar perfective ones(4.1.1.1), their use of the terms 'imperfective' and 'perfective' as applied to stative predications makes the character of their proposal, as far as aspect is concerned, rather confusing. Firstly, because the potentiality of co-occurrence of those verbs with the perfective and imperfective would necessitate their drawing a distinction between two types of imperfectives or perfectives. Secondly, because the notion of 'becoming', which is explicitly related by Gili Gaya to the perfective character of estar predications, seems to imply that he does not refer to the state predicated of the entity, but to the process from which that state results. And this interpretation makes the characterization of ser predications as

imperfective very difficult to justify. In other words: should it be understood as states which do not result from the completion of any process or as non-cessative states?

This question leads us to a third point which concerns again the propriety of employing notions such as perfection or completion to state predications. Indeed, states, such as those lexicalized by adjectives and expressed by ser and estar sentences, belong, together with activities and processes such as walking and running, to the class of second-order entities which cannot be seen as perfected or imperfected, since they do not imply a goal to be achieved. They are permanentes, in Bello's terms (cf. 1.1.1) or non-cyclic, in Bull's classification (cf. Bull: 1963), and, therefore, unmarked for the feature perfective.¹

However, the fact that both the status of ser and estar (as syntactic categories) and the place of the semantic opposition between ser and estar sentences within the semantic category of aspect have remained unsolved problems, can be said to reflect the continuing controversial state of these topics in general linguistics. Thus, the failure of the works we have reviewed to reach a more comprehensive account of this peculiarity of Spanish and Portuguese predication is largely due to this fact and also to the paucity of systematic treatments of other topics in both languages.

¹. Cf. also: Miller (1971) and Macaulay (1971).
2. **Locative sentences in Portuguese**

By considering sentences such as:

   (My house is there/in São Paulo.)

2. O cinema *é* ali/na esquina.
   (The cinema is there/on the corner.)

   (The book is there/on the table.)

   (John is there/in the office/in London.)

and the unacceptability, in ordinary contextual conditions, of sentences such as:


2a. O cinema *está* ali/na esquina.

3a. O livro *é* ali/em cima da mesa.

4a. João *é* ali/no escritório/em Londres.

It seems, at first sight, plausible to say that copula-selection in Portuguese locative sentences is dependent on the capacity for motion of the entity located or denoted by the subject NP. Therefore, *estar* could be characterized as the copula associated with nouns with the feature [+movable] and *ser* as the copula associated with the feature [-movable].

However, there seem to be subsets of locative sentences in Portuguese which could be considered as counter-examples to this prima-facie conclusion, i.e. sentences which use *estar* in expressions of location of unmovable entities and *ser* sentences with [+movable] subjects. Examples of the former are sentences such as:
since sentences (a) are not synonymous with sentences (b) and, as utterances, they are subject to different conditions of appropriateness. Their difference in meaning would become clear if one brings to notice the fact that they differ from (1) and (2) relatively to the type of location they express. That is, (1) and (2) express a relationship of containment (i.e., they locate an entity wholly within the boundaries of another entity or location), whereas (5) and (6) express a relation of non-containment. Being expressions of non-containment, (5) and (6) may imply a deictic reference point, which may or may not be explicit. This is not the case for expressions of containment or simple position, such as (1) and (2). In fact, the reference-point or reference-location of (1) in its deictic version (i.e., the version with ali) is dependent on the speaker's and/or addressee's position, only in the sense that the interpretation of ali is based on it, but there does not seem to be any implicit deictic reference point in the non-deictic version:

(1') Minha casa é em São Paulo,
since the identification of São Paulo is independent of the speaker's and/or addressee's position.

Sentence (6) illustrates how some types of non-containment locations are dependent on a deictic reference-
point, since the expression 'on the other side' represents an ordered spatial relationship which must be as follows: deictic reference-point bridge-station: i.e., one must go, as it were, from the deictic reference-point to the bridge and from there to the station. Moreover, the fact that a deictic reference-point implied by expressions of non-containment location can serve either as a point-of-observation or a point-of-orientation¹ seems to account for the fact that these expressions can be given both a static and a dynamic interpretation. Therefore, in the case of sentence (6) the ordered spatial relationship expressed could be interpreted either statically or as the trajectory of the speaker and/or the addressee to the station.

Since estar is not only normally used to express the location of movable entities, but also has as a pragmatic presupposition, in sentences such as (6a), the movement or the intention of movement on the part of the speaker and/or addressee to the entity whose location is asserted, it seems plausible to look at estar sentences as the dynamic counterparts of ser locative sentences.

However it could be argued that the distinction between point-of-orientation and point-of-observation is irrelevant in the case of sentences like (5a-b) since the relative position expressed by them is one of distance and, thus, symmetrical and independent of the speaker's and/or addressee's position. This, however, does not invalidate our view that estar in locations of unmovable entities is

¹ Cf. Leech, 1969:8.5.
dynamic or marked relatively to a dynamic interpretation, since the idea of trajectory seems to be basic to that of distance.

There is another type of occurrences of estar in expressions of location of unmoving entities, which can be illustrated by the a sentences of the following examples:

(7a) Aqui está o cinema.
(7b) Aqui é o cinema.
(Here is the cinema.)

(8a) O cinema está ali, olha!
(8b) O cinema é ali, olha!
(The cinema is there, look!)

(9a) O cinema está na esquina, olha!
(9b) O cinema é na esquina, olha!
(The cinema is on the corner, look!)

Sentences such as (7a) and (8a) are fully acceptable in the context of moving towards and/or looking for an unmoving entity. Their locative content is somehow secondary to their demonstrative function as the obligatory presence of a deictic adverbial indicates (cf. the unacceptability of (9a) and also the French equivalents of (7a) and (8a) 'Voici le cinéma'/'Voilà le cinéma!')

Furthermore (7a) and (8a) are not possible answers to the question 'Onde é X?' (Where is X?) as the b sentences above are. They are rather answers to questions such as 'Onde está esse cinema?' literally 'Where is this cinema?' - most colloquially perhaps 'Where on earth is this cinema then?' which would be roughly equivalent to 'Onde esse

1. Cf. Atkinsons & Griffiths (1973) on the appropriate conditions for the utterance of such sentences.
cinema foi parar?" (literally 'Where did this cinema go to stop?' - i.e. 'what has happened to the cinema?'), which are also appropriate in the situation of looking for something and not finding it.

Given these preliminary considerations, it seems plausible to look at the selection of *ser* and *estar* in expressions of locations of unmovable entities as conditioned by:

1. the aspect or type of relationship conveyed by the sentence;
2. the deictic reference-point implicit in some types of non-containment locations being considered a point-of-observation or a point-of-orientation;
3. pragmatic factors which would allow perhaps for the recategorization of the unmovable entity as movable.

These will be the basic points we will concentrate on in our study of the selection of the copula relatively to the location of unmovables in 2.2.

That the presence of *estar* is obligatory in locative sentences with a subject NP referring to a movable entity seems also to be contradicted by sentences such as:

(10a) *Este livro está naquela estante.*
   (This book is on those shelves)(?)

(11a) *Estas cadeiras são na outra sala.*
   (These chairs are in the other room.)

Sentences (10a) and (11a) which are normal utterances in contexts of assigning fixed places for movable entities
referred to by their subject NP as their English equivalents might suggest. In fact, sentences b above would be acceptable only if an anaphoric reading were given to the demonstrative pronoun in the NP, since their deictic interpretation would result in the contradictory assignment of two different and simultaneous locations to the same entity.

If one considers as one of the possible paraphrases of (10) and (11) the following sentences:

(10a.i.) O livro que está na minha mão é naquela estante.  
(The book which I have in my hand goes on/belongs to those shelves)

(10b.i.) *O livro que está na minha mão está naquela estante.  
*(The book which I have in my hand is in those shelves.)

(11a.i.) As cadeiras que estão a meu lado são na outra sala.  
(The chairs which are by me go on/belong to the other room.)

(11b.i.) *As cadeiras que estão a meu lado estão na outra sala.  
*(The chairs which are by me are in the other room.)

it becomes clear, through the unacceptability or the paradoxical content of the b sentences, that ser cannot be interpreted as expressing the actual location of movable entities.

As the English translations given to (10a.i.) and (11a.i.) suggest, an interpretation of this subtype of locatives involves a notion of fixed location which differs from that assigned to those ser sentences which express the location of unmovables as do (1) and (2) above. Therefore, it seems insufficient to say that we are faced again
with a subset of locative sentences in which \textit{estar} expressions represent dynamic counterparts of \textit{ser}. Moreover, since it is not reasonable to say that entities such as books and chairs can have a fixed location in the same way that cinemas and houses can be said to have fixed positions in space, the problem of assigning a common semantic basis to the different types of \textit{ser} occurrences in locatives seems to involve the question of how spatial relationships between entities are perceived and conceptualized. Thus the following subsection 2.1 will consist of a discussion of some aspects of this question and of a tentative demonstration of how the opposition between \textit{ser} and \textit{estar} sentences in expressions of location of movables is correlated to them.

2.1 Location of movable entities

2.1.1 Some considerations on the notion of movability

Since movability, in a very simple and common-sense way, is definable as the capacity shown by some entities of either moving or being moved through space, it seems reasonable to say that it is a property which can be assigned, primarily, to entities which are discrete and concrete. These entities, which are, according to Strawson, 'primary occupiers of space, the possessors not only of spatial position, but of spatial dimensions' (Strawson 1959: 57), can be, indeed, said to be movable or unmovable, in a way entities such as events and processes cannot. Events, seen in their entirety, are better viewed as 'punctually located in space and time' (Lyons 1968: 8.1.10), as the
existence of an expression such as 'take place' meaning 'occur' or 'happen' in many languages (cf. French 'avoir lieu', Italian 'avere luogo', Portuguese 'ter lugar', etc.) seems to suggest.1

Among the entities which have been referred to as concrete and discrete, the ones which seem to present a greater degree of movability, are those which can be the source of their own movement and of the movement of other entities. This is so in the case of animates; and, among animates, persons must be assigned a special status as movables, due to the fact that volition and intentionality are implied in their movements, at least to a greater extent than is the case for animals. This point, as we shall see presently, is relevant for the discussion of the notion of authority, which is involved in the assignment of fixed locations for movable entities. The property of movability assigned to persons is also crucial for the understanding of the dynamic interpretation which can be given to the location of an entity relatively to a deictic reference-point (cf. 2.1).

As for non-animate entities, which do not move by themselves, but only through the intervention of a source of movement external to them, there does not seem to be a clear-cut classification of them as movable or unmovable.

---

1. There are, obviously, many problems concerning the difference between the way events, processes and states are to be related with space. Some of them will be discussed in the following chapters.
If, on the one hand, there are entities, like topographical phenomena (e.g. mountains and lakes) which, in the ordinary course of events, show a zero degree of movability, and, on the other hand, things such as books and cups, which, probably due to their dimensions, are generally considered as highly movable, there seem to be other classes of entities whose movability appears to be conditioned by properties other than their dimensions.

First of all, there is the class of entities such as plants, which, though being movable, have their existence conditioned to at least a certain degree of stability. Sentences such as:

(12a) A jaboticabeira _estava_ bem no meio do quintal.
(12b) A jaboticabeira _era_ bem no meio do quintal.

(The jaboticaba-tree was right in the middle of the back-garden)

seems to reflect it. (12a) is much more likely to be interpreted as the location of the fruit-tree before being planted, or having been cut, as it could be made explicit by (12a.i.):

(12a.i) A jaboticabeira _já estava_ no meio do quintal, no lugar onde devia _ser_ plantada.
(12b.i) *A jaboticabeira _já era_ no meio do quintal, no lugar onde devia _ser_ plantada.

(The jaboticaba-tree was already right in the middle of the back-garden, in the place where it was to be planted.)

This is not the case for (12b), as the unacceptability of (12b.i) indicates.

Another class of entities whose degree of movability is seen as variable under certain conditions, is that of objects whose functional properties require of them to be more or less stable. That is the case for telephones, lamp-
posts and statues, for instance, which, in order to fulfill their functions are bound to maintain a more or less stable relationship with another entity.

Sentences such as:

(13a) O telefone está no corredor.
(13b) O telefone é no corredor.
(The telephone is in the corridor.)

suggest the importance of the above consideration relatively to copula selection in Portuguese. Indeed, (13a) has as one of the appropriate conditions for its utterance that of its subject NP referring to a telephone which is either portable or unconnected (i.e. movable) while (13b) asserts its fixed location.1

There is another class of entities which, though being movable and not even having their existence dependent upon maintaining a fixed relationship with another entity (in the way, for instance, that plants are) need to be assigned a certain stability in order to fulfill their functions to an optimal degree. This is the case of pieces of furniture which serve characteristically as locations for more movable things such as books and clothes. Sentences such as:

(14a) O armário está no corredor.
(14b) O armário é no corredor.
(The wardrobe is in the corridor.)

1. (13b) can be given a deontic performative interpretation in some contexts: i.e., it might be translated into English as 'The telephone goes in the corridor', but it seems unnecessary to discuss this point for the moment since we will be dealing with it subsequently.
suggest this, since (14b) would be inappropriate as an utterance if the speaker is referring to the location of a built-in wardrobe.

It may be mentioned here that the double status of entities such as trees and movable pieces of furniture, relative to the property of movability is somehow reflected in the acceptability of *ser* sentences which express the locations of these entities being highly dependent on the discourse context and/or the situational context. For instance, Schnerr (1954:418-419) manifested his surprise on finding *ser* in expressions of location of 'such readily movable things as furniture' in nineteenth century Portuguese writers. However, if one considers the narrative technique of that period, which was basically that of creating a static background for the characters to move through, before introducing the plot, it seems that *ser* sentences, as well as existential ones and imperfective tenses would be the linguistic devices adequate to that effect. We will take up this point later.

It is also worth mentioning Dowty's account of the occurrence of the progressive in locative sentences in English, since he too attempts to explain this with notions such as movability and discourse context. Commenting on the ungrammaticality or oddness of sentences such as:

'(44) A statue of George Washington \{stood | was standing\}
at the entrance to the park.

(45) John's house \{sits | is sitting\} on top of a large hill.

(46) The quaint little village of Himpaldinken \{lies in | is lying\} in a verdant Alpine valley.'
he says:

'Consideration of a large number of these sentences shows that such locative sentences are acceptable in the progressive just to the degree that the object in question is readily moveable'.

(Dowty 1972:76)

And, subsequently, when trying to explain the unacceptability of

'(51) "Two oak-trees were standing in the middle of the forest."

and the acceptability of

'(52) After the forest fire, only two oak-trees were still standing in the middle of the forest.'

he adds:

'It may be that the difference has to do with discourse context. That is, progressive locatives with immovable subjects are more natural in a narrative context where the speaker is describing what he saw in a place he visited. Hence (52) sounds better with past progressive than present progressive (unless the present progressive is the historical present). If the speaker is simply reporting the location of an immovable object without recalling a particular time that he was there, the progressive is odd.'

(Dowty 1972:78)

Dowty's view that the progressive in locations of immovables (or less movable entities) is possible in narrative contexts which one could label as 'reconstitution of journeys', though being more directly related to what has so far been said about estar with immovables (cf. (7a) and (8a) in 2.1) seems to provide support for our view of ser with movables being associated with descriptive contexts which could be labelled as 'reconstitutive of static backgrounds'. This question too will be taken up later.

The fact that movable objects can be viewed as immovables and vice versa, cannot, however, be used as an
argument to explain the use of *ser* in sentences such as (10a) and (11a) (cf. 2.1), which are expressions of locations of entities whose functional properties require of them a high degree of movability. That is, sentences such as:

(15a) Esta cadeira é na sala.
(This chair belongs to the sitting-room.)
(16a) Esses livros são na estante da direita.
(Those books belong to the shelves on the right.)
(17a) Esses garfos são na gaveta.
(Those forks belong to the drawer.)

cannot be interpreted as expressions of fixed location as (12b), (13b), and (14b) are, since they express locations assigned to things when they are not being used or in movement. If movability as a property of objects implies different locations at different intervals of time, without going further into the problem of quantification of time-intervals for the moment, one can say that, in the case of (15a), (16a) and (17a) the number of time-intervals in which the entities denoted by their subject NPs have had locations other than the ones predicted for them, is irrelevant to their interpretations as belonging to those places. And this does not seem to be the case for (12b), (13b) and (14b). Therefore, if the semantic value of *ser* is to be determined on the basis of all the contexts in which it can occur, sentences such as the ones just examined suggest that it must be something over and above that of permanent location. However, the fact that they can be said to be paraphraseable by:

(15a.1) O lugar desta cadeira é na sala.
(The place of this chair is in the sitting room.)
could be considered as leading to an interpretation of them as either derived from the sentences above (in which *ser* is the equative copula) or as expressions of habitual location. An alternative interpretation could also be assigned to them, given their semantic relationship(s) with sentences such as:

(15a.ii) *Essa cadeira é da sala.*
(This chair is of the sitting room.)(lit.tr.)

(16a.ii) *Esses livros são da estante da direita.*
(Those books are of the shelves on the right.) (lit.tr.)

(17a.ii) *Esses garfos são da gaveta.*
(Those forks are of the drawer.)(lit.tr.)

and, consequently, they could be considered as a subtype of possessives. Furthermore, the deontic performative interpretation which can be a contextual implication from sentences such as (15a), (16a), (17a) (and also of their paraphrases (15a.i), (16a.i) and (17a.i), which can be said to be based on the fact that to assign places to things involves the notion of authority) could be taken as an argument for deriving those sentences from modalized *estar* sentences.

In the following section, therefore, we will discuss each of the alternatives mentioned above and the syntactic and semantic motivation for rejecting them.
2.1.2 *ser* in expressions of location of movables

It is worth mentioning that the first reaction of native-speakers of Brazilian Portuguese to sentences such as (15a), (16a) and (17a) is to say that they are less acceptable versions of possessive sentences such as (15a.ii), (16a.ii) and (17a.ii).¹

However, this does not happen with sentences which express spatial relationships defined as being of non-containment. In fact, sentences such as:

(18a) As cadeiras *são à esquerda da mesa.
(The chairs go to the left of the table)

(19a) Os livros de História *são perto dos livros de Geografia.
(The place of the History books is near the Geography books.)

(20a) Os garfos *são entre as colheres e as facas.
(The place of the forks is between the spoons and the knives.)

cannot be semantically related to possessive sentences, since there are no *de* counterparts, such as:

(18b) *As cadeiras *são da esquerda da mesa.

(19b) *Os livros de Historia *são de perto dos livros de Geografia.

(20b) *Os garfos *são de entre as colheres e as facas.

in Portuguese. Therefore, to explain *ser* sentences with movables as a sub-type of possessive sentences would leave unexplained the fact that *ser* is used in expressions of spatial relationships other than that of containment. Moreover, besides its being counter-intuitive to derive locatives

¹. An alternative and also frequent reaction is to consider *ficar* the correct copula for those sentences.
from possessives, this explanation would be contradictory to the hypothesis put forward in relation to many languages, on the basis of various types of syntactic and semantic evidence that the latter derive from the former (cf. Lyons 1967 and his references). However, the unacceptability of sentences such as b above seem to suggest that possessive sentences with ser must be regarded either as unmarked as to the type of spatial relationship they express or as derived from locative sentences which are expressions of containment.

As for the relationship between (15a), (16a), (17a) and (15a.1), (16a.1), (17a.1), it has been mentioned above that it could be taken as a syntactic motivation to look at as 'more sign of equivalence', in Bolinger's terms (cf. 1.1.2.1) i.e. as an equative copula. That is, a sentence such as:

(15a) Essa cadeira § na sala.
(That chair belongs to the sitting-room.)

would be derived from:

(15a.1) O lugar dessa cadeira § na sala.
(The place of this chair is (in) the sitting-room.)

through a reduction of the subject NP. This would also explain relationships holding between sentences such as:

1. There seem to be many questions concerning the relationships between locative sentences with ser and possessive sentences with ser in Portuguese, mainly in relation to the use of the prepositions em (at/in) in the former ones and de (of/from) in the latter. Some of these questions will be handled in the subsection about existential and possessive sentences.

2. Cf. Anderson's interpretation of the progressive forms, such as 'John is falling' as a reduced version of 'John is in the process of falling' (Anderson 1973:51).
as well as *ser* in locative sentences with immovables. In fact, sentences such as (2):

(2) *O cinema é ali/na esquina.*

can be said to have the same underlying structure as (15a.1) and (21a.1), since the lexeme *cinema* can be glossed as 'place where movie-pictures are shown', i.e., as a place-denoting noun.

It is worth mentioning at this point Schnerr's account of the regular use of *ser* with the word 'place' and its equivalents. He says:

'...the locative idea is already in the word *place* and the predicate, joined to the subject by *ser* is more a definition than a real designation of location...'

and

'The emphasis is often on the idea of fitness or propriety, although the word *place* can come close to having a material sense.' (Schnerr 1954:419)

Two of his examples are:

'Lugar de mulher não é na política, é na cozinha, ouviu?' (Oswald de Andrade, II, 364) ('A woman's place is not in politics, it is in the kitchen, did you hear?')

'O lugar de Pedrinho é lá em cima. Ele não tem nada que fazer aqui em baixo.' (Verfissimo, Saga, p.303). (Pedrinho's place is up there. He has nothing to do down here.)

---

The data presented above could lead us to an interpretation of locative sentences with *ser* as belonging to the class of equatives, with the locative expression in the predicate taking the value of a nominal expression (cf. Lyons, forthcoming).

Leaving aside for the moment the use of *ser* in location of events or with second-order nominals as subjects, let us consider sentences such as:

(15a.iii) O lugar onde essa cadeira *está* é na sala.  
(The place where that chair is is (in) the sitting-room.)

(15a.iv) O lugar onde *é* essa cadeira *é* na sala.  
(The place where that chair belongs is the sitting-room.)

(16a.iii) O lugar onde *estão* esses livros *é* na estante da direita.  
(The place where those books are is on the shelves on the right.)

(16a.iv) O lugar onde esses livros *são* *é* na estante da direita.  
(The place where those books belong is on the shelves on the right.)

(17a.iii) O lugar onde esses garfos *estão* *é* na gaveta.  
(The place where those forks are is in the drawer.)

(17a.iv) O lugar onde *são* esses garfos *é* na gaveta.  
(The place where those forks belong to is in the drawer.)

Those sentences seem to provide counter-evidence for the hypothesis that we have been discussing. First of all, they seem to demonstrate that a possible underlying structure

1. Those sentences sound slightly odd, due probably to the presence of two copulas blurring the boundaries of their constituents, and causing minor problems in processing or decoding them. But, the same structure embedded in sentences such as:

(22) Os mapas *estão/são* no lugar onde *estavam/eram* os livros de História.  
(The maps are in/belong to the place where the History books were/used to go (used to belong))

does not seem to present any problem.
for (15a.i), (16a.i) and (17a.i) is a complex sentence in which both the matrix and the embedded sentence are copulative or present structural conditions for the copula-insertion to be applied.

As for the examples given with expressions '(the) place of', where X refers to human beings, there seems to be no problems in deriving them from:

(23) Lugar onde mulher é/"está é na cozinha.¹ (The place where a woman belongs/is is (in) the kitchen.)

(24) O lugar onde Pedrinho é/"está é lá encima. (The place where Pedrinho belongs/is is up there.)

Perhaps, in some cases, '(the) place of X' should be interpreted as '(the) place where X does something' or 'the place of X's activities', although this is not the case for sentences such as:

(25) Eu sou aqui: você é no banco de trás. (I go here: you go in the back seat.)

in the context of deciding on which seats would be taken by whom in a car, and where the word lugar has its basic and concrete denotation. This seems to constitute a further demonstration that sentences such as (25) are not derived from:

(25a) Meu lugar é aqui; seu lugar é no banco de trás. (My place is here; your place is in the back seat.)

which is ambiguous between:

(25b) O lugar onde eu sou é aqui; o lugar onde você é é no banco de trás. (The place I go is here; the place where you go is (in) the back seat.)

¹. Both the unacceptability of the estar version of (23) and the fact of even the ser version being slightly odd, have to do with the word 'degree of definiteness' in both NPs - lugar and mulher, as will be subsequently demonstrated.
It is interesting to notice that an appropriate context for the utterance of (25b) is a situation where the speaker and the addressee, though not being in the places in question at the moment of the utterance-act, are supposed to have been occupying them recently and to return to them subsequently, as, for instance, if the conversation takes place during an intermission, in a theatre.

From what has so far been presented, there seem to be grounds to reject the possibility of looking at ser in expressions of location of movables as the equative copula in structures of the type 'the place of X is Y', since the same configuration underlying this type of ser sentence is present in 'of X'.

An alternative view of the copula-selection in expressions of locations of movables is that of assigning to ser sentences a habitual or iterative meaning in opposition to estar. The advantage of this hypothesis would be that of providing a basis to relate the opposition between ser and estar to the opposition between simple present and the progressive and, consequently, explain the presence of estar in the progressive, or its function as an auxiliary, with the same principle underlying its occurrence in copulative sentences.1

1. Cf. Leech 1969: 7.4.2 on the habitual or iterative present being more common than the instantaneous and the irrestrictive present in English. Cf. Thomas 1969:191 for a similar, though informal, view on Brazilian Portuguese. But cf. Kahne & Hutter for a different and more inclusive account, which will be subsequently discussed.
The interpretation of a sentence as habitual seems to depend, among other factors, on the presence of an adverb of frequency, by means of which the recurrence of an event of a state is quantified with respect to a certain period of time. Thus, if ser sentences are to be interpreted as expressions of habitual location of movable entities, sentences such as:

(26a) Essa cadeira está sempre na sala.
(That chair is always in the sitting-room.)

would be a paraphrase of:

(15a) Essa cadeira é na sala.
(That chair belongs to the sitting-room.)

This does not seem to be the case, since the conjunction of (15a) and (26a):

(27) Essa cadeira é na sala e está sempre na sala.
(That chair belongs to the sitting-room and it is always in the sitting-room.)

is not tautologous and

(28) Essa cadeira é na sala, mas está sempre no corredor.
(That chair belongs to the sitting-room, and it is always in the corridor.)

is not a contradiction.

What the relationships between the ser and estar sentences above seem to indicate is that the habitual location of an entity, which is based on the frequency of its actualized locations, may or may not coincide with its fixed or established location. However, a sentence such as:
(29) Essa cadeira é na sala, mas está sempre na sala. 
(That chair belongs to the sitting-room, but it is always in the sitting-room.)

is odd. But it does not seem to be the case that they have the same truth-value, since their negative conjunction:

(30) Essa cadeira é na sala, mas não está sempre na sala. 
(That chair belongs to the sitting-room, but it is not always in the sitting-room.)

seems perfectly natural.

Robin Lakoff (1971:132 ff.) argues for, at least, two distinct uses of but: what she calls a semantic-opposition-but, which she exemplifies with the sentence:

(57) John is tall, but Bill is short.

and what she refers to as a denial-of-expectation-but, as in:

(59) John is tall, but he's no good in basketball.

which she explains as containing the assertion: 'John is tall and he's no good in basketball' plus the speaker's presupposition that a tall person is expected to be good in basketball.

It seems that this could explain not only the oddness of (29) since mas ('but') is unacceptable if the speaker's

1. Given the normal presupposition that things will actually be where they belong, (29) is of course unacceptable, since the adversative conjunction mas implies that the normal presupposition is not fulfilled. It is possible, however, to construct a situation in which (29) would be perfectly acceptable. Suppose, for example, it had been asserted that in a certain house none of the furniture was ever in the right place, Y could challenge the truth of this statement by conceding that, whereas the desk belonged to one place and was actually in another place (and so for most items of furniture), the chair belonged to the sitting room, but was in the sitting room (contrary to what is in this context the expected situation). What is interesting here, and confirms our hypothesis, it will be noted, is the fact that (29) will now be acceptable and the substitution of e for mas would create a contextually unacceptable utterance.
expectations are that the chair should be where it belongs, but also the acceptability of (28), whose second conjunct asserts a location which is different from the one asserted by the first.

However, this explanation is not sufficient or fails in the sense of bringing together types of conjunctions - that represented by (59) and that represented by (30) - which differ in the way their respective conjuncts are semantically related. In the case of (59), the conjuncts share only their subject, or in other words assign different properties to the same entity. That is not the case for (30), as it is not the case for:

(31) João joga bola-ao-cesto, mas não está jogando hoje.
(John plays basketball, but he is not playing today.)

where the difference between the two conjuncts lies in their aspectual meanings and the negative content of the second is in opposition to the implication of the other, which justifies mas ('but').

It is interesting that Robin Lakoff, in the same paper, makes the suggestion that aspect is a factor governing the grammaticality of conjoined sentences. With respect to

1. Leech's view on the difference between the simple present and the progressive being a matter of the psychological light through which the action is regarded, i.e., that they do not differ in truth value, does not seem arguable. The oddity of their negative conjunction in his example: "he picks up the book but he is not picking up the book" is due to the definite NP object, which allows for an instantaneous reading of the first conjunct, which, according to his own views, is not a common reading for that tense. But: He picks up books, but he is not picking books at the moment) is not odd and seems to show the same or a similar type of aspectual opposition which we are trying to demonstrate as existing between ser and estar sentences (Leech 1969: 7.5).
the sentences such as:

(1) My grandmother wrote me a letter yesterday and six men can fit in the back seat of a Ford.

she says:

'The problem with sentences like these lie purely in the tense, or perhaps we should say aspect, of the verb: in one member of the conjunction, is generic and true for all times: in the other, it is specific, and refers to a particular point in time.'

(Robin Lakoff 1971:125)

It is arguable that sentences such as (1) are not so much ungrammatical as unacceptable in normal contexts and furthermore that Robin Lakoff's explanation of the unacceptability of (1) is faulty, since a sentence like

(2) My grandmother wrote to me yesterday and the primroses are now in bloom,

which does not contain an instance of generic tense (or aspect), is no less unacceptable than (1). The general principle governing conjunction in cases like this would seem to be the purely pragmatic principle that particular expectations are set up by either the participants' general knowledge or by the specific context of utterance. The compatibility of time-reference or aspect is just one part of this. As far as ser and estar are concerned, the truth of a ser sentence will, in the appropriate context, set up the expectation of the truth of the corresponding estar sentence, but cannot in general be said to entail it, as would necessarily be the case if the meaning of the ser sentence were accounted for in terms of permanence, essence or habituality.

From what has been said, it seems to follow that ser in expressions of locations of movables cannot be interpreted
as meaning habitual location, although the oddness of (29) and the acceptability of (28) and (30) seem to suggest that the speaker's presupposition is that the habitual location of X would coincide with its location as asserted by ser or with ser.

On the other hand, what could justify such presupposition would be the notion of normal location as the one expressed by ser sentences, taking norm, in this case, as a notion not necessarily based on the frequency of previously actualized locations (which is Bull's and Bolinger's view of ser in Spanish attributive sentences; cf. 1.1.2.1). In this sense of norm, estar is again the copula that it used, as one can see in the sentence:

(32) Essa cadeira está normalmente na sala.
(That chair is, normally, in the sitting-room.)

which is, again, not synonymous with (15a). The conjunction of the two is not tautologous and, as one would expect, in at least one of its readings ('normally'='generally'='frequently') synonymous with (27).

(33) Essa cadeira é na sala e está normalmente na sala.

In order to distinguish 'norm', as a frequency-based concept from 'norm' as rule established by someone with authority to do so, it is perhaps useful, for the purposes of this discussion, to oppose the notion of normal location to that of normative location. This distinction is, in any case, necessary to account for the use of ser sentences such as (15a) in contexts of having just moved to a house, or having just bought a chair, in which they refer to a location not yet actualized. Indeed, in these contexts, ser sentences
can receive a deontic performative interpretation (which would require go as a verb in its translation into English), which seems to confirm its normative value.

It is not enough, however, to characterize ser sentences as expressing a normative location, since estar sentences with a deontic modal predicated of them could be said to express the same meaning. But sentences such as:

(34a) Essa cadeira deve estar na sala.
(That chair must be in the sitting-room)

are neither equivalent to (15a) nor interpretable as expressing deontic modality in ordinary contexts. A deontic reading of dever seems to be conditioned, in these cases, to its co-occurrence with a point or period-of-time adverbial, such as (34b) illustrates:

(34b) Essa cadeira deve estar na sala às 2 horas/amanhã.
(That chair must/should be in the sitting-room at 2 o'clock tomorrow.)

to which there is no ser counterpart, as the ungrammaticality of (35) shows:

(35)*Essa cadeira é na sala às duas horas/amanhã.
(That chair goes in/belongs to the sitting-room at 2 o'clock/tomorrow.)

Moreover, modalized ser sentences such as:

(36) Essa cadeira deve ser na sala.
(That chair should go on/must belong to the sitting-room.)

are ambiguous between an epistemic and a deontic reading. This seems to bring us back to the point of departure. However, let us now consider sentences such as:

(37a) A igreja deve ser na praça principal, como sempre acontece em cidadezinhos como esta.
(The church must be in the main square, as it always happens in small towns like this.)
(37b) A igreja deve ser na praça principal, conforme ficou decidido na reunião com o prefeito.  
(The church has to be in the main square, according to what has been decided in the meeting with the mayor.)

(38) Camaiore deve ser perto de Lucca.  
(Camaiore must be near Lucca.)

(39) O lago Titicaca deve ser no Peru.  
(The lake Titicaca must be in Peru.)

They, in fact, seem to indicate that a deontic interpretation is dependent on the location predicated being variable. In the case of (37b), as in that of (36), the decision taken or reported by the speaker operates on the set of possible locations of the entity reducing it to one, which, concerning (37b) (and also (38) if Camaiore was a town which was being planned), would be obligatorily precedent to its actual existence (or construction). The same interpretation could not be given to dever in estar sentences such as (34b), where the decision taken or reported by the speaker operates on only one member of the set of possible locations of the entity, i.e. on its actualization at a specific point of time (or at a series of points of time).

At this point, after having presented counter-arguments to a habitual interpretation of ser sentences with moveables and having also pointed out the need for refining the notion of normative location in order to explain the behaviour of ser and estar in sentences with the modal dever, one can introduce the term 'habitat' as more adequate to the semantic characterization of the subtype of ser sentences we have been discussing. Its adequacy lies, firstly, in the fact of not implying the notion of permanent location, which has proved to contradict the possibility of conjoining
those sentences with *estar* sentences (cf. (27), (28) and (30)). Secondly, it is somehow related to the notion of
generic location, which arises from the opposition between
*ser* and *estar* sentences, the latter being expressions of
specific locations. Furthermore, the idea of propriety or
appropriateness, which is part of the meaning of 'habitat',
in which concerns its use in natural sciences, is also
relevant as a basis for decisions concerning the assignment
of places to objects.

The preliminary conclusion which can be drawn from
what has so far been discussed is that the different
readings given to locative sentences with *ser* are partially
conditioned by the semantic features of their subjects NPs
and by the speaker's view of the entities referred to by
them. Thus, the interpretation of permanent location given
to sentences such as (1), (2), (13b) and (14b), as well as
(37-39), is determined by the presence of the feature
[-movable] in the N which is the nucleus of their subjects.
This is also the case for expressions of spatial relation¬
ships of containment, referring to topographical phenomena,
and for expressions of inalienable location, such as those
illustrated by the following sentences;

(40) A cicatriz § no braço esquerdo.
(The scar is in the left arm.)

(41) Minhas rugas mais fundas são na testa.
(My deepest wrinkles are in the forehead.)

Similarly, it is the feature [+movable] in the NP
of sentences such as (10a), (11a) and (15a-20a) which
partially determines their being interpreted as expressing
'habitats'.

However, the common feature of those two subtypes of *ser* locative sentences seems to be that their set of possible locations is one or reduced to one, which, in any case, makes their collocation with specific point-of-time adverbials redundant (cf. (35)). They are, in this sense, opposed to locative sentences with *estar* which express the location of an entity as one member of the set of its possible locations, at a particular point of time, which can be of any magnitude, i.e. cover the whole of the existence of an individual, such as (42) illustrates:

(42) *A criança esteve na incubadeira desde o momento em que nasceu até morrer.*  
(The baby was in the incubator from the time he was born till he died.)

or be even eternal, as the answer to the question *Onde está Deus?* in the Portuguese version of the catechism shows:

(43) *Deus está no Céu, na Terra, em toda a parte.*  
(God is in Heaven, in Earth, everywhere.)

Thus, the dynamic meaning of *estar* sentences is explained also by the fact that they represent a view of the existence of a first-order''entity as a trajectory through time and space, which is opposite to that of *ser*. In order to clarify this notion of trajectory, and its aspectual and temporal implications, it is necessary to look at the co-occurrence of *ser* and *estar* locative sentences with tense-markers, and with temporal and aspectual adverbials.
2.1.3 Co-occurrence of *ser* and *estar* in locative sentences with movables, with tense-markers and adverbials.

The aspectual nature of the semantic opposition between *ser* and *estar* sentences, assumed or implied by both traditional and more recent views on the phenomenon (cf. 1.1) cannot be considered apart from other types of manifestations of the same semantic category in Portuguese, and specifically from its grammaticalization by means of tense-markers and its lexicalization by means of adverbials. It seems to follow from this that hypotheses about copula-selection in Portuguese must be, at least, partially based on its interaction with these other elements at the level of the sentence, if not at the level of the discourse.

The first point to be discussed here concerns, not the co-occurrence of *ser* and *estar* with the progressive, but rather their relationships with it. Insofar as, at many points in this work, we have made an appeal to the dynamic character of *estar* sentences or to their being associated with the notion of a trajectory, this is a crucial point (which will be taken up again subsequently). Indeed, their dynamic character seems in conflict with their 'stativeness', i.e. with a semantic property of them which by itself could be confirmed by their either rejecting the progressive or co-occurring with it as a sort of stylistical device.

The fact that *ser* and *estar* sentences are, semantically, stative (except that *ser* may be used as a non-stative verb with behavioural adjectives), is demonstrated by their not being paraphraseable with expressions such as 'be in the process of'. But the results obtainable with the other tests
are not so clear-cut. It is interesting to notice for instance, that not only non-stative adjectives, or behavioural adjectives, but also estar locative sentences with subjects referring to persons, may co-occur with verbs of suasion and in the imperative. This is illustrated below.

(44) Forceti José Augusto a ser fraco com Anamaria. (I forced José Augusto to be honest with Anamaria.)

(45) Forceti José Augusto a estar em casa às 10. (I forced José Augusto to be at home at 10.)

(46) José Augusto, seja fraco com a Anamaria! (José Augusto, be honest with Anamaria!)

(47) José Augusto, esteja em casa às 10! (José Augusto, be at home at 10!)

However, what is more important in the present discussion is the fact that, though ser co-occurs with the progressive not only in constructions with non-stative adjectives as predicatives, but also in locative sentences with second-order nominals as subjects, such as (48) and (49) below illustrate:

(48) José Augusto está sendo gentil com a irmã. (José Augusto is being nice with his sister.)

(49) O exame está sendo agora/na sala 17. (The examination is now being/in room 17.)(lit.tr.)

there is no such form as *está estando, or estar plus gerund of estar either in Portuguese or in Spanish. A 'prima facie' interpretation of this restriction could be that estar predications are incompatible with the progressive, as most

1. Cf. Lakoff (1965) and Dowty (1972) on tests for distinguishing stative vs. non-stative predicates.
stative predications are. There seem to be, however, syntactic and semantic motivations for rejecting this interpretation and they correspond in part to those presented by Bolinger (1971) as evidence for regarding the English progressive forms as adverbia nominal, that is, the possibility of progressives sharing 'to be' - estar in Portuguese - with locative adverbials and some types of adjectives. Some of Bolinger's examples are:

'He's here again and looking for trouble.'
'He's ready and waiting.'
'He was angry and practically foaming at the mouth.'

(Bolinger 1971:248)

which are equivalent to (50), (51), (52) in Portuguese:

(50) Ele está aqui de novo e procurando encrenca.
(51) Ele está pronto e esperando.
(52) Ele está bravo e praticamente espumando de raiva.

Bolinger also adds to these examples, the following unacceptable sentences:

'*'He's clever and waiting.'
'*'He's irascible and practically foaming at the mouth.'

(Bolinger 1971:248)

as evidence for his view that the conjunction of progressives with adjectives is possible only if the latter denote an

---

1. This argument would be empirically ill-founded since few stative verbs in Portuguese do not occur in the progressive. Even in the most ordinary contexts, the so-called verbs of perception, emotion and cognition are used in the progressive. Though being outside the scope of this work to give a full account of the different types of occurrences of the progressive in Portuguese, we will turn to this point later.

2. Cf. also Ivir 1960, for more examples of adjective coordination in English.
accidental property, the combination of essence and accidence resulting in zeugma. Despite rejecting the opposition essence vs. accidence as a general principle underlying ser and estar occurrences in Portuguese, our opinion is that the unacceptability of sentences such as:

(53a) *Ele é esperto e esperando.
(54a) *Ele é irascível e praticamente espumando de raiva.

which are semantically equivalent to Bolináer's examples of zeugma, one can conclude that estar both as a copula and as an auxiliary of the progressive is the surface realization of the same semantic element present in the basis of both stative and non-stative sentences. However, before pursuing this line of argument, we would like to make clear that the possibilities of conjunction of progressives and adjectives (or locative adverbials) is only partially conditioned by both having estar or being estar predications. As we have been trying to demonstrate in this section the meaning of ser and estar predications is dependent on the semantic properties of their subject NPs and/or of their adjectival or adverbial predicatives. Indeed, taking into consideration the fact that both esperto ('clever') and irascível ('irascible') can be also used with estar, the hypothesis that conjunction is, in this case, exclusively conditioned by the presence of this copula in both conjuncts, would predict the acceptability of sentences such as:

(53a.i) *Ele está esperto e esperando.
(54a.i) *Ele está irascível e praticamente espumando de raiva.

which is not the case. The answer to this problem seems to
lie in the different temporal extensions implied by the adjectival and by the verbal predication. In fact, está esperto and está irascível imply an inchoative process (such as that corresponding to 'has become clever' and 'has become irascible' in English), whose resultative state — as expressed with estar — is not perceivable (and therefore, predicable) at a point of time (or by a point of time adverbial), as it is the case for 'ready' and 'angry', 'waiting' and 'foaming at the mouth'. That is equivalent to saying that the temporal implications of the predications which are conjoined must be co-extensive in order for the conjunction to be acceptable, as is demonstrated by:

(53b) Ele agora está esperto e esperando o momento oportuno para para prová-lo.
(He is clever now and waiting for the right moment to prove it.)

(54b) Ele agora está irascível e provocando todo mundo à sua volta.
(He is irascible now and provoking everyone around him.)

What has just been said does not seem to invalidate our view that estar carries or represents, at a surface level, a semantic feature common to both the progressive and certain types of copulative structures.¹ What seems to follow from it is that the use of the co-occurrence with the progressive as a test for distinguishing stative from non-stative predications needs some revision, at least as

¹. Historical support for this hypothesis seems to be the chronological priority of the form estar plus gerund in Iberian Romance (cf. Bouzet 1953, mentioned in 1.0.1) and in the existence of similar constructions not only in modern Italian, but also in Old French and in late Latin (cf. Spaulding 1926).
far as Portuguese is concerned. That is, either those copulative structures (with adjectival, nominal and adverbial predicatives), as well as stative verbs which co-occur with the progressive, have to be considered as non-stative - which does not seem to be the case, - or stative predications have to be sub-categorized according to this semantic feature that they (may) share with non-stative predications in the progressive.

With respect to English, there seem to be already some proposals for this sub-categorization, which, ultimately, would lead to a revision of the notion of progressive. One is that represented by Bolinger's position mentioned above and based on the opposition essence vs. accidence. Similar to Bolinger's, but formalized within a localist framework, is that of Anderson, who, after propounding almost the same representation for progressive aspect, contingent adjectives and class-inclusion, claims that:

'We can relate the absence of progressive aspect with most adjectives to the fact that the contingents are already provided with such a higher predication. The difference between progressive aspect and contingent be with adjectives is that progressive aspect appears optionally above (non-stative) verbs, whereas the same kind of locative predication is obligatory above contingent predications.'

(Anderson 1973:57)

This view somehow implies that the 'be' of progressive and contingent predication in English is equivalent to Portuguese estar, and, therefore has a different source from the 'be' of equative and non-contingent predications.1

1. Cf. also Dowty 1972:84ff, on surface 'be', as well as surface 'do' coming from different sources and on their occurrences being in correspondence with those of the two 'allomorphs' of 'be' proposed by Ross (1972a:80-82).
Another proposal is found in Zydatiss (1974) on the basis of Schopf's (1969) concept of predication of a variable property: taking into consideration the co-occurrence of the progressive with 'verbs of posture', 'verbs of bodily sensations' and 'extensive predicates', such as 'live', 'stay', etc. he points out the need to classify what he calls 'state-situations'\(^1\) into non-variable and variable. Though much of his proposal is based on the notion of temporariness, limited duration or transience as related to variable state-situations, and of permanency and 'longer duration' to non-variable state situation the advantage of his use of an opposition based on the concept of variability is that it allows us, in the specific case of Portuguese, to account for the use of *estar* also in expressions of permanent, but yet variable, states. That is, as sentences (55) and (56) illustrate:

(55) O chofer *está* morto.
(The driver *is* dead.)

(56) O copo *está* quebrado.
(The glass *is* broken.)

in expressions of states that, being irreversible, are permanent from the moment they are initiated, but which form, together with their respective opposites, a set of two possible (and temporally ordered) states which can be predicated of the entity.

---

1. This term 'situation' is used by Zydatiss in the sense given to it by Jessen (1974) to which he refers. Thus, cf. Jessen 1974 for the notion of propositions as logico-linguistic correlates of situations or states of affairs.
One should also mention, in relation to Portuguese, Kato's paper on relative clause reduction in Portuguese, where she proposes that an estar-insertion transformation is applied if tense is followed by '-ndo ('-ing) in the deep structure also when the predicate is an adjective and this is very similar to the view we are arguing for at this point, although she is not primarily concerned with aspect. Her proposal, together with the ones previously mentioned, and mainly Anderson's, due to the relevance of his localist approach to the historical development of estar predications and to the data we will present on language acquisition, will be the object of further discussion in the section referring to the progressive. They have been mentioned at this point, however, in order to draw attention to the fact that copula-selection in Portuguese is determined by, at least, some of the factors governing the use of the progressive in Portuguese and, probably in other languages, and that, therefore, the use of co-occurrence with the progressive as a criterion for their classification is misleading. Furthermore, the view that estar sentences are dynamic counterparts of ser sentences is now partially justified not only by their notional parallelism with progressive forms, but also by the dynamic implications of notions such as contingency as it is implied by sentences such as (50-52) and (53b-54b), and variability, proposed by the authors mentioned above (cf. Lyons 1968:301).

Obviously, the use of the term 'dynamic' to describe stative predications must be still further specified to
avoid its being taken in the same sense as it has when it is applied to event and process expressions (or propositions). Though it will hopefully become clearer after looking at the co-occurrence of *ser* and *está* (in expressions of locations of movables) with particular tenses and temporal adverbials, we would like to say, for the moment, that the term 'dynamic' is intended to capture the notion that the entity to which an *está* predication refers has the potentiality of moving from one state to another—one state, the actual state being asserted to hold and the other being presupposed to be possible.

If one compares sentences such as:

(57a) João *está* no escritório às duas horas.
(John is in the office at two o'clock)

(58a) O carro *está* na garagem às duas horas.
(The car is in the garage at two o'clock.)

with *ser* sentences such as:

(59a) Os livros de História *são* naquela estante às duas horas.
(The History books belong to/go on those shelves at two o'clock.)

the first point to be noticed is that *está* sentences with point-of-time adverbials such as 'at two o'clock' are ambiguous between an inclusive reading of the time-reference ('two o'clock' referring to one of the time-intervals which belong to a larger time-interval during which the location is supposed to obtain) and a starting point-of-time reading ('two o'clock' referring to a point-of-time which is the first in the interval during which the location is supposed to obtain). But, in both interpretations, a habitual reading can be superimposed on those sentences as its co-
occurrence with a regular (or irregular) frequency
adverbial demonstrates:

(57a.i) João está no escritório às 2 hs. todos os dias.
(John is in the office at 2 o'clock every day.)

(58a.i) O carro está na garagem às 2 hs. todos os dias.
(The car is in the garage at 2 o'clock every day.)

This is, however, not the case for ser sentences
such as (59a). First of all, they are unacceptable with
specific point-of-time adverbials under an inclusive
reading. A starting-point reading would be possible only
if the prepositional expression a partir de ('from t
onwards') is overtly expressed. Thus, (59a.i) is an
acceptable version of (59a).

(59a.i) Os livros de História são naquela estante a
partir das 2 hs.
(The History books go on those shelves from
2 o'clock onwards.)

in rather special, nevertheless possible, contexts such as
that of assigning places to books for regularly restricted
periods, or for a period starting at some point in time.

At first sight, sentences such as (59a.i) are similar
to the estar sentences above in the sense that, when
modified by starting-point (and/or end-point of time)
adjuncts, they also seem to allow for a habitual inter¬
pretation. The comparison of sentences such as (59a.i)
and:

(59b) Os livros de História são naquela estante
até as 4.
(The History books go on those shelves until 4.)
(59c) Os livros de História são naquela estante das 2 às 4.
(The History books go on those shelves from 2 till 4.)

with:

(60a) João está no escritório a partir das 2.
(John is in the office from 2 onwards.)

(60b) João está no escritório até às 4.
(John is in the office until 4.)

(60c) João está no escritório das 2 às 4.
(John is in the office from 2 till 4.)

would apparently confirm this. Moreover, frequency adverbials such as todos os dias ('every day') and sempre ('always') may co-occur with both ser and estar sentences above, as illustrated by:

(59c') Os livros de História são todos os dias naquela estante das 2 às 4.

(60c') João está todos os dias sempre no escritório das 2 às 4.

Nevertheless, it seems necessary to distinguish the habitual (or iterative meaning) which results from the collocation of a frequency adverbial with an estar sentence and the reading which can be assigned to ser sentences such as (59c'). Firstly, because the speaker's knowledge (or belief) of the previous actualization of the location for a certain number of times, which is a necessary condition for the utterance of a sentence such as (60c'), does not hold for (59c') (cf. our discussion of (32) and (33) in 2.1.2).

Secondly, because the possibility of conjoining ser sentences with their estar counterparts, as shown previously (cf. 2.1.2) stands also for their 'frequentative' versions,
such as (61) demonstrates:

(61) Os livros de História são {todos os dias naquela sempre estante, mas estão {todos os dias junto aos livros de Geografia, na estante da direita. (The History books go {every day on those shelves, but they are {every day beside the Geography books, on the shelves on the right.

The fact of sempre being interchangeable with todos os dias in both conjuncts shows that the frequential meaning displayed by this adverb, in Leech's view (1969:7.4.2), only with event predications (when the verb is in the simple present) also applies to these subtypes of locative sentences. And this is a crucial point, not only because they belong to the class of stative predications, but also because this is not so for other types of ser sentences, as demonstrated by the sentences below:

(62) A Floresta Amazônica sempre é no Brasil e só o governo brasileiro pode decidir sobre o que fazer com ela. (The Amazonian forest is, nevertheless, in Brazil, and only the Brazilian government can decide on what to do with it.)

(63) Você é sempre jovem e capaz de mudar completamente de vida. (You are still young and able to change your life completely.)

(64) A casa é sempre minha e posso pintá-la de vermelho, se me der vontade. (The house is nevertheless mine and I can paint it red, if I feel like.)

in which sempre takes two of the meanings corresponding to with those associated with 'still' in English.¹

¹. Cf. Traugott and Waterhouse 1969:288, fn[2], on the differentiation of the 'yet' which suppletes with 'already', from the 'yet' which is synonymous with 'still' and 'nevertheless'.
Thus, it does not seem to be the case that the difference between the readings of (59c') and (60c') corresponds to the instantiation of \textit{sempre}_2 (= 'still' and exemplified by (63)) or of \textit{sempre}_3 (= 'nevertheless' and exemplified by (62)). In fact, \textit{sempre}_2 and \textit{sempre}_3 seem to have as their scope the truth-value or modality component (cf. Lyons, forthcoming), in which the basic proposition is embedded, as can be seen in:

(65) João \(\textit{ainda} \ \textit{sempre} \ \textit{está} \ \textit{sempre}_1 \ \textit{no} \ \textit{escritório}?^{1}
(Is it \(\textit{always} \ \textit{the case that} \ \textit{John is always in the office}?)

(66) Os livros de História \(\textit{ainda} \ \textit{sempre}_2 \ \textit{naquela} \ \textit{estante}?
(Is it \(\textit{always} \ \textit{the case that} \ \textit{the History books go always to those shelves}?)

which can be paraphrased by:

(65') \(\textit{É} \ \textit{sempre}_2 \ \textit{verdade} \ \textit{que} \ \textit{João} \ \textit{está} \ \textit{sempre}_1 \ \textit{no} \ \textit{escritório}?
(Is it \(\textit{still} \ \textit{true that} \ \textit{John is always in the office}?)

(66') \(\textit{É} \ \textit{sempre}_2 \ \textit{verdade} \ \textit{que} \ \textit{os} \ \textit{livros} \ \textit{de} \ \textit{História} \ \textit{são} \ \textit{sempre}_1 \ \textit{naquela} \ \textit{estante}?
(Is it \(\textit{still} \ \textit{true} \ \textit{that} \ \textit{the History books go always on those shelves}?)

Consequently, the specification of frequency represented by \textit{sempre}_1 in (59c') and in (66) (as well as the

1. It seems that the different readings of \textit{sempre} have to be correlated with its position with respect to the verb, a frequentional reading being usually given to its occurrence in post-verbal position. This, however, does not appear to hold for event predications in Brazilian Portuguese. Sentences like:

Ela \(\textit{sempre} \ \textit{vai} \ \textit{ao} \ \textit{cinema}?
Ela \(\textit{vai} \ \textit{sempre} \ \textit{ao} \ \textit{cinema}?

are translated into English as:

Does she always go to the cinema?

whereas in European Portuguese, \textit{sempre} in proverbial position would correspond to \textit{sempre}_2 or 'still', the second sentence above having as its English version:

Is she still going to the cinema?
temporal specification represented by the starting and/or end-point of time adverbials in (59b) and (59c)) should be interpreted as applying to the rule (or norm) concerning the assignment of a 'habitat' to movables.

Indeed, estar sentences in the present tense with *sempre* are to be interpreted as iterative, or as describing a series of separate states of affairs, because they express a location which has been entered and left for a certain number of times during a period coming from the past up to the present moment, whereas ser sentences such as (59c'), since they do not imply the actualization of the location at any moment, must be interpreted as expressing a normative location, the norm (established or inferred) being specified for time-intervals ('from 2 to 4') and for its frequency within a consecutive period.

The problem which arises from the above discussion is whether the temporal and frequential specifications with the rule as their scope in *ser* sentences, would lead us to the conclusion that the spatial relationship asserted by them is untensed, or, in itself, temporally unspecifiable. In order to verify this, it is necessary to look at the co-occurrence of *ser* sentences of the type being discussed with period-of-time adverbials.

If one considers sentences such as:

(67) João *está* no escritório agora.  
    (John is in the office now.)

(68) Os livros de História *são* naquela estante agora.  
    (The History books go on those shelves now.)

there are two points to be noted. First, that (68) tends to be interpreted as expressing change of 'habitat' or
normative location, as do sentences like:

(69) O cinema está na esquina agora.
(The cinema is in the corner now.)

which constitute a subtype of locatives with immovables and whose co-occurrence with time adverbials will be discussed later. One could say, then, that *agora* would be redundant, if it were not in opposition with a previous period in the past.

The second point concerns (67), which is interpreted as expressing a location obtaining or 'being in existence' at a period of time including the point of time simultaneous with the utterance-act in which case, given certain contexts, a 'change-of-location' reading is possible. But, in normal conditions, the period of time adverbial would be interpreted as referring to the point-of-time simultaneous with the utterance-act and the sentence would be paraphraseable by:

(67a) João está no escritório neste momento.
(John is in the office at this moment.)

which does not seem to be the case for either (68) or (69). Worth noticing is also that (67) and (67a) are the primary interpretation of their temporally unmodified version:

(67') João está no escritório.

while (68) differs from:

(68') Os livros de História são naquela estante.

since (68') is temporally unrestricted and *agora* in (68) implies the terminal point of a previous normative location being located before or at the time simultaneous with the utterance act. Though the different meanings of *agora* with *ser* and *estar* are consequent upon the incompatibility
of ser sentences with point-of-time adverbials, the reading 'change of habitat' of (68) deserves further consideration. Since change of 'habitat' and change of location entails ingress into another 'habitat' and into another location and, consequently, cessation of a previous 'habitat' or location, it is worth looking at the co-occurrence of já ('already') with those sentences in order to clarify this notion of change and its applicability to ser. First of all, one should draw attention to the fact that, while estar locative sentences easily accept já, ser sentences such as:

(69) Os livros de História já são naquela estante.1
(The History books already belong to/go on those shelves.)

are acceptable, it would appear, only as a comment following the utterance of a sentence such as:

(70) (Eu acho que) os livros de História deveriam ser naquela estante.
((I think that) the History books should belong to/go on those shelves.)

Thus (69) seems to differ from:

(71) João já está no escritório.
(John is already in the office.)

by the different scope of the adverb in the underlying structures:2

1. The contrastive stress on the copula confirms our interpretation of (69), that is, its containing the negation of:

Os livros de História não são naquela estante.

which is a presupposition of (70).

2. Cf. Traugott & Waterhouse (1969) on the use of 'already' in truth-value sentences and also sentences such as:

João sempre já está no escritório quando eu chego.
(John is always already in the office when I arrive.)

which must be obligatorily assigned as an underlying structure:

(Contd.)
(69') [It is ALREADY the case [the History books belong to/go on those shelves.]]

(71') [It is the case [John is ALREADY in the office.]]

This means that ingress into a 'habitat', besides being a rather contradictory notion, is not a possible interpretation for this particular type of ser sentences, já having to be considered as referring to the decision or to the establishment of the rule concerning the assignment of the 'habitat'.

As for the compatibility of ser predications, in the present tense, with period-of-time adverbials other than agora, let us consider sentences such as:

Contd.) [It is ALWAYS the case [John is ALREADY in the office when I arrive.]]

And:

Voii já está sempre comendo de novo.
[It is ALREADY the case [you are ALWAYS eating] AGAIN.]

1. It is perhaps admissible that the difference between the simple present and the progressive of activity and accomplishment propositions would be accounted for in a similar way, when co-occurring with já. As shown below, only the progressive seems to allow for a paraphrase with the verb começar ('start', 'begin') in the perfect:

Elé já constrói casas.
(it is already the case that he builds houses.)

Elé já está construindo casas.
(He has already started to build houses.)

Elé já constrói a casa.
(He will soon build the house.)

Elé já está construindo a casa.
(He has already started building the house.)

2. Cf. again Traugott & Waterhouse on the possibility of PERFECT (as a deep structure feature of the whole sentence of which 'already' is one of the realizations) '...being obligatory with some modalities, e.g. intention that involves decision...as I shall go-I intend to go-I have decided to go' (1969:302).
(72) Os livros de História são naquela estante hoje/amanhã.
(The history books go on those shelves today/tomorrow.)

(73) Os meninos são na sala 17 hoje/amanhã/este ano.
(The boys' place is room 17 today/tomorrow/this year.)

The period-of-time adverbials present in these sentences again represent the temporal specification of the rule and can refer depending on the context and/or on the pragmatic presuppositions shared by speaker and receiver, to:

1. the whole period of time to which the rule applies (cf. este ano in (73));

2. a period of time which belongs to the temporally ordered set of periods of time to which the rule applies (in (73), for instance, hoje and amanhã may be the weekdays on which the boys go to the French class in room 17.)

It now appears that the problem which originated the present discussion, (i.e. that of defining the temporal restrictions which are compatible with ser predications, and particularly, of explaining their co-occurrence in the present tense, with period-of-time adverbials) has as its solution the assignment of both aspectual and temporal restrictions to the higher S in which the proposition is embedded, or to the modality component of the sentence.

And this would be consistent with the fact that temporal and aspectual restrictions in ser sentences with moveables as subjects must apply to the rule (inferred or established) which is implied by them and which concerns the assignment

1. Obviously, the same interpretation can be applied to agora in (68).
of a 'habitat' to an entity.

It could be argued, however, that a simpler and, thus, more satisfactory solution would be to consider ser predications as compatible only with a temporal reference which is not a point of time, but a period of time viewed as a whole, that is, not as a series of discrete and ordered units. Moreover, the fact that, in the case of an inferred norm or rule, an inference such as 'the 'habitat' of X is Y' must be based on the actualization of the location of X in Y for a certain number of times, apparently favours this alternative solution. However, since an existing rule or norm (either imposed or inferred) does not guarantee the actualization of the location at any particular point of time, it appears that this view should be discarded.

Another argument in favour of assigning temporal and aspectual restrictions to the modality component has to do with the difference between the norm as implied by a ser sentence and a decision concerning the location of an entity at a specific point-of-time, which is expressed by a deontically modalized estar-sentence. The norm or rule implied by a ser sentence is one which operates on the set of all possible locations of the entity, or, in other words, which neutralizes its movability. If the movability of an entity is, by definition, its capacity of having different locations at different points of time, the neutralization of its movability has as a temporal implication that of referring to periods, not to points of time. Instead, a decision concerning the location of an entity at a specific
point of time (cf. (34a-b)) does not entail the neutralization of its movability, since it operates on only one member of the set of its possible locations. This explains why estar sentences such as (45) and (47) are not acceptable without an overtly expressed point-of-time adverbial as (45a) and (47a) illustrate:

(45a)* Forcei José Augusto a estar em casa.  
(I forced José Augusto to be at home.)

(46a)* José Augusto, esteja em casa!

and why sentences such as (34b) and (74):

(74) João deve estar no escritório às 2.  
(John must be at the office at 2 o'clock.)

cannot be given a deontic interpretation if a specific point of time is not predicated of them.¹

In fact, since the presence of estar in those sentences implies the actualization of the location as already obtaining (or conceived as obtaining) at the moment of the utterance, the appropriate conditions either for using imperative sentences (as a type of command) or for the receiver to give a deontic interpretation to (74) do not seem to be met. Moreover, the presence of a point-of-time adverbial makes a sentence such as (47) acceptable:

1. At least with some propositions, as those which encode activities, the argument above presented seems to hold also for their occurrences in the progressive. Indeed, the impossibility of assigning a deontic reading to:

†Ele deve estar cantando.  
(He must be singing.)

does not prevail, if a specific point-of-time adverbial is predicated of it. Thus,

†Ele deve estar cantando quando as cortinas subirem.  
(He must be singing when the curtains rise.)

is, at least, in Portuguese, interpretable as a deontic modalized sentence.
(47) José Augusto, *esta*ja *em* casa às 10hs!
not only by its implicit future reference, but also, and
this is crucial, by denoting a point-of-time, not a period
of time,¹ as the oddity of (47b)

(47b)? José Augusto, *esta*ja *em* casa amanhã!
(José Augusto, be at home tomorrow!)

and the preference for an epistemic reading of (74a) suggests:

(74a) João deve *estar* no escritório amanhã.

Thus, while *ser* sentences, in the present tense, tend
to reject temporal restrictions, the contrary can be said
about *estar*. In fact, if one restricts or assigns more or
less precise limits to the actualization of the location,
within the limits of the period-of-time adverbial amanhã in
(47c) and (73b), as one can see below:

(47c) José Augusto, *esta*ja *em* casa amanhã das 2 às 4!
?o dia inteiro?
?de manhã?

(73b) João deve *estar* no escritório amanhã das 2 às 4.
?o dia inteiro.
de manhã.
(from 2 till 4)
(all day)
(in the morning)

the former becomes acceptable and the latter, deontically
interpretable.

In brief, what the co-occurrence of *ser* and *estar*
(in the present tense, as well as *estar* in the imperative)

¹. Cf. Leech's commentary on the need for postulating 'a
feature [+ PERI] to explain certain discrepancies between
the uses of tenses and the use of adverbials of time...
For instance, the instantaneous present, the meaning of
which is no more than 'single-event now', has to be
applied to something apprehended at the present moment,
rather than in a present period...' (Leech 1969:133)
And cf. also (and mainly) Anderson 1973:77 on the require-
ment of a higher point-of-time predication for the
progressive.
in expressions of locations of movables, with temporal and aspectual adverbials, seem to demonstrate is that, while estar predcations can be bound or restricted to points and periods of time (conceived as a series of contiguous points of time), ser predications can only be restricted to periods of time (conceived as a whole or in their entirety).\(^1\)

Further evidence relevant to this point are the restrictions on the co-occurrence of this subtype of ser sentences with the perfective tense-marker, or the pretérito perfeito of the Portuguese verbal system. As one would expect, estar inflected in this tense accepts both point/period-of-time adverbials and durational ones, as (75a) illustrates:

\[(75a)\] João **esteve** no escritório às 2.
\[(\text{was})\] ontem (yesterday).
 a partir das 2 (from 2 onwards).
 até as 2 (until 2).
 das 2 às 4 (from 2 to 4).
 por muitas horas (for many hours).

while this is not the case for ser, which does not occur with time - when adverbials such as those present in 76a:

\[(76a)\] Os livros de História **foram** naquela estante (belonged to)
 \[\begin{array}{l}
 \text{ontem.} \\
 \text{a partir das 2.} \\
 \text{até as 2.} \\
 \text{no ano passado (last year).} \\
\end{array}\]

1. Further restrictions will be shown to be dependent on the semantic properties of other elements of the sentence, as will be evident from the data presented in the following sections.

2. The oddness of ser sentences of this type can also be detected in its temporally unmodified version, i.e., with no time-adverbial expressed. Cf. Leech, 1969:153 on the obligatory presence of durational adverbials in stative predications with the perfect tense.
This fact could lead to the conclusion that *ser* predications express unrestricted states, or states whose temporal extension and limits are bound (or conceived as bounded) to the temporal extension or limits of the entity of which they are predicated. However, the acceptability of *ser* sentences with starting and/or end-point of time expressions referring to larger time-units, and with durational adverbials, as shown in (76b)

(76b) Os livros de História *foram* naquela estante até eu vir trabalhar aqui. (until I came to work here.)
    enquanto eu trabalhei aqui. (while I worked here.)
    por muitos anos. (for many years.)

seems to provide counter-evidence to this conclusion. In order to solve this problem, three points must be brought into consideration. The first refers to the meaning of the *pretérito perfeito* with stative predications, as well as with activity propositions, which, due to the homogeneous or non-cyclic character of the situation-types encoded by them, is cessative, and not completive.¹

The second point concerns the difference between the starting and/or end-point of time adverbials present in (76b) and in (76a). In my opinion, the acceptability of (76b) does not seem to have to be accounted for as a matter of factual knowledge, i.e., by saying that 'habitats' are normally expected to be temporally specified in years, and

not in hours. What seems relevant to the point being discussed here is that adverbials such as 'from 1960 to 1970', i.e. those occurring in (76b), provide an explicit past reference-point to the sentence, whereas adverbials such as 'from 2 till 4', i.e., those referring to hours (weekdays and months) are not inherently ordered with respect to the time of the utterance-act. Indeed, they do not predicate 'pastness' of the proposition, but, instead, in the case of stative predcations, refer:

i. either to the period of time defined by the moment of the ingress into the state (location) and by that of the exit of it (cf. 'from 2 till 4' in (75));

ii. or to the period of time defined only by the exit-boundary time (cf. 'until 2' in (75));

iii. or to a specific point-of-time at which the ingress took place (cf. 'at 2' in (75)), a final point-tensor being implicit in the cessative reading assigned to the whole predication.

It seems plausible, then, to say that the 'pastness' of the spatial relationship expressed in (75) is an implication of the cessative meaning of the pretérito perfeito and it is not conveyed by the point-tensor adverbials which refer primarily to the ingress and/or exit-boundary. If it is so, the by-product of the interaction of those point-tensor adverbials with the pretérito perfeito in ser sentences such as (76a), would 'force' an interpretation of 'actualized-in-the-past' relationship, thus contradicting their being expressions of
Instead, the adverbial expressions present in (7bb), have an explicit temporal reference with which the cessative meaning of the perfective agrees (or is in agreement). This seems to allow for their temporal specification to be interpreted as referring to the rule, not to the actualization of the relationship at a certain time in the past.

1. Worth mentioning is the use of the verb passar ('go through', 'pass' in its concrete motional sense) as an 'aktionsart' verb used with this type of ser sentences, such as exemplified below:

Os livros passaram a ser naquela estante quando eu mudei para cá.
(The books passed to belong to those shelves when I moved here.) (lit.tr.)

Or, perhaps:

[It has come to pass [the books belong to those shelves when I moved here.]]

This use of passar seems parallel to that of começar ('begin'). That is, as the latter encodes inception of events, passar expresses 'passage' (border-crossing, in Jussen's terminology (1973)) from a 'generic' or habitual state to another. Other significative examples of this use are:

Teresa passou a ser uma menina alegre assim que mudou de escola.
(Teresa passed to be a cheerful girl as soon as she moved school.) (lit.tr.)

João começou a estudar depois que o professor o repreendeu.
(John started to (began) study(ing) after the teacher passed to reprimanded him.) (lit.tr.)

But:

João passou a estar no escritório às 2, depois que o chefe o repreendeu.
(John passed to be(ing at the office at 2, after the boss reprimanded him.) (lit.tr.)

Notice also the use of the directional verb por denoting inception, as in French 'se mettre à', and in Italian 'mettersi a'.

'habitats'.

The third point in this discussion concerns the unacceptability of time-when adverbials with ser sentences in the pretérito perfeito, which indicates that an explicit past reference is not a sufficient condition for adverbials to co-occur with them, another condition being that of being durational. In fact, adverbials such as ontem ('yesterday') and no ano passado ('last year') which are compatible with estar sentences such as (75), specify periods of time within which the whole extension of the state (location) is included, i.e., the temporal extension defined by the ingression and exit boundaries. Thus, the incompatibility of ser sentences with these adverbials seems again consequent upon their not entailing actualization at any specific moment or period.

Support for this view is also provided by the co-occurrence of ser and estar in the pretérito perfeito with sempre and with the aspectual adverbials já, ainda.

The oddity of (77):

(77)? João esteve sempre no escritório.

contrasting with the perfect acceptability of (77'):

(77') João esteve sempre no escritório das 2 às 4, durante a manhã.

ontem.

(John has been always in the office from 2 till 4.)

durante a manhã, ontem.

and also its appropriateness as an answer to a question such as:

(76) Onde estava/esteve João das 2 às 4?

during the morning? ontem?

(Where was/has been John from 2 till 4?

during the morning? yesterday?)
shows that estar-sentences require an explicit (or contextually recoverable) temporal specification for sempre. This is not the case for ser sentences, as exemplified by (79):

(79) Os livros de História foram sempre naquela estante.
(The History books have always belonged to those shelves.)

As for the aspectual adverbial já, both ser and estar sentences are compatible with it:

(80) João já esteve no escritório.
(John has already been in the office.)

(81) Os livros de História já foram naquela estante.
(The History books have already belonged to those shelves.)

However, since já, co-occurring with the perfective does not seem to express the completion of an ingressive phase (or cessation of a previous state), its presence in both sentences should probably be accounted for by postulating the same underlying structures as for (69):¹

(80') [It is ALREADY the case [John has been in the office.]]

(81') [It is ALREADY the case [the History books have belonged to those shelves.]]

1. Traugott & Waterhouse (1969:298) express the view that 'already' is redundant with sentences with 'have-en' and that their function in this case is, if any, to emphasize perfectiveness. In my opinion, the presence of já with the pretérito perfeito in Portuguese could be explained as referring to the speaker's and/or addressee presuppositions about the 'alreadyness' in which the state has come about. In the case of (80) above, it would indicate the fulfilment (or 'perfection') of the speaker's expectations about the 'coming about' of the state 'John having been in the office' or that it has obtained at a time previously to the time expected by the speaker and/or the addressee.
or:

\[(81^\prime\prime) \text{ [It has ALREADY been the case [the History books belong to those shelves.]]} \]

The semantic motivation to propose \((81^\prime\prime)\) as an alternative interpretation of \((81)\) lies in the facts which arise from the examination of sentences such as:

\[(82) \text{ João ainda não esteve no escritório.} \]
\[(83) \text{ Os livros de História ainda não foram naquele estante.} \]

Sentence \((82)\) seems to be interpretable as a denial of the expectations of the speaker and/or the addressee about the 'having come about' of the state (or location), in the same way as \((80)\) expresses the fulfilment of those expectations (cf. fn. 1 on \((80)\)). This would justify the assignment of \((80^\prime\prime)\) as an underlying structure to \((80)\), as well as of:

\[(82^\prime) \text{ [NEG It is ALREADY the case [John has been in the office.]]} \]

as an underlying structure of \((82)\). If the embedded sentence has to represent the full content of the presupposition - the state of 'John being in the office' having come about previously to the moment of the utterance-act -, the perfective must be one of its constituents.

As for \((81)\) and \((83)\), the presence of \(já\) ainda não is not explainable in the same way, i.e., as expressing the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of the speaker/and or addressee expectations. Indeed, \((81)\) and \((83)\) do not depend on the speaker's sharing with the addressee expectations about the time in which a state should/would come about. They can even be conjoined in an utterance such as:
(84) Os livros de História já foram naquela estante, naquela outra da direita, na seção de mapas; só ainda não foram junto aos livros de Geografia... O diretor desta Biblioteca é completamente doido!

(The History books have already belonged to those shelves, to those other shelves on the right, to the section of maps; the only place to which they have not yet belonged is beside the Geography books... The chief-librarian in this Library is completely crazy!)

which constitutes a statement about a state of affairs.

This allows us to interpret the perfectivity of já (and of ainda, which suppletes with it in negative sentences)\(^1\) and that expressed by the tense-form,\(^2\) as applying to the rule the modality component, not to the spatial relationship expressed by the propositional component, and to propose (83\(^'\)) as the underlying structure of (83):

\[(83\(^'\)) [NEG it has ALREADY been the case [the History books belong to those shelves.]]\]

similarly to what has been proposed for (81), and consistently with our view on the adverbial já in the present tense.

By examining the following sentences:

(85a) João estava no escritório às 2 horas. 
\hspace{1cm} \text{(was)} \hspace{1cm} às 2 às 4. 
\hspace{1cm} a partir das 2. 
\hspace{1cm} até às 4.

---

1. Cf. Traugott & Waterhouse (1969) for a detailed account of 'already' and 'yet' as a suppletive set and on their perfective meaning. As for Portuguese já and ainda ('still', 'yet'), their relationships deserve a much more careful treatment than that provided by this work.

2. The term 'tense' has been used in this subsection to refer to what is traditionally described as different tenses in reference-grammars.
(86a) Os livros de História eram naquela estante às 2 horas. 
    das 2 às 4. 
    a partir das 2. 
    até às 4. 

in which an imperfective tense-form - or the pretérito 
imperfeito of the Portuguese verbal system - co-occurs 
with point-of-time and starting and/or end-point-of-time 
adverbials, and also:

(85b) João estava no escritório hoje. 

ontem. 
quina-feira (Thursday). 
a semana passada.

(86b) Os livros de História eram naquela estante hoje. 

ontem. 
quina-feira. 
a semana passada.

in which period-of-time adverbials are present, it becomes 
clear that the same behaviour described as pertaining to 
these types of sentences in the present tense is found with 
the imperfective. Indeed, the non-cessative value of this 
tense makes them interpretable as expressing a spatial 
relationship still in existence (or imperfective at a past 
reference-point) and this explains their similarities or 
the features which they have in common, which are:

i. the incompatibility of ser with point-of-time 
adverbials;

ii. the possibility of assigning a habitual reading to 
estar sentences, such as (85a), and not to ser sentences, 
such as (86a), in which point-tensor adverbials have to be 
understood as giving temporal specification to the rule;

iii. the interpretation of period-of-time adverbials 
in ser sentences, such as (86b), as specified in (a) and (b) 
relatively to (72) and (73).
The point made in ii. above deserves some consideration, since it seems to apply also to durational adverbials. In fact, *estar* sentences like:

(85c) João *estava* no escritório *por duas/muitas horas.*

(John used to be in the office for two/many hours.)

must be interpreted as habitual, as its English translation indicates. This is equivalent to saying that, as scalar tensors (cf. Bull 1963), they measure the temporal extension of each instantiation of the location in a series which, in the case of (85c) is imperfective at a certain point in the past. *Ser* sentences, however, are incompatible with this type of adverbial in the *pretérito imperfeito*, as (86c) illustrates:

(86c) *Os livros de História *eram* naquela estante *por duas/muitas horas.*

and this seems to constitute another argument favouring the view that *ser* sentences express a single and continuing state of affairs which, consequently—and contrarily to *estar* sentences—is not conceived as repeatable or countable.

The same kind of support for this view is provided by the co-occurrence of sentences of this type with the *pretérito perfeito composto*—or Present Perfect—of the Portuguese verbal system. But, before initiating the discussion of this last point, a brief account of the meaning of this tense should be given.

According to Kahane and Hutter (1953:20), the Present Perfect in Portuguese is a form which relates the past to the non-past, a definition which coincides with Jespersen's
view about the inclusive perfect in English (1924:271-2).

However, this does not seem to be enough to characterize this tense in Portuguese, because, in contrast with its potentiality of co-occurrence in English, it does not accept 'since' phrases, which require the verb to be in the Present tense (as in French and in Italian).

(87) Eu tenho morado em São Paulo desde 1952.
(I have lived in São Paulo since 1952)

Another characteristic of this tense is its incompatibility with achievement and accomplishment propositions.\(^1\)

(88) Mário \(\text{tem} \) chegado \(\text{(pres.perf.)} \)
\(\text{chegou} \). \(\text{(preterite)} \)
(Mário has arrived.)

(89) Mário \(\text{tem} \) chegado cedo \(\text{últimamente} \). \(\text{(pres.perf.)} \)
(Mário has been arriving early lately.)

(90) Mário \(\text{tem} \) construído a casa. \(\text{(pres.perf.)} \)
\(\text{construiu a casa} \). \(\text{(preterite)} \)
(Mário has built the house.)

(91) Mário \(\text{tem} \) construído casas. \(\text{(pres.perf.)} \)
(Mário has been building houses.)

On the basis of the data above, it seems plausible to say that, with event predcations, the Portuguese Present

---


2. Sentences such as:

\(\text{Mário tem a casa construída} \).
(Mário has the house built.)
\(\text{Eu tenho a casa já preparada para os hóspedes} \).
(I have the house already prepared for the guests.)

differ from the Present Perfect sentences above, by having the 'beneficiary' (not necessarily the 'agent') as their subjects (cf. Lyons, 1963a:397). It is worth noticing how these forms are distinct from Present Perfect occurrences: the past participle is, obligatorily, in post-nominal position and agrees in gender and number with the noun (as an adjective in attributive function.)
Perfect expresses a series of events still going on, i.e., the series is incomplete at point present. This also explains the incompatibility of sentences such as (89) and (91) above with specific time-when adverbials which have a past reference.

This interpretation also holds for estar sentences with the copula inflected in this tense, as is illustrated by (92):

(92) João tem estado no escritório às 2 horas. até às 4.
*ontem.
*na semana passada.

since they must be assigned an iterative meaning, the state (or location) being asserted as actualized for a certain number of times during a period coming from the past up to the present moment.

As for ser sentences, such as:

(93) Os livros de História têm sido naquela estante.

they are only acceptable in contexts which allow for an interpretation of 'iterativeness' as assigned to the rule. In other words, they mean that the rule concerning the assignment of a normative location has been enforced (and subsequently suspended) for a certain number of times during a period coming from the past up to the present. However, like their preterite counterparts (cf. (76a)), they are incompatible with starting and/or end-point-of-time adverbials, such as 'from 2 till 4'. This can be explained by the perfectivity of the past participle sido imposing a reading of cessation of ingression and/or exit - or of actualization - which is in conflict with the meaning of ser sentences, as we have been emphasizing throughout this section.
2.1.4. Some preliminary conclusions

The facts that emerge from the study of the behaviour of *ser* and *está* locative sentences with moveables, relatively to aspectual and temporal restrictions, seem to form a rather clearcut pattern.

As for aspectual restrictions, represented by adverbials and by the verbal forms traditionally called imperfective (*Presente* and *Pretérito Imperfeito*) and perfective (*Pretérito Perfeito Simples* and *Composto*) tenses, the scope of their predication in *estar*-sentences is, undoubtedly, the propositional component, which represents the spatial relation between the entity and its location. In contrast, the acceptability of *ser* with the preterite and the aspectual adverbials *já* and *ainda* is submitted to contextual conditions which constitute a clear indication of the scope of these elements being the norm or rule (inferred or established) which is implied by *ser* sentences.

The same applies to frequency adverbials: the reading corresponding to 'still' which must be assigned to *sempre*, when *ser* is inflected for the present tense, in contrast with its frequential meaning, when it co-occurs with the perfective (cf. (79)) constitutes further evidence of the incompatibility of the locative content of a *ser* sentence with the meanings 'habitual', 'ingressive', 'cessative'. In other words, the interpretation assignable to *ser* sentences in these contexts strongly suggests that what can be viewed as 'countable', 'recurr ent' and of course, 'actualizable', is the rule or norm implicit in these sentences and represented in their modality component.
The basic argument for distinguishing *ser* and *está* predications with respect to the feature 'actuality'\(^1\) lies, however, in their restrictions of the co-occurrence with time-when adverbials. Indeed, the situation that has just been described holds for the co-occurrence of *ser* and *está* with durational adverbials: with *está*, they must be interpreted as temporal restrictions operating on the spatial relation asserted; with *ser*, their scope is the rule or the truth-value sentence. Instead, as far as time-when adverbials are concerned, one has, on one hand, the acceptability of period-of-time adverbials under the same conditions of interpretation as stated above. On the other, one has a full contrast in the behaviour of the copulas relatively to point-of-time adverbials: *ser* completely rejects them, whereas their presence is a necessary condition for the acceptability of imperative and deontically modalized sentences with *está*. If specific point-of-time adverbials (starting-, end- and intermediary point-of-time adverbials) are 'non-omissible determiners' (cf. Ivič, 1962) of *está* in these cases, the absence of temporal restrictions in *está* predications must have its acceptability conditioned to the possibility of recovering from the context some time-specification (cf. (77)).

Therefore, one could say that *está* predications

---

1. This is, as a matter of fact, the distinction assigned by Kahane & Hutter (1953:26) to the opposition between *está*-forms vs. non-*está*-forms, in their study of the Brazilian Portuguese verbal system.
express spatial relations which are necessarily temporarily specifiable or that *estar* is marked for the actuality of the relationship asserted, and that *ser* predications are characteristically untensed or unmarked for the actuality of the relationship expressed. This conclusion seems rather satisfactory for *estar*, but still insufficient to explain *ser* in expressions of locations of movables and its normative implication.

In order to give a more precise formulation to the unmarkedness and normative implications of *ser*, it seems necessary to give further consideration to notions such as actuality and movability, and to try to establish the implicational relations holding between them.

It can be said that actuality, as a feature of a predication, has to do with the possibility of stating the validity of the predication for a time interval whose extensional range goes from one minimal unit to a maximum number of units, provided that the perception of the relation asserted is possible (or viewed as possible) within its limits. This seems to be a basic notion, or a notion which is not subject to controversy, as far as our commonsensical view of the world goes, and without considering it to be a statement to be validated by any psychological theory of perception. The problem, however, is to relate this notion of actuality with that of movability, given that they both seem to be closely connected with the meaning of *estar*, and in order to specify what is meant by irrelevancy of actuality as applied to *ser* sentences.
The assignment of the property of movability to an entity is equivalent to defining its set of possible locations as having more than one member, or to looking at the existing-in-the-world of a movable entity as a potential series of immediately successive locations.¹ This means that an assertion about the location of a movable entity implies the negation of any relation holding between the entity and the other members of the set at the same time. Consequently, the validity of the predication of a location to a movable is dependent on the availability of the relation as an object of perception (or in its being observable), in other words, on the possibility of putting it into relation with the deictic coordinates of space and time.

If the 'actuality' of estar sentences is consequent upon the presence of the feature [+ movable] in the head noun of their subject NPs, it could be argued that the unmarkedness of ser sentences as for the 'actuality' of the spatial relation asserted should be conditioned by the recategorization of the N which denotes the entity located as [- movable]. This, however, does not seem to be the case, as the interpretation of the ser sentences with movables which we have been discussing in this section, and also the different interpretations which must be assigned to the co-occurrence of the perfective tense with ser in the sentences below, demonstrate:

(76b) Os livros de História foram naquela estante por muitos anos.
(The History books belonged to those shelves for many years.)

¹ Cf. Jessen (1973) for a precise formulation of the notion of immediate succession.
A Floresta Amazônica foi no Brasil por muitos séculos.
(The Amazonian Forest was in Brazil for many centuries.)

Although in both sentences the scope of the perfective and of the durational adverbial is not their propositional component, or the spatial relation asserted, in (94) 'pastness' is predicated of the existence of the entity\(^1\) and this does not seem to apply to (76b). As has already been discussed 'pastness' in this case, is predicated of the norm concerning the assignment of 'those shelves' as a 'habitat' to the books. This is further demonstrated by the possibility of conjoining (76b) with an adversative clause which asserts the continuation of the existence of the entity, or of the books:

(95) Os livros de História foram naquela estante por muitos anos, mas não são mais.
(The History books belonged to those shelves for many years, but they don't any more.)

whereas the result of its conjunction to (94) is paradoxical:

(96) *A Floresta Amazônica foi no Brasil por muitos séculos, mas não é mais.
(The Amazonian Forest was in Brazil for many centuries, but it isn't anymore.)

The difference between these two types of *ser* predications which have been demonstrated to be both untensed or temporally unspecifiable seems to fall into the two classes of the generic expressions defined by Dahl (1972) as 'law-like' or nomic statements, which he distinguishes

\(^1\) Cf. Anderson (1973:7a) on 'the assumption that a (tensed) existential accompanies...any definite substantive predicate subordinate to a non-empty (i.e. referring) N'.
as follows:

"Depending on the character of the alternativeness relation, we may get rather different types of nomic statements. One important distinction is between descriptive nomic statements, i.e. those which express physical, biological, etc. laws, and normative ones, i.e. those which express social (moral) norms, customs, regulations and so on. A descriptive nomic statement tells us what holds in e.g. 'physically possible worlds', a normative nomic statement tells us what holds, e.g. in the 'morally perfect worlds'. Since our world is clearly a physically possible world, but not so obviously a morally perfect one, an important consequence follows: the norms expressed in normative nomics are broken, whereas the laws of descriptive nomics may not be."

(Dahl 1972:5)

Considering that normative locations or 'habitats' expressed by ser sentences with movables involve either the inference of a norm from the observation of a certain regularity in the actualization of a certain location, or the establishment of it by someone in authority, and that both inferred and established norms can cease to exist, there seem to be no grounds to propose the recategorization of movables as immovables as the explanation of the selection of ser in some type of locative with movables. Moreover, not even its occurrence with immovables which could be classified as a descriptive nomic statement concerning a specific entity, suggests that ser is used in expressions of permanent, essential, non-changeable states or locations. The Amazonian Forest can be destroyed, Brazil may lose the part of its territories in which the Amazonian Forest is located.

Therefore, the characterization of ser sentences, from the facts presented about its use to express locations of immovables, as unmarked as for the actuality of the relation
asserted, seems to be understood as simply unrelated to the deictic coordinates or untensed.

2.2. Location of immovable entities

Before initiating the discussion of the factors which might possibly govern the selection of ser and estar in expressions having to do with the location of immovables, it should be mentioned that as far as the validity of statements about general tendencies of the language stands, the use of ser prevails over that of estar in this case and the fact that the basic question for asking directions is Onde é X? ('Where is X?'), if X is an immovable entity, seems to reflect this.

Indeed, apart from the obligatory use of estar in very few subtypes of locative sentences with immovables, the selection of this copula seems to be largely determined by the pragmatic presuppositions of the speaker (cf. our preliminary discussion on sentences such as (5a) and (6a) in 2"). What is meant by this is that the basic meaning of the proposition remains the same and that judgments of grammaticality are not involved in these cases. However, the different presuppositions which account for the use of certain types of spatial relationships between immovables constitute points relevant for the specification of the semantic value of copula selection in general, as is our intention to demonstrate and, thus, deserve careful discussion.
2.2.1. The selection of *ser* and *estar* and its dependence on the type of spatial relationship asserted.

As pointed out in 2., one of the factors which appears to govern copula selection in the case of the location of immovables seems to be the type or aspect of the relationship asserted. Indeed, sentences such as:

(1) Minha sala *é* no terceiro andar do Adam Ferguson Building. *é* (My room is in the third floor of the Adam Ferguson Building.)

(2) O restaurante *é* na esquina. *é* (The restaurant is at/on the corner.)

(3) A cabana *é* naquela pequena ilha que se vê daqui. *é* (The hut is on that small island one can see from here.)

(4) Essa aldeia *é* na ilha de Marajó. *é* (That village is in Marajó Island.)

(5) A ponte *é* no rio Tietê. *é* (The bridge is on the river Tietê.)

which do not accept *estar* as a copula, express a relationship of containment; that is, as has already been defined, they locate one entity wholly within the boundaries of another entity. Sentence (5) could be considered as a counter-example to this, since a bridge does not seem to be perceived, in ordinary contexts, as touching the waters of the river it crosses. However, its length is determined by the width of the river, and it is plausible to interpret this as a type of containment.

The element which so defines the relationship in the above sentences is the preposition *em*, which may be said to

1. Notice that *estar* is acceptable (and obligatory) if (2) refers to a mobile restaurant or if the subject of (3) refers to a tent.
correspond to the English prepositions 'at', 'on' and 'in', as is suggested by the translations given to those sentences. This correspondence seems indicative of the unmarkedness of *em*, in Brazilian Portuguese, with respect to the features which distinguish 'at', 'on' and 'in' in English (cf. Leech 1969:161 and Clark 1973:41). What, however, seems relevant in this correspondence is the fact that authors such as Leech, Jessen and Clark, who have dealt with spatial location in English, have considered 'at', 'on' and 'in', as belonging to the class of prepositions which express simple position, and as distinct from those such as 'in front of', 'behind', which denote, according to Leech and Jessen, relative position or, in Clark's terms, are relational. The question, then, is to verify whether the notion of simple position vs. relative position and that of containment vs. non-containment are interdependent and, if it is so, how it would clarify the incompatibility of *estar* sentences with *em* in expressions of the location of immovables.

1. The unmarkedness of *em* relatively to the dimensions of the reference object or location seems to be peculiar to expressions of static spatial relations between immovables in Brazilian Portuguese. The opposition between *em* and a ('at') is, indeed, operative in the formal (and written) register, as exemplified below:

A menina estava *em* janela/à porta.
(The girl was at the window/at the door.)

In expressions having to do with location of movables. It is also maintained in expressions of temporal location, both in colloquial and formal Brazilian Portuguese (cf. 2.1.3 for examples of the use of *a* with point-of-time adverbials and *em* with period-of-time expressions.)
According to Leech (1969: 8.1) and to Jessen (1973), the notion of simple vs. relative position (or location) is based on the perception or conceptualisation of an entity as an object or as a location: a spatial relationship of simple position is asserted when an entity conceived as an object is located in relation to an entity conceived as a location and a relative location is a spatial relation asserted to hold between two entities conceived as objects. As pointed out by Leech, the asymmetric character of expressions of simple position – and sentences (1) to (5) are examples of this type of expression – is demonstrated by the nonsensical result obtained by reversing the relationship between the entities denoted by their NPs, as illustrated by (2'):

(2') * Aquela esquina está no restaurante.
("That corner is on the restaurant.")

and this is a consequence of their unequal status. That is, the entity denoted by the NP governed by the preposition - i.e. naquela esquina in (2) - is a location.

On the other hand, expressions of relative position, such as:

(6) O cinema está junto ao restaurante.
(The cinema is by the restaurant.)

are factually equivalent to:

(6') O restaurante está junto do cinema.
(The restaurant is by the cinema.)

and this demonstrates that the entities referred to in (6) are perceived or conceived as two objects spatially related 'not directly, but through the mediation of locations' (Leech 1969:165).
Thus, there do not seem to be any grounds for the establishment of a relationship between the notions briefly presented above and our view of the obligatory presence of *ser* in expressions of spatial containment. In fact, sentences such as:

(7) O restaurante *está* em frente àquela esquina.
(The restaurant is in front of that corner.)

which are expressions of simple position, as the oddness of (7') indicates:

(7') Aquele esquina *está* em frente ao restaurante.
(That corner is in front of the restaurant.)

are also expressions of non-containment. This is, in fact, accounted for in Jessen's proposal (1973:112) that the distinction between overlapping (or 'atness') and non-overlapping location is primary or superordinate to that of simple vs. relative location. Since an overlapping location is a spatial relation between entities which share some part in common, containment can be said to be a subtype of overlapping, definable as holding between entities which have in common a part which represents the totality of the area of one of them (or of the entity whose location is in question.). From this (and from examples such as (7) above) it follows that an expression of spatial containment may be, at least theoretically, either an assertion of simple position or one of relative position and the same holds for expressions of non-containment, i.e., they are not necessarily assertions of the relative position of objects.

Another point which makes Jessen's approach to
location useful for our discussion of copula selection in locative sentences is that she explicitly treats the notion of order (and direction) as dependent on that of non-overlapping:

"Static, polarized, non-overlapping (relative) location comprises the two possible ordering relationships along a linear dimension other than that of coincidence (or, more loosely, overlapping). Both its interpretation and the direction of its polarity are situationally determined. In a spatial context, it is applicable to three orientational axes yielding the opposition 'above'/ 'below', 'in front of'/ 'behind', 'to the left'/ 'to the right of' (cf. Leech, 1970) with polarity being determined often with respect to the speaker-observer, often with respect to physical or conceptual properties of the reference-object." (Jessen 1973:112-3)

Since the notion of direction is, as Jessen also states, 'the dynamic equivalent of order', her view provides support for our interpretation of estar sentences, such as (5a) and (6a) in 2.1.0, as dynamic counterparts of ser sentences, as exemplified by (5b) and (6b) in the same section. Indeed, both (5a) and (5b):

(5a) Minha casa está a cem metros da estrada.
(5b) Minha casa está a cem metros da estrada.

(My house is a hundred metres from the road.)

are examples of expressions of non-overlapping location (and consequently, of non-containment) and relative position, the order expressed by the prepositional locution 'at n units from Y' being determined by the actuality or the possibility of the speaker being at Y. However, both sentences are expressions of static location, no implication of the house being movable being obligatory for the acceptability of (5a). In what sense, then, is the term 'dynamic' applicable to it? We will leave this question open for the moment. It is a question that is of much more
general import and the answer to it (or one of the possible answers to it) must follow from arguments which will be presented in the context of the discussion of other uses of *ser* with expressions referring to immovables.

2.2.2 **Expressions of containment**

From the points which have just been presented, it seems that one needs the notion of containment vs. non-containment to explicate spatial relationships which involve only the notion of location and also those which involve location plus direction. Clark's semantic treatment of English prepositions is, indeed, mainly based on these notions – location and direction – and, thus, provides, together with Leech's detailed account of relative position and orientation, the guidelines we need in order to discuss *ser* and *estar* occurrences in this section.

Let us start by considering again the type of spatial relations conveyed by *at*, *on*, and *in*, which, as mentioned before, correspond to *em* in Brazilian Portuguese, in the particular case of the location of immovables. Clark characterizes them as being simply positional, in contrast with their (positive and negative) directional counterparts *to*/*from*, *onto*/*off*, *into*/*out of* (cf. Clark, 1973: 40). It would not be necessary to go further into this point, since directional prepositions such as these (which correspond to Portuguese *para/de, para dentro de/para fora*
de) do not occur, normally, in stative predications. 

However, the static meaning of the prepositions 'away from', 'off' and 'out of', which have not been considered by Clark, and have been analysed by Leech as the negative counterparts of 'at', 'on', 'in', deserves consideration.

First of all, the prepositional locution fora de, which corresponds to the English prepositions just mentioned, can also be said to be the negative counterpart of dentro de ('inside'). This would lead to the interpretation of:

(8) O restaurante fora do parque.

as being ambiguous between two readings, that is, as being paraphrasable by:

(8') O restaurante não está no parque.
(The restaurant is not in the park.)

(8") O restaurante não está dentro do parque.
(The restaurant is not inside the park.)

This interpretation is, however, disputable on the grounds that fora de does not seem to be equivalent to the negation of em-relations such as those expressed by the sentences (1) to (5) above. Indeed:

1. However, sentences such as:
   Esta estrada é para Campinas.
   (This road is (goes) to Campinas.)
   Aquela estrada é de Campinas.
   (That road is (comes) from Campinas.)

   are possible in Brazilian Portuguese. But they seem to belong to the same subtype as:
   Este vinho é para você.
   (This wine is for you.)
   Este vinho é do Minho.
   (This wine is from the Minho region.)

   in which assertions of origin and destination are equivalent to assertions of class-membership. We will give some consideration to this point later, in the subsection referring to copula-selection in sentences with prepositional phrases as predicative expressions.
Minha sala não é no 1.° andar do Adam Ferguson Building.

A cabana não é naquela pequena ilha que se vê daqui.

A ponte não é no rio Tietê.

cannot be related to:

Minha sala é fora do 1.° andar do Adam Ferguson Building.

A cabana é fora daquela pequena ilha que se vê daqui.

A ponte é fora do rio Tietê.

for (1") - (3") are unacceptable. On the other hand, sentences such as:

(9) João (não) está na fila.
  (John is (not) in the queue.)

(9') João está fora da fila.
  (John is out of the queue.)

are, at least factually, equivalent and, moreover, do not have a dentro de version:

(9") *João (não) está dentro da fila.
  (*John is (not) inside the queue.)

The facts just presented could constitute, at first sight, bases on which one could argue for the need to postulate either two prepositions having the form em, one

1. Forms such as no, na, do, da, which appear in the data presented throughout this work, result from the contraction of the preposition with the definite article:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Definite Article</th>
<th>Contracted Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>em</td>
<td>o(s)</td>
<td>no(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>em</td>
<td>a(s)</td>
<td>na(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>o(s)</td>
<td>do(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>a(s)</td>
<td>da(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>o(s)</td>
<td>ao(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a(s)</td>
<td>às(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>o(s)</td>
<td>pelo(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>por</td>
<td>a(s)</td>
<td>pela(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of which may be negated by *fora de*, or two prepositions having the form *fora de*, one corresponding to the negation of *em*, the other to the negation of *dentro de*. This is an important point in our discussion of copula-selection with respect to immovables, since *estar* may be the copula in *dentro de*- and *fora de*-expressions, but does not normally co-occur with *em*, as demonstrated below.

(10a) O restaurante *é/está dentro do parque.*
(The restaurant is inside the park.)

(10b) O restaurante *é/está fora do parque.*
(The restaurant is outside the park.)

(10c) O restaurante *(não)* *é/está no* parque.
(The restaurant is (not) in the park.)

However, the relationships between (9) and (9') above, as well as between:

(11) *Anamaria* *não está* no Brasil há três anos.
(Anamaria has not been in Brazil for three years.)

(12) *Os livros* *não estão* sempre no lugar.
(The books are not always in their place.)

and:

(11') *Anamaria está fora do* Brasil há três anos.
(Anamaria has been out of Brazil for three years.)

(12') *Os livros estão sempre fora do* lugar.
(The books are always out of their place.)

seem to provide evidence for the second proposal, that is that *fora de* can be assigned two readings which correspond to the distinction between 'out of' and 'outside' in English. First of all, the comparison of these sentences to (1'), (2'), (3') and (1''), (2''), (3'') above suggest that *fora de* can be said to be the negative counterpart of *em* only when
the entity located is movable. This seems to imply that sentences such as (9), (11) and (12) are not paraphrasable by (9*), (11*) and (12*), or by fora de sentences. Indeed, their difference in meaning becomes clearer with the presence of a temporal or frequentative adverbial in the sentence.

In the case of (11) and (11*), it is noticeable that the negation expressed by não has a different scope from the negative component of fora de. (11) is appropriate only as an utterance following a statement such as:

(13) Anamaria está no Brasil há três anos.
    (Anamaria has been in Brazil for three years.)

as a part of an utterance such as:

(14) Anamaria não está no Brasil há três anos: ela
    está só há dois anos.
    (Anamaria has not been in Brazil for three years,
    (but) only for two years.)

or:

(15) Anamaria não está no Brasil há três anos: ela
    está na Argentina há três anos.
    (Anamaria has not been in Brazil for three years:
    she has been in Argentina for three years.)

On the other hand, (11*) clearly implies:

(16) Anamaria saiu do Brasil há três anos.
    (Anamaria left Brazil three years ago.)

1. Cf. Leech's discussion of sentences such as:
    'He's just out of prison.' = 'He's just come out of
    prison.'

and the following comment of his:

'With some prepositions - those associated with
negative position and with static orientation - the
resultative interpretation is more common; it is,
indeed, almost their habitual interpretation with
subjects referring to human beings, animals, or
mobile objects.' (Leech 1969:193)
which, as (14) indicates, is not an implication of (11).

The facts just presented allow us to propose as underlying structures to (11) and (11'):

(11) [NEG [[Anamaria be in Brazil] for three years.]]
(11') [[[NEG [Anamaria be in Brazil]] for three years.]

As for the difference between (12) and (12'), this can also be accounted for by the different scope of the negative element in these sentences, as is roughly formalized below:

(12) [NEG it is the case [ALWAYS [the books be in their place.]]]
(12') [It is ALWAYS the case [NEG [the books be in their place.]]]

The underlying structures proposed for (11') and (12') seem to capture the fact that the negative content of fora de has as its scope the spatial relation asserted. Since the negation of an em- relation between a movable entity and a location presupposes its having left the location, as (16) indicates, it seems plausible to say that fora de sentences carry the presupposition that the entity was once positively associated with the location. However, although this seems to account for (11'), it does not account for (12'), in which the location is a normative one or a habitat, and, consequently does not imply actualization-in-the-past, under negation. Thus, one should reformulate

---

1. Indeed, a sentence such as:

'Não posso convidar ninguém ainda: acabei de mudar e as coisas estão todas ainda fora do lugar.'
(I cannot invite anybody yet; I have just moved and all the things are still out of their place.) (lit. tr.)

seems to provide evidence for this point.
the view presented above by allowing the presupposition carried by fora de sentences to include the expectations of the speaker as to the actualization of the spatial relation.

The above discussion of fora de expressions as the negative counterparts of em- relations leads us to reject the possibility of interpreting (8) as being directly related semantically to (8'), and more generally, to reject the possibility of giving to fora de expressions with immovables any other interpretation than that of the negation of dentro de. Another point which confirms this is the non-equivalence of sentences such as:

(17) O restaurante não é/está mais no parque.
   (The restaurant is not in the park anymore.)

which are acceptable under a reading of restaurante as referring to a set of activities (which can move from a place to another) rather than to some actual building (8') or (10b).¹

At this point, our aim is, then, to identify the feature by which dentro de is distinct from em, in order to explain the co-occurrence of estar with the former and its rejection by the latter. By considering sentences such as (9') and (9'') and also:

(18) A bola caiu na grama/no canto do gramado
   "dentro da grama/"dentro do canto do gramado.
   (The ball fell on the grass/on the corner of the lawn.
   *inside the grass/*inside the corner of the lawn.)

¹. This subtype of occurrences will be further considered in a later subsection.
(19) A bola caiu no gramado/no círculo.

dentro do gramado/dentro do círculo.
(The ball fell on the lawn/in the circle.
   inside the lawn/inside the circle.)

which show the incompatibility of dentro de with nouns
denoting reference lines such as fila ('queue') and
surfaces, such as grama ('grass') and canto ('corner')
which are not perceived or conceived as delimited areas,
one can set forth the following conclusions:

i. dentro de is marked for the feature of
'delimitation', whereas em is unmarked;

ii. it is this feature which makes of the relation
referred to by dentro de an ordered spatial relation: it
implies a location having an 'inside' and an 'outside',
and, therefore, it asserts the position of the entity as
being ordered relatively to the limits of the location.

This means that, in spite of both prepositions being
expressions of containment, em is unmarked not only for
dimensionality (as is 'at' in English), but also, or con¬
sequently, for any feature specifying the relation between
the entity and the location. This view seems equivalent
to Parisi and Castelfranchi's definition of the spatial
relation conveyed by 'a' in Italian 'that it is one of
simple or elementary spatial coincidence' (1969:13). It
may also be related to Mattoso Câmaras statement about em
in Portuguese; that em is used to indicate general

1. The same restrictions on the co-occurrence of dentro de
   seem to operate in Italian: cf. Parisi and Castelfranchi
   on the component of delimitation which differentiates
   'dentro' from 'in' in this language (1969:23).
location, as opposed to other prepositions which convey specific information (cf. Mattoso Cámara 1972:154-5).

Moreover, the component of order (or direction) mentioned in ii. above seems to account for the possibility of using *estar* with *dentro de* in Portuguese, and, conversely, its incompatibility with *em*. Indeed, the *estar* version of (10a), though inappropriate as an answer to the question *'Onde é o restaurante?* ('Where is the restaurant?') is normally in answer to this question in circumstances in which the speaker interprets the question as *'Qual é o caminho para o restaurante?* ('Which is the way to the restaurant?'). Thus, it could be present in a sentence such as:

(20) Tome a estrada para Itapecerica, vire no primeiro posto de gasolina e continue até encontrar um parque: o restaurante *está* dentro do parque.
(20) Take the road to Itapecerica, turn at the first petrol-station and go on till you find a park: the restaurant is inside the park.)

What contexts such as the one illustrated by (20) suggest is that:

i. *estar* may be used when the speaker presupposes that a certain position of the addressee, relative to the reference-location (in this case, the park), can be actualized at a certain point-of-time (dependent on the time in which his movement towards the entity takes place);

ii. this presupposition is explainable by the fact that the spatial relation between the addressee and the entity (in this case, the restaurant) is dependent on its position in relation to the location (i.e. the park) and so it is the direction of his movement towards the entity. In other
words, the utterance of (10a) in the context above is factually equivalent to telling the addressee to enter (or cross the limits of) the park to reach the restaurant.

This seems to explain why *em* cannot accept *estar* even if the speaker believes in the possibility of the addressee moving towards the entity in question: when the location of an entity is expressed as a non-specific and non-ordered spatial relation between the entity and a reference-object or location, the position of the addressee is irrelevant. That is, the same relation holding between the addressee and the reference-object or location holds between the addressee and the entity and, consequently, the trajectory to the entity is the same as the trajectory to the location.

Further evidence for this interpretation is provided by sentences such as:

(21) O cinema está no mesmo lugar que o restaurante.

(The cinema is in the same place as the restaurant.)

There is also a group of prepositional locutions, which, though expressing spatial relations of containment, like *dentro de*, take *estar* as a copula. To this group belong expressions such as: *no alto de* ('on the top of'), *no fundo de* ('on the bottom of'), *no meio de/no centro de* ('in/on the middle of'/on the centre of'), *à beira de/na orla de* ('at/on the edge of'). Examples of this type of occurrences are:

(22) A igreja está no alto da montanha.

(The church is on the top of the mountain.)
(23) A aldeia está bem no fundo do vale.  
(The village is right in the bottom of the valley.)

(24) O restaurante está no centro da cidade.  
(The restaurant is in the centre of the town.)

(25) A cabana está à beira da floresta.  
(The hut is on the edge of the forest.)

As pointed out by Leech (1969:8.3) with respect to English, these expressions have as constituents nouns such as alto, fundo, which are ambiguous in the sense that they can refer either to a part or an extremity of a location, and others such as meio, centro, which can be said to refer to parts.¹ This ambiguity, however, does not need to concern us here. The semantic function of these nouns in sentences such as the ones above is to specify the position of the entity within the limits of the location: both when they refer to a part of a location (with which the entity is conceived as coincident or as contained by) and when they refer to an extremity, the spatial relation between the entity and the location is specified with reference to the orientational axes (or directions) which are defined either by the intrinsic properties of the location, or by the position of the speaker.

In the case of (23), fundo, in the locative expression no fundo do vale, refers to the extremity of

¹. Cf. Leech, 1969:175 on the difference between the relation 'extremity of' and 'part of': '...the two elements linked by the relation (extremity of) are not necessarily of the same dimensionality.'
the valley\(^1\) and specifies the position of the entity with reference to the negative direction of the vertical axis in the tridimensional space denoted by its argument vale.

In a sentence such as:

\[(26) \text{O quarto } \&/\text{está no fundo do corredor.} \]

(The bedroom is at/on the bottom of the corridor.)

\textit{fundo} can refer either to the extremity of it, i.e., the wall (a two-dimensional area) facing the entrance, or to a part of the tridimensional space denoted by corredor. In both cases, the position of the room is specified along the primary horizontal axis, its negative direction being determined either by the intrinsic properties of the location or by the position of the speaker.

The acceptability of estar in this type of sentence, that is to say, the optional use of estar and ser with these prepositional locutions, in contrast with the obligatoriness of ser in:

\[(22') \text{A igreja } \&/\text{está na montanha.} \]
\[(23') \text{A aldeia } \&/\text{está no vale.} \]
\[(24') \text{O restaurante } \&/\text{está na cidade.} \]
\[(25') \text{A cabana } \&/\text{está na floresta.} \]
\[(26') \text{O quarto } \&/\text{está no corredor.} \]

seems to be another indication that the distinction

\(^1\) Bern ('right', 'exactly') as a modifier of the whole locative expression, seems to confirm this interpretation: it could be said to emphasize the superlative meaning which is a component of the notion 'extremity'.
containment vs. non-containment is not relevant in the search for a principle (or principles) to explain copula-selection in Portuguese. It suggests, instead, in the same way as the *dentro de-* sentences discussed earlier, that this distinction should be replaced by that between ordered and non-ordered spatial relations or, in Clark's terms, by the distinction between spatial relations involving only location and spatial relations which are specific in the sense that they involve location and direction.

Since the position of the speaker and/or the addressee is relevant only when the spatial relationship refers to directions, it is plausible to say that the *estar* sentences above contain:

i. an assertion of the spatial relation between an entity and another entity or location;

ii. the presupposition of the speaker about the position of the addressee and/or of himself relatively to the reference object or location.

This position may be specified either by the context (as in the case of (13)), or by the preposition which governs the dependent NP (as in the case of *do outro lado* ('on the other side') in (6a); cf. 2.1.0).

---

1. Schnerr reports a roughly similar proposal, put forward by Dunn (Dunn, J. *A Grammar of the Portuguese Language*, Washington, 1928) who *...claims that the general location of Coimbra in Portugal would be expressed by *ser*, whereas its specific location on the banks of the Mondego would call for *estar** (Schnerr, 1954:424). Cf. sentence (18) for an example of the same type.
One of Schnerr's examples provides an interesting point to be discussed in the present context:

'A China é muito longe! Creio até que está fora do mundo!' (Machado de Assis, Teatro, p. 34) (Apud Schnerr 1954:418)

(China is very far! I believe even that she is outside the world!)

Considering the metaphorical value of the second locative sentence, i.e. that it is equivalent to the superlative of the expression of distance (or 'farness') conveyed by the first locative sentence, estar is more appropriate than ser in the second sentence. Since the first locative sentence implies a deictic reference-point relatively to which China is far, and the second, a reference location - the world - to which the speaker belongs and China does not belong, or is outside of (or as extremely far as that), the use of estar emphasizes the fact that the basic reference-point in both locative sentences is the position of the speaker end of the addressee.

2.2.3. Expressions of non-containment

There will be discussed under this heading the prepositional locutions em frente de/a, atrás de, ao lado de, à direita de, à esquerda de, em cima de, embaixo de, which correspond to the English 'in front of', 'behind', 'beside', 'at/on the right of', 'on the left of', 'above', 'below', those characterized by Clark as '...indicating location by specifying a direction from the point of reference in which the object is located' (1973:42).

1. I take the view that the same definition applies to the prepositional expressions discussed in the previous subsection; they also specify direction by referring to the part or the extremity of the location with which the entity located totally or partially overlaps.
Given that this characterization is applicable also to these prepositions in Portuguese, our claim that the possibility of estar occurring in expressions of the location of immovables is determined by the component of direction expressed by the preposition, would, therefore, predict that the prepositions above may co-occur with estar. This is, in fact, the case. Moreover, estar is the obligatory copula of a subset of sentences in which they are present.

In order to give a more precise account of the factors determining the optionality and the obligatoriness of estar, it is necessary to examine more closely the meaning of those prepositions. Firstly, like their English correspondents, they differ among themselves by the different directions they presuppose: em cima de/em baixo de presuppose a vertical direction or refer to a vertical axis; em frente de/atras de, to a primary horizontal axis, and ao lado de, à direita de, à esquerda de, to a secondary horizontal axis.

What is important for our purposes is how these directions or axes are defined. As has been fairly extensively discussed in the literature on spatial location in English and in other languages, these axes or directions (mainly the primary horizontal axis) can be determined either with reference to the physical, perceptual properties of the reference object (which is the case for objects perceived or conceived as asymmetrical) or with reference to the speaker's (observer's) position or field of vision.
As has been mentioned in our earlier discussion of 
ser and estar with prepositional expressions such as no 
fundo de, the definition of the orientational axis with 
reference to the speaker’s and/or addressee’s position 
does not yield the obligatoriness of estar.

Sentences such as:

(27) O restaurante está em frente do cinema/atrás do cinema. 
em cima do cinema/em baixo do cinema. 
À direita do cinema/à esquerda do cinema.

(The restaurant is in front of/behind the cinema. 
above/below the cinema. 
at the right/at the left of the cinema.

are ordinarily interpreted as indicating the location of 
an entity by specifying its position at an axis defined with 
reference to the intrinsic properties of the reference 
entity, since buildings, like cinema are conceptualized, 
at least functionally, as asymmetrical objects. The 
em frente de- relation in (20), for instance, is normally 
terpreted as equivalent to saying that the cinema and 
the restaurant face each other, or that the restaurant is 
opposite to the cinema.

Instead, sentences such as:

(28) A quadra de tênis está na frente da piscina. 
em frente de tênis está na frente de piscina. 

2. Worth drawing attention to is the fact that, in this 
particular case, na frente de (in the front of) is, 
preferably, used. There seem to be, in fact, other 
problems concerning the use of em, a and of the definite 
article with prepositional expressions, which, unfortu-
nately, will not be handled in the present work.
(The tennis court is in front of the swimming-pool.
behind
at the right
at the left

would be preferably interpreted as having the orientational axis (specified by the preposition) defined with reference to the speaker's and addressee's field of vision, so that the conditions for the use of na frente de and atrás de are determined by the actual or imaginary position of the speaker and addressee relative to the reference object, in this case, the swimming-pool.

Therefore, one can say that the difference between the spatial relations conveyed by the prepositional locutions present in (27) and those in (28) lies in the fact that, while the position of the speaker may be pragmatically presupposed in the former, it constitutes a primary reference-point in the latter, or, in other words, is an implication of them.

This is also the case for other prepositional locutions such as de-ste lado/daquele lado/do outro lado ('on this side'/'on that side'/'on the other side')
antes de/depois de ('before'/'after') and além de ('beyond').

With the exception of além de, they, indeed, contain an explicit reference to the position of the speaker and/or of the addressee in the form of the deictic elements which are constituents of the locution. Moreover, the temporal implication of antes de and depois de indicates that not only the position of the speaker and/or of the addressee is implied by sentences containing these expressions, but also their possible or actual trajectory to the entity located.
Indeed, sentences such as:

(29a) A casa é deste lado do cafezal.
     (The house is on this side of the coffee-plantation.)

(30) A casa é daquele/do outro lado do cafezal.
     (The house is on that side/on the other side of the coffee-plantation.)

are not only paraphrasable by:

(31) A casa é antes do cafezal.
     (The house is before the coffee-plantation.)

(32) A casa é depois do cafezal.
     (The house is after the coffee-plantation.)

but also by:

(31') A casa é antes de chegar ao cafezal.
     (The house is before arriving to the coffee-plantation.) (lit.tr.)

(32') A casa é passando o cafezal.
     (The house is passing the coffee-plantation, after passing the coffee-plantation.)(lit.tr.)

The difference between these sentences and na frente de/atrás de expressions such as (28) is, then, parallel to that between 'behind' and 'beyond' in English, which is defined by Leach in the following way:

"The pair of assertions just mentioned are parallel, but not quite identical in meaning: where one pair relates position to a point of orientation, the other relates position to a point of observation.... From 'The cottage is behind the tree' one makes the inference that the tree is visible, and that the cottage is hidden from view by it....In 'The cottage is beyond the tree', however, there is no such inference, but rather the suggestion that in order to reach the cottage, one would have to pass the tree."

(Leech, 1969:182)

At this point, it seems necessary to reformulate the proposal made in 2.2.1, about the optional selection
of *estar* in locative sentences referring to immovables in order to incorporate the facts which have arisen from the data above, that is:

1. *estar* is optional when the spatial relation asserted is ordered and, thus, allows the speaker to make a (pragmatic) presupposition about the position of the addressee or of himself relative to the location;

2. *estar* is also optional when the spatial relation asserted is ordered relatively to the position of the speaker and/or of the addressee, or to their (actual or possible) trajectory to the entity, in other words, when it implies a deictic reference-point.

Let us now consider a subtype of the locative sentences represented by (27) above, in which the primary or secondary horizontal axis can be defined either with reference to the intrinsic properties of the location or with reference to the speaker and/or the addressee, but in which the reference-location is identified by the position of the speaker and/or the addressee. This is the case of sentences such as:

---

1. Once again, one of the examples quoted by Schnerr (as illustrative of the inconsistency of the use of *ser* with immovables), provides an interesting instance of the stylistical use of the optionality of *estar*: 'De um lado, enorme e iluminada de mil lâmpadas elétricas, estava a cidade....Do outro lado, era o mar, a lua, e as estrelas, tudo iluminado também.' (Amado, *Mar Morto*, p.65) (Cf. Schnerr, 1954:418) ('On one side, huge and illuminated by thousands of electric lights, was the town. On the other side was the sea, the moon, the stars, all illuminated too.)
in which the location is referred to by a deictic adverbial. **Estar** may occur in this subtype of sentence only if the noun which is the head of the subject NP denotes a set of activities which is conceived as movable or transferable, as is clearly demonstrated by:

(35) O restaurante \( ^{\text{e}} \) está em frente daqui agora.
(The restaurant is in front of here now.)

and by the unacceptability of:

(36) A Ilha de Marajó está em frente daqui.
(The Island of Marajó is in front of here.)

If, however, attention is given to the fact that (33) and (34) are paraphrastically related to:

(33') O restaurante \( ^{\text{e}} \) está em frente do lugar onde
- nós estamos.
- eu estou.
(The restaurant is in front of the place where
- we are.
- I am.

(34') O restaurante \( ^{\text{e}} \) está em frente do lugar onde
- você está.
- vocês estão.
(The restaurant is behind the place where you are.)

the restrictions on the co-occurrence of **estar** with these sentences become explainable. They seem, in fact, to contain:

1. 'There' does not correspond exactly to the Portuguese \( ^{\text{e}} \), as one can see from the underlying structure assigned to it in (34'): it can be said to be [+ proximate] with respect to the addressee and [- proximate] relative to the speaker while **aqui** is either [+ proximate] with respect to both, or only to the speaker.
i. an assertion of the spatial relation between an immovable entity and the location identified by the position of the speaker and/or of the addressee, i.e., a ser assertion;

ii. an assertion of the spatial relation of the speaker and of the addressee and the location, i.e., an estar assertion.

If this is so, estar would be, in fact, acceptable as a copula of the matrix (in (33') and (34')), only if a variable relation is asserted to hold between the entity and the location, as is the case for (35).

In the same way one could explain the oddness of estar in sentences such as:

(37) O restaurante \& aqui encima.
??está
(The restaurant is up here.)

(38) O restaurante \& lá embaixo.
??está
(The restaurant is down there.)

in which the deictic adverbial does not refer to the location whose spatial relation with the entity is asserted, but to the position of the speaker and/or of the addressee relatively to that location. That the reference location is not defined deictically is clear from the gloss which can be given to (37) and (38)

(37) O restaurante \& encima, onde (nós estamos).
\{eu estou.
(The restaurant is upstairs, where we are. I am.

(38) O restaurante \& embaixo, onde (nós não estamos).
\{eu não estou.
(The restaurant is downstairs, where we are not. I am not.

and from the potentiality of co-occurrence of any of the
three deictic adverbials\(^1\) in apposition with \textit{embaixo} and \textit{encima} in the sentences above. This is, moreover, consistent with the fact that they are not governed by the prepositional expressions which, for their part, refer to parts of the location (cf. our discussion of (22) to (25) in 2.2.1).

Although the unacceptability of \textit{estar} in the sentences above may be accounted for by the fact that the deictic adverbial represents by itself an assertion of the position of, at least, one of the participants in the communication-act relative to the location and that this makes, consequently, the presence of \textit{estar} redundant, this might also be used as a counter-argument to our proposal. In fact, if the pragmatic presupposition of the speaker about his or the addressee's position relative to the location is enough to yield the possibility of using \textit{estar}, one would expect the obligatoriness of this copula when that position is asserted. Therefore, it seems that our proposal needs to be reformulated in order to account for the fact that the content of the presupposition, implication or assertion which yields the (optional or obligatory) presence of \textit{estar} in locative sentences with immovables

\(^1\) The three deictic adverbials I am referring to are aqui, af, ali/la, which are distinguished one from the other by the feature of proximity with reference to the speaker and to the addressee, ali and la being, roughly speaking, [- proximate] to both. Therefore, we will disregard the opposition between the set aqui/af/ali and ca/la, though ca ('here') may occasionally appear in the European Portuguese examples taken from Schnerr. From its use in Brazilian Portuguese, one can say that ca survived only in directional expressions, i.e., as complement of motional verbs such as vir ('come') and of directional prepositions such as para ('to').
must include something else besides the position of the speaker and/or the addressee with respect to the reference-location.

The data which may provide the basis for this reformulation are, of course, those concerning the obligatory presence of estar with immovables, such as the sentences below:

(39) O Castelo está na minha frente e eu só
     percebi isso agora.
     (The Castle is in front of me and I have only noticed it now.)

(40) O Castelo está atrás de você, olha!
     (The Castle is behind you, look!)

(41) O mar está/tem estado 1 à nossa esquerda desde
     que saímos de Salvador.
     (The sea has been on our left since we left Salvador.)

The first thing to be noticed regarding these sentences is that the reference-object (or location) is not defined or referred to by a deictic adverbial, but by a personal or possessive pronoun. This is equivalent to saying that the immovable entity denoted by the subject NP is not located with reference to another immovable but to a movable, and would, apparently, lead to the conclusion that estar expresses a relation which is perceived or conceived as variable. However, this is not sufficient to explain the other types of estar-occurrences discussed in 1. It seems to me that the use of the Present Perfect in this context is also iterative (cf. our discussion of the co-occurrence of this form with ser and estar with movables in 2.1.3): it conveys the information that, during the journey, the sea (or its position relative to the speaker and the addressee) was intermittently (or non-continuously) visible from the road.
this section, which, for their part, do not offer grounds for any claim about this copula reflecting the recategorization of the entity located as to the feature of movability.

It could be, however, argued that sentences such as (39) and (40) above are, at least factually, equivalent to:

\[(39') \text{Eu estou em frente do Castelo e só percebi isso agora.} \]
\[(I \text{ am in front of the Castle and I have only just noticed it.})\]
\[(40') \text{Vocé está na frente do Castelo, olha!} \]
\[(You \text{ are in front of the Castle, look!})\]

and that the converseness of the spatial relation asserted allows one to consider (39) and (40) as belonging to the same type to which (39') and (40') belong, i.e. they are statements about the location of movable entities. Apart from the difference between (40) and (41) - to which it should be necessary to add the information that the addressee is turning his back to the castle, there is some motivation to reject this view.

If one brings into consideration other instances of the location of immovables with respect to a movable reference-point, it does, indeed, become clear that the obligatory selection of estar in (39) and (40) has to be accounted for in a different way. First of all, it should be noticed that sentences of the former type require, in order to be acceptable, a demonstrative pronoun as a modifier of the noun denoting the movable reference-object or any other element which can represent an assertion of the position of the speaker relative to that object, at the moment of the utterance. This is illustrated by the
oddness of

(42) ?? A garagem está em frente do carro.
(The garage is in front of the car.)

(43) ?? O restaurante está ao lado do ônibus.
(The restaurant is beside the bus.)

in contrast with the full acceptability of the *ser*
counterparts of:

(44) A garagem está em frente daquele carro vermelho.
(The garage is in front of that red car.)

(45) O restaurante está ao lado daquele ônibus.
(The restaurant is beside that bus.)

and of:

(Can you see that car parked over there? The garage is in front.)

(47) Você está vendo aquele ônibus verde? O restaurante está ao lado.
(Can you see that green bus? The restaurant is next to it.)

The obligatory selection of *ser* in these sentences demonstrates that they do not belong to the same type as
(39) and (40) and that they are, instead, similar to (33),
(34), (37) and (38), in the sense that they also contain
an assertion of a spatial relation between two immovables -
the garage and the place where the car is - (i.e. a *ser*
assertion), plus an assertion of the location of a movable -
the car - (i.e. an *estar* assertion) in some place which is
within the deictic space. Indeed:

(44') A garagem está em frente do lugar onde está
(parado/passando) aquele carro vermelho.
(The garage is in front of the place where that
red car is parked/passing by)(lit.tr.)
(45') O restaurante é ao lado do lugar onde está aquele ônibus.
(The restaurant is beside the place where that bus is.)

are what one could call the full versions of (44) and (45).

This seems to demonstrate that it is not the movability of the reference-object that accounts for the obligatory presence of estar in (39) and (40) and, consequently, that the potentiality of the occurrence of this copula in the other types of locative sentences discussed in this (and in the precedent) section is not to be primarily related to the movability of the speaker and/or of the addressee whose position they seem to presuppose or imply.

A possible solution to this problem may arise from the discussion of the contextual conditions to which the utterances of these sentences are subject. The main one concerns the observability of the immovable (or movable) entity whose location is asserted, at (or immediately before) the moment of the utterance-act, as the presence of verbs such as perceber ('perceive', 'notice', 'realize') and olhar ('look') in the second clause of (39) and (40) suggest. It could be argued that the same condition holds for the utterance of (44) and (45), as well as for other locative sentences with deictic elements. However, it should be noticed that the entity which must be accessible to the observation of the speaker and of the addressee, in the latter case, is not the one whose location is in question, but the reference-object. Furthermore, the spatial relation between the garage and the place where the car is does not change if the position of the car changes
(or if the speaker and/or the addressee move out of the place from which the car is observable). This means that observability as a contextual condition for the utterance of (44) and (45) is consequent upon the movable status of the reference object, that is, a movable entity cannot normally serve as a reference-object to locate an immovable if it is not observable or conceived as observable. This is, indeed, one of the conditions defined by Strawson, for material bodies to be used as reference-points:

'Of course not all material bodies, or things which have them, are regarded as even transient parts of such a framework: many bodies are too much in movement, or too ephemeral, or both. One would not, so to speak, use them in giving spatial direction unless they were then and there observable.' [my underlining] (Strawson, 1959:54)

This does not seem to be the case for the utterance of (39) and (40), as well as of:

(48) O restaurante está em frente do José Augusto e ele, em vez de entrar, parece que ainda está procurando por ele.
(The restaurant is in front of José Augusto and, instead of going inside, he seems to be still looking for it.)

(49) Meu cachorro deve estar perdendo o faro: o açougue está atrás dele e ele não dá nenhum sinal de tê-lo percebido.
(My dog must be losing his sense of smell: the butcher (shop) is on his back and he shows no sign of having noticed it.)

(50) Aquele robô deve estar precisando de uma revisão: a mina de manganes está mesmo ao lado dele e ele não dá nenhum sinal de tê-la detectado.
(That robot must be in need of a revision: the manganese mine is right beside him and he shows no sign of having detected it.)

In fact, the entities referred to by the NP governed by the preposition are not, in this case, reference-objects in the same sense as the car and the bus in (44) and (45),
or as they could be in sentences such as:

(51) O restaurante está em frente do lugar onde está (parado/passando) o José Augusto.
(The restaurant is in front of the place where José Augusto is (standing/passing by.))

(52) O açougue está atrás do lugar onde está aquele cachorro.
(The butcher (shop) is on the back of the place where that dog is.)

(53) A mina de manganês está mesmo aí lado do lugar onde está aquele robô.
(The mine of manganese is right beside the place where that robot is.)

Consistently with the fact that the acceptability of sentences such as the former (i.e. those which obligatorily have *estar* as a copula) requires that the entities referred to by the NP governed by the preposition should be animate or, to express it better, entities endowed with perceptual capacity, one could say that these sentences are expressions of the location of immovable entities in the immediate perceptual field of a movable - and perceptually capable - entity. This seems to mean that they are not reference-objects, but reference-locations and that observability is not merely a contextual condition for the utterance of (39), (40), (48), (49) and (50), but their basic content.

Therefore, it seems that the presupposition, implication or assertion which has been hypothesized as carried by *estar* in expressions of locations having to do with immovables is not about the position of the speaker and/or of the addressee relatively to the location, but about the actualization of the spatial relation asserted by the sentence in the speaker's and/or in the addressee's perceptual field, i.e. about its observability at a certain point-of-time, and which is, on the other hand, dependent on the position of
both or one of the participants in the communication-act.

This view is, by no means, new, as far as the literature on ser and estar in Spanish is concerned: it is, indeed, already present, although in a rather embryonic state, in the works of Gili Gaya (cf. 1.1.1) and of Andrade and Fernandez (cf. 1.1.2.2) which have related estar to immediate perception. It can also be found in Kahane and Hutter's treatment of estar as an auxiliary which expresses "...actuality in contrast with non-estar forms which express irrelevancy of actuality" (1953:26).

On the other hand, the assignment to estar of a meaning of actuality or existence in the immediate perceptual field is, in a way, parallel to Lyons' notion of deictic existence as carried by demonstrative pronouns and by the definite article (1973:107ff), and to the epistemic predicates - SEE, ATTEND and KNOW - postulated by Atkinson and Griffiths in order to explain some of the appropriateness conditions for the utterance of some type of locative and existentials in English (1973:V). But we will leave these points to the following section, in which we will be dealing with expressions of distance and with locative-demonstratives, from which more evidence will be provided for the view just presented.

2.2.3.1 Expressions of distance

Expressions of distance, such as those expressed by the prepositional expressions a x units de ('at x units from'), longe de ('far from'), perto de ('near') and by the adjectives próximo and distante ('proximate' and
'distant'), as well as position at/along a point of a path, such as those specified by na direção de ('in the direction of'), no caminho de ('on the way to'), no principio/fim/metade ('in the beginning/end/middle') of a road, avenue, etc., are, among expressions of locations of immovables, those which, though stative, more strongly imply the notion of trajectory or 'directed movement.'

As far as expressions of distance are concerned, this is clearly demonstrated by their constituents a and de ('at' and 'from') assigning to the entity located the status of a goal or destination and to the reference-object, that of a source or starting-point of movement, respectively. That is also the basis upon which depends the possibility of specifying distance from one point to another by utilizing either spatial measurement units or time-interval units, i.e., distance in terms of the time spent in the movement from a point to another, given a standard velocity, the means of locomotion being implicit or explicit.

Indeed, sentences such as:

(54) Campinas está a 96 km. de São Paulo.

(Campinas is 96 km. from São Paulo.)

and:

(55) Campinas está a 1 hora e 20 minutos de São Paulo (de ônibus).

(Campinas is 1 hour and 20 minutes from São Paulo (by bus).)

are, at least factually, equivalent. The relatedness of the notion of distance with that of directed movement is also reflected by the idiomatic expressions synonymous with perto de ('near') present in the examples below:
(56) Campinas está a três passos de São Paulo.
(Campinas is three steps from São Paulo.)
(lit.tr.)

(57) A Universidade está a um salto daqui.
(The University is a jump from here.) (lit.tr.)
in which a relatively very short distance is metaphorically expressed by a low number of specific movements. One can therefore say that expressions of distance strongly presuppose the position of the addressee relatively to the spatial relation asserted and the possible actualization of his movement through the successive points or intermediary locations which constitute the trajectory from X to Y. Accordingly, the estar versions of the sentences above and also of:

(58) Campinas está perto de São Paulo.
(Campinas is near São Paulo.)

(59) Campinas está longe do Rio de Janeiro.
(Campinas is far from Rio de Janeiro.)
similarly to the other types of expressions of relative position which have been discussed so far, can be said to contain an assertion of the location of an immovable relatively to another immovable, plus the presupposition of its actualization for the speaker and/or the addressee, at a certain point-of-time, which is determined or conditioned by the time in which his/their movement towards the entity takes place.

Further evidence relevant to this point is provided by sentences such as:

(60a) O mar está a cem metros da estrada.
(The sea is a hundred meters from the road.)
The *está* versions of (60a) and (60b) are, indeed, ambiguous between what one could call a static and a dynamic interpretation of the spatial relation between the speaker and/or the addressee and the road, whereas their *ser* versions can only be assigned a static reading. That is, while the *ser* version and one of the interpretations of the *está* version of (60a) do not carry the presupposition of the movement of the speaker and of the addressee along the road, in the situation of this movement being actualized, the other interpretation of the *está*-version of (60a) is, obligatorily, dynamic. It would, indeed, be understood as: 'The sea is a hundred meters from the point of the road where we are now/which we are now passing'.

The ambiguity of *está* is maintained if a temporal dimension is explicitly assigned to the spatial relation, as exemplified by (60b). Its *ser* version would have to be obligatorily interpreted as referring to a recent change in the situation of the (previously existent) road with respect to the sea, whereas *está* would allow this reading-change in the position of the road - and the other one, i.e., the change of the speaker and of the addressee's position along the road.

As for (60c) which is an instance of obligatory *está*-selection, only the second reading is admissible, and
this is consequent upon the meaning of the temporal clause. In fact, what is specified by it is not the temporal extension of the spatial relation between the sea and the road, but the spatial extension corresponding to the series of contiguous or non-contiguous (cf. footnote on (41) above) points of the road at which the distance from it to the sea was a hundred meters.

The spatial relation to which, in this case, a temporal extension is assigned is, therefore, that between the speaker and the addressee in relation to the road. Since their movement along the road involves the correlation of each spatial position to a certain point-of-time, the ordered series of points-of-time referred to by the temporal clause in (60c) corresponds to the ordered series of the speaker's and the addressee's spatial locations or positions on the road. In other words, (60c) can be glossed as: 'The sea is a hundred meters from the points of the road at/by which we have passed since we left Salvador.'

In the same way, (60d):

(60d) O mar estava a cem metros da estrada às 2 hs;
(The sea was a hundred meters from the road at 2 o'clock.)

can be glossed as:

(60d') O mar estava a cem metros do ponto da estrada pelo qual nós passamos às 2 hs.
(The sea was a hundred meters from the point of the road by which we passed at 2 o'clock.)

This type of expression could be considered as moving world expressions, as Fillmore has labelled them, since as he himself explains:

"The second thing to notice is that when the speaker is in motion he can take his (actually changing)
location as the basic stable reference point and speak of the rest of the world as in motion. Thus we can talk about [this next town coming up] and about [the scenery passing by].

(Fillmore, forthcoming:19)

The application of Fillmore's view to the sentences above would lead us to the recategorization of the entity located as movable, and, accordingly, to founding on it the explanation of the obligatory estar-selection in this case. This would be, however, not only in disagreement with the interpretation given to (60c-d) (and represented in their glosses) which seems to be in accordance with the intuitions of native speakers about their meaning, but also with the fact that the obligatory presence of estar in sentences such as (39) and (40) above do not carry this implication.

What seems, in fact, to account for estar-selection and, conversely for the unacceptability of ser, i.e. (60c-d) is that the spatial relation between the sea and the road is presented as actualized (or made observable) by the speaker at certain point(s)-of-time of his (and the addressee's) journey along the road. Therefore, the motion of the speaker and of the addressee can be said to be the factor on which the actualization of the spatial relation (sea-road) by himself (and by the addressee) is dependent, but not the factor which primarily rules estar-selection in this case.

The same explanation seems to hold for copula-selection in the particular case of longe de and perto de expressions with deictic adverbials and with unmarked reference. This term - 'unmarked reference' - is taken from Clark (1972) who utilizes it to refer to locative sentences in which the NP governed by the preposition is omitted, its omission being
not a case of the ellipsis of a previously mentioned element. However, his view on what the absence of the NP stands for:

"As for distance, it is the ego that serves as a point of reference in unmarked cases. Consider the sentence San Francisco is far. This implies that San Francisco is far from here or from me."

(Clarke, 1973:44)

is insufficient to explain *ser* and *estar* occurrences with expressions of this type in Portuguese, as well as the meaning which results from the interaction of aspectual and temporal adverbials with copula-differentiation in them.

If, indeed, sentences such as:

(61a) O restaurante (já) é perto (agora).
(The restaurant is (already) near (now)).
(62a) Stonehaven (já) é perto (agora).
(Stonehaven is (already) near (now)).

have as their full versions:

(61b) O restaurante (já) é perto daqui (agora).
(The restaurant is (already) near here (now)).
(62b) Stonehaven (já) é perto daqui (agora).
(Stonehaven is (already) near here (now)).

their *estar* counterparts:

(63a) O restaurante (já) está perto (agora).
(64a) Stonehaven (já) está perto (agora).

are not related in the same way to:

(63b) O restaurante (já) está perto daqui (agora).
(64b) Stonehaven (já) está perto daqui (agora).

Though, under one of their readings, (63a) and (64a) are paraphrasable by (63b) and (64b), in the context of the speaker's and/or of the addressee's movement towards the entity located, they have to be understood in a way which does not allow us to consider such equivalence between them and their deictic counterparts. This difference may become clearer after the consideration of the following points:
i. *estar* is ordinarily interchangeable with *ser* in (63b) and in (64b), whereas it is obligatory for a dynamic interpretation of (63a) and (64a);

ii. both *ser* and *estar* versions of (63b) and (64b), when a temporal or aspectual restriction is assigned to the spatial relation asserted, must be interpreted as referring to a change which is not that of the position of the speaker's and/or of the addressee in relation to the entity located. In (63b), the change which is implied by either the temporal or the aspectual element refers to the change of location of the entity 'restaurant' (conceived as a set of activities, not as a building) with respect to the place referred to by the deictic adverbial. In (64b) the change has to do with the path or means of access to Stonehaven, such as a shorter road having been built which made Stonehaven nearer to the place referred to by the deictic adverbial. In contrast, (63a) and (64a), under their dynamic reading, must be obligatorily understood as referring to the change of the position of the speaker and/or of the addressee in relation to the entity located, which is either an intermediary point in their trajectory or the destination of it.

Summing up, (63b) and (64b) could be assigned as their respective underlying structures:

(63b') [It is ALREADY the case [[the restaurant is near X][X is the place][at which we are]])

(63b") [It is NOW the case [[the restaurant is near X] [X is the place][at which we are.]]]

(64b') [It is ALREADY the case [[Stonehaven is near X] [X is the place][at which we are.]]]

(64b") [It is NOW the case [[Stonehaven is near X][X is the place][at which we are.]]]
Structures parallel to these do not seem to be assignable to the dynamic readings of (63a) and (64a). This is a point made very clearly by Schnerr, who illustrates it with examples suggesting the close relation between what has been discussed as actualization, and the speaker's perception of visual and auditory signs of the entity whose location is actualized.

"A general statement to the effect that a given place lies at a great or slight distance from the speaker will, more often than not, take ser:......"E é muito longe daqui o São Paulo?" (Raquel de Queiroz, O Guinze, p.88).

If, however, the relative position of the speaker and of the point contemplated is in the process of changing, estar is to be expected. "A casa grande já estava perto. Já ouvimos o rumor do engenho moendo." (Lins do Rego, Hanga. p.104). In the following example, the reference is to a ship putting out to sea: "Porém agora a cidade está longe e o brilho das estrélias está muito mais perto deles que as lâmpadas elétricas." (Amado, Jubiába, p.124).

(Schnerr, 1954:421)

If, indeed, (63a) and (64a), or their dynamic versions, are not equivalent to (63b) and (64b), that is, to a deictic adverbial interpretation of their unmarked reference, it could be the case that the NP that is omitted might be considered to be a personal pronoun, or, more specifically, a pronoun referring to the ego which is moving towards the entity. And this is the alternative interpretation proposed by Clark.

This would be equivalent to saying that (63a) and (64a) are equivalent to the effect that a given place lies at a great or slight distance from the speaker will, more often than not, take ser:......"E é muito longe daqui o São Paulo?" (Raquel de Queiroz, O Guinze, p.88).

If, however, the relative position of the speaker and of the point contemplated is in the process of changing, estar is to be expected. "A casa grande já estava perto. Já ouvimos o rumor do engenho moendo." (Lins do Rego, Hanga. p.104). In the following example, the reference is to a ship putting out to sea: "Porém agora a cidade está longe e o brilho das estrélias está muito mais perto deles que as lâmpadas elétricas." (Amado, Jubiába, p.124).

(Schnerr, 1954:421)

If, indeed, (63a) and (64a), or their dynamic versions, are not equivalent to (63b) and (64b), that is, to a deictic adverbial interpretation of their unmarked reference, it could be the case that the NP that is omitted might be considered to be a personal pronoun, or, more specifically, a pronoun referring to the ego which is moving towards the entity. And this is the alternative interpretation proposed by Clark.

This would be equivalent to saying that (63a) and (64a)

1. Here are the translations of Schnerr's examples:

'Is it very far (from here) 'the' São Paulo? More far away than the Amazonas?'

'The farmhouse was already near. We could hear the noise of the engine grinding ('the sugar-cane'),

'But now the town was far away and the brightness of the stars was nearer to them than the electric bulbs.'
have as their full versions:

(65)*o restaurante está perto de mim/nós (agora).
(The restaurant is (already) near me/us (now).)

(66)*Stonehaven (já) está perto de mim/nós (agora).
(Stonehaven is (already) near me/us (now).)

and, moreover, that they are, at least factually, equivalent to:

(68) Eu/nós (já) estou/estamos perto do restaurante (agora).
(I/we (already) am/are near the restaurant (now).)

(69) Eu/nós (já) estou/estamos perto de Stonehaven (agora).

However, there are reasons to reject this interpretation, the main one being the unacceptability of (66) above, and also of (65), which is acceptable only if restaurante denotes a mobile unit. In fact, (65) would be fully appropriate in a situation in which both the restaurant and the participants of the communication-act were in motion. This point seems to clarify the relationship between (63a) and (65), since it indicates, firstly, that (68) is ambiguous between the mobile-restaurant reading and:

(68') Eu/nós (já) estou/estamos (agora) no lugar que é perto do restaurante.
(I/we (already) am/are (now) at the place that is near the restaurant.)

that is, a non-mobile restaurant reading. Secondly, it suggests that (63) is equivalent to:

(63a') O restaurante é perto do lugar onde eu/nós (já) estou/estamos (agora).
(The restaurant is near the place where I/we (already) am/are (now).)

and could be assigned as its underlying structure:

(63a''). [It is the case [[the restaurant is near X][I/we ALREADY am/are in X NOW.]]]

This seems to be a rather satisfactory treatment of the
problem, as far as our semantic intuitions stand and the acceptability of (66) suggests, since it reveals the two locative assertions contained in (63a) and in (64a) and assigns to estar in these sentences the role of carrier of the second assertion, i.e. that concerning the location of the speaker and of the addressee. It is of this spatial relation that, on the other hand, the temporal specification - agora - and the aspectual specification - já - are predicated.

A counter-argument to this proposal could arise by comparing it with the interpretation given to the obligatory selection of estar in (39) and (40). However, the way in which these interpretations differ can be said to be consistent with the way expressions of distance and expressions of relative position such as em frente de and atrás de differ.

First of all, the orientational axes to which the latter expressions refer, either when defined with reference to the intrinsic properties of the location or when defined with reference to the speaker and/or of the addressee, presuppose, at least, a two-dimensional reference-object (or location, which, in the case of (39) and (40) above can be said to be the perceptual space which contains the animate or the perceptually-capable entity). As for expressions of distance, they refer, by definition, to only one dimension, and this is equivalent to saying that the two entities, whose spatial relation is asserted, are conceived as points.

Furthermore, although both types of relation are symmetrical, expressions of distance can be reversed, while expressions of relative position such as em frente de and
atrás de represent converse relations (cf. Leech 1969:165 and 171). This seems to be correlated with the fact that the former are expressions of relations between comparables, whereas this is not necessarily the case for the latter. Thus, the ambiguity of (68) could be explained by the fact that, under its mobile-restaurant reading, it expresses a relation between two movable objects, while, under its non-mobile interpretation, as represented in (68'), it expresses a relation between two immovables (or locations).

In the same way, (63a) which is virtually synonymous with (68'), is also an expression of spatial relation between two immovables (or locations) - the restaurant and the place which is a point on the trajectory of the speaker and of the addressee to the restaurant. This point is not, however, defined simply by their being located at this point, as is the case for (61b), (62b), (63b) and (64b), in which the deictic adverbial governed by the prepositional expression has as its underlying structure an equative structure (cf. (63b'-b") and (64b'-b") above). Instead, it is specified by a predicative structure in apposition to a dummy element which represents the place in question (cf. (63a'-a") above). Although it would be rather complicated to derive (63a) from (63a') or (63") it seems that the meaning of (63a) and (64a) would, arguably, allow for an interpretation not very different from that.

1. The use of movability as a criterion to distinguish objects from locations is found in Jessen (1973) and in Strawson's discussion on 'material bodies as better candidates for the status of basic particulars' (1959:53ff).
If this is so, one might argue for the unmarked reference of these sentences to stand for the place and the moment of the utterance-act, which cannot indeed be fully represented by either 'here' nor 'us', as far as relations between entities (or predications) are concerned, but by an element capable of representing both 'here' and 'now', or 'there' and 'then'. This element seems to be encoded by estar.

2.2.2. Expressions of containment within the deictic space

Sentences such as:

(69a) O cinema é ALI.¹
(The cinema is THERE.)

constitute data which are highly relevant for testing the validity of the hypothesis we have been trying to demonstrate throughout this chapter. Since they express a non-ordered spatial relation of containment between immovables, the fact of ser being their obligatory copula could be explained by the irrelevancy of the speaker's and the addressee's position as far as this type of spatial relation is concerned. This explanation is, however, contradicted by their being expressions of containment within the deictic space and having as one of the appropriateness conditions for their utterances the observability of the entity located.² Therefore, if the

¹ The capitalized words which appear in the sentences discussed in this section are those which, under normal intonation, '...receive main stress and serve as the point of maximal inflection of pitch contour.' (Chomsky 1971:199)

² I am disregarding for the moment the anaphoric use of the deictic adverbial in this particular case.
obligatory use of estar with immovables has been above hypothesized as representing an assertion of the location of the immovable (or of a relationship between immovables) in the immediate perceptual field of the speaker and/or of the addressee, (69a) could be considered as providing counter-evidence to it.

However, the comparison of the ser sentence above with:

(69b) O cinema está ALI.
(THERE is the cinema.)

which has estar as its obligatory copula suggests that any conclusion about the validity of our view must follow from the discussion of copula selection in these subtypes of locative sentences.

The first point to be made about those sentences is that, in what is probably their most ordinary use, that is, as answers to questions about the location of immovables, they are, characteristically, answers to different questions. While (69a) can be an answer to 'Onde é o cinema?' ('Where is the cinema?') (69b) can only be an answer to 'Onde está o cinema?' The circularity of the argument is only apparent. In fact, if it is the case that both (69a) and (69b) may be said to have observability as one of their contextual conditions, this does not, indeed, hold for the questions to which they are answers. 'Onde está o cinema?' is adequate as a question only in a situation where the speaker and/or the addressee are moving towards the entity or, more precisely, are looking for it somewhere in the vicinity (or within the limits) of the

1. Cf. our brief discussion of (8a) in 2.0 and its appropriateness in contexts which would call for 'Voilà' in French.
place where they are and where they know (or presuppose) the entity to be located. This question could, indeed, be part of an utterance like:

(70) Você disse que o cinema *era* aqui nesta rua, mas eu *não* estou vendo nenhum cinema. *Onde* *está* o cinema?
    (You said that the cinema *was* here in this street, but I cannot see any cinema. Where is it?)

One of Schnerr's examples seems also to illustrate it very clearly:

"Onde *está* a aldeia que dizias, homem?"  (Schnerr 1947:19)
    (Where is the village you said *to be* here), man?)

since it presents the *estar* question as part of the reaction of the speaker to the fact that his expectations about the location of the village somewhere in the vicinities of the place in which himself and the addressee are have not been fulfilled.

On the other hand, the *ser* question, which, as mentioned before, is the basic one for asking directions, can be uttered at any place, regardless of its proximity to the place or location of the entity in question. Indeed, among the set of possible answers to it, one could have:

(71) Eu *não* sei onde *é* o cinema.
    (I don't know where the cinema is.)

(72) O cinema *é* na terceira esquina à direita.
    (The cinema is on the third corner on the right.)

(73) Você conhece aquele prédio de vinte andares na Rua Pamplona? O cinema *é* ALL.
    (Do you know (know where is) that twenty-storey building in Pamplona Street? The cinema is THERE.)

This demonstrates that, in answer to a *ser* locative question the reference-location is not obligatorily referred to by a deictic adverbial used in its primary or concrete sense. Instead, an *estar* locative question cannot be answered
by either (72) or (73) and must be obligatorily answered by a locative sentence in which the reference-location is referred to by either a deictic adverbial or by an adverbial expression where a deictic element is present, as illustrated by:

(74) O cinema está na tua frente.
(The cinema is in front of you.)

(75) O cinema está naquela esquina, você não está vendo?
(The cinema is on that corner there, can't you see it?)

Moreover, to answer an estar locative question by (71) would represent the failure of the presupposition of the person who uttered the question about his addressee's knowledge of the location of the entity. Indeed, an adequate answer to an estar locative sentence in this case would be:

(76) Eu (também) não estou vendo o cinema.
(I also can't see the cinema.) (Cf. (70) and (71) above)

What one can conclude from the facts just presented is that observability as a contextual condition for the utterance of ser sentences like (69a) is a requirement imposed on them exclusively by the presence of a non-anaphoric deictic adverbial, whereas, for the utterance of estar sentences such as (69b) it is consequent upon the presupposition shared by the speaker and by the addressee of their being in the place where the entity they are looking for should be observable.

Thus, it seems that the difference between (69a) and (69b) and equally, between the questions to which they are appropriate answers, is parallel to that between (63a) and (63b) and could accordingly, be represented by underlying structures similar to those proposed for the latter.

Let us now consider sentences such as:
which differ formally from (69a) by having their sentence-stress, not on the deictic adverbial, but the definite NP, and consistently with it, by the fact that they are possible answers to a different type of question. The question to which (77a) is a possible answer is 'O que ali?' ('What's there?'), or to 'O que aquilo?' ('What is that?'), or, even, more explicitly, to 'O que aquele prédio ali na esquina?' ('What is that building on that corner over there?').

This seems to allow us, on one hand, to consider (75a) as ambiguous between an equative and predicative interpretation and, on the other hand, to assign this ambiguity also to sentences such as (69a). In other words: if there is a sense in which 'O que ali?' ('What's there?') is equivalent to 'O que aquilo?' ('What is that?'), it must be also true that 'Onde X?' ('Where is X?') may be interpreted, in some circumstances, as 'Qual X?' ('Which is X?').

The permutability of the deictic adverbial with the definite NP, which is demonstrated by the fact that both (69a) and (77a) are acceptable sentences in Portuguese, seems to confirm this. In addition to this, the fact that, in Portuguese, contrarily to which happens in English,¹ there does not seem to be any constraints on the occurrence of deictic adverbials in subject position, is further demonstrated by the acceptability of sentences such as:

¹ Cf. Lyons 1973:98 and n. 7 for those restrictions in English and, mainly, on the reasons he presents for deriving a demonstrative adverbial from NP.
(78) Aqui é FRIO.
(79) Aqui está FRIO.
(Here is cold.) (lit.tr.)

which are equivalent to:
(80) Este lugar é FRIO.
(81) Este lugar está FRIO.
(This place is cold.)

as well as by:
(82) Aqui é SÃO PAULO.
(Here is São Paulo.)
(83) SÃO PAULO é aqui.
São Paulo is here.)
(84) Aqui é UMA CIDADE.
(Here is a town.) (lit.tr.)
(This place is a town.)

The possibility of assigning an equative reading to
(77a), as well as to (69a), and, consequently, of considering
expressions such as o cinema (and a ilha ('the island')) as
place-referring expressions, is consistent with the common
sense view that immovables (like buildings and topographical
phenomena) are entities which are inherently related to
their locations, i.e., whose locations are part of their
essence. In fact, a pair of assertions such as:

(85) Aquele é O MEU ISQUEIRO.
(That's MY LIGHTER.)
(86) Ali está O MEU ISQUEIRO.
(MY LIGHTER is there.)

or

(87) O meu isqueiro é AQUELE.
(My lighter is THAT (ONE),)
(88) O meu isqueiro está ALI.
(My lighter is THERE.)

are not related in the same way as:

(77a) Ali é O CINEMA.
(THE CINEMA is there.)
and:

(83) Aquele é O CINEMA.
(That is THE CINEMA.)

This suggests that, while ser sentences like (77a) and (69a) can be interpreted as statements of identity between places, this is not the case for estar sentences such as (86). It could be argued, however, as it has been, rather indirectly, by Schnerr (1954)(cf. 2.1.2), that ser locative sentences with movables, those which we have described as expressions of 'habitats' or normative locations, are also interpretable as equative. There do not seem to be any grounds for this view, to which, in fact, the non-equivalence of:

(89) Os livros são AQUELES.
(The books are THOSE (ONES).)

with:

(90) Os livros são ALI.
(The books go on/belong to that place/THERE.)

provides counter-evidence. On the other hand, the attempt to prove the possibility of assigning an equative interpretation to (90), based on the hypothesis\(^1\) that it derives from:

(91) O lugar dos livros está ALI
(The place of the books is THERE.)

is misleading. The ambiguity of (91) between the readings equivalent to:

(91') O lugar onde os livros estão está ALI.
(The place where the books are is THERE.)
(lit. tr.)

(91") O lugar onde os livros são está ALI.
(The place where the books go on/belong to is THERE.)

not only demonstrates this, but also shows that (91') and (91")

---

1. Cf. our discussion of the expression 'the place of X' in 2.1.2.
can be statements of identity between places to which objects are related in different ways, but non-inherently. One could even say, based on the sentences above, that Strawson's statement that '...the identification and distinction of things turn on the identification and distinction of places...' (1959:57) is true as far as immovables are concerned and also for movables in situations where (91') is appropriate. It does not seem to apply, however, to (91").

The fact that there is semantic and syntactic motivation to regard ser-sentences like (69a) and (77a) as being, under one of their readings, statements of identity between places, leads us to a crucial point of the present discussion. It concerns the kind of information that, by uttering those sentences, the speaker assumes the addressee to have about the entity in question, in contrast with his assumptions in the situation in which an estar-sentence like (69b) is appropriate.

Considering that his assumptions must contain, at least theoretically, the same information obtainable in the case of the addressee having previously put to him the question 'Onde é X?' or 'Onde está X?', it becomes possible, without going further into the question of the reference of definite NPs, to make some points which are necessary steps for our discussion.

By uttering (69a):

(69a) O cinema é ALI.  
(The cinema is THERE.)

the speaker's presuppositions are, under a predicative interpretation of the sentence, that the information that
the addressee has about the entity in question does not include its location. Under an equative reading of the same sentence, the speaker's presupposition seems to be that the two place entities he is referring to constitute two distinctive cognitive entities (or mental representations) in the speaker's mind. Although, in the case of (77a):

(77a) Ali es O CINEMA.
     (THE CINEMA is there.)

the entity to which the addressee is attending to is known by the speaker to be that referred to by the deictic adverbial, under an equative interpretation, it is necessary that the same presupposition proposed for (69a) holds also for (77a). However, under a predicative interpretation of the same sentence, the issue is not very clear, as we will see subsequently.

As for (69b):

(69b) O cinema está ALI.
     (THERE is the cinema.)

the speaker's presuppositions, given the contextual conditions defined earlier, are that the information the addressee has about the entity includes its location and, most probably, its being in the vicinity of the place where they are at the moment of the utterance.

The reason why there has been repeated, at this point, a conclusion drawn at the beginning of this subsection (on

---

1. Cf. Atkinson and Griffiths 1973: for a discussion of some of the problems involved in statements of identity. Problems of this kind have been much discussed by philosophers in connexion with sentences like Frege's famous The Morning Star is the Evening Star, which, unlike The Morning Star is the Morning Star, is informative and non-analytic.
the basis of data concerning only one subtype of ser and estar occurrences) is to emphasize the contrast between the speaker's presuppositions regarding the utterance of (69b), with the semantic and contextual implications of estar sentences like:

(77b) Ali está O CINEMA.
(There's THE CINEMA there.)

It is worth noticing that (77b) differs from (77a) only by having estar as a copula, since they are identical with respect to sentence-stress placement and the position of the deictic adverbial. Moreover, as its English translation suggests, (77b) cannot be an answer to 'Onde está o cinema?', but to 'existential' questions such as 'O que tem ali?' ('What is there over there?') or to 'O que tem naquela esquina?' ('What is there on that corner?').

It is also fairly common as an utterance in contexts of showing a town to a visitor or a newcomer, as is illustrated by (92), of which (77b) may be a part:

(92) Este é o centro da cidade. Ali está O CINEMA, naquela esquina está A IGREJA, e mais adiante está a PREFEITURA.

(This is the centre of the town. There is THE CINEMA there, on that corner there is THE CHURCH, and ahead, there is the TOWNHALL.)

1. Notice that (77b) can be an answer also to 'O que é ali?' ('What's there?') or to 'O que é naquela esquina?' ('What's on that corner?'), the implications of it being, as will be discussed later, that both (77b) and the ser questions just mentioned under a predicative reading, seem to be locative-existentials.

2. Here and in the following discussion there1 stands for the unstressed existential form that is commonly held to be inserted by transformational rule in sentences containing an extraposed indefinite subject; there2 is the deictic or anaphoric adverbial that contrasts with here (Cf. Allan, 1971; Lyons, 1973).
Attention should be drawn to the fact that **ser** can adequately replace **estar** in (92) and, accordingly, in (77b), and that the same applies to the existential (and possessive) copula **ter** ('have', 'there to be'), if the entity which is ascribed to the location in question is denoted by an indefinite NP.

(93) **Este é o centro da cidade. Ali** tem UM CINEMA, 
naquela esquina tem UMA IGREJA, mais adiante 

[tem A PREFEITURA.] 

Another point which seems relevant for establishing the distinction between the types of **estar** occurrences illustrated by (77a) and by (69b), respectively, is that observability is not a contextual condition for the utterance of the former, as it is for the latter. Indeed, both **ser** and **estar** are allowed in sentences such as:

(94) **A Praça da Repúblicas é o centro da cidade. Ali** tem O CINEMA, em uma das esquinas tem 
A IGREJA, e mais adiante tem 

[tem A PREFEITURA.]

(The Republic Square is the centre of the town. There is THE CINEMA there, on one of the corners there is THE CHURCH, and ahead there is THE TOWN HALL.)

in which **ali** is used anaphorically. **Ter** would also be perfectly acceptable under the condition just mentioned.

It seems clear from the data presented above that **estar** is interchangeable with **ser** in sentences of this type, and this appears to contradict some of the basic points of our proposal, since it makes **estar** optional in expressions of non-ordered spatial relations of containment. If it is
so, the hypothesis that **estar** is the carrier of the presupposition, implication or assertion that the immovable entity is located in the immediate perceptual field of the speaker and/or of the addressee, which has been partially founded on the notion of ordered vs. non-ordered spatial relations between immovables, seems also to need reformulation.

Nevertheless, either the reformulation of the hypothesis or an alternative proposal consequent upon its rejection, would have to take into account some points which arise also from the consideration of sentences such as (77a) and (77b).

Firstly, that, if it is the case that sentences of the type illustrated by:

(77a) **All é O CINEMA.**  
    (There$_1$ is THE CINEMA there$_2$.)

(77b) **All **está O CINEMA.**  
    (There$_1$ is THE CINEMA there$_2$.)

provide evidence for the optionality of **estar**, this is not the case for:

(95a) **O CINEMA é ali.**  
    (THE CINEMA is there.)

(95b) **O CINEMA está ali.**

which, in fact, differ from (77a) and (77b), respectively, by having their 'focus' in subject position, i.e. before the copula.

Secondly, a phenomenon which is parallel to the one just presented can be found with non-deictic adverbials, as exemplified below:
The consideration of these data, together with the unacceptability of **estar** in (1-5) - (cf. 2.2.1) and, similarly, of:

(99)* **O cinema está NA ESQUINA.**

allows us to list the main facts about the potentiality of occurrence of **estar** in expressions of non-ordered spatial relations of containment, when the entity located is referred to by a definite NP.

i. **estar** is optional when the definite NP which refers to the entity in question is the 'focus' of the sentence, but is not in subject position (cf. (77b));

ii. **estar** is unacceptable when the definite NP which refers to the entity in question is both the 'focus' of the sentence and the occupier of subject position (cf. (95b));

iii. **estar** is unacceptable when the 'focus' of the sentence is a non-deictive locative adverbial in predicative position (cf. (99)).

iv. **estar** is obligatory when the 'focus' of the sentence is a non-anaphoric deictic locative adverbial in predicative

---

1. The conditions of appropriateness of these sentences will be discussed subsequently.
position, in contexts in which the utterance of the question 'Onde está X?' is appropriate (cf. (69b)).

The parallelism between the two sets of sentences above, i.e. the correlation of their 'foci' and the position of their referring expressions, with the restrictions on the occurrence of estar, becomes even more relevant if one compares them with:

(100a)* Um cinema está ALI/NA ESQUINA.
(100b)* Um cinema está ALI/NA ESQUINA.
   (*A cinema is THERE_2 ON THE CORNER.)
(101a) ALI/NA ESQUINA está um cinema.
(101b) ALI/NA ESQUINA está um cinema.
   (THERE_1 ON THE CORNER there is a cinema.)
(102a)*UM CINEMA está ali/na esquina.
(102b)*UM CINEMA está ali/na esquina.
   (*A CINEMA is there_2/on the corner.)
(103a) Ali/na esquina está UM CINEMA.
(103b) Ali/na esquina está UM CINEMA.
   (There_2/on the corner there_1 is A CINEMA.)

The general restrictions on the occurrence of indefinite NPs in subject position, independently of sentence-stress placement, or 'focus', and independently of copula-selection, which these sentences have demonstrated to exist, cannot be seen in isolation from the restrictions on the potentiality of occurrence of estar listed above. Both sets of restrictions seem to be, in fact, part of a more general phenomenon having to do with the interdependence between copula-selection and definiteness of reference, or, in more general terms, between aspect and reference.

The unacceptability of (100a), for instance, in contrast with the fact that Portuguese allows us to say (at least, in some contexts):

(104) UMA TOALHA está no chão.
   (A TOWEL is on the floor.)
demonstrates that the restrictions operating on what Allan (1973:6) calls, following Halliday's proposals and terminology (1967, 1968), 'thematization of 'new' information' are stronger in the case of indefinite NPs referring to immovable entities. This suggests, on the one hand, that the notions of 'given' and 'new' information are not enough to explain the relationship between locatives and existentials and provides, on the other, the complementary facts one needs to delineate the general behaviour pattern of locative sentences relative to the feature 'definiteness' of the NP which refers to the entity located, as far as Brazilian Portuguese is concerned:

i. in expressions of locations of movables, estar is compatible with both indefinite and definite NPs in subject position;

ii. in expressions of locations of movables, ser is compatible only with definite NPs in subject position;

iii. in expressions of locations of immovables, ser is compatible only with definite NPs in subject position;

1. Worth drawing attention to, at this point, is Dowty's mention (1972:74–79) of similar restrictions operating on the occurrence of the progressive with verbs of posture. Based on sentences such as:

'(43) Dirty clothes are lying everywhere.'

and:

'(44) A statue of George Washington (stood/ was standing at the entrance of the park.)'

he not only relates the acceptability of the progressive with 'readily moveable objects' (cf. our previous mention of Dowty's account of those sentences in 2.1.1) but also adds the following comment:

'There seems to be a difference in acceptability depending whether there-insertion has applied in (52–53). (Contd.'
iv. in expressions of locations of immovables, *está* is compatible with definite NPs in subject position only if the NP is not the 'focus' of the sentence and is incompatible with indefinite NPs in the same position.

Examples which substantiate point (ii)\(^1\) are:

*Um livro está ALI/NAQUELA ESTANTE.*

("A book goes THERE/(ON) THOSE SHELVES.")

ALI/NAQUELA ESTANTE está um livro.

(THERE/ON THOSE SHELVES goes a book.)

*UM LIVRO está ali/naquela estante.*

("A BOOK goes there/on those shelves.")

Ali/naquela estante está UM LIVRO.

(There/on those shelves goes A BOOK.)

Since the way in which we would propose to handle such examples will be clear from the summary and preceding discussion, we will not go further into the question at this point.

---

Contd.)

(52) *A statue of George Washington is standing at the entrance.

(53) There is a statue of George standing at the entrance.

I am not sure of this distinction. It is no doubt one of the mysteries surrounding locatives, existentials, and the relation between them.'

(Dowty 1972:78)

1. I am disregarding, for the moment, the occurrence of indefinite generic NPs in subject position in *ser* sentences with movables, whose acceptability is dependent upon the genericness of the 'habitat' predicated of the class of entities denoted by it. But cf. footnote (1) and sentences (23) on p. 76.
These facts could lead us to a rather improper conclusion: that \textit{estar}, in expressions of locations of immovables, requires from the NP which occupies subject position, a higher degree of 'definiteness' than that required by \textit{ser}. Furthermore, this conclusion seems to be defensible if one takes into consideration that, by requiring of the definite NP in subject position that it should be part of the presupposition of the sentence, an \textit{estar}-sentence can be said to refer only to the locations of immovable entities which are in the field of attention of the addressee.

In order to be able to give a more precise formulation to what is meant by 'higher degree of definiteness', it is necessary to discuss, separately, the two types of \textit{ser} sentences which have appeared so far in this section and whose possible structures have been defined in (iv).

The first type is exemplified by (69b):

(69b) O cinema \textit{estar} ALI.
(THERE$_2$ is the cinema.)

Sentences of this type can be labelled locative-demonstratives$^1$ for reasons which are adducible from the consideration of the contextual conditions for their utterances and which have been already defined. They also could be said to be instances of a contextually conditioned obligatoriness of \textit{estar}.

$^1$ I have borrowed the term 'demonstrative' from Atkinson and Griffiths (1973) who have employed it to designate the type of sentences represented by 'THERE is the $X$', in English, which are semantically equivalent to (69b) in Portuguese.
The second type is exemplified by:

(77b) Ali está o CINEMA.
(96b) Na esquina está o CINEMA.
(101a) ALI/NA ESQUINA está o cinema.
(103b) Ali/na esquina está o CINEMA.

and could be, less informally, represented by:

(A) LOC + estar + NP

or by:

(A') LOC + estar + NP

and will, for obvious reasons, be called locative-existentials, (A') representing the (apparent) optionality of estar in this case.

2.2.5. Locative-demonstrative sentences

The contextual conditions for the utterance of (69b) and also of 'Onde está o X?', to which it can be an answer, together with the condition imposed on the locative adverbial in this case, that it should be a non-anaphoric deictic adverbial, provide the starting-point for our discussion of the interdependence of copula-selection, 'definiteness' and 'focus' in Brazilian Portuguese.

As has been pointed out earlier, the utterance of (69b) is appropriate when the presuppositions of the speaker about the relation between the addressee and the entity whose location is in question are:

1. LOC and NP and (A') stand for any locative adverbial and definite and indefinite NPs, respectively, since those sentences present, characteristically, no restrictions concerning deixis and "definiteness".
i. the addressee knows about the existence of that particular entity;

ii. the addressee is attending to the entity;

iii. the addressee knows that the location of the entity is somewhere in the vicinity of the place where he himself and the speaker are.

Indeed, the utterance of (69b) is equivalent to pointing to the entity in order to inform the addressee where the entity is in his immediate perceptual field; and this is something he would not be able to do without a deictic element being present in the predicative expression.

In the case of (69a), which is a possible answer only to 'Onde é o X?', (i) and (ii) must be also presuppositions of the speaker, although (iii) is not. In fact, by uttering (69a), he informs the addressee about the location of the entity, which is consequently the content of the 'focus' of this sentence, not of its presupposition.

However, in the case of (95a):

(95a) O CINEMA é ali.
     (THE CINEMA is there.)

which is a possible answer to 'O que é ali?' (What is [it that's] these?), the speaker's presuppositions cannot include (ii), though it would include (i), under an equative reading of this sentence.¹

---

¹. Under a predicative reading, (i) can be assumed by the speaker, as would be the case, for instance, when showing a small town to a visitor, a situation where the speaker can assume that the addressee's views on small towns are that they have only one cinema. Otherwise, the use of the definite NP can be explained as follows:

'When the speaker refers to a specific individual, by whatever means, he tacitly accepts the convention that he will provide any information (not given in the context) for the addressees to identify the individual in question'. (Lyons 1973:106).
Thus, the unacceptability of estar in:

(77b) O CINEMA está ali.

in contrast with:

(69a) O cinema está ALI.

suggests that their definite NPs differ as to their 'degree of definiteness' in the sense that the definite article in (69a) represents two presuppositions - (i) and (ii) - and, in (77b), it would represent only (i).

Support for this view can be found in Lyon's analysis of the definite article in English (1973), on which, as a matter of fact, many points drawn in this and in the following section, are based. Indeed, his analysis of the definite article as a demonstrative pronoun ('that') or as an amalgam of a demonstrative pronoun and a demonstrative adverbial ('that there') is the one we need to explain the restrictions on the occurrence of estar with the definite NP of sentences such as (77b).

One can relate the presupposition (i), which is a condition for both (69a) and (77a) to what is said by Lyons about 'that':

"The pronominal component in the definite article, that, has exactly the same function as has the same component in the other forms of the demonstrative adjectives; that of informing the addressee that a specific individual (or group of individuals) is being referred to which satisfies the description."

(Lyons 1973:106)

and the presupposition (ii), which is a condition for the utterance of (69a) to:

"Just as the meaning of the weak demonstrative that is derived by abstraction from the gesture of pointing, so the weak demonstrative adverb there is derived by abstraction from the notion of location in
the deictic context. If the underlying structure of the man is taken to be that\textsubscript{1} where\textsubscript{1} man (derivable in various ways as we have seen), this can be said to separate and segmentalize the components of context-dependent uniqueness of reference (that\textsubscript{1}) and the existential presupposition or implication (there\textsubscript{1}). (Lyons 1973:108)

Thus, one could replace our provisional notion of 'degrees of definiteness' by the explanation, based on Lyons's proposal, that the definite article in the NP which occurs in estar sentences such as (69b) must have as its underlying structure 'that\textsubscript{1} where\textsubscript{1}', whereas the definite article in the NP which occurs with ser sentences, such as (69a), is ambiguous between 'that\textsubscript{1}' and 'that\textsubscript{1} where\textsubscript{1}'. Be that as it may, the presuppositional differences between the two classes of examples are clear, whether they are to be accounted for in the syntactic derivation of the sentences in question or not.

Let us now consider sentences such as:

(104) Ali ESTAT\textsubscript{1} o cinema.
      (THERE\textsubscript{1} S the cinema.)

(105) Ali ESTAT\textsubscript{1} um cinema.
      (THERE\textsubscript{1} S a cinema.)

which might be said to represent another type of locative-demonstratives and, consequently, must be put in relation with our proposal that estar, when obligatory, requires of the NP which occurs with it, that it should refer to an entity which is already located in the field of attention of the addressees.

It is difficult to bring out naturally in English translation (except, perhaps, in a very narrow transcription) the difference between (69b) and (104). Some indication of their difference of meaning and presupposition may be
given by contextualizing them as follows. Suppose we had arranged to meet someone else at a cinema, whose location was previously unknown to both. Having identified the cinema myself, I could say to my companion: 'THERE's the cinema.' But suppose that my companion fails to identify the cinema for himself, I could say: 'THERE's the cinema.' (104) would be appropriate in the former context, and (69b) in the latter.

Sentences (104) and (105) differ from (69b) by having their sentence-stress on the copula and this is a relevant point, obviously, in the context of the present discussion. Firstly, it should be made clear that there is no phonological and/or semantic motivation to regard (104) and (105) as mere estar counterparts of:

(106) Al o cinema.
     (The cinema IS there.)
(107) Ali um cinema.
     (There IS a cinema there.)

in which the copula receives contrastive stress. Indeed, (106) is distinct from (104), as well as (107) from (105), by the 'extra-heavy stress and extra-dominant pitch' which characterizes the copula, besides the fact that o cinema - which is the 'focus' of the sentence under a normal intonation - preserves its prominence in (106), in the same way as um cinema in (105). 1

"Quite possibly, these processes are to be described in general as superimposing a new contour on the normal one. Thus in 'It isn't John who writes poetry', the word 'John' retains its intonational prominence with respect to the following phrase, exactly as under normal intonation."
As for the semantic interpretation of (106) and (107), they appear to be the negative counterparts of, i.e. they would be used to deny the propositions expressed by:

(108) Ali não está O CINEMA.
    (THE CINEMA is not there.)
(109) Ali não está UM CINEMA.
    (There is not A CINEMA there.)

which, for their part, are negative counterparts of (77a) and (103a). One could, therefore, assign to (106) and (107), the following underlying structures:

(106') [NEG[NEG[Ali está O CINEMA.]]]
(107') [NEG[NEG[Ali está O CINEMA.]]]

Structures parallel to these are not, however, assignable to (104) and (105), since sentences such as:

(110)*Ali não está O CINEMA.
(111)*Ali não está UM CINEMA.

do not exist in Portuguese. This is consistent with the fact that (104) and (105) are complex sentences, which can have their content partially negated by means of (108) and (109) respectively, and by:

(112) Ali/aquele não está O CINEMA.
    (That is not THE CINEMA.)
(113) Ali/aquele não está UM CINEMA.
    (That is not A CINEMA.)

However, the assertion carried by estar cannot be negated by (110) and (111) because one cannot reasonably deny someone else's perception in this way. And this seems to be, indeed, the basic content of sentences such as (104) and (105): the location of the immovable in the immediate perceptual field of the speaker. In fact, an appropriate negative reaction of the addressee would be, in this case, to say 'I cannot see it.'
the location of the immovable in his own perceptual field. One might say that, insofar as (104) and (105) have as their function that of drawing attention to the presence of an entity rather than that asserting that the entity is in a particular place, it does not make sense to talk of negating (104) and (105): one cannot negate an attention-drawing utterance, as one can negate a locative proposition.

Therefore, assuming that the difference between:

(77b) O cinema está ALI.
(104) Ali ESTA o cinema.

carried by their sentence-stress placement under normal intonation, corresponds to the different presuppositions carried by those sentences, it is plausible to say that the presuppositions carried by (104) are:

i. the addressee knows about the existence of that particular entity;

ii. the addressee is attending to the entity;

iii. the addressee knows about the location of the entity being somewhere in the vicinity of the place where himself and the speaker are;²

1. Cf. Atkinson and Griffiths (1973:47-48) for the discussion and formalization of the difference between the appropriateness conditions for uttering 'THERE's the X' when the addressee is at the same place as the speaker and when he is not and, consequently, cannot perceive the entity (as when the conversation is by the telephone, for example.)

2. Although presuppositions (i) and (iii) are presented here as unrelated, I assume that (iii) is part of (i), since 'to know about the existence of a particular entity' includes its location, if the entity in question is an immovable. Indeed, the oddness of 'I know London, but I don't know where London is.' seems to demonstrate this. This appears to be a further argument favouring Lyons's view of the distinction between entity-referring expressions and place-referring expressions, on which, on the other hand, an explanation of the absence of restrictions, relative to the occurrence of indefinite NPs in subject-position with movables, can be based.
iv. the addressee is attending to the place definable as the vicinity of the place where the speaker and himself are.

The contextual conditions for the utterance of (104) confirm the interpretation given to the fact that the NP and the deictic adverbial are unstressed in this sentence. (104) is not a possible answer to 'Onde está o cinema?', as it is the case for (77b). The most ordinary use for this sentence is as a verbal expression of the natural reaction of the speaker to the situation of having perceived the entity towards which the addressee and himself are moving. It is, in this sense, equivalent to 'I have seen it' and this is, in fact, the content of its basic proposition.

Nevertheless, the presence of the indefinite NP in (105) does not allow us to interpret this sentence in the same way. In order to account for the fact that (105) is not a possible answer to '*Onde está um cinema?', which is, for its part, unacceptable in Portuguese, but to the locative-existential question 'Onde há/tem um cinema por aqui/neste bairro?' ('Where there is a cinema in this place/in this quarter?'), it is necessary to consider (105) as carrying the following presuppositions:

1. the addressee is attending to the class of entities denoted by the head noun of the indefinite NP;

2. the addressee is attending to a location which is definable as the vicinity of the place where the speaker and himself are;

Notice that this second presupposition is necessary in order to explain the inappropriateness of:
Na cidade vizinha há um cinema.

which is a locative-existential. This is equivalent to saying that pointing (or the linguistic equivalent of pointing) is part of the meaning of (105), or that the utterance of the ter-question above requires as an answer the location of the entity within the place previously specified, which is, in the case of the example we have given, the deictic space.¹

If it is arguable that the presuppositions i and ii above are carried by sentences such as (105), our hypothesis of the definite article which occurs in the NP of the estar locative sentences having as an underlying structure 'that₁ there₁' remains valid. Indeed, by comparing the presuppositions assigned to (104) to those assigned to (105), it becomes clear that the ones which are absent in (105) are those concerning the knowledge that the addressee has about the existence of a particular entity and about the particular location where that entity is situated. And this corresponds to the component of 'context-dependent uniqueness of reference' which Lyons assigns to 'that₁'.

If one brings now into consideration the same author's view on existential sentences with 'there to be' and 'exist':

"It is my contention that our understanding of God exists, under one interpretation, is based upon our abstraction from the notion of deictic existence of more or less the spatial-temporal implications of the weak form of the deictic adverbial."

(Lyons 1973:103)

¹ Cf. Atkinson and Griffiths (1973:52) for the notion of 'relative location' as applied to something which is not a reference-point.
one could argue for 'there₁' to be present in (105). In other words, one could argue for (105) being a conjunction of a locative-existential ter-assertion plus a demonstrative, that is, an estar-assertion. This is, furthermore, in accordance with the presence of ter/haver ('there₁ to be') in the question to which sentences such as (105) are answers.

This point, and also that connected with the fact that the distinction between movables and immovables seems irrelevant in the case of locative existentials, will receive more consideration in the next subsection, in which the relationships of ser, estar, ter and haver sentences will be discussed. Before it, attention must be drawn to some points of Atkinson and Griffiths' discussion (1973) of the English demonstrative sentences which correspond to (104) and (105), and to (69b), since, besides providing further support for the view we have just set forth, it shows some of the theoretical problems present in our analysis of these and other instances of estar with immovables.

Based on the conditions of appropriateness for the utterance of sentences of the type 'THERE's the X', which corresponds to (69a) in Portuguese, Atkinson and Griffiths propose a formal analysis for these sentences, in which the epistemic predicates SEE, ATTEND and KNOW assume a particular importance, and to which they provide the following gloss: '...S can see something and it's the X and it's there (Atkinson and Griffiths 1973:48).

As for 'THERE is an X', based on the fact that the utterances of this type of sentence is submitted to the same
appropriateness conditions as the former, except for 'the conditions determining the appropriate use of the definite article' (1973:50), their analysis of the content of these sentences could be glossed as: *S can see something and it's an X and it's there.*

The elements conjoined in the glosses above are equivalent to our interpretation of the locative-demonstrative sentences exemplified by (69b), (104) and (105), with an important difference: the first gloss which corresponds to the analysis of 'THERE's the X' in English, cannot account for the difference between (69b) and (105) in Portuguese.

Considering that the elements that receive sentence-stress (or contain the centre of intonation) are, in (69b), the deictic adverbial, and in (104) the copula, and that this can be correlated with the fact that, by uttering (69b) the speaker informs the addressee about the position of the entity at a point of the deictic space - ALI - and, by uttering (104) he informs the addressee that he has seen it (ESTÁ), the difference between these two types of sentences might be defined by the hierarchical relations holding between the assertions they contain.

This could be interpreted as equivalent to accepting the view that one can '...determine the focus and presuppositions directly from the deep structure, in accordance with the standard theory, the focus being the predicate of the dominant proposition of the deep structure' (Chomsky 1971:199–206) formulated and rejected by Chomsky in favour of the view that these notions must be
determined from the semantic interpretation of sentences.

Without committing ourselves to any of these alternatives, one could hypothesize that (69b) contains:

i. as its matrix clause, the assertion of the location of the entity at a point (obligatorily) contained by the deictic space ('the $X$ is there'), i.e. a ser assertion;

ii. an assertion of the location of the entity in the immediate perceptual field of the speaker ('$S$ sees the $X$'), i.e. an estar assertion;

iii. an assertion of the identity between two distinct cognitive entities, the one the addressee is presupposed to be attending and the one the addressee has a particular description for ('it is the $X$') i.e. a ser sentence such as 'that$_1$ $X = X$ which is there$_1$'  

As for (104), it is (ii) above that constitutes the content of its matrix, the other assertions being secondary to it. The difference between (104) and (105) would lead to the modification of (iii), as follows:

iii. an assertion that an entity (the one which the speaker has just perceived) belongs to the class of entities

1. At this point, it is presumably necessary to make clear that the underlying structures which we have so far proposed (as well as the ones which will be later presented) for locative sentences in Portuguese are meant to bring out semantic differences between different sentences and different interpretations of the same sentences. No claim is made that these semantic representations play any role in the generation of sentences or in the assignment of meaning to sentences by means of phrase structure rules, in a more integrated theory of grammar.

2. Cf. Lyons 1973:100 for more details on the derivation of [that$_1$ there$_1$].
which is in the field of attention of the addressee, i.e., a *ser* assertion.

However, this alteration does not bring out the locative-existential content if (105), or does not make clear which one of its conjuncts contain the *ter*-assertion mentioned in our discussion of this sentence. The solution to this problem seems to lie in the fact that the *ser* question 'Onde é um cinema?' or, more adequately the *ser* question embedded in 'Mostre-me onde é um cinema' ('Show me where is a cinema') can have as one of its possible answers (105). Moreover, if one brings into consideration the fact that (1) above cannot be an assertion of (105) by the simple reason that "'an X is there' is unacceptable, it becomes clear that (105) contains a *ter*-assertion, that is:

1. an assertion of the type 'There is an X there', or a locative existential sentence, or, an assertion corresponding to the Portuguese sentences: ALI tem um cinema/ALI é um cinema.

This demonstrates the ambiguity of the *ser* sentence just mentioned (or 101a) between an ostensive definition meaning and a locative existential reading. Another piece of evidence for this can be provided by the different sentences which can be uttered as a response to 'Mostre-me um cinema' ('Show me a cinema') or to 'O que é um cinema?' ('What is a cinema?') for which it is no difficult task to provide an appropriate context. In fact, both (101a) and:
(114) **AQUILO** está um cinema.  
(THAT is a cinema.)

are appropriate verbal responses to 'Mostre-me um cinema', whereas (101a) is preferable (but no more than preferable) as a response to 'Mostre-me onde está um cinema.'

2.2.6. **Locative existentials in Brazilian Portuguese:**  
**haver, ter, ser, estar and existir.**

Let us consider the following group of sentences:

(115) No castelo tinha uma quarto secreto onde a rainha malvada tinha trancado a princesa.  
(In the castle there existed/was a secret room where the wicked queen had locked the princess.)

(116) No castelo estava uma quarto secreto onde a rainha malvada tinha prendido a princesa.  
(In the castle was the secret room where the wicked queen had locked the princess.)

(117) No castelo existia um quarto secreto que a rainha precisava para esconder a princesa.  
(In the castle there was the secret room the wicked queen needed to hide the princess.)

---

1. **Aquilo** stands with respect to aquele/aquela as isto for este/esta and isso for esse/essa, it is the form of the demonstrative pronoun with the feature [-proximate] relatively to the speaker and to the addressee, which is unmarked for gender and for number.

2. Cf. again Atkinson and Griffiths (1973:50) for a more detailed discussion (and formalization) of the relationships between the utterances of such sentences.
(118) No castelo, no fundo de um longo corredor existia um quarto, a porta meio aberta, por havia

havia

tinha

estava

onde o príncipe pôde ver a princesa que dormia

o seu sono de cem anos.

(In the castle, at the bottom of a long corridor there was a room, its door half open, through which the prince could see the princess sleeping her sleep of one hundred years.)

(119) No castelo, no fundo de um longo corredor *existia *havia *tinha *estava

um quarto a porta meio aberta, por onde o príncipe pôde ver a princesa que dormia o seu sono de cem anos.

(In the castle, at the bottom of a long corridor, was the room, its door half open, through which the prince could see the princess sleeping her sleep of one hundred years.)

The structural similarities shown by these sentences, i.e. the fact that they present the same configuration - LOC+Cop+NP -, allow us to consider them as belonging to the same class of locative sentences, the one labelled as locative-existentials. One of the main characteristics of them is the interchangeability of the existential copulas - haver, ter and existir - of Brazilian Portuguese (cf. 1.0.3) - with ser and estar, in some specifiable contexts. If, on the one hand, this phenomenon permits the extension of the label 'existential' to their ser and estar versions, the presence of an explicit locative adverbial seems to make all of them interpretable as more locative than existential. However, the characteristic position of the adverbial in these sentences - that is, its occurring before the copula - can also be said to lead to the interpretation of them as being more existential than locative, in the sense that they ascribe entities to places, not places to entities, or,
in other words, they represent assertions of the existence of an entity in a place to which the addressee's attention is (has been) previously directed.

The point made by Lyons (1968b) about the difficulty of drawing a distinction between locative and existential sentences being related to the semantic and syntactic nature (i.e. position and 'detachability') of the locative adverbial present in this type of sentence, seems to confirm the view that the semantic interpretation of them is, at least, partially, determined by the presence/absence of the locative adverbial.

"Consider the following sentences:
(1) There are lions in Africa.
(2) There are books on the table.
We might be inclined to say that the first is 'existential' and the second 'locative' on the grounds that the first, but hardly the second can be paraphrased with a sentence containing exist: Lions exist in Africa. And one might add that In Africa is syntactically 'detachable' (and therefore an adjunct): Lions exist. Moreover, from the point of view of their semantic analysis, existential sentences might be described as implicitly locative (or temporal). The assertion that something exists requires complementation, with a locative (or temporal) expression, before it can be interpreted." (Lyons 1968b:390)

This point, or more specifically, the 'detachability' of the locative adverbial apparently imposing an existential reading on this type of locative sentence is, according to Bull (1943) one of the two features which distinguish haber ('there to be') from estar in Spanish. On the basis of the interchangeability of those copulas in sentences such as:

"Coge una espada que habrá...sobre la mesa..."  
(Eduardo Marquina)
(Pick up a sword which there will be...on the table...)
"Xavier, dame aquel cofre...que está sobre el tocador" (Valle-Inclán)
(Xavier, give me that coffer...which is on the dressing-table.)
(Bull 1943:120)

Bull comes to the following conclusion:

"With estar location is not achieved except by establishing a complex, implied or actual, composed of the verb and a locative adverb or preposition(sic).... This is of extreme significance for, in contrast, the historical development of haber, with its implied subject, makes it possible to achieve communicative completeness without locative complements."
(Bull 1943:120-121)

However, since the explicit presence of a locative does not exclude the possibility of haber-selection in Spanish, Bull appeals to another type of specification to explain what he calls the 'almost stable division of the locative field between haber and estar': 'The division of function which they now share is based on the concept of definiteness and indefiniteness' (Bull 1943:121).

The presence of 'almost' in Bull's statement about the selection of haber and estar, in locative-existentials in Spanish being governed by the feature definite in the NP, is justified by the statistical account he presents, at the end of his paper, on the co-occurrence of these copulas with definite and indefinite NPs in the data extracted from 30 Spanish modern novels. Though rare, estar followed by indefinite NPs occurs and is fully acceptable, and the same is true for haber with definite NPs.

Therefore, both the presence/absence of a locative adverbial and the presence of a definite/indefinite article in the NP do not seem, indeed, to be sufficient to account for copula selection in locative-existentials in Spanish -
and in Portuguese — as Bull's examples on his paper about the related functions of haber and estar — and Brazilian Portuguese sentences such as (117-119) above-demonstrate.

What the occurrences of the various existential (or locative) copulas in both languages seem to suggest is that their selection is dependent upon the degree of information or 'specification' which is provided about the entity (and its location) by the different constituents of the sentence, i.e. by the locative adverbial, by the determiner in the NP and also — and this seems to be an important point — by the relative clause which follows it (cf. 118-119). It is not at all difficult to realize what kind of information or 'specification' is brought by these elements into these sentences. If one takes into consideration the proposal that the definite article represents an assertion, implication or presupposition of deictic existence — or of the location of the entity in the deictic space,¹ it might be said that, in spite of their heterogeneity as surface categories, both the adverbial and the definite article convey information about the location of the entity referred to by the nominal in the sentence. As for the relative clause, the obligatory presence of estar in (119) and its, let us say, optionality in (117) indicates that its content (or the type of information it provides about the entity in question) as well as its being appositive or restrictive,

¹. Cf. Lyons 1973:108 and our arguments for looking at the definite article which co-occurs with sentences in which estar is obligatory being derivable from 'that₁ there₁'.
are also determinants of copula-selection in locative existentials.

Although we will leave aside, for the moment, the task of defining the relationships between the type of information provided by the relative clause and copula-selection in sentences such as (115-117), from the comparison between (117) and (119), it seems that this assumption is justifiable. Indeed, the obligatory presence of estar in (119) must be related, at least in narrative contexts such as those exemplified by all the sentences above, to the meaning 'actuality' or 'actualized state' which is made explicit in the sentence by the expression a porta meio aberta ('its door half open'). This is consequent upon the fact that past participles of verbs in accomplishment propositions such as abrir a porta denote a resultative state which is, by definition, variable and perceivable (or observable) at a certain point-of-time, being, furthermore, demonstrated by the presence of estar (or of a 'short/resultative passive') in the unreduced version of the appositive relative clause: a porta do qual estava meio aberta ('the door of which (room) was half open').

This seems to lead to the conclusion that the obligatory selection of estar in locative-existentials such as (119) is mainly determined by the presence of an element which replaces, in narrative contexts, the availability of the entity - or its location - in the perceptual field of the speaker and/or of the addressee. This is tantamount to saying that the use of estar in such narrative contexts involves the narrator's transportation of himself and of the
addressee to a point of reference in relation to which
the scene may be described as if it were before his very eyes.
Sentences such as (119) could, then, be considered as a sub-
type of demonstratives (cf. 2.1.2.2.1), or as narrative-
demonstratives.¹

Another argument which favours this view concerns the
type of spatial relation expressed by the locative adverbial.
If one compares (119) with:

(120) No castelo ♦existia o quarto, a porta meio aberta,
♦havia *tinha ♦era
*estava
por onde o príncipe pôde ver a princesa que
dormia o seu sono de cem anos.

it comes to notice that the obligatoriness of estar in (119)
is also partially determined by the further locative
specification brought into the sentence by the adverbial
no fundo do corredor ("at the bottom of the corridor") that
is, by an expression of an ordered spatial relation of
containment (cf. 2.1.2.1.1). In other words, of a spatial
relation which can be related to the speaker and/or the
addressee's position, not to his real position, in the case
of narrative-demonstratives, but to his imaginary location,
relatively to the entity. It would not be a digression to

¹. Cf. again Bowty (1972:78) on the use of progressive
locatives with immovables:
"It may be that the difference has to do with discourse
context. That is, progressive locatives with
immovable subjects are more natural in a narrative
context where the speaker is describing what he saw in
a place he visited... If the speaker is reporting the
location of an immovable object without recalling a
particular time that he was there, the progressive is
odd." [my underlining]
say, at this point, that it is this which allows the addressee to follow the prince on his way to the room of the Sleeping Beauty, since that is the basic function of the interaction, in sentences such as (119), of the locative adverbial with estar and with the appositive clause: to make a whole situation visualizable or observable.

If the selection of estar in locative existentials is explainable by the presence (and type) of the locative adverbial preposed to the copula, by the feature 'definiteness' in the NP plus the type of information provided by the relative clause (or another element) that is in apposition to the definite NP, it seems reasonable to try to find the factors which govern the selection of existir, ter, have and ser in their behaviour relatively to these elements.

It would be misleading, however, to use the term co-occurrence in this case, although restrictions of co-occurrence will be pointed out to demonstrate that copula selection, in the case of locative-existentials is also dependent on how the entity referred to by the NP is related to space and time (cf. Lyons (forthcoming) on the distinction between first, second and third order entities). Since a crucial point, as far as locative-existentials are concerned, seems to be, not the compatibility of the verb with specific types of adverbials, but their potentiality to resist a lack of specification, or a zero-occurrence of the adverbial, and of the determiner, for example, our approach to the data which will be subsequently discussed, will be more directed to the search for 'non-ommissible determiners' (cf. Ivić 1966).
The advantages of this approach are manifold, as will become clearer subsequently. For the moment, it suffices to say that one needs a notion of co-occurrence which assigns more significance to what Crystal (1966) has called 'zero-specification' than is usually the case in the current literature. This need is justifiable by the fact that, prior to the understanding of the dependence of copula selection on the type of spatial (and temporal) relation expressed by the adverbial, there is the necessity of accounting for the 'degree of specification' - from zero onwards - that must be present in the sentence in order for a certain copula to be acceptable. That is, indeed, explicit in Crystal’s view of the interpretation of tense-forms:

"One interprets a given tense-form in a particular way either because the key to the interpretation is given in the form of an adverbial specifier, or because the absence of such a key is itself equally clear as a pointer to which time is being referred to."

(Crystal 1966:5, my italics)

If one enlarges Crystal’s statement by including the copulas in the denotation of the expression 'tense-form' - and there seem to be many reasons for doing so -, and by extending the notion of 'specifier' to other elements of the sentence other than the adverbial - and the definite NP is surely one - and, finally, by redefining the content of the 'specifier' as spatial or temporal, it becomes clear that our aim, as far as locative-existentials in Portuguese are concerned is: to use both the presence (and type) and absence of a specifier as a pointer to which space is referred to by a particular copula.

Moreover, if a current concern of the linguistic
literature on the semantics of time and aspect is the correlation between the way events and states (or their linguistic encoding by means of verbs, adjectives and nominals) are related to time and time relations (as encoded by adverbials) it seems to be not only justifiable, but necessary, to look at the co-occurrence (from a negative and positive point of view) of the copula in the locative existentials with spatial locative adverbials as reflecting the way first and second-order entities are related to space.

In brief, it is our assumption here that the particular contribution of each of the copulas – existir, haver, ter, ser and estar – to the meaning of sentences such as (115-119) can be isolated by looking at the degree and type of specification (provided by either explicit or contextually-recoverable elements) they require in order to be acceptable. And, as far as locative-existentials are concerned, the specification seems to be, primarily, spatial.

2.2.3. Copula selection in locative existentials with immovables and its dependence on degree of specification

Let us consider the following sentences:

(121a) Existem vulcões. (pl.)
\[ \text{existem} \]
\[ \text{vulcões} \]
\[ \text{vulcão} \] (sing.)

(121b) Vulcões existem.
\[ \text{vulcões} \] (pl.)
\[ \text{vulcão} \] (sing.)

(Volcanoes exist)
(122a) Existem vulcões na Itália.

(Volcanoes exist in Italy.)

(122b) Na Sicília existem vulcões.

(In Sicily there are volcanoes.)

(123a) Na Sicília existe um vulcão que continua em atividade.

(In Sicily there is a volcano which continues being active.)

(123b) Na Sicília existe o vulcão que estudamos.

(In Sicily there is the volcano which we studied.)

(124a) Na Sicília existe um vulcão para você estudar.

(In Sicily there is a volcano for you to study.)

(124b) Na Sicília existe o vulcão que você precisa (estudar).

(In Sicily there is the volcano you need (to study).)

(125a) No centro da Sicília, além de uma planície quase deserta, existe um vulcão, a cratera coberta de vapor.

(In the centre of Sicily, beyond an almost desert plateau, there is a volcano, its crater covered with steam.)
The syntactic (or distributional) and semantic nature of the (negative and positive) restrictions of co-occurrence illustrated by the sentences above shows a rather clear pattern, which is, as for the feature 'definiteness', very similar to the restrictions on the co-occurrence of *ser* and *estar* with indefinite NPs, with 'that'-'definite articles and with 'that-there'-'definite articles which has been previously discussed. This pattern is represented in Table I (p.214).

Before embarking upon the discussion of the facts about the co-occurrence of the five copulas present in locative-existentials in Portuguese, which are represented in Table I and which are, most probably, a subset of the whole set of factors which could be relevant for copula-selection in this type of sentences, some points must be explained.

The first concerns the use of the feature [+ACTU] to distinguish, aspectually, what is predicated of the entity by the relative clause. This corresponds to the opposition 'actuality vs. irrelevancy of actuality' assigned by Kahane and Hutter to *estar*-forms vs. non-*estar* forms in the Brazilian Portuguese verbal system (1953:26) and, roughly, to the features [+SITU] and [+ACTU] postulated by Leech in his account of the progressive (1969:149) and of the
### TABLE I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>Cop</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>Rel.Cl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(121ab)</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>existir</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122a)</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>existir</td>
<td>haver</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122b)</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
<td>existir</td>
<td>haver</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123a)</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
<td>existir</td>
<td>haver</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123b)</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
<td>ser</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
<td>[+def]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124a)</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
<td>existir</td>
<td>haver</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(124b)</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
<td>existir</td>
<td>haver</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(125a)</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
<td>existir</td>
<td>haver</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(125b)</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
<td>existir</td>
<td>haver</td>
<td>[PLACE] +ACTU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The term 'functional' is, at this point, being used merely as an 'ad hoc' label on the basis of its use by Atkinson and Griffiths (1973) with reference to a particular class of examples. A more satisfactory account of the meaning of the sentences here classified as functional is proposed below.
semantic distinction between 'actual, real predications' and 'non-actual, non-real, hypothetical' ones, which underlies the opposition between non-modalized and modalized sentences (1969:208). Since the relationship which one can assume to exist between aspect and modality as semantic categories will be delineated in the general conclusion to part I of this work, it suffices to say, at this point that the use of this feature [+ACTU] here is meant to capture the condition of observability which non-generic and non-modalized predications seem to have in common.

The same feature is used to distinguish adverbials which express ordered spatial relations (such as no centro da Sicília and além de uma planície quase deserta, cf. (125ab)) from those which express non-ordered spatial relations (such as na Sicília, cf. (121ab-124ab)). This is consistent with our proposal that the former, both when involving [+OBS] or a (deictic) point-of-observation, and when involving [+ORI] or a (deictic) point-of-orientation (cf. Leech 1969:180-1), allows for the location of the entity (in question) to be presupposed, implied or asserted as actualized or actualizable relatively to the speaker's and/or the addressee's position (cf. 2.2.1). Therefore, the estar-version of (125a) can be said to carry the presupposition of the location of an entity in a particular (and given) place being actualized or actualizable relative to the position of the participants in the communication-act, whereas the obligatoriness of estar in (125b) is, partially, explained by [+ACTU] as a feature of the locative adverbial.
If one brings again into consideration Lyons's analysis of the definite article as expressing deictic existence,¹ or location in the deictic space, and the possibility of interpreting indefinite NPs as derived from existentials, or from a 'there₁', (and not 'that₁') predication, Table I could be reformulated by replacing the features [±def] and [±ACTU] by [±DEICTIC] or [±THERE₁]. And this could be said to imply that copula-selection is not dependent on the location of the entity to be specified (by other elements of the sentence) relatively to other entities in general, but on the location of the entity to be specified in relation to the deictic space, or to the speaker and/or the addressee. However, since our claim is that estar expresses the location of an entity (or of its relation with another entity) in the immediate perceptual field of the speaker and/or of the addressee, and since it is also our view, following Lyons's proposals, that 'there₁' is the locative underlying existir, haver and ter, and 'is derived by abstraction from the notion of location in the deictic context' (Lyons 1973:108), there seems to be a serious question to be answered together with the determination of the factors governing copula-selection in existentials and in general. How are we to distinguish the meaning of each of the instances of 'there₁' present in

¹. Cf. also Leech (1969: 3.3, 7.1, 7.5, 8.4 etc.) for the relationships he mentions between THIS, the definite formator, SITU, ORI, and OBS. In spite of his not assigning primacy or a superordinate status to the deictic element, the relevancy of deixis to explain the basic semantic distinction of natural languages seems to be implicit in his treatment of these features.
the copulas, in the definite and indefinite article and so on? Or, putting the question more precisely: which parts of the deictic contexts are referred to by the different occurrences or occurrence-types of 'there', i.e. by the differences between them which are encoded in surface structure by formally different copulas in Portuguese?

Obviously, our attempt to answer these questions must be based on the linguistic and extralinguistic contextual conditions to which the types of sentences (and of utterances of those sentences) which are represented in Table I are subject. Before we proceed in this direction, it is necessary to deal, not as carefully as it should be done, with the problem of discriminating the contexts in which existentials may be or are used, according to the degree of knowledge or information shared by the speaker and the addressee about the topic of the conversation or about the world. It is not our intention to go further into the subject than is essential in order to differentiate locative-demonstrative sentences, (cf. 2.2.2.1), whose contextual conditions are such that they require a maximum degree of information to be shared by the participants in the communication-act about the entity and its location, from sentences such as (115-119). The 'fictional' character of the latter allows us to say that their requirements on the amount of information shared by the speaker and the addressee are, in contrast with the former, minimal, or that they are appropriate utterances in contexts in which the speaker's communicative attitude implies the principle which Strawson has called 'The Principle of Presumption of
Ignorance' (Strawson 1971:86). That the difference between these two opposite types of contexts explain both the appropriateness of existentials in narratives and the fact that 'normally, in every day discourse, we are not concerned to assert or deny the existence of entities in any absolute sense of existence' (Lyons 1973:107), is perhaps too obvious to be mentioned. However, it is a distinction that one must have in mind when discussing the interpretation of the different copulas, and of the various degrees of specification they require. It is, moreover, the distinction which explains the difference between deixis and anaphora, as well as between the universe, to which both speaker and addressee belong, together with the other entities they can talk about, and the universe of discourse, which is, somehow, linguistically created by them.

Let us start by considering the fact that existir is the only copula which can take a zero-degree of specification, since haver and ter, though co-occurring with NPs which show a zero-degree of definiteness, require, at least, a locative adverbial, to be acceptable. Indeed, absolute existential sentences which can have both 'exist' and 'there to be' in English, are possible only with existir in Portuguese. Sentences such as:

(126a) "HA 0unicórnios.  
(There ARE unicorns.)

are acceptable as a denial of:

(126b) N&O 6 unicórnios na tua novela.  
(There aren't unicorns in your novel.)

as the contrastive stress on the copula indicates, being its acceptability, then, conditioned to the contextual
recoverability of a locative adverbial.

*Existir* is, in fact, the copula of absolute existentials, which could be said to be used to predicate of an entity or of a class of entities that they are real or located in the world. That is equivalent to saying that the 'there' which underlies *existir* has as its reference the world or the universe to which the speaker and the addressee necessarily belong. It follows from this that the utterance of sentences such as (121ab) reflects the speaker's knowledge of the world of which he is part, or which can be defined by the deictic coordinates of space and time, or as 'this world'. Of course, since people do not share the same knowledge about the entities which are located in the world or in the universe, and more than that, since there is no general agreement about which entities one can say that they are in the world, *existir*-sentences, with a zero-degree of specification reflect, as has been frequently observed, the speaker's ontological commitments, or his knowledge and his beliefs.

The reason why it has been necessary, at this point, to touch on questions of such a controversial nature as knowledge and belief has to do with the definition of the contexts in which one is called to make explicit one's ontological commitments and also one's simple knowledge about the location in the world of entities such as volcanoes, geysers, etc. Sentences (121a) and (121b), by virtue of the way they differ with respect to the NPs position and sentence-stress placement, enable us to define some of these contexts.
Existe(m) VULCÃO VULCÕES.

Vulcão EXISTEM. Vulcões

(121a) cannot be an answer to a question such as O que existe? ('What exists?'), which (unless a locative adverbial is contextually implied) is a rather odd question, in contexts other than discussions of metaphysics problems. Nevertheless, (121a) may be a normal utterance in situations, for instance, of telling a child, who does not share with the adult speaker his knowledge of geology or geography, about the location in the world of entities or of a class of entities called 'volcanoes'. It is worth noticing that they are more 'natural' as utterances if they form part of an enumeration of other classes of entities which share some properties with the class of volcanoes, such as geysers, or mountains, canyons, etc. This seems to be a suggestion that the function of sentences like (121a) is to provide information about classes of entities (unknown to the addressee, but with which he is generally concerned) which are located in the world - to which the child addressee can be said to be attending or interested in, as the distribution of the 'focus' in the sentence seems to indicate.¹

In this sense, (121a) is similar to (103a):

(103a) Ali/na esquina é UM CINEMA.
(There, on the corner, there is a cinema.)

¹ One could allow for the situation in which the child is not interested in the world as such, as, for instance, in a primary school geography class. This does not seem to be counter-evidence to our interpretation of (121a), since, in order for the teacher to utter this sentence, he/she must presuppose that the children's attention is being directed to the being-in-the-world of things like volcanoes, or that it should be so.
which has as one of its contextual conditions the speaker's assumption that the addressee is attending to a specific place.

Sentences such as (121b), which have the copula as its 'focus' and, thus, can be interpreted as existential predications to a class of entities which the speaker presupposes are being attended to by the addressee, besides presenting the same difficulty as (121a) as far as its relatedness to locative questions is concerned, are generally considered as being more acceptable under contrastive stress. That is, as a denial of the denial of the being-in-the-world of a certain class of entities or, in the case of (121b), of:

(121c) Vulcão não existe(m.)
(Vulcões (Volcanoes do not exist.)

The fact that the acceptability of these sentences lie, apparently, in their double negative character, has led authors like Mihailović (1971), not to mention the literature on existentials outside linguistics, to look at the well-formedness of absolute existentials, both semantically and grammatically, as being dependent on the fact that the existential status of the entity (or class of entities) to which existence is predicated is debatable.

Her view of sentences such as:

'(52) Monkeys exist.'
as tautological or semantically empty, though grammatically well-formed and of:

'(53)*There are monkeys.
(54)*There ARE books!

(Mihailović 1971:73)
as ungrammatical due to the fact that the existence of entities such as books and monkeys is established (i.e., not debatable or questionable) is equivalent to considering existential or absolute existentials as expressing only objects of belief.

There seem to be many reasons to reject her proposal. The first concerns her judgment on the semantic well-formedness of her example (53), to which it is easy to find a context, given the conditions we have mentioned before with reference to (121a), i.e. that of the speaker being in possession of (or acquainted with) the class of entities being referred to and assuming that the addressee is not. One typical context for the utterance of absolute existential sentences is that in which are involved as participants of the communication act an adult speaker and a child addressee. It is indeed characteristic of children at a certain stage to question adults about the being-in-the-world of entities with which they are not directly acquainted and of which they have little information other than that they have a name. And adults may answer with sentences such as (121b) or (52) above.

In fact, the validity of Mihailović's argument on the 'established existence' of certain classes of entities seems to be dependent on the rather utopian view of a world where the participants of every communication-act share the same knowledge about the world and the classes of entities which are in it and differ only in their beliefs about these entities. And this seems to be rather contradictory.

Another counter-argument to Mihailović's view comes
from the full acceptability of absolute existential sentences with singular definite referring expressions as subjects, in English (cf. Lyons 1973:108), in Portuguese and in other languages. Moreover, the peculiar behaviour of existentials of this type relatively to the locative specification brought into them by some adverbials provides us with important clues for the understanding of the 'there' which underlies existir.

If one compares sentences such as:

(127) João existe na minha lembrança.
    na tua imaginação.
    na realidade.
    (John exists in my memories.
    in your imagination.
    in the reality.) (lit. tr.)

(128) Edimburgo existe na minha lembrança.
    na realidade.

with:

(129)*João existe em Edimburgo.
    (John exists in Edinburgh.)

(130)*Edimburgo existe na Escócia.
    (*Edinburgh exists in Scotland.)

it seems plausible to say that existir is not generally used merely to predicate of an entity its 'being-in-the-world' i.e. its physical reality in the usual concrete or material sense that one gives to 'reality'. Its compatibility with a subset of locative adverbials referring to cognitive states which may be regarded as abstract locations suggests, indeed, that the 'there' of existir can be specified by what one could call cognitive spaces of human beings (in opposition to the perceptual space of animates), which contain entities of different existential status as far as 'reality' (or 'outside reality') is concerned. In other
words, spaces where are located their objects of knowledge, belief, and imagination.

This interpretation allows us to account for the use of \textit{existir} with higher degrees of specification (when the NP is indefinite, cf. Table I), that is, in contexts in which 'real existence' is not in question, and also in sentences such as (115-118) and (125a) which call for 'a reinterpretation of deictic existence in terms of what might be called textual existence' (Lyons 1973:109).

Indeed, what seems to be indicated by the restrictions on the co-occurrence of \textit{existir} with a higher degree of specification as illustrated by (121-125) as represented in Table I is that \textit{existir} sentences can take a locative adverbial (other than those designating cognitive states) when some specification about the class of entities (or one of its members) is presupposed or asserted by the sentence.

This seems to apply even for (122b):

(122b) Na Sicília existe(m) \textit{VULCKO.}
\textit{VULCUES.}
\textit{UM VULCKO.}

as it is suggested by the fact that it can be an answer to a question such as 'O que \textit{existe} na Sicília que me possa interessar/que eu possa ver?' ('What exists in Sicily which can interest me/which I could see?') and not to 'O que \textit{existe} na Sicília?' ('What exists in Sicily?'), which is a rather odd question if the interrogative is not somehow restricted or contextually-bound. Consequently, both (122a), (123a), (124a) and (125a), which share the same (or similar) contextual conditions and which differ only in the fact that
in (122a) the relative clause (which corresponds to the element which binds the variable in the question to the 'here-now' of the utterance-act) is not explicit, can be said to contain the same presupposition. These presuppositions are:

i. that the addressee knows about (or is acquainted with) and is attending to a particular place (a Sicilia);

ii. that the addressee knows about and is attending to a class of entities which can be defined as capable of fulfilling some function which he has in mind, or whose intentional definition is provided by the context;

iii. that he does not know about (or is not acquainted with) and is not attending to any specific member of that class.

1. Cf. Atkinson and Griffiths (1973:VI) for a more detailed account of the contextual conditions and/or semantic implications of this type of sentences which they call functional existentials, and mainly, for their proposal that the semantic representation of existentials with indefinite generic NPs must be identical or similar to that of the former. This is equivalent to saying, if I have not misunderstood their views, that underlying any type of NP in existential sentences there is a contextually recoverable element which locates the class of entities, whose existence or availability is in question, in the deictic context.

2. The view that the intensionality of a class of entities is contextually defined seems to be related to the shift of reference from one class to another class subordinate to it, which occurs in sentences such as:

'A Cadillac is big.'

in which 'big' must be interpreted relatively to the norm concerning the size of cars, not of Cadillacs, when the subject is an indefinite generic NP (cf. Chafe 1970:195).

Notice that the sentence above can be an answer to 'Which cars are big?' and that, at least in Portuguese, the same sentence with a definite NP is ambiguous between a shift-of-reference reading and a non-shifted reference one.
The points made above seem to lead us to conclude that existir-sentences, such as the ones mentioned above, contain an assertion of the location in the field of knowledge of the speaker of the relation between an entity X and the classes of entities which are contextually defined, as capable of fulfilling some function that the addressee has in mind and that are located in a specific place Y, known and attended to by the addressee.

In the same way, one could account for the acceptability of existir with definite NPs in sentences such as (124b):

(124b) Na Sicília existe o vulcão que você precisa (estudar).
(In Sicily there exists the volcano you need (to study).)

Indeed, by taking into consideration that (124b) is not a possible answer to a question such as 'Existe na Italia um vulcão que eu preciso/o vulcão que eu preciso?', but to a question such as: 'Existe na Italie alguma coisa que me sirva para estudar a propriedade x de certos solos?' ('Does there exist in Italy something which could serve for me to study the property x of certain soils?'), it is not difficult to imagine a possible context for this question and for the utterance of (124b) as an answer to it. They could indeed be part of a conversation between two geologists, one of them involved in research on some property of soils and, at the same time, planning to spend some time in Italy. The utterance of (124b) by the second geologist would represent his knowledge of a specific entity belonging to the class of entities which is defined by the
property x (which is the object of the research of his colleague) and of its being located in a specific part of the place his colleague knows about and is attending to. It is worth drawing notice to the fact that, in this case, both the specification provided about the entity and the specification provided about its location are members or parts of the superordinate class which is known and attended to by the addressee. In the same way as a specific volcano belongs to the class of volcanoes which are defined by having the property x, Sicily is a part of or belongs to Italy. And this seems to be a condition which determines the use of the definite article in (124b); the knowledge of the addressee about a particular entity, or the particular description which he has of it, must include its specific location, in the case of the entity being immovable (cf. 2.2.2). And this condition does not hold at all for the utterance of questions such as the one to which (124b) can be an answer.

On the basis of the facts discussed above, it is arguable that the definite article which appears in (124b) is an instantiation of a contextually definable 'that', which represents the knowledge of the speaker — not shared by the addressee before the utterance of the sentence, as is the case for (123b) and (125b), — about the entity: its location and its having the property x in which the addressee is interested.¹

¹. Cf. Atkinson and Griffiths (1973:60-3) for the solution similar to ours that they offer to the problem of differentiating definite NPs in which the headnoun receive sentence primary stress from those which do not receive sentence primary stress. On the question of coreferentiality posed by the latter, they say:

(Contd.)
In contrast, sentences such as (121b) and (127-128), which differ from the existent-sentences just discussed by having their subject NP preceding the copula, represent predications of a location to an entity or to a class of entities which the addressee is somehow acquainted with and is attending to: the child may have seen the picture of a volcano in a book and the addressee in the case of (127-128) must have, at least, heard something about John or about Edinburgh. That is, the entities in question are located (or have existence) in the field of knowledge of the addressee and in his field of attention. In the case of both the child and the adult addressee having asked questions such as 'Vulcões existem?' or 'João existe?,' what they are asking (or what is given in the answers to these questions by (121b) and (127)) is the specification of the 'there,' which is already present in the question. That is: in which part of the deictic space, including their cognitive spaces, João or vulcões are located.

Contd.)

'What appears to be needed, in order to solve this problem, is some set of entities, the composition of which is somehow determined by contextual conditions, and which is a subset of the entities the addressee is acquainted with. For example, it seems likely that the composition of this set is to some extent determined by a topic of discourse, where this notion is interpreted in a wide sense. If S says to H: "I was at Martha's house last night" and goes on talking about "the table", "the bathroom", etc., these will generally be interpreted by H as referring to the table in Martha's house, the bathroom in Martha's house, etc.'

(1973:61-2)

Notice that the NP in sentences such as (124b) is under sentence primary stress.
Before entering upon the discussion of haver/ter in locative existentials with immovable, attention must be drawn to some peculiarities of these verbs in Brazilian Portuguese. Firstly, as existential copulas corresponding to 'there to be' in English, they are not subject to the general rule of person and number agreement with the subject NP, although ter ('have') in possessive sentences and ter and haver as auxiliaries, are. This explains the fact that these verbs have been traditionally classified as 'subjectless' or 'impersonal'.

A second point concerns the distinction drawn between haver and ter in Brazilian Portuguese. Although traditional grammarians used to refer to the use of ter in existentials as either 'incorrect' or as a conservative feature of Brazilian Portuguese in relation to European Portuguese, more recent prescriptive grammars (cf. Cunha 1972:92) assign to the distinction a sociolinguistic status, ter being considered as a substandard and colloquial variant in standard Brazilian Portuguese of haver. In spite of the tendency of ter to replace haver in existentials being already reflected in the literary language, both their behaviour as auxiliaries and the existence of contexts in which, even in the substandard usage, ter cannot replace

1. Worth noticing at this point is the fact that both ser and estar are 'impersonal' as copulas of temporal and weather-clauses, respectively. And this seems to provide crucial evidence for our view of these copulas, —. As for existir, this tends to be 'impersonal', when the subject is postposed to the copula and is the 'focus' of the sentence. As a matter of fact, an answer to a rhetorical question such as:

Nã o existe ninguém ness a casa que possa ajudar-me?
(Does not exist anybody in this house who could help me?)

(lit.tr.)

(Contd.)
haver, indicate that the original semantic distinction between the two verbs is, at least partially, maintained, as will be seen in the following subsection. Therefore, in the context of the present discussion, no semantic opposition between ter and haver will be in question.

The fact that haver/ter are distinguishable from existir as existential copulas by requiring as a minimum degree of specification the presence of a locative adverbial, suggests that they are more context-dependent than existir, i.e. that the amount of information shared by the speaker and by the addressee in the case of the former must be greater than in the case of the latter. This is equivalent to saying that 'there' which is an underlying element in haver/ter, in spite of not being made explicit as in English, Italian, French by the unstressed form of deictic adverbial, refers to the deictic existence of an entity (or of a relation between entities) in a less abstract way than is the case for existir.

This is equivalent to defining the entities or the classes of entities of which one can predicate haver/ter to be a subset of the entities or classes of entities of which one can predicate existir. On the basis of the data discussed above, we can assume that the latter constitute a set definable by their being-in-the-world or their

Contd.,)

would be unacceptable with existir in agreement with the subject as in:

*Existo eu (1st person sing.)

Its acceptable form:

Existe eu (3rd person sing.)

(There exists ma) (lit.tr.)
availability at some specific place being known to the speaker and unknown to the addressee. If this is plausible, the subset of these entities or classes of entities of which there is predicable haver/ter has to be defined in the same way; i.e., by their negative existential/referential status relatively to the addressee and by their positive existential/referential status relatively to the speaker.

By re-examining the presuppositions carried by the existir and haver/ter sentences discussed above, it becomes clear that to this subset belong the entities or classes of entities the speaker presupposes the addressee is not attending to, and which he introduces in the field of attention of the addressee by uttering a haver/ter sentence.

Therefore, the 'there' of haver/ter can be said to refer to that particular area of the deictic space which is definable as the field of attention of the speaker.

This seems to explain the unacceptability of haver/ter without a minimum degree of specification (provided by the locative adverbial or by a restrictive relative clause) which guarantees the presupposition that the addressee is acquainted with the entity or class of entities in question. And also the greater 'stability' of haver and ter as 'impersonal verbs'. Indeed, whereas existir, ser and estar can be used both 'impersonally' and with the NP (with which they agree in number and person) in subject position, haver and ter only occur in the subtype of

1. Notice that the conditions for an existir-sentence to have the configuration NP+Cop+Loc differ from those imposed on estar with respect to the feature 'definiteness' of the NP; generic NPs can occur in subject position in the former, but not in the latter (cf. (121a) and (127) for existir and estar-sentences - sentences utilized in the exemplification of this and of the preceding chapter.)
locatives characterizable as locative-existentials, which predicate entities or classes of entities of places.

This peculiarity of haver/ter sentences or the obligatoriness of the 'focus' of a haver/ter sentence being its subject NP\(^1\) given current views on 'focus' and 'presupposition' of a sentence, seems to be a clear indication that the matrix clause of these sentences constitutes an assertion of the location in the field of attention of the speaker, of an entity (or of a relation between entities) with which the addressee is acquainted, but to which he is not attending.\(^2\)

Although the obligatoriness/optionality of estar in locative-existentials has been already interpreted as representing the assertion/presupposition of the location of the entity in question in the immediate perceptual field of the speaker and/or of the addressee, it is necessary to examine the minimum degree of specification which is required by this

1. Notice that the same restriction holds for ter in possessive sentences and for ter and haver as auxiliaries and modal verbs in Portuguese: their surface subject is the nominativized locative (cf. Lyons 1967,1968:8.4; Anderson 1971,1973). The same interpretation can be extended to attributives, given the paraphrase-relations holding between ter, ser and estar sentences of this type, as will be exemplified later.

2. Notice that, in the case of the speaker of (124b) having to specify the information he has passed to his geologist colleague by means of that sentence, the choice of a sequence of the type:

'As far as I know, it is Etna which will provide material for your research'

or of the type:

'It is Etna that I have in mind.

depends, among other factors, perhaps, on the version of (124b) he has uttered being an existir or a haver/ter sentence.
copula, in comparison with that of ser, in order to relate the use of the latter to our view that the different copulas reflect the different existential status of an entity (or relation), or its location at different levels of the deictic space.

The main differences these two copulas show with respect to their restriction of co-occurrence in locative-existentials concerns the interaction between the feature of definiteness in the NP and the feature [+ACTU] in the relative clause in apposition with it. While estar is obligatory with [+definite] and [+ACTU], ser is unacceptable under these conditions. This fact can be interpreted as another instantiation of the same phenomenon described in the context of our discussion of the co-occurrence of ser and estar with movables and aspectual and temporal restrictions: estar has, obligatorily, a temporal reference specified in terms of points-of-time, whereas ser rejects this type of temporal reference. However, this must be considered as restricted to the location of first-order entities, since, as will be subsequently demonstrated, the converse is true, as far as (at least, some) classes of second-order entities are concerned.

On the other hand, the minimum requirement of ser-predications is the presence of either the feature [+definite] in the NP or of the feature [+ACTU], in the relative clause in apposition with it. And this is also the minimum requirement for estar-predications. This is equivalent to saying that a subset of the entities (or relations between entities) of which estar can be predicated,
are such that *ser* can be predicated of them and, given the presuppositions carried by *estar*-sentences, that this subset comprises those entities which are negatively defined as non-located in the particular area of the deictic space which is the perceptual field of the speaker.

This interpretation is, however, not only inconsistent with the data presented in 2.2.2 which illustrate the possibility of a deictic adverbial occurring in *ser*-locative sentences, as well as the acceptance by *ser* predications of a [+ACTU] or point-of-time predication in the relative appositive, as illustrated by (125a). If, on the one hand, this apparently leads to the confirmation of our view on *ser* sentences as expressing 'irrelevancy of actuality', on the other hand, the requirement of the feature [+ACTU] in the appositive in the absence of 'that\textsubscript{1}' in the definite NP, suggests the need for this hypothesis to be refined.

Nevertheless, given the presuppositions carried by the sentences (121-125), which have been discussed in this subsection, it seems acceptable as a provisional conclusion, or as a conclusion whose scope is limited to locatives and locative-existentials with first-order nominals as subjects, to say that the referential/existential status of an entity (or of a relation) of which *ser* is predicated is definable by:

i. its belonging to the set of entities with which the addressee is acquainted:

ii. its belonging to a proper subset of the set mentioned in i., that is, to the subset of the entities to which the addressee is attending;

iii. its belonging to a proper subset of the subset
mentioned in ii, which is definable as the set of the entities within the perceptual field of the addressee, if, and only if, the act of acquaintance, attention and perception are not temporally ordered, or, in other words, are coincident.

Since our hypothesis on copula-selection in locative-existentials has been drawn on the basis of their occurrence with immovable as subjects, it seems necessary to examine data concerning the acceptability of the five copulas with movables, in order to validate the hypothesis or to enlarge its scope to the whole class of first-order entities.

Sentences such as those below provide the data one needs:

(131a) Existe diamante(s).

(131b) Diamante(s) existe(m).

(132a) Existe diamante(s) naquela gaveta.

(132b) Naquela gaveta existe(m) diamantes.
(133a) Naquela gaveta *existe um diamante que você pode vender.*

(In that drawer there is a diamond that you can sell.)

(133b) Naquela gaveta *existe o diamante que você pode vender.*

(134a) Naquela gaveta *existe um diamante da qualidade em que você está interessado.*

(In that drawer there is a diamond with the quality you are interested in.)

(134b) Naquela gaveta *existe o diamante da qualidade em que você está interessado.*

(135a) Na gaveta que ele abre com muito cuidado, *existe um diamante envolvido em um lenço de seda.*

(Inside the drawer which he, very carefully, opens, there is a diamond, wrapped with a silk handkerchief.)

(135b) Na gaveta que ele abre com muito cuidado, *existe o diamante envolvido em um lenço de seda.*

(Inside the drawer, which he, very carefully, opens, is the diamond, wrapped with a silk handkerchief.)

Table II (p.237) represents a summary of the restrictions of co-occurrence which can be observed in (131-135).
The similarities which can be observed, if one compares Table II with Table I seem to reflect the existence of similar conditions governing copula-selection in both types of locative-existentials and, consequently, its relation with the fact that both movable and immovable entities belong to the class of first order entities. In other words, with
the fact that both are primarily related to space, though they can be said to differ in the way the spatial relations among them are to be located in time (cf. Lyons, forthcoming).

However, if this explanation suffices also to account for the 'habitat' or 'normative location' interpretation which must be given to ser occurrences in (133b) and in (134b) and for the unacceptability of this copula in (135a), in which the appositive clause represents a point-of-time predication¹ (even when the NP is indefinite (cf. (125a))), it has also the effect of making crucial the examination of data concerning copula-selection in locative sentences with second-order nominals as subjects. Indeed, if it is the different way in which movables and immovables have their spatial relations located in time that accounts for the facts mentioned above, there seem to be still more reasons to look at the way second-order entities are related to time and space (and at how these relations are linguistically encoded) as basic for the establishment of any hypothesis on copula-selection.

Moreover, sentences such as:

(136) A festa é às 5 horas.     
(The party is at 5 o'clock.)

(137) A festa é no clube.       
(The party is at the club.)

(138) A festa é no princípio/no meio/no fim. 
(The party is in its beginning/middle/end.)

¹ Cf. 2.1 and, specifically, our discussion on the restrictions of co-occurrence with ser with point-of-time adverbials.
which illustrate some of the restrictions on the co-occurrence of *ser* and *está*, not to mention the other copulas in locative-existentials, seem to give a clear demonstration of that necessity.

At this point, however, what seems necessary is not only to give a better or clearer presentation of the proposal we have put forward, in this section, about the semantic differentiation underlying the phenomenon of copula-selection in Brazilian Portuguese, but also to bring some support to the rather strong claims it represents, from both traditional and more recent literature on existentials.

On the basis of the facts discussed in this section concerning the degrees of specification which are required by each of the five copulas which can occur in locative existentials in Brazilian Portuguese, together with the main contextual conditions for their utterance, what seems defensible is the hypothesis that *existir*, *haver/ter* and *está* have in their underlying structure 'there1' or a weak demonstrative adverbial '...which is derived by abstraction from the notion of location in the deictic context' (Lyons 1973:108). Given that, also according to Lyons what is abstracted from the notion of deictic existence is '....more or less of the spatial and temporal implications of the weak form of the deictic adverbial' (Lyons 1973:108)1 (our underlining), it seems to be an implication of his proposal

---

1. Cf. also 'We could approximate to the apparatus of bare existence-claim by pressing space-time indication towards the limit of non-specificity.' (Strawson 1974:115).
on existentials and on the definite article, that the
grammaticalization (or lexicalization?) of the distinction
between levels of abstraction is possible, or theoretically
admissible, in natural languages.

There seems to be enough syntactic and semantic
motivation to look, indeed, at the various instances of
'there₁' which underly existir, haver/ter and estar in
locative-existentials referring to first-order entities in
Brazilian Portuguese, as being differentiated with respect
to the 'more' or the 'less' of the spatial and temporal
implications of the weak form of the deictic adverbial from
which they are derived.

The 'there₁' which underlies estar can be said to
refer to that relatively small part of the deictic context
which is definable as the perceptual field of the speaker who
is delimited by it, the term 'perception' being used here
to allow for the possibility of referring to the different
modalities of perception.

The 'there₁' which underlies ter/haver, as far as
first-order entities are concerned, refer to that part of
the deictic context which is definable as the field of
attention of the speaker, relatively to the field of attention
of the addressee, either in ordinary face-to-face verbal
interaction, or in the universe of written discourse (or
public speech). As for existir, it refers to the, (at
least theoretically) larger and more abstract part of the
deictic context which is defined as the cognitive field of
the speaker (relatively to that of the addressee) to which
belong, or in which are stored, his objects of knowledge, belief, imagination, that is, cognitive entities which are or are not associated with entities which are in the external world. And this also explains its use as predications of 'textual existence' (cf. Lyons 1973:109).

This notion of levels of deictic context or deictic existence which we have utilized to distinguish, semantically, between the different copulas of Brazilian Portuguese, corresponds, partially, to Bally's view (1926) (based on Lévy-Bruhl's study on the possessive pronouns of Melanesian languages), reported by Van Ginneken (1939:85) on the need to distinguish '...entre les diverses zones concentriques dans la grande région de cette sphère personnelle', in order to give a positive explanation of the development of 'have' predications in some Indo-European languages, from its original use with the concrete meaning of 'grasp', 'hold' (cf. also Lyons 1967 and 1968:395ff).  

It is worth quoting the conclusions set forth by Van Ginneken in his brief review of the works of Meillet (1924), Kurylowicz (1931) and Vendryès (1937) on the differences between 'être' and 'avoir' (or 'be' and 'have') which are suggested in their development of auxiliary functions in Indo-European languages.

---

1. In my opinion, it is also a similar distinction - i.e. the distinction between the different 'zones concentriques' of the deictic sphere - which underlies Hjelmslev's semantic dimensions for case systems; Cf. Hjelmslev (1935:1-70) and Anderson's discussion of it (1971:6). It is adducible from the position I am taking relatively to the topic of my work that I do not agree with Anderson's criticism of Hjelmslev's view of case, since it implies a 'localism without deixis', which seems to be somehow counter-intuitive.
About Vendryes's view on the 'passé composé' having developed to fulfil 'le besoin des langues indo-européennes' to have at their disposal the means to distinguish between resultative and non-resultative processes, Van Ginneken says:

"Ce qui manquait à cette explication, ce n'est que le rapport du 'but atteint et de l'état obtenu' aux diverses zones concentriques de la sphère personnelle.... Les deux verbes auxiliaires forment donc une catégorie pour exprimer les rapports subtils d'une action ou d'un état aux différentes zones concentriques de notre sphère personnelle. L'état actuel, qui est la suite d'une action passée, appartient au point central, et le verbe 'être' répond seul à ce besoin d'une possession inaliénable. Le verbe 'avoir' a été créé pour exprimer les rapports des actions humaines avec les zones moins centrales de notre sphère personnelle; c'est à dire, pour les possessions aliénables."

(Van Ginneken 1939:89-90)

And also:

"Mais parce que la sphère personnelle du sujet a plusieurs degrés d'intimité, et que nous employons l'auxiliaire 'avoir' pour les rapports des choses concrètes avec des degrés un peu moins intimes, c'est le verbe 'être' enfin qui sert pour exprimer les rapports des choses concrètes avec le centre le plus intime de notre sphère personnelle, qui contient en même temps les idées les plus abstraites."

(op.cit.:90)

Although Van Ginneken's notion of 'zones concentriques de la sphère personnelle' is rather vague as to the sense in which it should be inserted in the frame of the communication-act or defined in the intersection of the personal spheres of the speaker and of the addressee, his interpretation of 'avoir' and 'être' as auxiliaries brings to notice a very interesting point connected with the differentiation between ser and estar. Since the languages of the Indoeuropean family which he brings into discussion do not present an equivalent of the ser/estar opposition as a grammatical feature, it is plausible to look at his
explanation about the ambivalence ('concréte' vs. 'abstraite') of 'être' as corresponding to this distinction. This seems to be in agreement with the 'concreteness' of ester and with, at least, the generic uses of ser.

With reference to more recent works on locatives, existentials and deixis, it should be pointed out that Atkinson and Griffiths's paper, together with Lyons's analysis of the definite article, not only provides support for our proposal, but has been the basis for many of the conclusions set forth on the relationships between locatives and existentials.

Since their work, or points made on it, have been mentioned in relation to many passages of this section, the part of it to which we need to refer, in the present context, is their postulation of the three epistemic predicate constants - KNOW, ATTEND and SEE - in the meta-language they utilize in their analysis of locative-demonstrative and of existential sentences in English.

Since it lies outside the scope of this work to provide a contrastive study of English and Portuguese, with respect to locative and existential sentences, it seems sufficient to say that very similar, if not identical, contextual conditions, appear to be operative in both languages, regarding the utterance of the different subtypes of locatives that Atkinson and Griffiths deal with. And this seems to justify the fact of our proposal and theirs being, basically, the same.

Moreover, the implicational relations that these authors state as holding between the three predicates (and
which correspond to our three levels of abstraction or zones of the deictic sphere) which are as follows:

"For See (A,a) implies Att(A,a), i.e., if A is directly perceiving a, then he is attending to it, and Att(A,a) implies Kn(A,a), i.e., if A is attending to a, then he is acquainted with it."

And:

"It is worth pointing out that the implications we have mentioned do not hold in the opposite direction, e.g. from J's knowledge that a speaker is acquainted with a particular entity he cannot conclude that the speaker is attending to or directly perceiving it." (Atkinson and Griffiths 1973:39)

provide the explanation one needs to the fact of some contexts being shared by the five copulas, exemplified in (121-125) and in (131-135).

2.3. Locative sentences with second-order nominals as subjects

In order to validate our hypothesis that ser is unmarked as to the actuality of the relationship asserted (or presence in the deictic space of the speaker), it seems necessary to look, though briefly, at expressions of the location of second-order entities in space and time.

(1) A demonstração é na praça.

está

(The demonstration is in the square)

(2) A demonstração é às cinco

Não está

If one considers the acceptability of estar in (1), in contrast with its incompatibility in (2) which is an expression of temporal location, again it is the condition of observability which governs the utterance of the estar-version of (1) that leads to a preliminary understanding of these apparently contradictory facts. The estar-
version of (1) is, in fact, acceptable if the second-order nominal 
demonstração refers to the location of the event in X ('a praça') 
as observable at/around the moment of the utterance-act. This 
means that the second-order nominal in (1) denotes an event or situa-
tion still in existence, that is, obtaining for a certain time to 
which the time of observation can be related. In terms of our 
framework, this means that it refers to a situation during its 
actualization or to part of its trajectory through space and time.

However, this does not seem sufficient to explain the accepta-
bility of estar in (1), since one cannot refer to an event observable 
to the speaker and/or to the addressee at/around the moment of the 
utterance-act with either ser or estar. Indeed, a sentence such as:

(3) *O jogo está na tua frente.
(The match is in front of you.)
is unacceptable, and its ser-counterpart:

(4) ?O jogo é na sua frente.
('The game is in front of you.)
is either unacceptable or must have the personal pronoun interpreted 
as referring to an immovable place, that is: as representing a place 
normally associated with the addressee as (4') illustrates:

(4') O jogo está em frente da sua casa.
('The game is in front of you.)

This seems to indicate that second-order entities cannot be 
located to a movable reference-point, and consequently that, like 
immovables, they are inherently related to their places, or to the 
places where they happen. The acceptability of estar with (1) and 
the fact that one of the contextual conditions for its utterance is 
the observability of the spatial relation asserted, must, then, be
explained by the fact that _demonstração_ refers to a movable situation. This is also the obligatory interpretation which should be assigned to:

(5) A reunião _está_ na sala 18.
(The meeting is in room 18.)

The use of _estar_ in (5) would enforce an interpretation of reunião as an event which involves the moving of, at least, some of its participants, from one place to another, that is, whose trajectory through time and place involves a plurality of places. One could conclude from the facts presented above that the observability of events is dependent on their passing through places; and this is consistent with the fact that in order for something to be observable it must be contained in the zone of the deictic space defined as its perceptual field. Since animate entities, and in this case, the speaker and the addressee are, by definition, movable entities, it could be said that an event can only occupy the perceptual field of the speaker and of the addressee when their locations are, at least, partially coincident or overlap.

Let us now consider (2), which does not accept _estar_ as a copula, Once again, this defines the relation asserted as non-observable, that is as non-actual. Indeed, the non-actuality of the _demonstração_ or its location at a certain point-of-time can be interpreted as a subtype of normative location, the rule or norm being either inferred from the previous actualization of the same temporal location or determined by someone in authority. The assignment of the meaning 'future event' to (2) is equivalent to ordering its prospective phase to the utterance-act, as is the case when a deictic adverbial replaces the non-deictic and point-of-time adverbial in (2):
(2') A demonstração é amanhã

(The demonstration is tomorrow.)

In the same way, the non-actuality of

(6) A demonstração foi às duas horas.

(The demonstration was at two o'clock.)

entails its non-observability, the meaning 'past event' being assigned only if its non-existence or its retrospective phase is ordered relatively to the deictic coordinates of time and space.

However, events such as demonstrations, meetings and matches are observable even when they do not occupy various and successive locations in space: they endure for a certain period of time, during which they can be located in the perceptual field of animates. Indeed, since animates are, by definition, moveables, they can make their location at a certain time at least, partially coincident with the space occupied by non-moveable events. This means that the location of an event in the immediate perceptual field of an animate is possible only in cases in which the time at which their spatial locations overlap is one of the points of time that constitute the trajectory of the event or its existence. And this explains the fact that estar is acceptable, and, more than that, obligatory in expressions of temporal locations:

(7) A reunião está no começo/ no fim/ no meio.

(The meeting is at its beginning/ at its end/ at its middle.) (lit. tr.)

or in the so-called progressive constructions such as:

(8) A reunião está sendo na sala 18.

(The meeting is being in room 18.)
Indeed, must be interpreted as expressing the availability of the event to the observation of the addressee at a specific place and asserts the overlapping or the partial coincidence of the time of the utterance-act with a point on the trajectory of the event in question through time.

From the examples and facts discussed above, we feel justified in our interpretation of ser-predications as expressing non-actuality, or the negation of the location of first-order entities and second-order entities in the perceptual space of the speaker and/or the addressee. However, in so far as entities such as events and immovables exist and are related to other entities in the world, they must be located in some zone of the deictic space when we talk about them, a zone which is the speaker's or the addressee's field of perception. The data to be presented in Part II about the emergence of ser-utterances in the samples of very young children seems to indicate that ser asserts the location of such entities both in the field of attention, as does ter, and in a cognitive field, as does existir.
3. Conclusion of Part I

Part I of this work has consisted of a presentation and discussion of the data concerning the phenomenon of copula-differentiation in locative sentences in Brazilian Portuguese in a systematic attempt to define the principle, or principles, governing the opposition between ser and estar within the aspectual system of the language.

We have considered the restrictions on the co-occurrence of those copulas with different types of spatial relations as encoded by different constituents of the sentence, that is to say:

(i) the spatial relation underlying the notion of movability as a feature of their subject NPs;

(ii) the type of spatial relation (ordered or non-ordered relatively to a reference-point or to the properties of the reference location) predicated of immovable entities, by the preposition governing the object NP;

(iii) the type of reference-point (deictic or non-deictic) in relation to which the spatial relation asserted was implicitly or explicitly defined.

These considerations have led us to the conclusion that copula-selection in Brazilian/Portuguese has as its basic function that of signalling the actuality vs. the non-actuality of the relationship asserted or presupposed by the sentence.

The steps which have led us to this conclusion with respect to the expression of the location of movable entities were based on their restrictions of co-occurrence with deictic modals and with point-of-time and period-of-time adverbials, combined with different tense-markers. The main result of these procedures was to enable us to define as a non-omissible determiner of estar a point-of-time adverbial (or an adverbial...
denoting a period of time definable as a succession of points of
time). In contrast with estar-predications, ser-predications reject
such aspectual restrictions. This contrasting behaviour of estar-
predications and ser-predications was the basis for the specification
of the meaning of non-actuality that has been assigned to ser with
movables as subjects: that of expressing their normative location
(or 'habitat'). This interpretation is shown to be more general
and more satisfactory than the traditional interpretation of ser-
predications in terms of permanence.

As for locatives with immovables as subjects, their co-occurrence
with different types of adverbials has enabled us to specify the
meaning of actuality vs. non-actuality more precisely: indeed, the
acceptability of estar with expressions of spatial relations which
could be ordered relatively to the position of speaker and/or the
addressee (plus the obligatoriness of its selection given the
presence of the NP governed by the preposition of any element
implying the observability of the entity at the moment of the
utterance-act) has led us to define actuality as the presupposition
or assertion carried by estar that the entity (or the relation) is
located in the immediate perceptual field of the addressee.

However, the analysis of locative expressions of another type
whose function it is to assign entities to places, and the defini-
tion of the contexts shared by the existential ser and existir,
has shown the need for defining other zones of the deictic space
within which entities and relations between entities could be
located: these are (i) the zone defined as being the intersection
of the field of attention of the speaker and of the addressee, and
(ii) the zone defined as being the intersection of the cognitive
awareness of the speaker and addressee with reference to the entities
which are objects of the discourse.
However, it has remained unclear, from the distribution of *ser*, *está*, *ter*/*haver* and *existir* in so-called existential contexts, how one might reconcile the meaning of non-actuality with the co-occurrence of *ser* with point-of-time adverbials in sentences expressing the location of second-order entities in time and in space. After considering the fact that *ser* is used for assigning to movables places which can be never actualized, for expressing the location of immovables as being unspecified relatively to the deictic coordinates and for locating at appoint of time the starting-point or the end-point of an event also in relation to the deictic coordinates, we have drawn the plausible conclusion that *ser* is unmarked in relation to the actuality of the relationship asserted.

The possibility of extending our proposal to cover other areas in which the opposition of *ser* and *está* is operative is indicated by the correlation between *ser*, *está* and *ter* in possessive constructions and in attributive constructions with adjectives and also, as has already been mentioned at various points in this work, with constructions involving progressive aspect and past participles.

Indeed, the relation between sentences such as

1. João *tem* um livro.
   (John has a book)
2. O livro *é* de João.
   (The book is John's)
   (John has the book with him)
(4) Maria tem a felicidade de ser magra.
(Mary has the good fortune to be slim)

(5) Maria é feliz de ser magra.
(Mary is fortunate to be slim)

(6) Maria está feliz de ser magra agora.
(Mary is happy now that she's slim)

(7) A televisão tem quebrado muito.
(The television-set has often been broken)

(8) Essa televisão é quebrada.
(This television-set is broken)

(9) A televisão é quebrada a cada briga deles.
(The television-set is broken every time they fight)

(10) A televisão está quebrada.
(The television is/happens to be broken)

(11) Mario tem cantado.
(Mary has sung)

(12) Mario está cantando.
(Mary is singing)

and many other constructions would seem to be explicable in terms of the existential operators proposed for the semantic analysis of sentences containing ter, estar and ser of the kind that we have been dealing with. But it has been beyond the scope of this work to deal in detail with such further relations. Our principal aim has been to deal with what, according to our hypothesis, are the basic locative constructions.
PART 2

THE DATA
1. **Introduction**

This second part of the present study represents an attempt to look at the emergence of forms of *ser* and *estar* in the acquisition of Portuguese by two Brazilian children as partial evidence for the hypothesis about the semantic representation of copula-differentiation which has been presented in the first part. As will be detailed later, the data collected from the youngest child cover a period which starts at the stage of one-word utterances and ends at that of an utterance-length of approximately two and a half words or morphemes.\(^1\) The second child was recorded from the beginning of the so-called syntactic period or Stage II (cf. Brown 1973) till that of an utterance-length of more than three words.

Our claim that the copula-differentiation is an aspectual marker in the nominal and adjectival predication of Portuguese and, as such, must be considered within the whole aspectual system of the language, explains the treatment which has been given to the data. Not only the emergence of *ser* and *estar* (and *ter*) forms, but also that of tense-inflections and auxiliaries has been taken into account, together with their co-occurrence with locative (spatial and temporal) expressions, in order to establish

---

1. Cf. 1.1.4. below for the justification of our use of 'mean-length-of-utterance' as a criterion for the establishment of stages in linguistic development, in spite of our negative view of its validity.
a sequence of emergence reflecting the linguistic development of the children, relatively to this particular area.

Furthermore, on the assumption that a semantic distinction is neutral with respect to the way in which it is either lexicalized or grammaticalized in particular languages, we have also taken into consideration certain phenomena other than inflections, auxiliaries, copulas and adverbials, which are present not only in the first combinations of words but even before that (i.e., in the one-word stage.) The kind of data I am referring to are those that have been reported in the literature on the acquisition of many unrelated languages and have been labelled 'operations of reference' by Brown (1973), 'functional relations' by Bloom (1971, 1973) and 'operators' by Schlesinger (1971). They have been interpreted as expressions of 'nomination' or 'existence' (e.g. 'this X', 'there X', 'see X'), of 'non-existence' (e.g. 'allgone X', 'away X', 'no X') and of 'recurrence' (e.g. 'more X', 'nother X'). It seemed plausible to look at these semantic relations which are, together with those of Agent-Action, Action-Object, Entity-Location, predominant in the early syntactic stages - and present even before that as isolated utterances, i.e. without an explicit X), as the first linguistic manifestations of the cognitive category on which the semantic category of aspect seems to be based. As will be extensively discussed later, the appropriate use of these expressions in certain contexts seems to indicate that the child has mastered
concepts about the way first-order entities and second-order entities are to be related to space (and, subsequently, to time), concepts, which, in their turn, are built up on the notion of the location and displacement of objects in the child's perceptual field.

Thus, in spite of the tentative nature of all hypotheses concerning language acquisition, I hope that my interpretation of the sequence of the different types of linguistic encoding of aspectual notions in the acquisition of Portuguese will not only provide evidence for the 'deictic-localist' interpretation given to *ser* and *estar* (and to the other copulas and auxiliaries) in Brazilian Portuguese, but also make some contribution to the understanding of aspect as a semantic category.

From a strictly psycholinguistic point of view, it is also our aim to provide some support for the view recently proposed by some investigators that language acquisition is a process which can be defined as the mapping of linguistic structures onto previously acquired cognitive structures. This view seems to imply the ontogenetic priority of semantics with respect to syntax or, at least, its determinant role in the acquisition of the latter. Indeed, by following up the different ways in which aspectual notions are expressed at successive stages and by relating these to the order of emergence of locatives, we can reasonably claim that the former are derived from the latter. Moreover, in view of the fact that children are not able to order events on the time-axis till stages much more advanced than the ones I have
worked on, their use of tense-forms must be considered, as we shall see later, as encoding aspectual notions based on internalized action-schemata. There is, therefore, sufficient reason to assume that their mastering of aspectual notions is prior and basic to that of temporal relationships.

Thus, the relationships between location in the perceptual space, which is the primary space 'par excellence', location in the deictic space, which is definable as the intersection of the child's space with that of the adult interacting with him,¹ or existence—that is, the cognitive category on which the semantic category of aspect is mapped—and location in time, could be seen as ordered according to their degree of complexity and dependence. The steps which have led to this conclusion will be presented in the course of our discussion of the data.

1.1. Description of the study

1.1.1. The children and the data collection

Two boys—Luciano and Fernando—had samples of their speech audio-recorded for the purpose of this study. Both belong to middle class families, their fathers being professionals and their mothers being university students.


'But language is acquired as an instrument for regulating joint activity and joint attention. Indeed, its very structure reflects these functions and its acquisition is saturated with them.'

(our underlining)
at the time of the data collection. Luciano is the second-born child in the family, having a sister one year and a half older than him. At the end of the data collection another sister was born, but this did not seem to have interfered with his verbal behaviour, as far as one can judge on the basis of the data collected in the later sessions.

Fernando is the first-born in his family, and he too was followed by a brother, born in the last month of the data collection. Our complete failure in getting him to talk in the last session (cf. Table I) seems to have been due to his reaction to the event.

Both children have had, during the whole period of the collection of the samples, regular contact with other children - relatives and friends - and with adults, with whom they used to interact very freely. Another common factor present in their lives after they had completed two years, was attendance at a kindergarten for approximately three hours every day.

As for the situational conditions of the sessions, both children were audio-recorded in situations of informal verbal and non-verbal interaction with their parents, mainly the mother (and only the mother in Fernando's case), and eventually close friends of the family, house employees and occasional visitors. These situations including toileting and dressing and, in Luciano's case, 'bed-time solitary talking' (his mother being present, but outside his visual field) and playing activities with his sister.

Luciano was recorded weekly, from the age of 18 to
27 months, for approximately half an hour on each occasion: the gaps which can be noticed in Table I were due to his mother's engagements and occasional illnesses of the child. The recording was done by the mother, my student at that time, and she was also responsible for a written situational record of the sessions. Luciano's corpus constitute a total of 24 sessions corresponding to 16 hours of recording and to 6,736 totally or partially intelligible utterances.

Fernando has also been recorded weekly, from the age of 21 to 28 months, for approximately half an hour each time, the gap between sessions xii. and xiii, being due to the winter holidays that the family spent out of São Paulo. The recording was done by Cristina Pereira, a post-graduate student who had been working with me for some years and she too was in charge of the written situational record taken during the sessions. She also interacted with Fernando in some of the last sessions.

Fernando's sample represents a total of 24 sessions corresponding to 14 hours and to 9,742 utterances. There was no problem regarding the intelligibility of Fernando's speech and this seems to be the main explanation for the fact that his corpus contains 3,000 utterances more than that of Luciano. There must also be taken into consideration the more advanced phonological stage that Fernando had reached at the time the data collection started.

It remains to be added that both children have had, since their birth, a monolingual immediate environment and were, therefore, exposed to the São Paulo standard Brazilian
Portuguese. Although the house employees were speakers of a sub-standard variant, this does not seem to have influenced the children's speech.

1.1.2. **Transcription of the data and some problems concerning their validity**

As was mentioned in the previous subsection, the collection of the data, in both cases, was not carried out by the investigator. This seems to violate a practical norm inferred from most reports on longitudinal data used by researchers in child language. Moreover, the transcription, though carried out by the investigator, was done, in the case of part of Luciano's corpus, a year and a half after the data collection (the first part was transcribed almost immediately after the sessions) and in Fernando's case, six months later.

The reasons for this are twofold: our original purpose on the collection of Luciano's sample was to obtain a pilot corpus with reference to which one could trace a general outline of the acquisition of Portuguese and also detect some of the methodological problems involved in longitudinal studies of child language, in order to establish guidelines for future effective research. Thus, it was regarded as unnecessary, at that moment, to follow very strictly the norms used in earlier studies. The other reason why Fernando's corpus was not recorded by the investigator herself, is that his sample was collected in Brazil while the investigator was in Edinburgh pursuing the post-graduate studies which led to this dissertation.
However, conscious as we are of the risks involved in our disregard of the normal procedures of data collection, we feel confident that the transcripts of both samples are representative of the children's linguistic production at that time, since the number of unintelligible and uninterpretable utterances is minimal in the case of Fernando, and high only in the first sessions with Luciano. But, as will be shown subsequently, other factors - mainly the transitional character of his phonological production at that time - seem to account for this (cf. number of utterances in session i. and ii., Table I).

Thus a normalized transcription was made of both the children's and the adults' utterances, since a phonetic one did not seem to be relevant to the kind of data we were looking for. Conversations between adults to which the child was not attending have been, in some instances, only partially transcribed. The transcripts have been revised twice by the investigator herself; and to each utterance there has been added all the relevant information about the extralinguistic context, in so far as this was clear from the linguistic and non-linguistic clues - such as adults' utterances, in the first case, noises of toys and other objects, in the latter - and from the situational record written during the sessions.

There have been no relevant problems with the discrimination of the forms whose emergence was being investigated. The verbal inflexions for the third-person singular and third-person singular forms (which were over-generalized by both children almost till the end of the
sample) are stressed suffixes and they are phonetically very clear, as far as the use of the perfective tense is concerned. As for the third-person singular of the Indicative Present of *ser* and *estar*, only *él* was sometimes ambiguous. The reason is that its phonetic salience is dependent on the sentence stress position and it can be homophonous with monosyllabic items which seem to accompany hesitation phenomena in the speech of children and adults. *Té* - the colloquial form of the third-person singular of the Indicative Present of *estar* - did not present any particular problem regarding its interpretation, due, most probably, to the fact that, though monosyllabic, it is normally stressed. There have been some difficulties relating to the discrimination of articles, prepositions, contractions of prepositions with articles, which, however, did not seem to affect our interpretation of the data.¹

1.1.3. On the criteria utilized for the selection of the data

The problem of defining the criteria utilized for the selection, from a longitudinal sample, of data to be used in a study of the acquisition of a particular subsystem of the language the child is exposed to needs to be

¹. As for locative sentences expressing *en*-relations, the absence or the phonetic/phonological *status* of the preposition *en* did not invalidate our interpretation of them as locative, due to the semantic content of the nouns combined and to the evidence provided by the context.
considered, before we embark upon any discussion of the data. The complexity of the task prevents us from going, at this point, further than it is necessary to give some justification for the criteria utilized in our work. Thus we will restrict ourselves to the main questionable points which are involved in the qualitative and quantitative criteria utilized, explicitly, or implicitly, in studies on child language in the last two decades, and start by locating our views on the subject closer to those implicit in the traditional works on child language, represented mainly by the diarists, such as Grégoire (1937,1947) and Leopold (1939-1949).

Firstly, if it is reasonable to say that the investigator's hypothesis about the particular subsystem of oppositions in the adult language whose development it is intended to trace in the child's sample, endangers the validity of his/her conclusions, it also seems true that the investigator's view of language - which is the basis for his definition of the above mentioned criteria - endangers the 'representativeness' of the subset of elements of the corpus selected for his/her research.

Moreover, quantitative and qualitative criteria underlie not only the investigator's assumptions about the degree of representativeness of the corpus as a whole, but - and this is the crucial point - its segmentalization into units of different size and nature: utterances(?), words(?) morphemes(?) (Cf. Crystal 1974:294-295).

Taking Bloom's (1970:2,1) procedures for selecting obtained utterances as an example of the more or less
general position of researchers with respect to this methodological problem, one could start by saying that her qualitative criteria, both for decisions concerning smaller units of the corpus - 'words' and 'morphemes' - and for larger units - such as 'sentences' and 'utterances' - are based on the comparison of the children's data with the adults' linguistic competence and performance. This could not possibly be the object of criticism, if it were not for the rather contradictory use of this qualitative criterion, as far as the difference between, let us say, the smallest and largest constituents of the corpus is concerned.

Indeed, if, on the one hand, 'tentative morpheme identity is ascribed... to forms with morpheme status in the adult model...', on the other hand, 'duplications with or without reduction of something said to the child, immediate repetitions of the same utterance by the child ...are not included in the analysis' (Bloom 1970:17). This also could not possibly be object of criticism, considering that creativity has been, traditionally and non-traditionally, viewed as restricted to the syntactic level, or to the combination of smaller units into larger ones.

The validity of the criterion of creativity in relation to the adult's linguistic competence and performance, which is negatively applied in the assignment of 'morpheme identity', and positively considered in the case of larger (syntactic) units, is, however, challenged by the data provided and discussed by many investigators
in the field. On one side, the problem of assigning morpheme identity even on a tentative basis, is, by itself, very controversial, as far as the denotation of lexical units is concerned.¹ The recent works by Donaldson and Wales (1970), Eve Clark (1971,1973), Andersen (1975), not to mention the phenomenon of under-inclusion and over-inclusion pointed out as characteristic of the earlier lexicon of children by Guillaume (1927) and Leopold (1939-1949), sufficiently demonstrate this.²

On the other hand, creativity used as a criterion for the selection (and segmentability) of data in relation to larger units, is challenged by the findings in longitudinal data on language acquisition concerning the use by children of large segments of the adult's immediately preceding utterance as a kind of explicit presupposition or topic in their own utterance. These data, and other of similar nature, such as the use of prefabricated routines, have been reported and discussed by Ruth Clark (1975 and forthcoming) who has explained its use as 'one of the strategies used by children to simplify the tasks of speech reception and production' (1975:1).³

¹. Cf. also on the question of segmentalization, which is involved in ascribing morpheme identity to children data, Crystal's (1974:297) view on the need of a prosodic criterion 'to avoid the danger that morpheme-sequences for the child are assumed to be sequences of words, when the child may be using them as compounds...'

². Cf. Bloom's (1973:4.2) own discussion and review of the traditional literature on this topic.

³. Cf. Brown's (1973:101) view on the precursors of wh-questions that appear in Stage 1 as generated '...by some complex mechanism either as fixed routines or as simple frames in which a set of words could rotate.' But, we will discuss this point later with reference to locative questions.
If these facts must be taken into consideration by the investigator in his/her attempt to define qualitative criteria for the selection of the data or for looking at what should be discarded or not, it seems to follow that the assignment of linguistic (syntactic and semantic) status to any item of any size and belonging to any category of the adult language must be a decision made on the basis of its occurrence and recurrence in specific sets of discourse and situational contexts. This seems to be indeed the only way one can define the linguistic function of the larger segments or unanalyzed wholes children take from the adult's precedent utterance, and how a partial or over-extended meaning can be assigned to phonologically smaller units in the earlier stages.¹

This justifies the fact that we have made no attempt to build up successive grammars to account for the differences between stages (and sub-stages) of the child linguistic development. It allows us, equally, to look at the corpus - and by corpus we mean the set of successive situations in which the communicative acts - and the 'linguistic' elements present in them - are inserted - as providing the information which can be relevant to the establishment of the sequence of development of primitive semantic relations, as well as for relating achieved degrees of semantic complexity to different forms of

¹. This seems also to be true as far as the use of language by adults is concerned. Cf. Atkinson & Griffiths (1973: 36) and our discussion on functional existentials (Part I, 2.2.2.1, sentences (124ab) and (134ab), in which is suggested that both the denotation and the referentiality of a NP can be contextually defined.
expressing them.

This is equivalent to saying that the subset of linguistic units of any size and belonging to any category of the adult language used by the child at a certain stage must be defined in the intersection of the set of linguistic and extralinguistic contexts in which they are appropriately used by adults with the set of linguistic and extralinguistic contexts of which the child's corpus is composed.

Such a position does not seem to represent a strong claim, if consideration is given to the fact that it is, at least, partially implied by any interpretation of children's data, be it 'rich' or 'lean'. If, on one hand, it could be interpreted as an extension of Harris' distributional criteria (1951, 1964) to that part of the context which is not 'linguistic', this proposal seems parallel to Schnelle's approach to the relationship between semantics and pragmatics in his attempt to characterize linguistic communication with children:

'SHowever as some reflection shows, the set of possible semantic contents and the set of possible contexts (or components of contexts) are practically the same: any aspect that can become a relevant context can, in another speech act, become expressed itself. Therefore the description of possible contexts j is the same.'

(Schnelle 1970:178-179; apud Atkinson and Griffiths 1973:96)

1. It seems to me that Bloom's arguments (1970:5-9) for the viability of assigning a deep structure to children's utterances with more grammatical distinctions than those represented in the surface favour, instead, a view such as the one we have attempted to delineate briefly in this subsection.
However, the notion of possible contexts, which can be made operative, in a more or less satisfactory way, in descriptions of adult's utterances, is inapplicable to the description of the language of children, since the contexts the investigator deals with, in this case, are necessarily actual or actualized. In the same way as children cannot make judgements on the grammaticality or acceptability of sentences, they seem not to be able to provide different contexts for expressions used by them in previously actualized situations.

This fact brings into the question of data selection the problem of defining the quantitative criteria which must be established by the investigator in order to guarantee the representativeness of the sample, i.e. the actualization of a maximum of possible contexts.

Quantitative criteria have been, however, used — and explicitly in a few cases — as a kind of substitute resource for the formal measurements utilized in psychological and psycho-linguistic experiments, in longitudinal and informal studies of child language. This is, indeed, how one could interpret Bloom's classification of 'structures', as unique, marginal, and productive (1970:2.1.1) and Cazden (1968), followed by Brown (1973), criterion of full control of grammatical morphemes, defined as 90% of occurrences in previously specified obligatory contexts, for two successive two-hours samples.

Their use of quantitative criteria for measuring what both have called linguistic productivity of a given form or structure differs, however, from our view on the
need for them expressed above. Both Bloom's and Cazden's criteria apply to forms and structures assumed as already (and somehow) defined - or having their 'meaning' and 'function' specified - , a certain number of occurrences¹ or a certain frequency making of these forms and structures candidates for membership of the class of forms and structures which can be accounted for in the grammar of a certain stage, or of the class of items already acquired. Instead, it is clear implication of our view that the form in question, be it a 'structure' or a grammatical morpheme, is only definable, syntactically and semantically, by the features which are common to the linguistic and extralinguistic contexts - and it is the plurality of the contexts which is the crucial point here - in which it occurs.

To exemplify this difference, it seems sufficient to make explicit some of the questions which can arise from the consideration of the notion of linguistic productivity. Should one deny any meaning or function - or simply ignore the existence - of a grammatical morpheme which occurs in 50% of previously defined obligatory contexts? Or, to give a more concrete example: should one discard the use of 'that' or 'there' as operators of reference in the earlier stages because these forms do not occur in certain obligatory contexts, for example, by the fact that they are not used to refer to objects and locations which are outside the immediate space of the child and his inter-

¹. It does not seem proper to refer to Bloom's criterion in terms of frequency, since the standard of five occurrences which she uses to ascribe productivity to a structure is independent of the size of the sample. Cf. the number of utterances in Gia I sample (1970:80) and in Gia II sample (1970:91).
locutor? Or, in more general terms, should one not consider grammatical morphemes and/or structures in the same way that lexical units have been traditionally and non-traditionally considered? That is, to allow them also to have their meaning and function classified (or accounted for) as over-inclusive and under-inclusive, relatively to the meaning and function of the forms in the adult language with which they can be correlated?

If the answers to these questions are positive, it seems possible to say that the notion of linguistic productivity and that of full control are misleading, in the sense that they emphasize a one-one correspondence between units of any size present in the children’s data and their phonological correspondents in the adult’s language and/or language performance. And this is, furthermore, implicitly rejected in Bloom’s treatment of negation (1970: § 7) and suggested not to be the case in Cazden’s comments on the correspondence between the sequence of acquisition of selectional restrictions and Chomsky’s (1965:152-153) view on a scale of degrees of deviance (Cazden 1963:447).

However, the only conclusion that one can reach by reflecting on this problem of defining quantitative criteria, seems to be that, insofar as the number of occurrences of forms and expressions, as well as the number of possible contexts which are actualized, are a function of the size of the corpus, the more we have the better. And this calls for the definition of the ideal investigator as a full-time linguist-parent.
Although we have not touched on other serious problems involved in the selection of data from longitudinal samples, the above considerations seem to be enough to justify our rather simplest or traditional attitude as far as the data from Luciano and Fernando are concerned. Our basic criteria have been, from a qualitative point of view, the intelligibility and the interpretability of the data. That is to say, the data which have been selected were those with respect to which there could be discriminated a feature of the immediate context (objects, persons, places and events — and linguistic units can be considered also as objects of perception and attention) to which the child was attending at/around the moment of the utterance act. Needless to say, the data described above constitute a subset of those to which, at least a partial phonological interpretation could be assigned relatively to adult production.

As for segments produced in imitation of adult’s utterances, or parts of them: such segments are practically absent from Fernando’s corpus and occur in Luciano’s one only when elicited by the adult. This is the reason why they have not been considered. However, fragments or partial reproductions of stories constitute, despite their limited number of occurrences, an important source for some conclusions on the relation between the emergence of aspectual notions and temporal notions, due to the well-known fact that they are characteristic contexts for the use of the narrative past.

As far as the segmentalization of the corpus or
samples in constituents of different sizes is concerned, apart from the distributional criteria mentioned above, prosodic features have been considered as boundary-markers of utterances and of their constituent sequences (cf. 1.1.5).

1.1.4. **On the criteria utilized for the establishment of stages**

Given the considerations set forth in the preceding subsection, it seems almost unnecessary to say that the problem of establishing stages of development has been taken as secondary to the simple detection of qualitative changes, at their emergence and in their subsequent period of stabilization, in the temporal continuum assumed to be represented in the samples.

Therefore, the following chapters will consist of the description and interpretation of data which point to these qualitative changes, the division of Luciano's and Fernando's series of samples in three consecutive periods - Time I, II and III, being consequent upon the need for facilitating the exposition rather than a reflex of our view of the process of language development.

However, since data on the acquisition of other languages are to be referred to in this study - and, for instance, different (or apparently different) sequences of emergence of tense-forms will be compared - there has been the need to locate them in the 'continuum' of the process divided according to criteria used in other studies. So, not only the age of the child during the
period in which a certain qualitative change seemed to take place, but also the mean length of the child's utterances at that period, will be referred to.

Mean length of utterance, or MLU, has been, then, provided for each session, as can be seen in Table II, according to the rules presented by Brown (1973:54). Given our preceding discussion of the validity of qualitative and quantitative criteria involved in the selection and segmentability of data on language acquisition, it seems again unnecessary to mention, at this point, that our reference to the MLU of the different periods which will be the object of our subsequent discussion, does not imply any commitment to the view that it can be used as 'an index of linguistic maturity'.

Moreover, the validity - or usefulness - of measurements of this kind for crosslinguistic studies of language acquisition is also very controversial, and Brown himself agrees, though partially, with Park's (1970) argument, based on his own research on the acquisition of German, on the near impossibility of utilizing Brown's rules for data relating to the acquisition of highly inflected languages. Unfortunately, Brown's solution to the problem consists in restricting the morphemes which should be counted to those 'that were correctly used' (1973:71-72), which is, indeed, far from being a solution.


2. Cf. Crystal (1975) for criticism of the practical viability and theoretical congruence of Brown's rules for determining MLU.
### TABLE I

Number of utterances per session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Luciano</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fernando</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>064</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii.</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii.</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 6,736 ut.  TOTAL 9,742 ut.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>MLU</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>MLU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>1;6.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>i.</td>
<td>1;9.5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>1;6.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>1;9.20</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>1;6.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>1;9.28</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>1;7.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>1;10.3</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>1;7.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>v.</td>
<td>1;10.15</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>1;8.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>1;10.21</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>1;8.10</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>1;11.0</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>1;8.20</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>1;11.06</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>1;9.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>1;11.15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>1;9.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>x.</td>
<td>1;11.21</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>1;10.5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>1;11.27</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>1;10.9</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>2;0.4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>1;11.28</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>2;1.1</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>2;0.2</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>2;1.7</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>2;0.10</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>2;1.21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>2;0.17</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>2;2.0</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii.</td>
<td>2;0.27</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>xvii.</td>
<td>2;2.5</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii.</td>
<td>2;1.8</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>xviii.</td>
<td>2;2.12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>2;1.17</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>2;2.19</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>2;1.17</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>2;2.26</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.</td>
<td>2;1.22</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>xxi.</td>
<td>2;3.10</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii.</td>
<td>2;1.23</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>xxii.</td>
<td>2;3.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiii.</td>
<td>2;3.8</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>xxiii.</td>
<td>2;4.1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv.</td>
<td>2;3.15</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>xxiv.</td>
<td>2;4.21</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we have done with Luciano's and Fernando's data was to count morphemes to which the corpus provided evidence of some stability or a gradual increase in use, and to use, in most cases, a criterion of occurrence on minimal pairs in the same sample. This, probably, resulted in a MLU lower than it was to be expected from the linguistic development of the child at the time.

As Table II shows, we did not find MLU increasing regularly from one session to another as in Brown's data on Sarah, Eve and Adam (1973:55-57). It seems sometimes to have dropped independently of the child's emotional or physical conditions. The data on the acquisition of Italian presented by Bates (1974) also seem to show the same phenomenon. However, there is a relative consistency in the increase of MLU, both in Bates's data and on ours, over the samples as a whole.

1.1.5 Format of the data and glossary of notations

The format of the data, as transcribed and presented below, is: interlocutor's utterances on the right, the situational descriptions and the child's utterances on the left. Situational descriptions are presented before and after the child's utterance, when necessary, and are enclosed within parentheses. Both the interlocutor and the child's utterances are followed by a 'translation' into English (literal or free, depending on the point in discussion). These translations or 'glosses' also are

enclosed in parentheses, and they are placed within single quotation marks to distinguish them from the situational descriptions. There is used, when this is helpful as a guide to the presence of identical or similar items in the child's utterance and on his interlocutor's (or to the adult's 'expansion' or 'correct version' of the child's 'words' or 'structures') the procedure of underlining both instances of the form or structure.

The speech events are numbered on the left; and the number of the session and age of the child appears on the right, below the interlocutor's utterance. The child's interlocutors are referred to by initials, the main ones being, in the case of Luciano, M. for mother, F. for father and C. for Carla, his sister. In the case of Fernando, besides M. for mother, Cr. refers to Cristina Pereira, the investigator's assistant and S. to Suely, his nanny. Other initials will be identified in parentheses when first mentioned.

The following notations will be used:

..... indicates lapse of time

----- indicates unintelligible or indiscriminable segment

: indicates elongation of the immediately preceding element - for example, 'manhê:' which is the child (and the adult) vocative form of mãe in Portuguese ('Mummy', in English)

↑ indicates raising terminal contour

↓ indicates falling terminal contour
2. The data from Luciano

2.1. Main characteristics of Luciano's sample at Time I

The data which will be presented and discussed in this section correspond to the first eight sessions of Luciano's sample, recorded during the period of January to March of 1970. They constitute, thus, excerpts of the child's verbal (and non-verbal behaviour) during the first part of the second half of his second year of life.

As shown in Table II, his linguistic production at this time is, characteristically, one word per utterance, only the last two sessions presenting a more regular production of utterances of two-word length.¹

It is also characteristic of Time I - and, in our opinion, this is probably more important than the transition from one to two-word utterances - that there is an increase in the intelligibility and in number of Luciano's verbal (and non-verbal) responses to adult's

¹ This period seems to have been preceded, from what I could assume from non-videotaped data, by the production of successive and related single-word utterances, of the same type as described by Bloom with respect to her daughter Allyson's transition from what she calls a pre-syntactic to a syntactic period (cf. Bloom 1973:4.4)
utterances directed to him, and in the number or frequency of utterance-acts initiated by him and directed to adults.¹

Indeed, the first sessions can be said to illustrate the fact that, still at that time, a more or less large part of his vocal activities could be characterised as pre-linguistic (or para-linguistic?), by consisting in manipulation of sound-sequences with no ascribable 'meaning' [or possible to be ascribed to them]. They could be described as sequences of generally monosyllabic segments, whose intonational patterns seemed to be coordinated with body, head and hands movements of the child, usually involved in some repetitive playing activity.

However, it is not the impossibility of assigning morpheme-identity to segments of those sequences - or to the absence of a terminal contour - which justifies the qualification of this behaviour as pre-linguistic, but, mainly the features of the context in which this type of vocal behaviour is embedded. Indeed, those sound-sequences are not part of any communication-act, or, to express it better (and allow for the careful or more cautious use of 'communication' to designate verbal interaction with young children as participants) attention and/or action are not shared by the child with an entity which could possibly be his interlocutor, at the moment (cf. Bruner 1975).

¹. Worth noticing is that Luciano's interaction with his sister Carla was maintained at a mostly non-verbal level, till more or less the middle of the period defined as Time II in the sample.
This feature of sound-sequences, that is, their being inserted or not in contexts of joint attention and joint activity of the child with the adult, together with their degree of similarity with phonological units of the adult language, seems to constitute an adequate criterion to characterize Luciano's 'primitive lexicon' at Time I, as follows: ¹

1. Sequences of sounds without terminal contour, accompanying solitary activity (present in session i. and, mainly, in session iv. in which has been recorded 'bed-time solitary talking');

2. Sequences of sounds, with or without terminal contour, accompanying mutual activity of the type 'fighting for a toy' or embracing, and similar to the expressive speech of adults in similar situations (mainly displayed with his sister and throughout the sessions in which she has been present);

3. Sequences of sound, with or without terminal contour, but similar to onomatopoeic words used by Luciano's parents to designate the activities with which the emission of these sequences is simultaneous; sometimes interpretable as devices for drawing attention to himself or to the activity, but, most of the times, ambiguous. An example of this type is:

1. Exemplification of these types of vocal behaviour will be provided in the subsequent subsections, in the case of types which will be objects of particular discussion.
(1) (L. and C., his sister, are lying on the floor. L. closes and opens his eyes, and moves his head simultaneously with the emission of the sounds:) ê...ã/ ã...ê/ê...
nâna'<
ità/ità'<
('nite-nite')
('lie'/ 'lie')

M: Vocês estão brincando de deitar no chão?
Então, nana os dois! ('Are you playing at lying on the floor? go nite-nite, then, both of you!')

(1, 1;6.15)

4. Monosyllabic segments, characteristically with rising/falling terminal contour, in contexts in which attention is shared or expected to be shared with the adult (simultaneous or not with joint activity), prosodically and phonologically very similar to elliptical answers and other items with a phatic function in adult speech (e.g. 'ã?', 'um?', equivalent to an informal or non-polite 'Pardon?' in English.) Cf. 2.1.1. for exemplification and discussion.
5. Monosyllabic (and few disyllabic) segments, usually with terminal contour, in contexts in which attention is shared with the adult or produced in order to obtain it, usually simultaneous with joint action, similar to verbal forms of Portuguese, such as: ɐ ('look'), bô ('finished', 'allgone', 'away'), bô ('away'), dâ ('give'), tê/tô ('take'), tê/que ('want'). Cf. 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 following for exemplification and discussion.

6. Disyllabic segments, usually with a terminal contour, in contexts in which attention is shared with the adult, simultaneous or not with joint action, with very little similarity with words of the adult language (or 'family idiolect'), and sometimes assigned a tentative interpretation by the adult interlocutor.

7. Disyllabic (and a few trisyllabic) forms, characteristically provided with a terminal contour (in one-word utterances), which could be classified as names and noun-like forms, due to their use and to their similarity with words of the adult language (and/or 'family idiolect'). They are used with reference to persons, animals, objects, food, bodyparts, and in contexts of shared attention (or, in other cases, to obtain it), simultaneously or not with joint activity. Cf. 2.1.2. for exemplification and discussion.

Among the 'lexical' types listed above, no attention will be further given to 1., 2., although it is our belief that they should be the object of more psycholinguistic research, and to 6., due to its uninterpretability and
transitional character in Luciano's speech. The reasons why we shall concentrate on 3., 5., and 7., which will be the object of discussion in the subsequent subsections, lie above their greater productivity, as far as number of occurrences and combinatorial possibilities in subsequent stages are concerned. They seem to provide some evidence for our view of aspect - or location in the deictic space - being a primitive semantic category. Moreover, insofar as deixis, by definition, involves the notions - discussed and introduced by Bruner in the field of child language acquisition (1975) - of shared attention and joint activity, it seems arguable that the data mentioned above also provide evidence for Bruner's hypothesis that grammar originates 'as a set of rules abstracted from jointly regulated activity which has become codified in the culture of a linguistic community' (Bruner 1975:17).

2.1.1. Manipulation of 'formulae' of verbal interaction: Luciano's first 'ser'(?). forms

The type of data mentioned in 3. can be considered as Luciano's first verbal attempts to demonstrate that he is attending to the linguistic component of the deictic context, that is, to utterances produced by the adults around him.

A subtype of these utterances - present already

1. Cf. Bloom; 4.1.1 on the fluctuation of some of the 'words' of Allyson's earlier lexicon and her discussion of the phenomenon.
at the first session and continuing to appear throughout the sample, in spite of his acquisition of other and 'more linguistic' and socially appropriate means of expressing the same thing, can be exemplified by the following segment of the corpus (or speech-act):

(2) (L. is looking at a magazine or to the illustrations contained in it with his mother.)

M: Mostra pro papai a revista, mostra.

('Show Daddy the magazine, show him'.)

M: Mostra pro papai a revista.

('Show Daddy the magazine'.)

M: Mostra. Esse af...a outra.

('Show. That there...'.

M: The other one...')

(M. points to another magazine.)

M: Ói que bonito também, viu?

('Look how nice it is also, did you see?')

M: Vai lá mostrar pra ele.

('Go there and show him.')

(iii. 1;6.27)
The contexts in which this subtype of verbal response to linguistic components of situations appear at Time I are typical: it does seem, indeed, to follow the initiation (or first utterance) of a communication-act by the adult, even in the case of both child and adult being involved in the same activity or attending the initiation of the speaker to inform his interlocutor.

In this particular case, the mother was trying to break the silence, silence being undesirable given the fact that the recording session had just started. Others of the innumerable examples of this subtype of verbal response are found in contexts which show that its occurrence is independent of the utterance type produced by the adult: it has been used after vocatives, questions, demands and comments or statements, and it has always been followed by the adult's repetition or expansion of his/her previous utterance.

In adult Portuguese, *ô?* is a very informal/impolite variant of the less impolite *ô que?* (*what?*) and of the polite formula *Desculpe, mas eu não entendi,* (*Sorry, but I haven't followed you.*). It could be said to express the intention of the speaker to inform his interlocutor that he has perceived his utterance, he has attended the initiation of the speaker to inform his interlocutor, but I haven't followed you! It has been used after vocatives, questions, demands and comments or statements, and it has always been followed by the adult's repetition or expansion of his/her previous utterance.

In adult Portuguese, *ô?* is a very informal/impolite utterance. Given the fact that the recording session had just started, trying to break the silence, silence being undesirable in this particular case, the mother was at Time I expected to follow the initiation (or first utterance) of a communication-act by the adult, even in the case of both child and adult being involved in the same activity or attending the initiation of the speaker to inform his interlocutor. It does seem, indeed, to follow response to linguistic components of situations.
adult. His \( \text{ampil} \) should be interpreted as a request for more information of any kind, or for the adult to use another available code. That was, indeed, what his mother did; by pointing, by directing his identification of the magazine, and also, within the possibilities of Luciano's linguistic 'competence' at the time, by repeating and changing her previous utterance.¹

The second subtype of utterances demonstrative of the child's attention to linguistic components of contexts differ both formally and in terms of their contextual embedding from the one exemplified above. An example of it, which shows its higher degree of elaboration is found already in the first session:

(3) (L. throws a flower behind the chair where F. is sitting not attending to L's activity!)

\[ \text{bole} \]

('allgone') F: Quebrou? Acabou?

('Broke? Finished?')

(lit.tr.)

\[ \varepsilon \downarrow \text{f} \varepsilon \downarrow \varepsilon < \]

('It is. Flower!')

(F. picks up the flower) F: Flor? Jogou fora a flor?

('Flower? Did you throw away the flower?')

¹ The story of Luciano's \( \text{ampil} \) does not end with its replacement by 'Que \( \text{ampil} \)' ('What is it') five months, more or less, later. He must still be using it, at least, in some circumstances as most adult speakers of Brazilian Portuguese do.
(F. hands the flower to L.) F: Toma a flor para você, toma.
('Take the flower for you, take.')

(i. 1;6.15)

The \( \delta \downarrow \) which occurs frequently in Luciano's sample at Time I has to be understood as being in contrast with a rising terminal contour \( \delta \uparrow \), which appears with a certain frequency also in the beginning of Time I. A significant example of this third subtype of verbal responses to adult utterances is:

(4) (L. is looking at the pictures of a magazine; M. is near.)
\( \delta \uparrow \)
bô...vovô \( \downarrow \)
\( \delta \uparrow \) (shouting)
('look! ga...granny! look!')
(M. at the microphone, describing the situation) M: Está apontando a figura com o dedinho.
('He is pointing the picture with his finger'.)

\( \delta \uparrow< \)
(Is it?)

M: \( \ddot{E} \).
('It is' (lit. tr.) or 'Yes').

(iii. 1;6.27)
By comparing utterances of the type represented by (2), (3) and (4), the viability of assigning context-distributional properties or 'privileges of occurrence' to \( \mathcal{E} \uparrow \), \( \mathcal{E} \uparrow \) and \( \mathcal{E} \downarrow \) does not seem to be a matter of over-interpreting the child's 'intentions' or 'meaning intentions'. (3), indeed, represents an instantiation of the use of \( \mathcal{E} \downarrow \) which is in contrast with the monosyllabic items indicated in (2) and (4), by occurring, in the great majority of interpretable cases, subsequently to a question from the adult interlocutor. This is not the case for (2), as mentioned above, and for (4). Moreover, \( \mathcal{E} \uparrow \), which occurs in (4) can follow not only any utterance-type of the adult interlocutor, but also utterances not directed to the child, which is clearly the case illustrated by (4).

By examining the contextual conditions operating in the adult's use of \( \mathcal{E} \) and \( \mathcal{E} \) as elliptical answers in Portuguese, it will become clear that a partial set of those conditions seem to be fulfilled in Luciano's utterances containing them. The \( \mathcal{E} \downarrow \) of assent or agreement, which corresponds to English 'It is true', 'You are right', 'I agree' seems to follow a non-interrogative utterance, and it is interpreted, or can be interpreted, as requesting the interlocutor's opinion about the content of the preposition or its validation.

In other words, it is equivalent to a yes/no question, its scope being the truth-value sentence, or the validity of the whole proposition embedded in it. It differs, indeed, from \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \) which occurs, as well as any verb in Portuguese, as an answer to yes/no explicit questions, such as could be exemplified by the following sentences:

'Voc\'\(\tilde{\varepsilon}\) viaja amanh\'\(\tilde{\varepsilon}\)?

'Viajo'.

('Are you travelling tomorrow?')

('I am travelling.')(lit.tr.)

A casa \( \tilde{\varepsilon} \) grande?

\( \tilde{\varepsilon} \).

('Is the house big?)

('It is.') (lit.tr.)

A casa \( \varepsilon \) grande.

\( \varepsilon \).

('The house is big.')

('It is.')

As for \( \varepsilon \uparrow \), which seems to correspond to English 'Is it?' or 'Is it so/true?', this appears in contexts which indicate that its function is merely to signal the speaker's having perceived, attended to and understood what was previously said to him by his interlocutor. Its interpretation as a request for confirmation of the truth-value of the content of the proposition expressed by the utterance is ontogenetically secondary to it. In this sense, \( \varepsilon \uparrow \) is in opposition with \( \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} \), which implies perception, attention, but partial or no-comprehension
of the interlocutor's previous utterance.¹

From the points just made, it seems arguable that the use by Luciano of those segments is indicative of his having already acquired at Stage I a primitive system for signalling the presence in his perceptual and attention field of a linguistic component of the situation. The only problematic point about his manipulation of these formulae refers to the use of \( \$ \) in answer to explicit yes/no questions, such as in the cases illustrated by (3).

However, the development of other types of answers which make their appearance already in Time I, or more precisely in session v., seems to be indicative that his \( \# \), at the first period in Time I, already represents his sufficient, though partial, level of decoding the adult's question, if this is embedded in a clear and narrow context.

Examples of the emergence of other types of answers to yes/no questions (and also to wh-questions) are contained in the following segment of session v.: (5) (L. and C. are having lunch assisted by M.)

batá↑

('potato!')

M: Que você quê?

('What do you want?')

¹ It would be interesting, in a fuller treatment of this use of \( \$ \), to relate it to comparable phenomena in other languages and to such theoretical claims about the universality of the verb 'to be' (ser rather than estar) in underlying structures as have been made by Hurlford (1973:275).
(irritated and emphatic)

M: Você *quê* batata, Luciano?

('Do you want potato, Luciano?')

M: Como *que* chama?

('How is it called?')

(Getting angry)

(v. 1;7.10)

(5) shows that Luciano is moving, at this time, towards the acquisition of the basic mechanism for answering to yes/no questions in Portuguese, that is, to the repetition of the modal, auxiliary or simple form of the verb, present in the interlocutor's question. *Sim* (from Lat. *'sic'*), which corresponds to 'yes' in English is, indeed, restricted in Brazilian Portuguese to the function of 'rejoinder' or emphatic which precedes or follows the verbal form in this type of answer.

Other data of a different kind which appear to confirm the interpretation given above to *â* answers - also present in the last two sessions of Luciano's sample at Time I - are those indicative of the emergence of a formal differentiation between negative utterances expressing rejection and negative utterances expressing denial, parallel to the more elaborated and adult-like
forms which his positive answers start to exhibit.

Negative forms - nê, nû, nê - are frequent in the first sessions, in contexts which do not allow for any other interpretation than that of expressing rejection with respect to different kinds of behaviour requested from him, either verbally or not, by his parents or his sister.¹ Four weeks after the first session, the forms nu ê ↓ and a variant nê ↓ make their appearance in contexts such as the one exemplified below:

(6) (L. has found an old
photo of his mother and
observes it.)

M: Quem ê? Quem ê, Luciano?
('Who is it? Who is it, Luciano?')

quem ê ↑

M: Quem?
('Who?')

o vovô ↓

('grandfather')

M: Não! Quem que ê?
('No! Who is it?')

tá ↓

(?)

M: Quem ê que tá na fotografia?
('Who is it that is in the photography?')

¹. Cf. Bloom 1970:7, for her study on the syntactic and semantic development of negation, which shows that expressions of denials follow expressions of rejection in her subjects' acquisition of English. However what she calls the "no" of "nonexistence" does not appear in Luciano's data.
Further development of this particular area of Luciano's competence would also deserve mention and discussion. For the purposes of this work, however, it suffices to add that the discourse contextual distributions of these more complex forms are similar, if not identical, to that of Luciano's \(\hat{e}\), at the first sessions of Time I, in the sense that it occurred as a verbal response to non-interrogative utterances, as is the case for the adult's expressions of assent in Portuguese, and also as a positive answer to interrogative utterances. Moreover, the negative counterpart of the \(\hat{e}\) expressing assent, that is, the \(nu \hat{e}\) of denial, exemplified above, and the negative counterpart of the \(\hat{e}\) of positive answers, that is the \(nao + V\), which became frequent and have emerged, respectively, at Time II, seem to confirm this interpretation.

The facts just discussed seem sufficient to give some plausibility to the view that, already at the beginning of Time I, \(\hat{e}\) is in opposition to \(\hat{e}\) and \(\overset{\rightarrow}{N}\).

These three formulae of responses to adult utterances
could be defined, indeed, as Luciano's first discourse rules, since they were employed by him to signal the reception - perception and attention - of the adult utterance. Their privileges of occurrence seem to allow us also to hypothesize a first subcategorization of utterances, that is, the child's discrimination, at an early stage, of the difference between questions and non-questions.¹

Indeed, \( \overline{\text{s}} \) and \( \overline{\text{c}} \) could be said to belong to the same category or subcategory in the sense that they do not seem to constitute answers to questions, but directions for the addressee to maintain the contact, either by providing more information (or the necessary information, independently of channel) for the decoding to be successful, or to confirm his previous utterance and/or supply the continuation of it. Their function would be either phatic or metalingual in Jakobson's (1960:355) sense of these terms.

The use of \( \text{ser} \) forms to pass to the addressee the information about the location of his previous utterance in the attention field of the speaker, in the adult language

¹ Cf. Bruner (1975:10):
'There is the possibility that distinctive 'speech acts' are learned in a primitive fashion by this means-demand-prosody demanding rising intonation, etc. There is little concrete evidence save the often-repeated observation that prosodic patterns come to set up definite expectancies in the child and that the child not only 'comprehends 'intention' in these patterns, but learns to produce them intentionally as well'

It is my belief that the data above also suggest that it is so and that more concrete evidence would be obtained if more research work had as its object the very much neglected holophrastic stage in language acquisition.
and in the speech of Luciano at Time I, can, in our opinion, be related to our interpretation of *ser* as expressing the punctual location of events in space and time. And the utterance-act is the basic event, as far as language is concerned. Moreover, the deictic origin of affirmative answers, documented in some languages, also seem to point to this. However, it does not seem necessary to pursue this argument to reach the conclusion which must be given, at this point, about the first *ser* forms of Luciano's 'Portuguese' at Time I. They seem to correspond to a partial subset of the rules which govern the use of *ser* in the adult language, or more precisely, to the discourse rules relative to the use of *ser* in adult Portuguese. In this sense, they can be said to be also indicative of Luciano's having, at least, some knowledge about his role as an addressee ("receiver" or "beneficiary" of the communication-act) and, conversely, about his interlocutor's role as a speaker ("agent" or "source"). The examples given above seem to suggest that he had some success in it: the contact was maintained.

But children, as adults, are not only and always interested in the linguistic components of situations: they also attend (and draw their interlocutor's attention) to other features of it, that is, to objects, places, persons and events which are in the world. Obviously, Luciano's world at Time I was restricted to a zone not very much larger than that definable as his immediate perceptual field. Therefore, our object of study in 2.1.2 will be
how the child expressed his interest in (and draw the adult's attention to) these entities at Time I.

2.1.2. Proto-aspectual forms in Luciano's sample at Time I or 'operations of reference'

Specific objects of discussion, under this heading, will be two of the items contained in Luciano's lexicon at Time I and referred to in 5. above, and their relationships with the nounlike forms referred to in 7.

' and ' are these two forms and one of the reasons for paying particular attention to them is their frequency of occurrence at Time I - more than 30 interpretable utterances of each -, their potentiality of collocation with other units of the child's lexicon at a subsequent stage and, equally, the frequency of occurrence of functionally and semantically related forms in the data of children acquiring other languages.

This not only leads to the assignment to these two forms of the status of highly productive elements, but also calls for a more careful discussion of their occurrences than has been given to them in the literature on 'operations of reference' or 'functional' relations.

Although Bloom (1970, 1973) and Brown (1973) have given an extensive treatment of this topic and have also related their early appearance to the child's cognitive stages seen within a Piagetian model of cognition, they seem to have failed in relating the various 'operations of reference' - nomination or existence, cessation and non-existence, and recurrence - one to another and, what is even
more important, to the superordinate category of reference, whose postulation seems to us to be implicit in the label Brown has put on them.

Another insufficiency of Brown's work with respect to these 'prevalent semantic relations of Stage I' (Brown 1973:168-201) is his not having related them to the other relations expressed during the same stage, i.e. Agent-Action, Action-Object, Entity-Location, etc., and also to acquisition of morphemes or 'modulations of meaning' which, according to him, characterize Stage II.

As for Bloom's treatment of what she calls 'function words' (1970) or 'function forms' (1973), she goes as far as to say, after discussing the meaning of 'more', 'away', etc.:

"All of the conceptions underlying such words as these do not come together to constitute a cognitive category as such; rather, each is a distinctive cognitive notion. Thus, there is no basis in terms of content, experience or meaning to justify the assertion that such word-forms are subsumed within a linguistic category that would specify structural relationship."

(Bloom 1973:117)

Thus, it is our aim in this section to provide the data and arguments for looking at ⁶ and ⁶⁰, as well as at their correspondents in English and in other languages (that is, to the so-called operations of reference which are the basic meanings of both the holophrastic stage and of Stage I) as proto-aspectual markers or expressions of locations in the zone of the deictic space definable as the immediate perceptual space of the child, and of his interlocutor.
The first point which should be made about 6 and bô is that, among the items presented in 5. above, they are the ones which are used by Luciano to initiate a communication-act with the adult that does not involve other activity than that of directing attention to some feature of the situation. Indeed, the other items present in 5. are also frequently used as first utterances of an utterance-act initiated by Luciano at Time I, but they are embedded in contexts which make of them clear requests for actions to be performed for him by the adult. This is what can be apprehended for the use of dâ ('give'), pô ('put'), ecê/descê ('go down') and other verblike forms.

Instead, 6 ('look') and bô ('allgone', 'away') seem to be interpretable as expressing requests for attending to something in the immediate environment, to himself or to the activity he is performing at the moment. In other words, they seem to be 'attention-drawing devices' or 'proto-declaratives', in the sense similar to that given to this term by Bates (1974:57), that is, by involving 'the formulation of social interaction as a goal', in opposition to the imperative or 'proto-imperative' functions of dâ, pô, ecê/descê, etc.

In adult Brazilian Portuguese, 6 is the reduced form of olha ('look'), which occurs in the informal standard register, generally accompanied by pointing (movement of hand or head), in apposition with locative-demonstrative

1. Cf. also Atkinson (1974) for some justification of the use that is made here of the predicate ATTEND.
sentences. It is also used, similarly to 'hello' and 'hi' in English, as a greeting formula when followed by the name of the person to which the salute is addressed, its variant 6i/6i being, otherwise, employed. The unreduced form olha, apart from his 'normal' - non-aphatic use - in statements, is also the ordinary form used to direct the addressee's attention to objects of auditory, visual, olfactory and tactile perception. It functions exactly as 'listen', in English, in a telephone conversation and it can be used in sentences such as:

Olha que música linda!
que perfume bom!
que tecido macio!

('Look how beautiful is this music! 
how nice is this parfum! 
how soft is this fabric!) (lit.tr.)

The data on acquisition of languages other than Portuguese show that forms equivalent to Luciano's 6 have mainly originated from verbs of visual perception, deictic adverbials or pronouns and greeting formulae, and that, among the operations of reference, they are more frequent than the forms meaning 'recurrence' and 'non-existence' (cf. Brown 1973:171, Table 21).

That Luciano used 6 to draw the attention of his addressee to something he had perceived and was attending to at/around the moment of the utterance-act, is undeniable. However, since at Time I his 6 was not followed or preceded - except in rare occasions, till the last two sessions - by another item which could bring some specification about his object of perception and attention, it was sometimes
difficult, and at other times almost impossible, to identify what he was calling attention to. Moreover since the gesture of pointing, which quite often accompanied his utterances, '...of itself will be never able to make clear whether it is some entity, some property of an entity, or some location that the addressee's attention is being directed to' (Lyons 1973:97), the ambiguity of δ - minor in the case of (4) above, in which the specific object of his attention is the figure of a woman (vovó ('granny')) in the magazine - could reach the degree illustrated by (7):

(7)(L. in the veranda with F.)

δ↑δ↑δ↑δ↑ δ↑ <

(Without pointing)

F: Olha o quê? Olha que bonita a árvore? A árvore? ('Look what? Look how nice is the tree? The tree?')

(L. climbs on F.'s knees to dandle. F. has been hurt in an accident with a horse and cannot fulfil his request.)

fofó↑fofó↑fofó↑ fofó↑fofó↑fofó↑

('dandle!, dandle, etc.')

F: Ai,ai,...ai, de cavallinoh, não!

('Ouch, ouch...ouch, riding a horse, no!')

(L. climbs down F.'s knees and points to the floor, where is one of C.'s dolls. The doll has only one leg.)

δ↑δ↑Ieiê↓Ieiê↓

('Look! Look! Ieiê! Ieiê.' )

1. Ieiê, Iêia (and similar forms) are Luciano's versions of
Contd.) Carla, his sister's name, the semiconsonant standing, in his speech, for non-labial and non-frontal plosives of the adult system.

1. Notice that his father interpreted as Ota - Luciano's version of outra ('another'), rarely used - the form u tá↓. Luciano's declarative version of onde (es) tá? ('where is it?'), another fluctuant item of Fernando's lexicon at the time. But, cf. our subsequent discussion of it in 2.1.3.

2. It is very important to notice that the first, third, fourth and the last utterances of Luciano's father are not yes/no questions about states of affairs. They are instead, metalinguistic questions, in the sense that he is asking Luciano whether the interpretations he was giving to the child's utterances were correct or not. The intonation of these questions as clearly indicative of (Contd.
It is clear from the linguistic context (cf. fn. 3) that the first $\delta$'s of Luciano remained undeciphered for his father. As for the second series of them, it took time or time spent in a series of scanning operations (on the linguistic and non-linguistic components of the whole situation) for his father to identify finally the object towards which Luciano was directing his attention, that is, to an abnormal state of affairs; one leg missing in Carla's doll or the missing leg of Carla's doll.

This interpretation could lead us to the assignment to the meaning 'change of state/change of place' or abnormal state the status of component of $\delta$ utterances of Luciano, at Time I. And this would be in accordance with Bates's view that what is most likely to draw the attention of the child (and, therefore, to be drawn subsequently to the adult's attention) in a situation is that aspect of the situation undergoing (or having undergone) greatest change. However, this view, which she uses to justify her proposal that children operate, in an early stage with presuppositions and 'focus', cannot be applied as such to Luciano's utterances of this type. If it were so, the hypothesis which we will attempt to demonstrate, that $\delta$ is a precursor of estar (and also of the definite article), or that it expresses location in the perceptual field of the

Contd.) their embedding in a matrix of the type: 'Is that what you mean?', the 'that' being successively made explicit, as shown above. This seems to confirm our interpretation of Luciano's $\delta$ given above, and its subcategorization in a noumenal vs. a phenomenal $\delta$ (Cf. Greenfield, Smith and Laufer (in press) as reported by Bates (1974:79) for a parallel interpretation of 'yes').

1. Support for that particular proposal of Bates (1974:98) which is, for its part, based on the works of Greenfield and al. (in press) and on Antinucci and Volterra (1973), is implicit in our brief treatment of the first ser forms of Luciano in 2.1.1.
speaker, would be contradictory to our view of change of place, state, or norms regarding places and states of entities, being a derived meaning of estar predications in the adult language.

That this is not the case is not very difficult to demonstrate by examining the linguistic and the situational contexts in which a-utterances occur, not only in Luciano's sample, but among speakers of Brazilian Portuguese. These types of linguistic and situational contexts are, indeed, definable by the alternative interpretations which have been presented to Luciano by his father in (7), as including two types of states of affairs or situations; those resulting from a change of place, state or norm, and those to which the reading 'change' cannot be assigned. A possible interpretation of the 'dummy' element in Luciano's first a-utterances in (7), for example, is the location in his field of perception and attention of a tree or of the beauty of a tree and no concept of change seems to be involved in this.

Moreover, the occurrence of a in (4), as well as in many other circumstances - pointing to the dog with which he had been trying to play for some time, pointing to his father's bare feet and subsequently to his own feet, etc., - does not allow us to assign other interpretation to his first and main operator of reference than that of locating, in the addressee's field of attention, of an entity - either a first-order or a second-order entity - which, though being in his perceptual field, was not being
perceived and attended to by the addressee at the moment of the utterance-act.

The privileges of occurrence of \( \text{b} \), which will be subsequently presented, in opposition with those of \( \emptyset \), seem to make clearer the reasons for setting forth this hypothesis.

First of all, it should be noticed that, in contrast with \( \emptyset \) which has never occurred in answers to locative questions such as 'Onde está X?' (as it does in the adult's language, \( \text{b} \) - and, at late Time I, \( \text{b}^1 \) -) was Luciano's ordinary answer to this question, in the case of the person or object in question being absent from his immediate perceptual field. This seems to be parallel to other distributional features of \( \emptyset \) and \( \text{b} \), that is, to the fact that \( \emptyset \) could occur with falling terminal contour and demand-rising terminal contour, whereas \( \text{b} \) was restricted to a falling terminal contour prosodic matrix.

1. The diacritics * and * have been and will be used in the normalized transcription of the children's data to indicate the opposition closed vs. open vowel, following the convention utilized in Brazilian Portuguese orthography. As will be discussed later, though only briefly, this opposition seems to be one of the most operative in Luciano's morphophonemic system at Time I. It is interesting to note that this is similar to what happened in Latin (cf. the opposition between the radicals of the Infectum and the Perfectum of a large subset of verbs) and to what happens in Portuguese, where it constitutes, together with the suffix -s, the plural-marker of a subset of nouns and adjectives, as well as a tense- and person-marker in the verbal system.
The interpretation of this phenomenon, together with Luciano's temporary use of < (sessions iii. and iv.) with an interrogative-rising contour in contexts which make it interpretable as equivalent to 'Onde esta X?', point towards the possibility of Luciano's using both intonational patterns and vocalic distinctive features as aspectual markers at different levels of his utterances. Insofar as mood, modality and aspect are phenomena undoubtedly related in many languages, it does not seem impossible that this could be demonstrated. In any case, the importance of the above hypothesized relation between mood (or intonation) and aspect (and the distinction open vs. closed) is arguable, as far as the use of the other verblike forms of Luciano's lexicon at Time I and at Time II are concerned. We will provide data and arguments for it in the subsequent section.

As for the relation between Luciano's bô and adult Portuguese, there does not seem to exist a one-one correspondence, as is the case for <. This is equivalent to saying that, as an adult, it would be improper or 'incorrect' for Luciano to use bô, in situations other than that of talking to a child, or playing hide-and-seek with her/him.

In order to trace back the unreduced form which could correspond to Luciano's bô, in the adult language, it is useful to examine the following instantiations of it at Time I:
(8) (F. had been playing with and trying to blow a plastic toy-trumpet. The mouthpiece comes off.)

\[ \text{bô} < \]

(in distress)  

F: Quebrou?  

('Did it break?')

\[ \text{bô} \]

(affirmatively)  

(L. hands trumpet to F.)

F: E?  

('Is it?')

\[ d/nád/ná \]

(?)

\[ \text{bô} \]

Quebrou?  

('Did it break?')

\[ \text{bô} \text{ bô} \text{ bô} \]

(angry)  

(F. tries to fix the mouthpiece onto the trumpet)

F: Não quebrou, não! Papai vai arrumar para o Luciano, espera.  

('It did not break, it didn't. Daddy will fix it for Luciano, wait.')

(ii. 1;6.21)

(9) (L. is in the veranda with F. The farmhouse dog passes in front of them, in the garden. F. cannot see Cuqui, the dog, since he has his back turned to the garden.)

\[ \text{auau} \]

(onomatopoeic form for 'dog')

F: O auau?  

(The 'auau?')
(emphatically and pointing to the garden. F. does not turn to look at it.)

F: Chama o auau, chama.
Chama o auau, chama a Cuquinha.
('Call the 'auau', call (her). Call the 'auau', call little Cũqui'.)

('No. No.
'auau'...allgone')
(Since L. is close to the table where the tape-recorder is and since F. could not see if the dog was still visible, F. assumes that L. is attending to the tape-recorder.)

F: Quebrou?
Não, não mexe.
('Has it broken? No, no, do not touch it.')

(L. had been eating a piece of bread, which he put aside to play with a paper-bag full of 'confetti'. After a while, he puts it aside to dandle in his chair. After another while, he is moving and looking around, as if searching for something.)

('Bread. Allgone.')
('Allgone.')
M: Que foi que você perdeu?
Que foi que você derrubou?
Heim? O que que é?
('What have you lost? What was it that you have dropped?
Hum? What is it?')

pão...pô↓
('Bread...(?')

não↓(emphatically)
('noi')

(L. has found the
piece of bread on the
table.)
ô↑
('Look' or 'There'.)

M: Ah, confetti?¹
('Oh, confetti?')

M: Confetti, você perdeu?
('Was it confetti that you have lost?')

M: Ah, pão! Casquinha de pão!
('Oh, bread! A small piece of breadcrust!')

(pão↓(assent)
('Bread.')

M: Casquinha de pão. Pão! Come.
('Breadcrust. Bread! Eat.')

(iii. 1;6.27)

1. Luciano's mother's interpretation of pô, that is of the child's denasalised version of pô, is explainable by context-interference, or by her being acquainted with the fact that Luciano had been playing with confetti before, and also by the fact that bô/pô was his 'word' for round-shaped objects and circles. Bô is the reduced form of bola ('ball') in the lexicon of Brazilian children at the same stage as Luciano at Time I and even in further stages.
The contextual properties of Luciano’s b6, illustrated by the examples above, as well as by (3), and mainly by his parents’ alternative interpretations of it, seem to suggest that this item corresponds to the reduced version of the third-person singular of the Pretérito Perfeito of a subset of accomplishment/achievement verbs in Portuguese, i.e. of acabou (cf. (3)), quebrou (cf. (8)) and derrubou (cf. (10)), which correspond to the English past-tense forms 'finished', 'broke' and 'dropped', respectively.

It seems worth drawing attention, at this point, to the following comment made by Cazden, during a discussion about the interaction between grammar and semantics:

"Roger Brown made a suggestion about the interaction between grammar and semantics, which was that the first verbs that seemed to receive a past tense were verbs like smashed; banged; dropped where the instantaneous quality of the action and the fact that it was inherently over by the time it was discussed might be the beginning of the triggering of the use of the past tense. I am sorry that when I was testing the inflections I never really followed that up."

(Cazden 1971:75)

The data from English reported above coincide with those presented by Grégoire (1947:144ff.) on the acquisition of the French verbal system by his sons, in which the emergence of past participle predications with 'cassé' and 'tombé' precede that of other forms and other verb-classes. A similar phenomenon seems to happen in the acquisition of Italian, judging from the data presented by Volterra (1974), that is, the use of the past-participial forms 'otto' (from 'rotto', 'broken' in English) and
'auto' (from 'caduto', 'dropped' in English) as the first forms marked for tense.

Since Portuguese verbs expressing achievements/accomplishments and carrying the 'meaning' change of place/change of state constitute the first class of Luciano's verbs inflected in the preterite and the main class inflected in this tense in Fernando's sample at Time I, as we will show later, the interpretations given by Luciano's parents to his *bó-* utterances are arguably related to this intra-sample, inter-sample and apparently cross-linguistic phenomenon. Briefly, these interpretations and, obviously, the situations in which they have occurred at Time I, appear to lead us to the assignment of the meaning 'completive' to this item of the child's repertoire.

However, the reading which has been assigned to *bó* in (9) (which is contrary to his father's interpretation of it at the utterance-time), as well as its use in contexts indicative of Luciano's signalling the absence from his immediate environment of animals (alive or in picture-books) and persons, suggests that the meaning 'completive' must be made clearer or more explicit in order to account for this subtype of *bó* occurrences. Another fact which points to this is the subsequent emergence, already in the last three sessions of Time I, and evidenced by six occurrences, of the form *bó/bóa*, which appears to be the child's reduced version of *embora* ('away') in contexts sharing the same features of segments of the type described above. Examples of it are contained in:
(11) (Just before the session
L. had a visit from a
neighbour and her dog.
Ten minutes later, L. is
with M in her room.)
o au...bôa...(low)
bô au <
('Auau'...away...
allgone 'auau'.')

M: N?
('What?')
O que que foi embora?
('What has gone away?')

o au (very low)
foimbo <
('The 'au'. Gone-away')

(viii. 1;8.20)

(12) (At lunch time. One of
the house maids is away.)
M: Que de a Maria?
('Where is Maria?')
Que de a...
('Where is...')

bô <
('Away'.)
M: ... Maria?
Foi embora?
('Has she gone away?')
(vi. 1;8.0)

The unstable nature of Luciano's newly enriched
'aspectual' system is clearly suggested in (11) and even
more clearly in (13), that is, twenty days later:

(13) (L. kneels down to pick
up a parquet-tile which
has come off.)
bô, manhê <
('Allgone, mummy!')
M: O que que acabou?
('What is it that has
finished?')
'It isn't (that).' 

'M: Quebrou?
   ('Broke (you mean)?)'

angry

('It isn't (that).')

M: Num quebrou?
   ('It didn't break?')

'No'

M: Êsse ai ë o taco.
   ('That one there is the tile')

'What?'

(Noise of the tile dropped by L.)

M: Ta-co (Emphatic syllable-division)
   ('TILE'.)

(L. tries to follow M.'s directions for the pronunciation of 'taco'.)

cá..co có..co..

'What?'

M: Ta-co.

'What?'

M: Ta-co.

pípi (with surprise)¹

('Birdie!')

---

¹. It is very doubtful that Luciano had seen a bird, even if he was looking through the window, at or around the time he told his mother so. Much more probable is his having used it to draw his mother's attention to some other entity—(an 'imaginary' bird), that is, away from the linguistic entity taco, whose pronunciation was too hard a task for him.
M: Que dê o piupiu?
('Where is the birdie?')

lá...bô ↓ <
('There(?)...away.')

M: Foi embora?
('Did he go away?')

lá...lá...lálá... ('singing')
(viii. 1.8.20)

What the examples above seem to show is that, two months after the time Luciano was employing, more or less regularly, bô ↓ for signalling the non-observability at/around the utterance time of different classes of entities — persons, dogs, birds, 'normal' states of trumpets etc. — he started to use bô with a more specific meaning, and with, at least, some consistency. That is, bô came to be excluded, in some circumstances, from contexts in which he could use bô.²

This leads to the conclusion that Luciano's earlier bô, which was in complementary distribution with ô, as far as extralinguistic and discourse contexts are concerned, cannot be assigned any other semantic value than that corresponding to [-ACTUAL], [-DEICTIC] or [THERE₁], in opposition to ô which is marked for actuality or location in the immediate perceptual zone of the deictic space.

1. This is the first occurrence of lá ('there') in Luciano's sample. In the same session, lá (ô), the 'there' which is [-proximate] to the speaker and [+proximate] to the addressee in adult Portuguese, appears also for the first time, in an answer to a similar locative question. Given the possibility mentioned in fn.1, it is doubtful that one could assign any deictic specification to it.

2. Cf. Bloom (1973:90) for a parallel, although not as relevant as in the case of Luciano, phenomenon in Allyson's use of 'away' and 'allgone', the former seeming to correspond to Luciano's earlier and undifferentiated bô.
However, this conclusion fails to account for a large set of data found in Luciano's sample at Time I, that is, to his use of items belonging to the part of his lexicon described in 7. above, or of his nounlike forms, and of verblike forms other than _digest and _bō_. It seems obvious — from his mother's report of it, from the data pertaining to the first two sessions, and from data concerning the acquisition of other languages — that noun-like forms and verb-like forms were also used — and prior to the emergence of _digest and _bō — to express actuality and non-actuality. Indeed, the presence of vocatives at a very early stage of development and of verblike and nounlike forms in utterances used by the child, with a demand-rising contour, to request actions to be performed by the adult in his benefit might be considered as the first non-actuality meanings 'linguistically' encoded. And this seems to be perfectly in accordance with Piaget's (1955) view that action-schemata are built up or internalized from sensory-motor operations and with Bruner's view (1975) that action-sequences in joint action are mastered by the child before he starts to signal action-sequence segments.

In fact, vocatives, proto-imperatives such as Luciano's use of _dā_ (give'), _pā_ (put'), _eca/_descā_ ('go down') with demand-rising contours, presuppose the non-actuality (or presence) of the entity in the child's immediate environment, (or, conversely, the absence of the speaker in the field of attention of the addressee-to-

1. Cf. Greenfield et al. (in press) for the chronological priority of vocatives in the linguistic behaviour of their subjects.
be) in the same way as the latter forms presuppose that the requested action has not yet been actualized. This point which may seem to be unduly speculative on the basis of the data considered so far, will be justified in relation to the data from Luciano Time II and III.

It may be added here that both vocatives and verb-like forms used in request-utterances are contextually and prosodically contrastive to the use of nounlike and (some very few) verblike forms with falling terminal contour in contexts similar to those which constitute the privileges of occurrence of ʃ, in large part of Luciano's sample at Time I. They are also often accompanied by pointing, as is the case in the following segment of session iii:

(14) (F. is lying on his bed
    with his eyes closed.
  L. comes near him, and
  points to him (his eyes?)
  naná
  ('Nite-nite.')

  F: Tô nanando.

  (I am making 'nite-
   nite')

(iii. 1;6.27)

Since we will provide further data and discussion on the contrast between request-utterances and descriptive/declarative utterances of the type exemplified above, it remains to be said, relatively to Luciano's primitive

1. Compare this occurrence of naná with the one in (1) which Luciano has produced repetitively, without terminal contour, and concomitantly to his head movements.
aspectual system at the first and second part of Time I that it comprises a marker for actuality - \( \delta \) and a falling terminal contour matrix - in contrast with two different markers for two different types of non-actuality. The non-actuality expressed by the embedding of, most probably, any word form, into a rising-terminal contour matrix, could be said to convey the meaning (or to correspond to the subcategory) \([+\text{BEFORE}]\) or \([+\text{MODAL}]\) (in the adult system), and the non-actuality as expressed by his early \( \delta \), could apparently be assigned the meaning (or could be said to correspond to the subcategory \([+\text{AFTER}]\) or \([+\text{PERFECT}]\).

However the hypothesis that the primitive aspectual system of Luciano at Time I was already sufficiently complex to present the subcategorization of the feature \([-\text{ACTUAL}]\) in terms of \([\text{PERFECT}]\) is challenged by the data concerning \( \delta \)-occurrences late in Time I. In fact, the assignment of the feature \([\text{PERFECT}]\) to early \( \delta \)-occurrences implies that a further subcategorization of it is represented by the opposition \( \delta \) vs. \( \delta \), which, on the other hand, is only definable in terms of their different privileges of occurrence in the sample. The occurrence of \( \delta \) in situations such as those represented by the segments of session viii. below, apparently suggest that \( \delta \) could be a marker for completion of goal- or intention-oriented actions, that is, a terminal marker of accomplishments.

(16) (L. is playing with a toy-pussy cat on which his own reins has been put as a collar. L. had been pulling it around the
nursery. He stops to take
the 'collar' off the pussy-
cat's neck.)

bô <
('Allgone'.)

M: Ah, 'cê tirou as
correias?
('Oh, did you take
the reins off?')

(L. plays at beating M.
with the reins and laughs.)

(viii. l;8.20)

(17) (L. wants M. to give him a
big match-box made in soft
cardboard.)

M: Você num vai abrir?
('Do you promise
not to open it?')

não
('No'\(^1\))

M: Não?

nã
(Confirming the
preceding 'no')

M: Então, toma.
('Take it then'.)

1. Luciano's no has to be interpreted as 'I promise not to
do it', which is consistent with his (and the adult's)
use of the rules regarding positive answers to yes/no
questions, that is, to repeat the element with pre-
dicative import in the propositional component. He
could, not, indeed, have answered Prometo ('I promise'),
which is, on the other hand, not overt in his mother's
utterance, though encoded by the intonational contour of
it. In any case, the fact that his mother handed him
the matchbox, subsequently, seems to confirm our inter-
pretation. It also is worth drawing attention to his
assentment of negative nã\(^1\) followed by the nã\(^1\) of denial,
in the same situation.
(Few seconds later L. opens the matchbox.)

bô ↓ <

('Allgone'.)

nuê!(emphatic)
(M. takes the box from L.'s hands.)
quê...mamãnhê!
mia...meia...
('Want...mummy!
mine(?)...mine(!)')
(M. 'changes the topic', but L. is already interested in another soft cardboard box.)

hum ↓

M: Você rasgou?
('Have you torn it?')

M: 'Cê bateu a cabeça hoje, Loiro?¹
('Did you bang your head today, Loiro?')

hum ↓

M: Onde é que você bateu a cabeça? 'Cê caiu?
('Where did you bang your head? Did you fall down?')

hum ↓

M: Olha para a mamãe.
'Cê caiu hoje?'
('Look at Mummy! Did you fall today?')

(L. tears into pieces the empty toy-box.)

bô: ô: ô: ô:↓

('Allgoooone!')

¹. Loiro is one of the child's nicknames, the other one being, for obvious reasons, Lu. Loiro is the adjective for 'blonde' in Portuguese and Luciano has very light hair.
(L. goes on tearing up the pieces of the box.)

M: 'Cê tá rasgando tudo?'
('Are you tearing it all up?')

iê:
('It is' or 'Yes'.)

Contexts such as the ones above share some very important features with a subset of contexts in which bo-utterances are inserted early in Time I, not only those which are documented in the sample (cf. (3) where bo is uttered by Luciano after having thrown the flower away) but also the ones reported by his mother: for example, after having finished drinking his milk. Given that the particular feature of this subset of bo-utterances is their being used at/around the terminal point or completion of a goal-oriented action performed by the child, it is plausible to say that bo had the function of a completive marker at late Time I.

Furthermore, research on pre-linguistic behaviour, such as that reported by Bruner in his already mentioned paper, demonstrates that completive markers are part of the child's signalling system even before the end of his first year of age.

1. This seems to be, from what I can deduce from my own experience as a mother and in my work in child language, as well as from the literature on 'operations of reference' (cf. Bloom 1973:90), the basic situations for the 'learning' of this operator. And this relationship between 'basic situations' and language acquisition does not constitute an argument favouring a behaviouristic view of the process. The role of the mother/father in these situations is one of 'provider' and, only secondarily, one of 'reinforcer' (cf. Bruner, 1975), otherwise there would be no possibility of explaining the gradual increase in semantic (and syntactic) complexity which characterizes linguistic development. It is also part of my experience that mothers can sometimes reinforce with some success (Contd.)
"In the case of intention-oriented interactions, the principal form of signalling is MARKING THE SEGMENTS OF ACTION. Most usually it begins by the use of a terminal marking, the use of what might be called a COMPLETIVE. The child takes a mouthful of newly introduced food from a spoon; the mother exclaims, Good boy! with distinctive intonation. Or he offers back an object handed to him, and the mother exclaims: There! .......... It may be well that completion marking of this kind serves as an initial step in primitive semantic segmentation, the forming of units."

(Bruner 1975:13)

However, bo-occurrences do not seem to be inserted only in contexts in which they can be said to be markers of completion. Another subset of contexts in which they occur, both early and late in Time I, shows no correlation with completion of action process by the child, or by anybody else. This is the case for Luciano's bo in (13), with reference to the abnormal location or looseness of the parquet-tile. Its looseness could not be related to a specific or goal-oriented action, but to some process in which Luciano was not involved, either as observer or agent.

A third subset of contexts which bo was appropriately used by Luciano, judging from his parents' verbal and non-verbal responses to his utterance, was with reference to the completion of processes which, though resultative, cannot be included in the class of intention-oriented actions, in Bruner's terms, or goal-oriented actions. Indeed, Luciano was very upset with the fact of having, involuntarily, 'broken' the toy-trumpet, and very concentrated in his search for his piece of bread, as (8) and (10), respectively, indicate.

Contd.) very 'odd' linguistic forms of behaviour such as the pronunciation of words that are long and difficult, but which do not alter the system that is being gradually built up by the child.
Based on the fact that a change of place or state consequent either upon an immediately preceding process or action, or upon a process which is not specifiable as to agency and time of actualization, one could argue for the view that Luciano's bô expressed state or location resultative from any type of action or process.\(^1\) Counter-arguments for this interpretation, however, are the further development of what could be called predicative structures in Luciano's (and in Fernando's) sample at Time II and III. \(\text{Estar + past participle, which is the paradigmatic construction for expressing resultative states in Portuguese, and estar + adjective only emerge after a large range of verbs, belonging to the different verb-classes, is used with Pretérito Perfeito inflections, and also after the emergence and relative stabilization of estar + gerund, or of present progressive forms.}\)

Moreover, from the various sources of data about the holophrastic stage and Stage I (the two-word stage), as well as from studies on pre-linguistic behaviour or cognitive development, it is reasonable to say that children tend to deal, firstly, with concepts such as location and action, and only secondarily, with states. That resultative states are less complex entities, from a cognitive point of view, than 'permanent' or less variable states, such as colour and shapes of objects, is plausible and, as a matter of fact, it is a conclusion that can be drawn from Fernando's

\(^1\) This is, as a matter of fact, what is claimed by Volterra (forthcoming) in her paper about the use of the past participle in a relatively early stage of the acquisition of Italian by two subjects.
linguistic development (cf. also McNamara 1972). But this is not an argument for the ontogenetic priority of resultative states relatively to actions and processes.

Consequently, given the distributional properties of bO-utterances late in Time I, the hypothesis that bO constitutes, within the aspectual system of Luciano, either a completive marker or an expression of resultative states does seem untenable. What, indeed, arises from the discussion above, is the unmarkedness of bO with respect to the situation-type to which it applies. In other words, the system of oppositions upon which the differentiation between accomplishments, achievements, activities and state propositions rests had not been mastered yet by the child, or, at least (to restrict our view to the linguistic area) was not encoded or represented in his aspectual operators. And this seems, in fact, to be what he 'informs' to his mother, by rejecting her alternative interpretations of his bO-utterance in (13): it did not mean acabou ('finished') or accomplishment, it did not mean quebrou ('broke') or an achievement. It meant only that a situation previously observable (or located in his perceptual field) was not observable at the moment of his utterance.

On the other hand, the main fact concerning the contextual complementary distribution of bO and bO is, undoubtedly, its correlation with the distinction between animates and non-animates: the former is restricted to contexts which make it interpretable as referring to the absence (non-location at the immediate perceptual field at or around the moment of the utterance act) of animates,
whereas the latter applies to processes or actions undergone by non-animates. This seems to indicate that Luciano's subcategorization of his earlier $b_o$ into $b_6$ vs. $b_0$ represents his having started to relate or to encode one of the possible relations between first-order entities and second-order entities. That is to say, that the non-observability or non-availability of a situation in his immediate perceptual field was, in the case of animates, determined by their capacity as DOERS or agents of their actions and movements, whereas, in the case of non-animates, it was determined by actions or processes in which they are patients. And this is tantamount to saying the Luciano was showing by the use of $b_6$ and $b_0$ that he already 'knew' that persons and animals move and do things by themselves, while objects do not.

This amounts to the rejection of the possibility of drawing the distinctions [-PERFECT] or [-MODAL] mentioned above. Indeed, a lower degree of complexity has to be correlated with the unmarkedness of the negative aspectual operator $b_0$, with respect to the distinction animate vs. non-animate (i.e. with respect to agency vs. non-agency). This seems to make plausible the assignment of the following semantic representations to Luciano's aspect operators at TIME I:

$I - \delta = [+\text{NEG} [+\text{LOC} [\text{Situations}]]] = [+\text{LOC} [\text{Situation}]]$

$II - b_0 = [+\text{NEG} [+\text{LOC} [\text{Situation}]]] = [-\text{LOC} [\text{Situation}]]$

The representation assigned to $\delta$, contrasts with that of $b_0$ early in Time I, in respect of the value assigned to the
component of the higher S. This seems to capture adequately the fact that Luciano used both operators with reference to situations or entities which entered and left his perceptual and attention field. That is to say, [+NEG] in II is intended to capture the fact that, by using bō, Luciano was negating the location in his immediate perceptual field of situations once positively associated with it, that is, once made observable to him. Re-examination of the exemplification provided for bō will confirm the need for this higher negative predication.

In the same way, the presence of a minus value associated with NEG in I, accounts for the negation of the set of possible locations of the entity or situation apart from the location defined as the part of the immediate perceptual field of the 'speaker' at the time of the utterance-act. It is intended to express the fact that only the location at the primary 'thereI' is not negated. In this sense, the opposition 6 vs. bō could be glossed as 'I see it' vs. 'I do not see it (which I saw before)', and associated with the predicate and predicated of 'ATTEND TO'. Their function as an attention-drawing device has already been mentioned.

As for the opposition between bō and bō late in Time I and in part of Time II, the distributional properties of these operators discussed above seem to require that we draw a distinction between situations which result from happenings (in which there is no recognition of agency) and situations which result from doings (in which the coming about of a resultant situation is attributed to some agent). Since we are not claiming that it is possible to
represent these semantic distinctions in terms of nested atomic predications (but cf. Dowty, 1972), we will simply classify the two kinds of resultant situations as achievements and accomplishments (cf. Vendler 1967). The structures we are concerned with, therefore, are:

III - bō [+NEG [+LOC [Achievement]]]

IV - bō [+NEG [+LOC [Accomplishment]]]

Before starting the discussion of Luciano's primitive verbal system at Time I, that is to say, the type of situations he is already encoding at that period, and in the context of which III, IV and V. will be better justified, two points arising from the proposal of the structures above must be briefly treated.

Both of them refer to the atomic predicate LOC, which, together with NEG, has been proposed by Anderson (1971) as one of the basic (or primitive) semantic categories, which underly the relations present not only in the propositional component of sentences, but also in the modality aspectual component, which he presents as an existential predication or as a higher [+LOC] (cf. Anderson 1971: 5). Our proposal is, indeed, very similar to his, in spite of the rather important way in which they diverge as far as the specification of LOC is concerned. The existential predication of situations is, according to Anderson, their location with reference to a particular point in time, as one can see below:

"Aspect, I suggest, is concerned with the relation of an event or a state to a particular reference point: it is located before (retrospective), after (prospective) around (progressive) or simply at (AORIST) a particular point in time.....'Tense-markers', on the other hand, combine with temporal
adverbials in establishing the reference points ('axes of orientation'); they locate in time a point with respect to which events and states can be located. In this sense, the aspects are 'relative' or 'secondary tenses'."

(Anderson 1971:40)

It seems plausible to say that Luciano's data already at Time I, as well as the functions that estar has as a 'copula' and as an 'auxiliary' in adult Portuguese are counter-arguments for Anderson's temporal view of aspect, which is, furthermore, contradicted by the fact that temporal expressions in many languages can be considered as derivative with respect to spatial location expressions (cf. Leech 1969; Clark 1973; Jessen, 1973, etc.). If, indeed, the particular point of time with reference to which, situations are located, is, by definition (cf. Bull 1963), either the time of the utterance-act or a point of time defined in relation to the time of the utterance-act, the LOC which appears as a higher aspectual predication is, necessarily, deictic. That is, LOC must be specified relatively to the deictic space, and should be replaced above by [+THERE₁]. Given the data and the arguments discussed in Part I (cf. Part I, 2.2.5) it seems that the [+THERE₁] of the progressive, as well as that of the whole aspectual system of Luciano at Time I is the primary THERE₁, that which corresponds to the epistemic predicate SEE or PERCEIVE.

This leads to the second and final point of our discussion: no implication of temporal relations other than the opposition represented by [+NOW] parallel, though secondary to [+HERE] (or [+THERE₁] of perception) is assumed in the ascription to [-ACTUAL] of the subcategori-
zation represented by, on one side, I-IV above, and on the other, by the anticipatory meaning of Luciano's requests for action.

2.1.3. The primitive 'verbal' system of Luciano at Time I.

At Time I, the word forms Luciano used to encode particular situations, or more specifically, actions, were no more than a dozen, putting together those belonging to the class described (in 5. (cf. 2.1)) as showing a higher degree of correlation with adult verbal forms, and, among the onomatopoeic and idiolectal forms belonging to 3, those that were used with a rising/falling terminal contour.

As mentioned before (cf. 2.1.2), the distributional properties of these forms are relatable to those displayed by $\delta$ and $b\delta$ in the same period. This means that a very small subset of them - \textit{nand}' (nite-nite') and \textit{papá/pēpē}' (eat') for example - could occur in contexts similar to those in which $\delta$ occurred, the formal device correlated with those "in actualization" contexts being their embedding in a declarative or falling contour prosodic matrix.

1. \textit{Papá} is the form used by Luciano to designate both solid (or less liquid) food and the activity of 'eating' them, in opposition to \textit{mamá}, used for liquids (milk, water, juice) taken from his bottle/special cup and the activity of drinking them. The similarity of these wordforms with his early forms for 'mummy' and 'daddy' (which became at Time II (ma)mæ and (pa)pai), does not invalidate mine and his parents' interpretation. Both pairs occur in the lexicon of Brazilian children at this stage, and can be part of child-parent common lexicon for a large period of the child's life. It is interesting to notice that the most probable semantic opposition between mamá and papá is, as far as I could understand from Luciano's and my own children's use of them, relative to the type of container.
An example of it is the occurrence of naná in (14) above, which was translated by his father with the present progressive form of his own verb naná.

As has also been pointed out in 2.1.2, the more frequent (and, in fact, very frequent) use of verblike forms by Luciano at Time I, was in contexts which can be defined, in opposition to the privileges of occurrence of bo, as prospective contexts and by their embedding in a demand-rising terminal contour prosodic matrix. That is, they were used by Luciano to request the adult to perform actions for his benefit and upon two types of entities: inanimate objects and himself.

Examples of the former type are, most probably, all the occurrences of dá/miđá (give/give me), pó (put') and (a)bř ('open') and which can be exemplified by (18) below:

(18) (L. points to the fruit-tray on the table where there are bananas)

papá
('food!' or 'eat!')

M: Papá?
('Food?')
S(Sara): Papá?
M: Qué papá? Do titio.
Pedipro titio, pede.
('Do you want to eat? It is Uncle's (bananas).
Ask him, ask.

midá! <
dá!dá!
('give me!')
('give!give!')

(i. 1;6.15)

Examples of the latter are all occurrences of fóti-fóti
(Luciano's word for the activity of 'dangling on his
father's knees) with demand-rising contour and occurrences of *écé*/décé ("go down"), which, at Time II will stand in opposition to a new item of his lexicon *(u)*bf ("go up"). An illustration of this type of occurrence is:

(19) (Lunch-time. L. is on his high-chair and very impatient.)

\[ \text{decé:écé!} \]

\[ \text{decé} \downarrow \text{(impatient)} \]

\[ \text{qué} \downarrow \text{(assent)} \]

\[ \text{qué} \downarrow \text{(assent)} \]

\[ \text{M: Quê fazer xixi?} \]

\[ ('\text{Do you want to make wee-wee?}') \]

\[ \text{M: Nâo? Quê que vôcê quê?} \]

\[ ('\text{No? What do you want?}') \]

\[ \text{M: Quê descêr?} \]

\[ ('\text{Is it coming down that you want?}') \]

\[ \text{M: Então, espera af.} \]

\[ ('\text{Wait a moment, then.}') \]

\[ \text{vi. 1;8.0} \]

The contextual properties of both types of requests exemplified above are, in many ways, similar to those described as characteristic of *bô*, despite the basic opposition between *bô*-contexts and those exemplified above, as to the feature of 'actualization' or actuality. Indeed, the intersection of the set of contexts in which the verbs *descêr* and *subir*, *dar* and *pôr* are used in adult Portuguese, with the set of contexts, represented in Luciano's sample, where phonologically similar forms are inserted, provide the grounds for interpreting them as encoding goal-oriented actions (or accomplishments), their goal being change of
place (= 'negation of the actual place'). This seems to allow for the assignment to the action-requesting utterances in Luciano's sample at Time I of the following structure:

\[ V. [+\text{NEG}[-\text{LOC} [\text{Accomplishment}]]] \]

which contrasts with IV above, with respect to the value of LOC. And this is consistent with the presupposition carried by those utterances of the prospective nature (and, therefore, possible actualization) of the action.

However, V. is incomplete as a semantic representation of \( \text{pô} \uparrow, \text{dâ} \uparrow, \text{decê} \uparrow, \) etc., due to the fact of leaving unspecified the goal or object of request which is part of their meaning as utterances. It would be, however, a proper way of representing the multiple ambiguity of \( \text{tê}/\text{que} \) ('want'), which is as frequent as \( \text{dâ} \) in Luciano's data early in Time I. In fact, Luciano used \( \text{que} \) in so many different contexts that his parents' scanning operations for identifying the object of the request were far more numerous than those necessitated by \( \text{pô} \uparrow, \text{dâ} \uparrow, \text{decê} \uparrow. \)

Consequently, a more adequate representation of action-requesting utterances other than \( \text{que} \) would require the specification of the goal or accomplishment requested, that is, its locative content, or its 'change-of-place' meaning. Moreover, since Luciano never referred, at that period, to a change of place involving a place outside the immediate deictic space, the specification and the propositional content of the utterances represented by V. would entail the specification of LOC. In other words, it would require the consideration of the kind of division Luciano, at Time I, was imposing to his immediate perceptual field
when he asked to be moved from his high chair, or things to be moved from where they were. It seems arguable, given the use of vocatives at a very early stage and his da-utterances, that he was taking himself as a reference-point and the place where he was as a reference-location. Persons and objects are requested to move or to be moved towards him, either into his field of perception or into his field of action, which is, by definition, a part of it.

The emergence (subsequently to vocatives, da and que which are an important part of his stable 'lexicon' a little before his first year) of decé and some onomatopoeic or idiolectal forms - indicate his encoding of different requests, that is, of requests for movements of which he himself is the object. That is, he ceases to be the only goal or destination of movements of other people for his own benefit, and starts to see other places as goals/destinations. Later on, and there is some evidence for it in the fifth session (1;7.10) of Time I, the goal/destination of the actions/movements he requests from adults are not only himself, but inanimate entities which are, in some ways, similar to animates: he asks his mother to put shoes on the doll, as well as in session viii., he asks her to put his reins on the toy pussycat.

(20) (L. is playing with his toy-pussycat.)

M: Tá brincando com o gato?
('Are you playing with the cat?')
(mi)au
(onomatopoea used to designate cats)

M: Ai, que gato lindo!
Ele anda?
('Oh, what a nice pussycat! Does he walk?')

(L. picks up his own reins and hands to M.)
pô...pô! manhê!
pô...pô....tâto!
('Put...put! Mummy!')
('Put...put...cat!')

M: X?
('Hum?')

M: Por no gato a correia?
('Put on the pussycat the reins?')

é!
('It is' or 'Yes'.)

(viii. 1;8.20)

In the same session, he uses as a goal for a specific movement requested from his mother for his own benefit, a new type of object in which he starts to be very interested: containers, that is, places for objects or non-animates, nesting boxes, matchboxes (cf. (17)), etc. And this is simultaneous with the addition to his lexicon of type 5. of the wordform abf ('open'), as illustrated by (21):

(21) (L. has just found a chewing-gum box. M. notices it.)

M: Vem cá.
('Come here.')

abf↑
('open!')
M: Você quer abrir?
('Do you want to open it?')

quê ↓
('Want'.)
(L. hands it to M.)

(viii. 1;8.20)

A fundamental question seems to arise from the hypothesis which is implicit in our analysis of the action-requesting utterances and which, as a matter of fact, has been asked by Macrae (1974), with respect to the possibility of children having a notion of movement similar to that of adults, that is as a function of the successive locations, or trajectory, of an object through space.

"Does the child perceive movement in this same way? Does he see a journey as a function of its starting-point and finishing-point - a means of changing one's position from point A to point B - or does he take the movement itself as primary, concerning himself only incidentally with beginnings or endings?" (Macrae 1974:3)

Based on data on the acquisition of English, which show that, instead of goal expressions, 'an unexpected richness of modal, aspectual and idiomatic uses' (op.cit.; 4) is found in the uses of 'come' and 'go', and on an experiment consisting of tests of comprehension of opposite pairs of directional prepositions ('to/from', etc.) done with 36 children between the age of 3;3 and 4;10 she concludes that a negative answer should be given to the first question above.

However, what does seem to be the case from both the results of the tests and the aspectual/modal value of 'go' (cf. the operators 'gone', 'allgone', 'away' also mentioned by her) in early stages is that the child does not operate
with a notion of a trajectory which does not have himself as either a goal or as the basic reference-point. Indeed, Luciano, at Time I, only requested movements to be done towards him; on him towards places other than the actual one where he was; on objects or with objects which were in his field of action and attention. It is rather difficult to see how experiments can reconstruct the features of non-formal interaction between child, interlocutor and objects in order to allow for the child to use himself as a reference-point.

These observations, and mainly, the development of Luciano's aspectual system in Time II seems to provide grounds for looking at Luciano's immediate perceptual space at Time I, as divided into two sections, definable by \([\pm \text{EGO-as-an-observer}]\) and \([\pm \text{EGO-as-an-actor}]\). Moreover, although all his requesting utterances presuppose \([\pm \text{EGO-as-a-beneficiary}]\) and \([\pm \text{EGO-as-an-object}]\), it seems arguable that his encoding of a primitive system of spatial relations - based on only one reference-point, or egocentric - is one of his first steps towards the encoding of notions such as agent/source of action, object/goal of the movement, as well as of types or directions of movements. This is, as a matter of fact, explained by Bruner, as follows:

"A first process involves the infant in the learning of the segments of joint action with their mother - their POSITION OF PRIVILEGES OF OCCURRENCE in sequences involving agent-action-object-recipient. The child is not only learning to distinguish segments, but also learning substitution rules, learning to reverse order (so that the recipient of action, the child, being to trade position with the agent) in what must be an early example of
deixis. In time, the child learns distinctive, if non-standard ways of signalling the different segments of the action sequence. Finally, standard communication is substituted for these." (Bruner 1975:9)

At Time I, Luciano's stage in replacing non-standard communication with elements of the adult language does not allow us to say that he was encoding more than some basic spatial relations, or of relations between himself, persons and objects defined relatively to his field of perception, attention and action. Thus, it seems that LOC and NEG and an egocentric reference-point are much simpler and more adequate notions to be considered as primitives than those conveyed by words such as agent, action, not to mention NPs and VPs. Furthermore, they provide the basis for us to look at the holophrastic stage and at the 'operations of reference' as having something to do with the so-called syntactic period and with the relations Agent-Action, Action-Object, Entity-Location, etc. which are said to be the prevalent semantic relations expressed by two-word utterances.

As a matter of fact, elements - 'words' and 'structures' - which are marginal or non-productive at late in Time I, seem to indicate Luciano's operation and encoding of semantic relations based on the primitive set hypothesized for Time I. The only interrogative utterances which appear in Time I (and, at its end, seem to move towards the adult's way of expressing them) are locatives. The first deictic words ï (from af, 'there') and ûte/âsse (from êste/ësse, 'this/that') - which refer to places and
entities within his field of attention and are no more than 'linguistic' equivalents of the gesture of pointing — also make their appearance at session vii. and viii. respectively.

(22) (L. finds Carla’s doll in the toy-basket.)

ε...mamãe ↑

('look...Mummy!')

ε...mamãe ↑

M: Hum?

M: Que?

('What is it?')

M: Que? Que que tem ali? ('What? What is that is there?')

(i ↓ <

('there')

(vii. 1;8.10)

(23) (L. with M. at the beginning of the session: L. almost runs towards the table where the tape-recorder is.)

M: Que é, Luciano? O que você quer? ('What is it, Luciano? What do you want?')

etê! <

(pointing)

etê! <

('This'.)

M: A?

M: Que que você quer? ('What do you want?')

esse!

('That')

M: Esse?

M: Não, aqui no gravador não pode, viu?
Luciano's í and ëte/ësse seem to be new forms to express the same 'meaning' as í-utterances, in the sense that they also are attention-drawing devices or linguistic equivalents of the gesture of pointing which, often, accompanies them. There is, however, a difference to be noted in the contexts in which they appear, relatively to the contextual distribution of í. They seem to refer to places and to objects respectively, and not to situations, as it was the case for í. They seem to be less ambiguous than í in this sense.

This difference, that is to say, the emergence of forms to fulfil some of the functions of í, seems to be relatable to two very strange types of utterances found also in session viii.

(24) (L. is in front of the mirror, in his mother's bedroom. He is chewing a piece of gum very ostensively, opening his mouth wide and observing it very carefully in his reflection in the mirror.)
ne...nênê...pápa <

('Baby'... 'eat')

M: Ah, o nenê está comendo chicle? Comendo no espelho?

('Ah, baby is eating? Eating in the mirror?')
nê...
(?)

(25) (m. has put L.'s reins on the toy-pussycat.)

nuê ↓
('It is not' or 'No'.)

quevê..tia tâto ↑<
('want-see'...
take off cat?')

M: Pronto, pronto. Assim?
('There it is. There it is. Like that?')

não! (emphatic)
(L. takes the reins off the pussycat.)

M: Você já tirou?
('Have you already taken it off?')

a ↑
('Hum?')

M: Você já tirou.
('You have already taken it off.')

ê ↓
('It is' or 'Yes'.)

M: Pronto, pronto. Assim?
('There it is. There it is. Like that?')

Both pêpa and tia, which appear above, are what one could call the first occurrences of 'simple present' in Luciano's sample. This is a possible conclusion given his regular use of pêpa in request-utterances and of tia (from tirar ('take off')) in session vii. and viii. The word-stress opposition between these two sets of forms, which seems to have been used by Luciano, is parallel to that found in the Brazilian Portuguese verbs with an -a radical, to distinguish infinitive from simple present-forms. On the other hand, similar simple-present forms are, together with imperfective forms, marginal in Luciano's
speech till after the end of Time III.  

However, the context in which pépa has been produced and the progressive 'expansion' his mother has given to it — and the, at first, undecipherable 'formula' quêvé in (25), seems to lead to the conclusion that Luciano was attending (cf. (24)) and drawing his mother's attention (unsuccessfully, in (25)) to his own action or to its 'on-goingness'. In fact, after some time, I could relate quêvé to Luciano's routine-form of asking the adult to show him an object (as in the situation of his mother's opening parcels, etc.), which I have discarded as data irrelevant to my object of study. Furthermore, it was part of my experience as a close friend of the family that the typical context of his sister's use of the same expression was for it to be a part of a question, such as 'Quê vé eu pular/dançar?' ('Do you want to see me jump/dance?) addressed to adults before executing the activity.

Without laying excessive emphasis on the argument, it is perhaps possible to say that Luciano was trying in (25) to make observable to his mother an action he was about to execute, that is, an accomplishment, of an event

---

1. Notice that this phenomenon is in complete opposition with the presence of unmarked present forms in the data on the acquisition of English (cf. Brown 1973, etc.) on the acquisition of French (cf. Gregoire (1937)) and of Italian (cf. Bates 1974).

2. This could be a case of a routine which could have developed into an operator similar to the KEW of 'Thank you' in Bruner's examples (1975:14-15), and which could be related to the mechanism discussed and designated by Ruth Clark as 'copying strategies' (1974).
that, contrarily to activities such as jumping and dancing,\(^1\) are only observable during the (relatively short) time preceding the moment at which the goal is reached (cf. Vendler 1967, for the difference between accomplishment and activities). The only reason why data like these — that is to say, unique occurrences — are brought into discussion at this point, is due to their contextual similarity with the present progressive forms which will emerge in the second period of Time II.

Since we have been discussing what Luciano seemed to be starting to do with his ō's at the last sessions of Time I, it is important to show that the same partial substitution-operations started to be used in relation to bō. In spite of the uniqueness of occurrence of preterite forms in the sample — only one in session vii —, Luciano, at that period, had started to use caiu in a situation that he very much enjoyed of dropping objects from his cot for the adult to pick them up. Moreover, the unique instance of the bō-replacing preterite, seems to me very significant:

(26) (L. is playing with a doctor toy-set. He is trying to open the syringe.)

ō..manhe!

('look...mummy!')

\(^1\) Cf. Griffiths (1974:7) for a similar occurrence in the sample of one of his subjects. The boy holds a doll to a visitor and says: 'See, lady; that lady dance.'
It seems unnecessary to discuss this sequence: the relationship of *vê* and the mother's expansion of it with the present progressive of the accomplishment-verb denoting the action, Luciano's marking the terminal of the action or its reaching of the goal with the preterite (absent from his mother's utterances) are clear enough. They seem to indicate that Luciano was, at that time, starting to encode trajectories of actions, or encoding his learning of the internal structure of events. Time II and III of Luciano and Fernando's sample seem to provide abundant data illustrative of this characteristic function of their verbal behaviour: to describe their own actions, that is to say, to signal the segments of them (in Bruner's terms). Using a linguistic terminology, one could say that they were very interested in things such as the prospective, progressive and completive phases of events, or in 'Aktionsarten'.
Indeed, another characteristic of the last two sessions of Time I is the differentiation of his action-requesting utterances - which we will describe and discuss in the section referring to Time II - and the syntactic status they seem to reach, together with $\mathcal{C}$-utterances, by representing instantiations of the first collocation of two units within a single rising-terminal prosodic matrix.

All the facts pointed out above and the apparently speculative nature of our discussion of them seem to constitute counter-arguments to the view that the operations of reference of the holophrastic stage are not to be related to further stages of acquisition. The data which will be provided in tables and in the context of the discussion of the subsequent parts of Luciano's sample and Fernando's corpus, will, it is hoped, demonstrate this.

2.2. Luciano's aspectual system at Time II

Time II comprises eight sessions of Luciano's sample, collected from April to August 1970, which corresponds to the last quarter of his second year of life. It is characteristically a period of 'syntactic' development, as far as the number of units per utterance is concerned. This statement seems to be contradicted by Table II, and by the MLU of sessions viii. to xi. However, the observation of the low number of utterances per session (shown in Table I) is suggestive of the presence of some common factor for both 'deficits'. Our decision to introduce Luciano's sister as a more or less regular participant in the sessions resulted in her 'stealing his part' and explains
the low quantity and, most probably, quality of the sample corresponding to the first four sessions of Time II. This initial failure proved to be worthwhile: it was, indeed, the presence of Carla that provided the opportunities for Luciano to have someone else other than the mother-interlocutor (or main interlocutor) about whom to talk. As soon as Carla started to act 'normally' in the sessions (as happened from xii. onwards), Luciano's production became representative of the period covered in the sample. Furthermore, we have noticed a decrease in the frequency of some forms in the sessions that Carla did not participate in. Luciano did not use to talk about absent people's activities at that period (and till the end of the sample), and, when involved in mutual activity with the mother, there were not so many contexts for describing their common actions. Many other questions related to the methodology of child language research could be raised at this point, but it is outside the scope of this work to pursue them.

2.2.1. TimeII, first period: the development of action-requesting utterances and of locative predications

Tables III and V are intended to show the main characteristics of Luciano's sample at the first four sessions of Time I. The items present in them are the most frequent, although the size of some sections did not allow us to discard data which, in other circumstances, would be considered less representative. The reasons for assigning them to the classes which correspond to the titles
in each of the columns are to be found in our discussion of the aspectual operators in 2.1.2. This also means that the items listed under each heading or in each column have occurred in contexts similar to the ones discussed with reference to the feature which is assumed to be represented by the title of the column. For example, the presence of *qué* under the heading [-EGO] of the column [-ACTUAL] means that Luciano used it to request something from the adult, whereas [+EGO] of the same column indicates its having been uttered to 'announce' his intention of doing something that he did in fact do subsequently. New entries into the lexicon or in the repertoire of structures will be underlined for further reference or discussion. Morphophonemic features which cannot be given a correspondent in English, and that are relevant for the understanding of a developmental feature of the sample, will be presented within parentheses following the English 'translation' or gloss.

Marginal occurrences of this and other periods of Luciano's Time II and III, when considered prognostical relatively to further stages will be treated in the subsequent discussion of the Tables. The last point to be made, before presenting the data, refers to the title NON-STATIVE and STATIVE PREDICATIONS given to the tables. No claim about Luciano's use of internalization of all the rules which account for their use in the adult's language should be inferred from the use of those labels.
## TABLE III
Luciano Time II - first period
NON-STATIVE PREDICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>[-ACTUAL&lt;sub&gt;pro&lt;/sub&gt;]</th>
<th>[+ACTUAL]</th>
<th>[-ACTUAL&lt;sub&gt;retro&lt;/sub&gt;]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>('want')</td>
<td>('want')</td>
<td>('look')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dâ!</td>
<td>pô</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>('give')</td>
<td>('put')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pô</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>('put')</td>
<td>('put')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qué/té desce</td>
<td>('want go down')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(u)bi!</td>
<td>('go up')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>péga!</td>
<td>('get')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| x. 1;9.22 | qué | qué | o/dia | o/dia | bôa | caiu/taiu |
|           |     |     | ('look') | ('look') | ('away') | ('away') |
|           | dâ! | bebê |       |       | caiu/taiu | ('fell down') |
|           |     | ('I am going to drink') | | | |
|           | péga! | decê |       | | |

1. All forms with exclamation marks in Brazilian Portuguese in these tables have to be interpreted as corresponding to English imperative forms.
### TABLE III (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>$[-\text{ACTUAL}^\text{pr0}]$</th>
<th>$[+\text{ACTUAL}]$</th>
<th>$[-\text{ACTUAL}^\text{retro}]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$[-\text{EGO}]$</td>
<td>$[+\text{EGO}]$</td>
<td>$[-\text{EGO}]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. (contd.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;9.22</td>
<td>(ub)ib!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abf!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>('open')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vê!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10.5</td>
<td>qué!</td>
<td>qué</td>
<td>δ/δia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dã!</td>
<td>nanã qui</td>
<td>('night here')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peóga!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deóé!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vê!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10.9</td>
<td>qué!</td>
<td>qué</td>
<td>δxpulando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dã!</td>
<td></td>
<td>('to put')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peó!</td>
<td>pô</td>
<td>('to put')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tiá!</td>
<td>tiá</td>
<td>('to take off')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sópa!</td>
<td>sopá</td>
<td>('to blow')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sé abí?</td>
<td>abf</td>
<td>('would you open?')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tóta!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tóta!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dã bóã?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It seems quite clear from the data presented in Table I that the first period of Time II is characterized by the development of Luciano's primitive action-requesting utterances into a more complex system for encoding prospective relations. The main direction of this development is suggested by the increase, which starts to be noticeable in the last two sessions of Time I of utterances that, though related to prospective contexts are distinct from requests by the fact that Luciano used them to 'announce' or draw the attention of the adult to an action that he was intending or about to perform.

Indeed, if in the preceding period, the differentiation between requests and strictly prospective utterances was very difficult to be distinguished due to their basic contextual and phonological/prosodic similarity, at Time II two types of markers seem to be introduced to carry the distinction.

New entries in the repertoire of the prospective utterances are selected either from imperative forms - as for example pega ('get') - or from the infinitive forms of the adult verb - as for example, bebe (from beber ('drink')), which occurs, as in English with the auxiliary ir ('go') in expressions of the immediate future. This selection was parallel to their distributional properties: Luciano never used pega before getting or picking up something he wanted, as he never used bebe for asking water or juice, which he would normally request by uttering the noun he had for the liquid. Moreover, bebe also occurred twice with the proper auxiliary, although, only at the second period of
Time II, the use of *ir* as an auxiliary becomes a regular feature of his strictly prospective or intentional utterances.

At the fourth session, a phenomenon, also represented late in Time I, and which, probably, did not appear in the following sessions of Time II, due to the already mentioned problem of the sampling, is the use of word-stress position as a feature to distinguish requests from intentional utterances. It was operative on a subset of disyllabic verb-like forms previously used only in its final-stressed form. Since this opposition is the one used in the adult system to distinguish imperatives from infinitives, it seems plausible to say that somehow Luciano was moving towards standard communication.

An example of the use of both forms, in the same segment of session xii, is:

(27) (L. 'hurt' his hand and runs to M. showing the hand.)

*sópa!*

('Blow it!')

M: *Sópro*  
('I will blow it'.)

*sópa*

('Blow' or 'going to blow'.)

(L. blows on his own hand.)

M: Vai *sópro* também? Hum? Coitadinks!

('Are you going to blow it too? Hum? Poor!')

(xii. 1;10.9)

A third form of encoding requests emerges also at Time II and this seems to constitute a further distinction established between the two types of prospectives: the polite request, which is, in Brazilian Portuguese,
ordinarily, an interrogative in the simple present, followed by *por favor* and with an expressive intonation contour superimposed on the interrogative contour. Luciano's *'Cé ábi?* ('Would you open it?') fits this pattern partially, and the subsequent development of requests shows that the feature [+EGO] start to imply more than the notion of agency already at the first period of Time II.

Another development of Luciano's aspectual system at Time II is the almost complete disappearance of *bd* and its replacement by the unmarked (or third person singular) form of the preterite of both achievement and accomplishment verbs. As was the case for *bd*, these forms are also employed to mark the completion of his own actions, and much less frequently, of other people's. The essential feature of the completion-marker of accomplishments is their reference to immediately preceding actions, and the fact that, for a long time, they have never been used to report a previous situation. But this is one of the main topics of the second period of Time II.

An important event of the first period of Time II would be the first appearance in Luciano's sample of a progressive form, in the context of observing his sister jumping on the carpet. Luciano says to his father: *Óia Ídia pulando!* ('Look Ídia jumping!). The fact that he did not use *estar* as an auxiliary is not the reason which prevents us from giving due importance to the event.

As a matter of fact, structures of the type *'ó/olha + NP + V-ando'* ('look + NP + V-ing') are what one could
label **demonstrative-progressives** in adult Portuguese, given the fact that observability at the moment of the utterance-act is one of their contextual conditions. Besides being acceptable, this structure seems to be predictable, if one considers Luciano's linguistic developmental stage at Time II: the matrix 'LOOK!' ('look' being unmarked as to the modality of perception and object of perception) is part of his repertoire since the first period of Time I. Moreover **demonstrative-structure** with *se/ela/olha* would allow him to describe activities performed by other people and, thus, observable to him, as well as his own activities that is, activities which have [+EGO-as-an-actor] and [+EGO-as-an-observer], similarly to the distinction which he is starting to encode in his prospective utterances.

However, examples of this utterance-type appear only once in the first period of Time II, and twice in the beginning of the second period. It is difficult to discern the factor behind this fact. Should one attribute it to the sampling problem mentioned above or to a factor linked with his cognitive development, that is, to his being in a still early stage of ego-decentration? This possibility cannot be discarded given the data of the second period of Time II, in which progressive forms with *estar* fully emerge and are used almost exclusively to refer to his own activities at or around the time of the utterance-act. Moreover, it is quite clear from Table IV below, that his basic reference-point is, still at the end of this period, his own position and his 'focus' of attention.
Table IV can be considered as a rough formalization of the following features of Luciano's stative predications at the first period of Time II:

a. the almost absolute predominancy of spatial locatives;

b. the absence of expressions of relative position;

c. the demonstrative character of the spatial relation conveyed by the child's utterances at this period.

The point made in a. does not seem to necessitate any explication, although one should, perhaps, emphasize the fact that *ser* and *estar*-utterances with nounforms and
adjectives are absent from Luciano's sample at this period. There are, indeed, some few occurrences of naming-utterances with ser, but these are elicited by the mother by means of ser-questions about names of animals and objects, in the context of looking at picture-books. Luciano, usually, answered those questions without the copula, that is, by providing the name required within a falling-terminal contour matrix.

As for point b., the absence of prepositions (till session xii.) suggests that the only spatial relation Luciano was encoding at that time was that of non-specific or non-ordered containment within the deictic space (cf. Part I 2.2). Indeed, his first estar-utterances are restricted, as to the nature of the entity and of the location expressed, to movables and to parts of the deictic space. This justifies the point made in c., that is, that they are characteristically demonstratives, or almost equivalent to the gesture of pointing.

The emergence of the deictic adverbials aqui at Time II, which could not be put in opposition with at, which occurs twice in interrogative-utterances, apparently indicates that he is starting to use the opposition [+EGO-as-an-observer] to divide his deictic space. However, there do not seem to be any grounds to consider ete/esse ('this'/ 'that') as anything other than variants and the technical and methodological deficiencies of our data forbid us to make any statement regarding proximity of objects to speaker and addressee in this case.
A very interesting point, however, regarding the use by Fernando of reference-points other than himself or his position concerns the differentiation of two types of structures with [-EGO] reference-points. One of them, which appears at session xi. and has been also registered at Time I, can be characterized by the absence of any copula in it and also by the feature [+ANIMATE] of the reference-location. Examples of this utterance-type are cauo...papai ('car'... 'daddy'), uttered in the context of having heard the noise of the engine of his father's car entering the garage, perfume...mamê ('perfume'.. 'Mummy'), when 'playing' with his mother's cosmetics, and innumerable other examples. The contextual properties of these utterances seem to call for their interpretation as possessives in which the copula ser is omitted, as it is omitted from other obligatory contexts, in comparison with the standard language, in Luciano's sample at that period.1

In contrast with these 'possessive' constructions, in the last session of the first period of Time I, two occurrences of the type x tá em y ('x is in y'), with y representing non-animate entities or places (such as chão ('floor') and banhelo ('bathroom'), are indicative of the way Luciano is moving towards the acquisition of the distinction between ser vs. estar-predications in Portuguese, that is, of their correlation with 'normative'

1. Worth drawing attention to is his use of utterances of this type to express 'origin' of objects, such as when showing the chewing-gum to his mother and saying queti...vovô ('gum'.. 'granny'), probably related to the fact that granny was the person who had brought the (Contd.)
vs. actual location of movables. The car and the perfume are, indeed, related to his father and mother in a different way from that by which his small toy-cow is related to the floor, after having been thrown by him from his cot. But this is a point to be discussed in the next section.

One final point may be made regarding Luciano's aspectual system in the first period of Time II with respect to the interrogative-locative utterances represented in Table IV. The crucial fact about these is their status as the first type of interrogatives found in Luciano's data: dê? occurs as soon as in the second session of Time I and goes on being used, not very frequently and interchangeably with its variant onde?, till Time II. In the beginning of Time II (and preceded by the interesting use of dê? in the same contexts) Luciano utters his first estar- forms in interrogative locatives to ask about his toy-dog and about his sister's.

It might be said that by using tá x?, and afterwards, tá af X? ('Is X there?') and o (di) tá? ('Where is it?'), Luciano is moving towards the ordinary way adults form questions about the location of movable entities in Portuguese. But that this is not the case is clear from a fact that is almost neglected in Portuguese grammars: 'Onde está X?' happens to be the interrogative-locative

Contd.) chewing-gum to Carla. Other examples, however, show that, as it can be said about 'possessives' in adult Portuguese, many relations between entities could be encoded by Luciano's precursor of the structure NP + ser + NP.
that is used only when x refers to first-order entities, while both first and second-order entities, i.e. persons, objects, events and even states can have their location questioned by the following 'formulae' in Portuguese:

(E.P.) Que é do João/da tesoura/da festa/da beleza de Maria?

(B.P.) Que dá o João/a tesoura/a festa/a beleza de Maria?

(col. BP) Que de o João/a tesoura/a festa/ a beleza de Maria?

(col. BP) Cadê o João/a tesoura/a festa/ a beleza de Maria?

('E.P.' stands for 'European Portuguese'; 'B.P.' for Brazilian Portuguese').

The conditions for the use of the ser locative question above, as far as movable entities are concerned, seem to be statable in terms of the speaker's presuppositions that the location of the entity in question is somewhere in his immediate perceptual field. Another condition seems also to be that he and his addressee have been attending to the entity previously; i.e. that the entity has been once positively associated with the attention field of the speaker and of the addressee. In the context, for example, of the speaker and of the addressee being involved in a joint activity like dress-making or of 'collage', and sharing a pair of scissors, the ser-question (with its de-version in Brazilian Portuguese) would be the
only appropriate question for the speaker to put to his/ her interlocutor/co-actor. It is this condition of joint attention and joint action that seems to account for the use of this construction. Since we have not dealt with this particular kind of location construction in Part I (assuming that it is correctly described as a location construction) and since, in a fuller treatment, it would need to be related to possessives of various kinds, we go no further into the question here.

2.2.2. Time II, second period: the successors of δ and bo in non-stative predications and the primordials of ser and estar in stative predications

The data summarised and classified in Table V reflect the great development of Luciano's aspectual system around the end of his second year.

The use of vai (2nd person singular of ir ('go'), Indicative Present) as an auxiliary or a catenative in prospective utterances is found at first (cf. session xiv.) in his now more polite requests for the adult to perform actions for his benefit and coincides with a decrease in the use of imperative forms. Moreover, the 'formula' vamos fazer x? ('Shall we make/do x?') which appears in requests for actions in which he is either a co-actor ('draw a circle') or a patient ('clean' = 'change his nappies') is also very productive at the same period in which his basic modal quer ('want') is partially replaced by the emergent pode ('may/can' of permission). The development of the notion of authority from that of agency,
which appears to be in Luciano's case built up on the spatial notions of source and goal within an egocentric frame of reference, would require a separate discussion which is outside the scope of this work. It seems sufficient to say that it indicates that Luciano has already mastered some basic operations regarding the prospective phase of actions, that is, his own actions/intentions and the adult's.

Another area which shows his having abandoned a non-standard way of signalling segments of actions is that of retrospective predications. The transition from the completive operator bö (entirely absent from his sample already in the first period of Time II) to the use of preterite inflections mainly with accomplishment and achievement-verbs is one of Luciano's main achievements at Time II.

It seems arguable that this transition should be related to the general process which seems representative of Time II and which could be described as ego-decentration or the encoding of actions in which he is an actor differently from his encoding of the relations in which he is an observer or a patient. It is noticeable that the first occurrences of eu/ö and of the first-person singular inflections are in preterite forms of accomplishment verbs, in contexts in which he is signalling the completion of an action immediately after having performed it, as shown in Table V. At the same time, accomplishments of his sister or of the adult, activities performed by him or by his sister (like pulö ('jumped')) uttered
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>[-ACTUAL pro]</th>
<th>[+ACTUAL]</th>
<th>[-ACTUAL retro]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-EGO]</td>
<td>[+EGO]</td>
<td>[-EGO]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. 1;11.28</td>
<td>sopé</td>
<td>sopé</td>
<td>caiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pega!</td>
<td>pega</td>
<td>chó x?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>câta!</td>
<td>câta!</td>
<td>('pick up')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>põe!</td>
<td>põe</td>
<td>peguí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv. 2;0.2</td>
<td>rumá!</td>
<td>seguíla</td>
<td>d x bigando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>('fix')</td>
<td>('hold')</td>
<td>('look x fighting')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abil!</td>
<td>fazé tasa</td>
<td>('make house')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tila!</td>
<td>tila!</td>
<td>('take off')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dêxa!</td>
<td>dêxa!</td>
<td>('leave it')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vai dêxa</td>
<td>vai pega oto?</td>
<td>('going to get another?')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vai pega oto?</td>
<td>('going to get another?')</td>
<td>('going to get another?')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yamo fazé pato?</td>
<td>('shall we make duck?')</td>
<td>('shall we make duck?')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>[-ACTUALpro]</td>
<td>[+ACTUAL]</td>
<td>[-EGO]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 2:1.10</td>
<td><strong>tonta</strong>! (&quot;tell!&quot;)</td>
<td>vai siulá (&quot;going to hold&quot;)</td>
<td>eu tô batendo (&quot;I am hammering&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>fala</strong>! (&quot;speak!&quot;)</td>
<td>vai pulá (&quot;going to jump&quot;)</td>
<td>eu tô v-ing (&quot;I am v-ing&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tonta x! (&quot;tell x&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td>tô fazendo x (&quot;I am making x&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vai quebá (&quot;going to break&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td>tô batendo (&quot;I am hammering&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vamo limpá? (&quot;shall we clean it?&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pode x? (&quot;may/can x?&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 2;0.17</td>
<td>vô pegá x (&quot;going to get x&quot;)</td>
<td>tô fazendo x (&quot;I am making x&quot;)</td>
<td>tiló (&quot;took off&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vai pô x? (&quot;going to put x?&quot;)</td>
<td>vô pô x (&quot;I am going to put x&quot;)</td>
<td>tô pomdo x? (&quot;are you putting x?&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vô fazê (&quot;going to make&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x, vô! (&quot;X, I am going&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pô x? (&quot;put x&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pode x? (&quot;may I x?&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
after having spent some time jumping on the mattress or on the floor), are very frequently 'subjectless' utterances.

It should be however emphasized again that Luciano's utterances with preterite forms do not seem to have a past-reference as the label retrospective might suggest. At Times I and II, forms with a preterite inflection are used to signal:

a. his having noticed/observed a change of place/state in the environment or an achievement which cannot be/is not attributed to a specific agent. Evidence of it is his use of quebô and datô (afterwards ago from rasgou ('tore up' or 'torn') at many instances of his attending to the same toy and the same picture-book which have been broken or torn up for some time);

b. a change of place/state caused by an 'involuntary' action of which an object or he himself are patients and that has taken place immediately before his drawing the attention of his interlocutor to it. Examples of this are his frequent use of caiu ('fell down', 'fallen') to signal his having fallen down accidentally but mainly his unintentional, but also 'intentional' action of dropping objects from his cot/high chair to the floor;

c. the completion of goal-oriented actions performed by himself and afterwards by his sister and his mother immediately or very shortly after the goal is achieved. Examples of this are: achô/achei ('found'/'I found') and many other forms which occur at the end of Time I and II sometimes with the aspectual adverbial iâ;
d. the cessation of activities without a pre-determined end or goal, immediately or shortly after having stopped to perform them. Examples of this are lavô ('washed'), bateu ('beat') in Time II. The same semiotic character can be attributed to the present progressive forms which make their appearance and are numerous in the last two sessions of Time II; they are produced either concomitantly with the activity he 'announces' that he is doing or in the middle of it. It could be said that he fragments the process in order to call his mother's attention to it. As shown by the structures represented in Table V no omission of the auxiliary estar is registered in the data and the first-person inflection (tô in opposition with tê which is the third person singular) is almost regular.

A crucial point about the emergence and quick stabilization of the 'formula' estar + gerund refers to the semantic nature of the class of verbs with which it co-occurred in Luciano's sample at Time II, that is: fazer x ('to make x') bater(em)x (com)x ('hit x with y, y = a hammer, the hand, etc.'), lavar ('wash'), brincar(de)x com y ('play at y with X'). The verbs used by Luciano in the present progressive, or most of them, are characteristically members of the class of those which encode activities or, according to Vendler (1967:100) processes with 'no set terminal point', if a definite goal or an explicit result or product is not established. At the second period of Time II, utterances such as tô fazendo tasa/cumidinha/bola ('I am making house/'dinner'/'ball') were respectively used in contexts of playing with wooden bricks, with Carla's toy kitchen-set, of drawing 'circles'. Both
the contextual conditions of these utterances and the fact that, at that time, the opposition between definite vs. indefinite NPs was absent or only emerging in his linguistic system, prevents us from saying that some of these utterances represent existential- causatives, as is the case in adult Portuguese for the causative fazer followed by a definite object NP, as an fazer a casa, desenhar o círculo ('make the house', 'draw the circle').

However, an important feature of this verb-class, which was the first to be used by Luciano in the present progressive with estar is the contextual condition of observability on which its appropriate use is dependent and which is explained by the fact that its members denote processes which can be said to obtain at any moment of their duration, in opposition to accomplishments which cannot be said to obtain (or to be in the world) before their completion. This is tantamount to saying that Luciano's first present progressives all refer to his own observable actions, in the same way as his first preterites caiu ('fell down'), quebrô ('broke') refer to observable results of achievements, that is processes which do not take time to happen: they are non-durative, and therefore, non-observable, in normal conditions - i.e. in the conditions operating in the contexts of Luciano's utterances.

It seems plausible to say, at this point, that Luciano's replacement of ô and ô with progressives and preterites is equivalent to the subcategorization of the situations represented in the propositional component of I and II in 2.1.1. Also worth emphasizing is the fact
that, at this period of Time II, Luciano has at his disposal standard means of signalling the various phases of his actions or of locating them in his interlocutor's attention. Sequences such as the one represented below and another five which are registered in the sample illustrate this:

(28) (L. with C. and M.)

\[\text{ti}..\text{ti}..\]
\[\text{nê, manhê..pode pulâ?} < \text{M: Pode.} \] ('You may' or 'Yes')
\[\text{('one..two..one..two..three..three..isn't it, Mummy.., may I jump?')}\]
\[\text{pode pulâ, Iáia?} \]
\[\text{C: Pode.} \] ('Yes'.)
\[\text{('Yes').} \]
\[\text{\text{ti}..\text{tei}!} \]
\[\text{\text{pulô!} <} \]
\[\text{('One..two..three..jumped!')}\]
\[\text{pode pulâ, manhê? <} \]
\[\text{('May I jump, Mummy?')}\]
\[\text{\text{M: Pode.} \] ('Yes'.)
\[\text{('Yes').} \]
\[\text{\text{ti}..\text{tei}!} \]
\[\text{\text{pulô!} \]
\[\text{ô vê pulâ até lá!} \]
\[\text{ô vê pulâ!} \]
\[\text{ê! (very happy)} \]
\[\text{('One..two..three! I am going to jump till there! I am going to jump!')\]
\[\text{(xv. 2; 0.10)}\]

The above illustration of Luciano's way of marking the prospective and retrospective phases of his activity of jumping or of the goal-oriented action of 'jumping till there', its iteration and also the fragmentation of its
prospective phase in units signalled with sound-sequences that he never used in another type of context ('one...two...three!') suggests that the encoding of analytical operations other than the decomposition of events in phases is beginning at this particular period. The possibility of this being so is, indeed, crucial for the explanation of the emergence of the type of stative predications represented in Tables VI and VII.

**TABLE VI**

Luciano Time II, second period

**STATATIVE PREDICATIONS**

- **LOCATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>[-ACTUAL]</th>
<th>[+ACTUAL]</th>
<th>[-ANIMATE]</th>
<th>[+ANIMATE]</th>
<th>[-ANIMATE]</th>
<th>[+ANIMATE]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>tá af x?</td>
<td>tá x?</td>
<td>δ/óofa/olha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11.28</td>
<td>ū tá x?</td>
<td></td>
<td>δ/óia aquí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>que dé x?</td>
<td></td>
<td>ésse af</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>δ x aquí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>é qui x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>que dé x?</td>
<td></td>
<td>δ/óia/olha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;0.2</td>
<td>um tá ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x está aquí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>que dé óta x?</td>
<td></td>
<td>tá aqui x.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('Where is 'other' X?')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ondi qui tá?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('Where is it that is?')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xv. and xvi. Few occurrences of the same type as above.
TABLE VII

STATIVE PREDICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>[-ACTUAL]</th>
<th>[+ACTUAL]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiii. xiv. xv.</td>
<td>Few and ambiguous occurrences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 2;0.17</td>
<td>que que é issu?</td>
<td>tá rido (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>('What is that?')</td>
<td>('(it) is nice')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>que é issu?</td>
<td>tá chuja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>é x?</td>
<td>('(it) is dirty')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>é x</td>
<td>tá limpo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>é um x. (?)</td>
<td>('(it) is clean')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>é o x (?)</td>
<td>tá quebedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>é x de Mamãe/Papai</td>
<td>('(it) is broken')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>é rido (lindo)(?)</td>
<td>tá consertado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>é chujo</td>
<td>('(it) is fixed up')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esse aqui é x.</td>
<td>('That here is x')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables VI and VII show, indeed, the emergence, at the second period of Time II, of stative predications other than expressions of concrete spatial location.

The main fact represented in Table VII is the frequent occurrence at this period of an utterance-type which was present sporadically and inconsistently in the preceding sessions: naming-utterances with ser, characteristically 'subjectless' or elliptical, whose 'subject' was, almost always, contextually recoverable. That is, their reference was usually an object within the field of perception, attention and, sometimes, within the field of action of Luciano (e.g. in his hand, or in the toy-chest that he was searching with his hands, or in another type of container, such as a picture-book can be.)
Two types of occurrences in the same period seem to have helped us to relate the position of ser-utterances of this type in the sequence of emergence of the aspectual markers in Luciano's sample.

One of them was the high frequency of the recurrence-operator ata ('other/another') in isolated, though repetitive utterances simultaneously with repetitive movements - such as in the context of undoing the wooden brick house he had built, by taking the bricks one by one and putting them aside. Once, the numeral 'doi' was associated with one of the ata-occurrences: that is, it has followed (and possibly been substituted for) it. This seemed to be a sort of 'counting-routine', although the sequence 'um...doi...têi' was associated exclusively with his jumping activities.

It was, indeed, in a context which can be said to be the reverse of his undoing of the wooden house that an important linguistic event took place: the first and unique occurrence in the sample of a ser-locative referring to a movable entity, that is, one of the wooden bricks, which had a reproduction of a façade-clock on one of its faces.

(29) (L. is looking for the 'clock-brick'. He finds it.)
eágio tá qui, manhê!
eágio tá qui, manhê! <
('Clock is here, Mummy! Clock is here, Mummy!')
M: Ai que lindo o relógio!
('Oh, how nice is the clock!')

(Later on. Building up the 'house'.)
The reversible character of the operations mentioned above suggests that, on one side, he was marking somehow the plurality of tokens of the same class - 'his wooden bricks' - or the extension of the set 'brick', by introducing one by one in his field of observation/attention and by assigning different locations to them, and, on the other, he was neutralizing the plurality of locations which a specific brick can occupy by assigning it to a place - a normative location - the norm being enforced by his own act of saying.

The fact that the first and numerous spontaneous occurrences of E x. are in interrogative requests such as - É mamaiHo? É uesso? ('Is (it) truck?', 'Is (it) bear?') which represent his wanting his mother to confirm the name he has used to designate the object, seem to me related in a very significant way to the process described above. They seem to be used in metalinguistic operations which bear a reverse-relation with another obsessive kind of behaviour of Luciano's at the same period, that is, of requesting his mother to tell him the name of objects for which he already has a name. Instances of the question Que que é isso? ('What is that?') are as numerous as the E x? just mentioned.

The plausibility of explaining the acquisition of
the generic uses of ser in this way can be denied by the fact that our argument is based on 'counting'-routines and 'naming'-routines and on a single occurrence of ser in locatives. What, however, justifies its viability is: firstly, the number of occurrences of ser sentences of this type in Fernando's corpus at the same chronological stage and more or less at the same stage of linguistic development as Luciano; secondly, the fact that, in both samples, other types of generics (cf. the generic use of the simple present and the increase in the number of indefinite NPs-occurrences) follows the above-mentioned uses of ser.

A last point to be made about stative predications is the emergence of estar + past participle and estar + adjectives — that is, of Luciano's first adjectives apart from those which have appeared before as duplications of adults' expressions of approval and disapproval (bonito/bom vs. feio, corresponding to English nice vs. nasty). Although the frequency of this new type of estar-predications will not be significant even at Time III, it is remarkable that their emergence coincides with the transition from -utterances to present-progressives in the first period of Time II.

Both estar + past participle and estar + adjective constructions are preceded by utterances of the type 'o/olha + N + V-edo' and 'olha + N + Adj', which correspond to 'look + N + V-ed' and 'look + N + Adj' in English; i.e. by structures which differ from the ones preceding the emergence of estar-present progressives only
with respect to the predicative expression of the structure embedded in the \( \delta/\text{olha} \) matrix. Examples of it are utterances such as \textit{olha o batipo quebrado}! ('Look the brick broken!'), produced in the same context of his previous \textit{quebr-} ('broke/en') utterances, that is, to draw the attention of the interlocutor to a change of state resulting from a process unspecified relatively to the moment of the utterance-act and to its cause or agent.

2.3. **Luciano's primitive system of temporal relations at Time III**

Time III comprises eight sessions of Luciano's sample, recorded from the end of July till the end of October 1970, and corresponding to the first quarter of his third year of life.

This section has as its object the discussion of only some of the facts which characterize the child's linguistic stage of development at the period mentioned above, since the multiplicity of aspects of his movement towards the target-language, at that time, forced us to impose a further limitation in the scope of this work. Therefore, tables listing the main utterance-types of Time III will not be included in this section, their presentation being introduced in the course of the discussion. However, lists of the main verbs and adjectives used by Luciano during Time I, II and III and the frequencies of occurrence of different tense-inflections and different types of \textit{ser}- and \textit{estar}- predications will follow the exposition.
2.3.1. A new use for the preterite: Luciano's reference to situations outside his immediate deictic space

In the first period of Time I which can be characterized, syntactically, by the frequency of utterances with more than two words, Luciano seems to be capable of, and more than that, very interested, in, signalling the different phases of actions - the prospective, the progressive and the retrospective phases - performed by him. Sequences such as the ones mentioned with reference to the second period of Time II are now more frequent and richer, in the sense that the progressive is present to mark or signal the intermediary phase of his accomplishments or the on-goingness of his activities. An example of such sequences is:

(30) (M. is blowing L.'s nose with a tissue. L. starts to pinch his mother's forearm.)

\[
\text{eu tó dando ilicão a mamãe!} < \\
('I am pinching Mummy!')
\]

(M: Limpa forte...mais forte...mais ainda.
Faz de novo.
Deixa eu ver.
('Blow it strongly... stronger...stronger yet. Do it again.
Let me see.')

\[
\text{eu dei ilicão a mamãe!} < \\
('I pinched Mummy!')
\]

(M: Olha aqui...que que você quer?
('Look here...what do you want?'))

\[
\text{eu dei belicão!} < \\
('I pinched!')
\]

(M: À?)
The concomitant character of the progressive-perfective sequences illustrated above suggests, indeed, Luciano’s acquisition of the linguistic means to express his knowledge of the internal structure of events, and the way they are related to the time of the utterance-act. For him to start to ‘talk’ about temporal relations, two further steps seem to be necessary: firstly, he must start to relate the completion and cessation of actions and activities performed at a time which is not the interval immediately preceding the utterance-act to the time of the utterance-act; secondly, to relate, at least, the completion or cessation or a single event to the completion or cessation of another single event. In other words, he must learn how to order his and other people’s action relatively to one another and to the basic event, that is, to the utterance act.

That is, indeed, what Luciano starts to do already at the first period of Time III: to refer to actions performed by him before the beginning of the session (e.g. ‘tomei leitinho’ (‘I drank (my) milk’)); to refer to things which happened to him at school the day before...
(Machucou, caiu. (’Hurt (myself), fell down.’)) to refer to his activities in the week before (Eu nanei a casa da vovô (’I made nite-nite (in) Granny’s house.’)).

However, the position of these events, that is, the order of the event being described with respect to the utterance-act is not further specified as it is the case for the adult’s use of when-adverbials. The temporal expressions which occur in Luciano’s sample till much after Time III are only agola (’now’), which appears already in the first period of Time II, and vague ‘future’ references, such as depoi (’after’ or ’afterwards’) and quau e dia (’some other day’). The latter is present in his requests for new toys, more visits to the Zoo, which clearly indicates the basic situation in which they were ’learned’, that is, from his parents evasive answers to this kind of request.

As for the second step which Luciano must make in the direction of the acquisition of ways of expressing temporal relations, the second period of Time III shows his first attempts at this. These attempts are represented in the sample by his first ’narrative discourse’ instantiations, which consist of fragments of stories told to him by his sister. An example of this (in which, incidentally, the reader’s attention is drawn to the correct sequencing of indefinite and definite noun-phrases - 'bicho' followed by 'o bicho', 'ômi' followed by 'o ômi') is:
Luciano could not attend to his father's request for the continuation of the story: the sequence which follows (31) shows hesitating answers, false starts, and the usual strategy of 'changing topic/activity' to avoid a task that he is incapable of accomplishing at that time.

However, imaginary contexts were not the only contexts to contain Luciano's first expressions of relations between events through apposition of larger units within a single falling terminal prosodic matrix. Coordination with e ('and') appears once in the sample, in the context of reporting a visit to the Zoo.

(32) (L. 'tells' M. about a visit to the Zoo on the previous day.)
girafa...puquê
o usso tomô banho e o
usso saiu!
('giraffe...because.
The bear took bath and
the bear came out.')
(L. is referring to the
bear that he had seen
in the Zoo.)
*e
('Yes'.)

M: Ah, o urso tomou banho e
saiu?
('Oh, the bear took his
bath and came out?')

The comparison of (32) with Luciano's report of
having fallen and hurt himself at the school (cf. above)
also reveals his progress in the encoding of situations
which are inherently ordered in time or irreversible; and
this is an important step for his acquisition of estar +
past participle and of some types of estar + adjectives
as we will discuss later. Indeed, the order of the
conjuncts in his report of the co-related movements or
actions is parallel to the order in which they have taken
place. For him to reverse this, as adults do sometimes,
it would be necessary for him to make use of the
prepositions depois de and antes de, and, previously to
that, to include events in the set of objects of his
operations of reversibility.¹ That the notion of causality
is absent from this primitive ordering of events is
another issue partially illustrated by (32) (cf. the puquê-

occurrence above) and by other very odd uses of the causative conjunction in Time III.

The probable absence of the notion of causality from the semantic representation of Luciano's expressions of co-ordination of successive events and also the very restricted number of entities which were members of the set definable as agents, of the actions described by him - hardly exceeding a dozen at the end of Time II - seems to suggest the inadequacy of describing children's utterances at early stages in terms of semantic categories such as Agent, Action, etc.; that is, within a case-grammar model of the type proposed by Fillmore (1968).¹ In other words, the utilisation of these labels for semantic relations with a much lower degree of abstraction than the notions of agency entail necessitates some further explication of them, or an explicit restriction of their use, when applied to children's utterances. That was, indeed, what we have been trying to do throughout Part II of this work: to demonstrate that Luciano, on his way to the acquisition of more complex cognitive structures and of Portuguese, was operating with a much more concrete notion of agency. What we are suggesting is that he operates it first with spatial relations such as the notions of source and goal built up in his interaction with his immediate environment and, mainly, with the adult interlocutor. Our point of view is such that it would lead us to favour a localistic theory of case-relations of the kind proposed by Anderson (1971) rather than that put forward by Fillmore (1968).

¹ Cf. Howerman (1973), Brown (1973) and also Schlesinger (1971) and Bloom (1973) for different approaches based on the same view of the semantic relations expressed in Stage I.
A further positive consequence of Luciano's being already in possession, at Time III, of some of the adult's linguistic means of marking or signalling the completion of single events and/or of the different phases of single events is the role of these operations in the mastering of notions such as reproducibility or recurrence. This has been pointed out by Bruner:

"The use of completives provides a finite structure that permits reproducibility. And reproduction there is, for it would seem as if both infant and mother take particular pleasure in repeating acts (with variation) for which a definite completive has been agreed upon." (Bruner, 1975:13)

We now come to the last point in our discussion of the types of non-stative predications found in Luciano's sample at Time III. This has to do with the increase in the number of simple present occurrences, which were starting to appear in the second period of Time II. These occurrences are of two types; and they are in strict complementary distribution as far as the distinction of animate vs. non-animate is concerned. In other words, Luciano used simple present utterances, and mainly interrogatives, to question his parents and to talk about properties of animals and properties of objects. That is, about the actions which are recurrent within classes of objects and classes of animals.

As for objects, the recurrence of events such as the breaking of glasses, toys, etc. together with the repetition by his mother of expressions asking him to be careful with breakable objects, probably explains the innumerable instantiations of the structure X québe? ('Does x break?')
with reference to glass or glass-like objects such as his mother's cosmetics and kitchen and tableware.

As for generic uses of the simple present with animals - and wild animals - as subjects, these are much more diversified and show his attempts to distinguish the class of humans from that of non-humans. Some examples of it are: Cобра мёді ('Snake bite'), Cоба моры ны золоmites ('Snake live in the Zoo'), Uссо ным дому ('Bear don't sleep'), etc. One can hardly be in doubt, given the constant use of these 'formulas' that some genericness in the relations between a subset of animates and a subset of activities was in his mind/attention at that time.

Worth drawing attention to is also the concomitancy of the frequency of this generic use of the simple present with the emergence of the use of poder ('can') and saber ('can') with the meaning 'ability', as illustrated by (32) below, in which he rejects the reading 'permission' assigned by his father to his poder-utterance:

(32) (L. is playing at flying paper-aeroplanes with F.
His aeroplane ends on the
top of the chest of drawers.)

do aviño!
do aviño! pega!

podes pegá, paié? <
('Look the plane!
Look the plane!
Get (it)! Can (you)
get (it), father?

F: Pode, bem.

('You may, darling'.)

eu não posso pegá não! <
(emphatic)

('I cannot get it!')

(xx1. 2;1.22)
2.3.2. A new use of estar in stative predications

At Time III, Luciano's aspectual system shows a further degree of complexity in the area of stative predications, more easily detectable than the pre-temporal stage which characterizes non-stative predications in the same period.

The main direction of this development appears to be related to the notion of definiteness, that is to the encoding of at least a subset of the distinctions reflected in the choice between indefinite vs. definite NPs in the adult language. Evidence for the viability of establishing such a correlation is the fact that together with the emergence of the generic use of the simple present one finds the following types of predications:

a) existential and possessive with ter followed by NPs with a zero-degree of definiteness, such as can be exemplified by the following utterances of Luciano's:

*Tem televisão no jorna* ('There is (a) television in the newspaper') (xxi. 2:1.22) *Tem leão no zoológico*? ('Are there lions in the Zoo?') (2:3.15) *O Dâni num tem nifómi* ('Danny does not have a uniform') *Eu tenho lôpa, eu tenho uma lôpa.* ('I have clothes, I have 'a' clothes'.)

b) possessives with ser, the omission of the copula and of the preposition de being much less frequent than previously. Examples of this are: *Essa mamadeira é do Dâni* ('This bottle is Danny's') (xxiii. 2:3.8) *Esse gavadói é da*

1. The most frequent types of possessives are *x & meu/minha ('x is mine'), followed by eu tenho x ('I have x').
mamãe (This tape recorder is Mummy's') (xxi. 2;1.22).

c) ser in pseudo-cleft structures such as: É a Ídia que vai toca ('It is Ídia who is going to change') (xx. 2;1.7)
Toi o papai que arrumou (minha cama) ('It was Daddy who made (my bed)') (xxiii. 2;4.1).

Another process noted in the area of stative predications is the occurrence of prepositions such as perto de ('near'), enchima (de) ('on the top of') and embaixo de ('under') in estar-locatives, the former being more frequent and, as far as the situations in which it has occurred suggest, properly used.

More important, perhaps, than this further subcategorization of spatial relations, is the emergence, although in an initial phase still at Time III, of estar + adjectives and past participles of verbs encoding resultative processes.

Two pairs of adjectives are frequently associated in the same sequence of utterances at this time: limpo vs. sujo ('clean' vs. 'dirty') lindo vs. feio ('pretty'/'nice' vs. 'ugly'/'not nice'). Luciano seemed to play at changing the subject of it, the mode of the utterance (Interrogative/declarative) and the pair of antonyms. An example of this learning-strategy (as it probably is) is the following sequence:

(33) (M. is dressing L. after having given him a bath.
She has just put trousers on him.

tá chuja, manhã < M: Tá limpa.
('Is it dirty, Mummy') ('It is clean'.)
Td limpa? <
M: É, num tá suja.
('Yes, it isn't dirty.')

ã?
M: Num tá sujo.
('It isn't dirty.')

mamãe também <
M: Mamãe tá limpa tambe
('Mammy is clean too.')

Tá? Mamãe tá limpa?
('Is she? Mummy is clean?')
'Are you?'
M: Tá
('Yes'.)

Tá...eu num tô sujo?
('Yes...I am not dirty?')
M: Não
('No'.)

X? Tá limpa?1 <
('A? Is "it" clean?')
M: Tá
('Yes'.)

Eu tô limpo. <
('I am clean'.)
M: Eu também
('I am too'.)
(xvii. 2;0.27)

His attempts to clarify the semantic relationship between limpo and sujo in (33) can be related to a rather usual feature of his behaviour at Time III, that of denying his parents' assertions of things being good or bad, nice or ugly. It is in a context similar to those that the first utterance with an imperfective tense occurs. (34) (L. shows signs of having a cold)
M: Você está resfriado.
('You have a cold')

num tô!
('I am not!')

1. There was no means of identifying the entity to which Luciano is referring in this utterance. From his mother's answers, the trousers were probably the object in question.
(xxiii. 2;3.8)

Since the use of the imperfective to deny the actuality of a state, or its hypothetical status, is one of the features of this tense-marker in Portuguese, one could consider (34) as another indication that Luciano was starting to encode the distinction between actuality vs. non-actuality of variable states. However, both *estar* + with this type of adjectives as predicatives, as well as *estar* + past participle are not productive structures at Time III and it is in Fernando's data that we will find the necessary evidence to pursue this argument.

No conclusions will be offered at the end of this chapter, but only following the presentation of the main features which characterize Fernando's aspectual system at the beginning of the data collection and at the end of it.
### TABLE VIII

List of verbs used by Luciano in the progressive and in the preterite (by order of occurrence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progressive</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pular</td>
<td>cair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brigar</td>
<td>quebrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brincar ('play')</td>
<td>achar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bater</td>
<td>rasgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fazer x</td>
<td>dar x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pôr</td>
<td>pôr ('throw')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soprar</td>
<td>jogar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acabar</td>
<td>pegar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavar</td>
<td>tirar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>querer</td>
<td>apagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dar x em x</td>
<td>desmanchar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chamar ('call x')</td>
<td>bater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almoçar ('have lunch')</td>
<td>segurarar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ver</td>
<td>pular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>escrever ('write')</td>
<td>fazer x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desenhar ('draw')</td>
<td>soltar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pintar ('paint')</td>
<td>comer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>costurar ('sew')</td>
<td>acabar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comer ('eat')</td>
<td>lavar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dormir ('sleep')</td>
<td>dormir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vir ('come')</td>
<td>escrever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doer ('hurt')</td>
<td>sair ('leave')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomar x ('drink x')</td>
<td>deitar ('lie down')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chorar ('cry')</td>
<td>ver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nanar ('nite-nite')</td>
<td>acabar ('finish')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The data from Fernando.

Fernando’s sample, which consists of almost 10,000 utterances, will be utilized in this work mainly as a source of evidence for the interpretation we have given to the development of the aspectual system of Luciano in Times II and III: i.e. in the period characterized by the acquisition of a subset of the functions assignable to tense-inflections, ‘auxiliaries’ and ‘copulas’ in adult Portuguese.

Therefore, among the innumerable aspects of Fernando’s corpus which would deserve an extensive treatment, only those which are of particular relevance with respect to the data from Luciano, will be mentioned in this chapter. This means that data which are representative of developmental features already mentioned and described in relation to Luciano’s acquisition of aspectual markers will be either summarized in Tables or briefly mentioned. Attention will be given only to points which show a divergent development or to those which are not represented (or only partially represented) in Luciano’s sample.

Fernando’s sample has been also divided, in order to facilitate the exposition, into three periods, which correspond roughly to Time II and III of Luciano’s sample, considering the period covered by the sessions and the children’s age. At session i., Fernando is one year and nine months old, that is, he has the same age as Luciano had at session ix., which is the first session of Time II.
Tables IX, X and XI which follow the exposition display the frequencies of occurrences of different types of aspectual markers in Fernando's sample.

3.1. Fernando's aspectual system at Time I

Time I comprises eight sessions recorded between April and June 1972, thus covering approximately the end of Fernando's second year.

Table IX can be said to demonstrate that Fernando at the beginning of the data collection is already at a stage parallel to that of Luciano at the end of Time II: i.e. to be in possession of the basic means provided in Portuguese to signal the prospective, progressive and retrospective phases of events or non-stative situations.

The list below presents the verbs which co-occur with the present progressive and the preterite forms in Fernando's sample at Time I.
The main divergence between Luciano's and Fernando's types of non-stative predications has to do with their use of the Simple Present. While this form appears much later and in generic interrogative and non-interrogative utterances, and moreover, never co-occurs with definite or indefinite NPs (cf. 2.3.1.) in Luciano's sample, Fernando's frequent use of the Simple Present already

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Present Progressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(more frequent occurrences)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cair</td>
<td>abrir ('open')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achar ('find')</td>
<td>subir ('go up')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acabar ('finish')</td>
<td>descer ('go down')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guardar</td>
<td>brincar ('play')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pegar ('get')</td>
<td>chorar ('cry')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quebrar ('break')</td>
<td>cair ('fall down')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desmanchar ('undo')</td>
<td>fazer x ('make/do x')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirar ('take off')</td>
<td>comer ('eat')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segurar ('hold')</td>
<td>bater ('beat','hammer')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descer</td>
<td>passear ('go for a walk')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subir</td>
<td>nadar ('swim')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abrir</td>
<td>mergulhar ('plunge')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sair ('come out')</td>
<td>ver ('see')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chutar ('kick')</td>
<td>falar ('speak')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parar ('stop')</td>
<td>chamar ('call X')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fechar ('shut')</td>
<td>voltar ('come back')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>virar ('turn')</td>
<td>pular ('jump')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acabar ('finish')</td>
<td>segurar ('hold')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ir embora ('go away')</td>
<td>andar ('walk')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main divergence between Luciano's and Fernando's types of non-stative predications has to do with their use of the Simple Present. While this form appears much later and in generic interrogative and non-interrogative utterances, and moreover, never co-occurs with definite or indefinite NPs (cf. 2.3.1.) in Luciano's sample, Fernando's frequent use of the Simple Present already
rivalled that of the Progressive at his Time I. However, the contextual properties of Fernando's Simple Present utterances suggest his having taken this form from the adult language to fulfil other functions than that of expressing characteristic activities of classes of entities.

The main occurrence-types of Simple Present forms in Fernando's sample seem to be:

a. to signal his own 'intentions' of initiating an action, that is, simple present utterances share, at Time I, a subset of contexts with the form vai + infinitive, or Immediate Future in Portuguese;

b. to signal each unit in a chain of successive and instantaneous movements/actions performed by him. An example of what one could call Fernando's use of the instantaneous present is the sequence: Fecha, abi, fecha, abi. ('Shut, open, shut, open..') (session iii. 1;9.28).

c. to establish the way in which some specific activity would be subsequently performed by him on an object, that is, in expressions of 'normative action', which may be seen as the equivalent of deontic modality applied to non-animates. An example of this is his utterance: Esse anda assim, anda assim ('This moves like that, moves like that') when initiating the action of moving a toy-car on the floor (session ii. 1;9.20).

d. to assign characteristic kinds of behaviour not to a class of animals, but to specific dogs or cats: Esse é o cachorro, ele num mòdi, num tem dente ('This is the dog, he does not bite, he has no teeth.') (session vi. 1;10.21).

1. Compare this use of the simple present with Luciano's use of the recurrence-operator in his undoing of the wooden brick house.
Fernando's use of the simple-present in contexts such as the ones partially described above suggests that the opposition Simple Present vs. Present Progressive was, at least, partially operative in Fernando's aspectual system at Time I. Furthermore, a phenomenon parallel to this is noticeable in his use of estar-locative and ser-locative utterances. No less than twenty-two instances of ser in expressions of normative location are found in Time I. Its lower frequency later in Time II and III must be interpreted as a function of the sample. As a matter of fact, the productivity of this structure-type was closely related to the type of activity developed during the session: almost every time that he played at putting cars in different garage-boxes or played with a wooden puzzle, he assigned places to the cars and places for specific pieces of the puzzle. An example of the latter context, which could be interpreted as a normative location in which the rule is inferred from previous instantiations of the same location, is the following:

(35) (F. is looking for a piece of the wooden puzzle.)
Que dê o oto?
On tá o oto?
('Where is the other one?')
M: Tem algum buraco vazio aí?
('Is there any empty hole there?')

(F. finds the piece)

It is interesting to notice that the main divergences between Luciano's and Fernando's linguistic development, as far as aspectual markers are concerned, around the end of their second year, have to do with the way they encode recurrent or characteristic relations, that is, non-observable relations (actualized at or around the moment of the utterance-act) between entities and places and entities and actions. It seems as if Fernando is dealing with a kind of semi-generics or existential generics (cf. Dahl, 1972) before reaching the stage of using more abstract or more generic utterances, while Luciano, although starting to use simple present forms much later, reaches a higher degree of genericness in their use. But this is only one of the possible justifications of this difference in their sample. It may well be that the 'basic situations' in which Luciano and Fernando have been exposed to their parents' Simple Present utterances have differed in a way which explains the children's difference of usage.

The only difference between estar-occurrences in Fernando's and those in Luciano's sample at the same stage (and it is a somewhat minor difference) is the higher frequency of prepositional phrases expressing relative position in estar-locatives in Fernando's sample. However, with the exception of perto ('near') and embaixo ('under the
table, the bed'), it has not been possible for us to check the appropriateness of their use.

Table X shows a large number of *ser* + adjective utterances, which, indeed, do not represent any development in this direction, noticeable in Fernando's sample. As mentioned in the footnote to that class of occurrences in Time I, this structure-type was 'produced', at least in 70% of it occurring as responses elicited by his mother about colour of objects. That his perceptual-cognitive development did not allow him to answer the questions properly is clear from his performance. And this seems to be another minor piece of evidence provided by the samples used in this work that the acquisition of linguistic structures follows the perceptual and cognitive development of the child in the particular area related to the semantics of the item or subsystem to be acquired. And it demonstrates that the concept of basic situations of mutual attention and interaction are only instrumental in this process of mapping linguistic structures or subset of signals onto previously acquired cognitive ones.

Other types of *ser*-utterances present in Fernando's sample at Time I, and not just his colour-naming utterances are somewhat difficult to interpret. Although no elicitation procedures have been used by his mother (with any regularity at any rate) in order to obtain from him, naming-utterances and possessive-utterances with *ser*, it is very doubtful whether at Time I, Fernando was using these structures to express all the meanings adults can express
when they make use of them (or in all the contexts in which adults might use them).

Indeed, no features or contextual properties of ser-utterances of these types - NP + ser + NP and NP + ser + de + NP - used by Fernando at Time I, seemed to indicate that, by using them, the child was assigning particular entities to classes, according to their inherent or characteristic properties, or according to their belonging permanently to their owners, as could be the case in some instances of their use by adults.

When Fernando handed a pencil to his mother and said: "Esse é pa disenha (iv. session. 1;10.3), it seems probable that he was not classifying pencils as things one draws with ('This is for drawing'), but rather imposing an instrumental condition ('This is for you to draw with now') on his mother's subsequent action of drawing. Similarly, utterances such as "esse é du calo/da piluinha/da moca/da Mamãe ('This is the car's (x)/the van's (x)/ the lady's (x)/ Mummy's (x)') used when distributing roles and instruments before starting a certain playing-activity, seem to be interpretable as normative expressions or expressions of norms to be applied for a certain (and sometimes very short) period of time rather than expressions of permanent possession.

As a matter of fact, Fernando has many times suspended the norm or rule almost immediately, by taking from his mother the car he has just given for her to operate with in the 'traffic game' they used to play. Less instantaneous uses of ser + de + NP, could be detected in the same
period: wheels found in a corner were somehow recognized by him as belonging, or being parts of, the van or the truck; and the tape-recorder which was present every time Cristina was there (i.e. during the sessions) always elicited a series of śl da mőca ('It is the lady's').

The points made above can be related to the interpretation we have given to Fernando's instantaneous and semigeneric use of the Simple Present at Time I. They suggest that his ser-utterances are 'under-inclusive' relatively to the use of ser in the adult language. Moreover, if one compares Luciano's questions and 'statements' about characteristic activities of snakes and bears - and we are talking here of absent and non-specific snakes and bears - to the context-bound character of Fernando's expressions of normative locations for cars, normative movements or instruments for actions, it is possible to explain the earlier emergence of Simple Present and ser-utterances in Luciano's sample. And this is again suggestive of how careful one should be in assigning 'rich' interpretations to child utterances without attending to their distribution in terms of the situational-context.

The same observation applies to another type of statives which start to emerge at Time I: the use of estar with past participles. A 'prima facie' conclusion which could be drawn from the occurrence of these utterance-types - that is, of the so-called resultative-passives - in certain contexts would be that of assigning to Fernando's aspectual system at Time I a
further subcategorization of states into resultative states and non-resultative states. And this would represent a sudden and very high increase in its semantic complexity, given that such a subcategorization would involve the encoding of the notion of a result: i.e. it would involve the encoding of a specific relation between processes and states, which would need to be justified within the whole system of relations he was encoding in other areas of his linguistic system at the time.

Since the first period of Time II is partially characterized by an increase in the number of occurrences of this type of estar-utterances, counter-arguments for this possible view, will be presented in the next section.

3.2. **Fernando's primitive 'temporal' system at Time II**

Time II comprises eight sessions recorded from July to September 1972, that is, around the beginning of Fernando's third year of life.

A characteristic of his linguistic behaviour in this period - and one that can hardly be shown in Tables - is the quantitative and qualitative difference in his linguistic behaviour when requested to use language to report situations outside his immediate deictic space. An illustration of this is provided below:
(36) (M. has just arrived)

M: E escuta uma coisa...o que você fez hoje?
('And listen (to this) ...what have you done today?')

M: O que aconteceu?
('What happened?')

M: Você bateu?
('Did you hit someone?')

M: Alguém bateu em você?
('Did someone hit you?')

M: Você brigou?
('Did you have a fight?')

M: Com quem?
('With whom?')

M: A Ana?
('Ana?')

M: E a mãe brigou com ela?
('And her mother fought ('got angry') with her?')

(M. gets a pencil somewhere.)

vô pô o bolso...
vô pô u bousso...
poe...pôe u bousso?
('I am going to put it (into) the pocket...I am going to put it (into) the pocket...can I put it (into) the pocket?')
(F. goes to M.'s pocket.) M: Pode por. ('You can'.)
(And goes on talking to M. and C. as usual.)

Fernando's performance in (36) above can be seen as a function of the difficulties imposed on him by two different tasks: a. that of reporting a non-actual event, that is, something which has happened in the morning, the retrospection of which involved his reversing the order in which he used to talk about events; b. that of assigning an 'agent' (or a starting-point or source) for an action which was characteristically mutual or reciprocal, and whose meaning in the adult language involves the notion of reversibility.

It is, indeed, the factor mentioned in a. which interests us now as an explanation of Fernando's performance in (36), due to the recurrence of a similar item of linguistic behaviour in three other segments of the sample at Time II, in situations where no descriptions of reciprocal actions were involved. This seems to lead to the conclusion that Fernando was unable, in this period, to relate past events to the time of the utterance-act, or to look at them as ordered in a sense opposite to the natural order in which they take place. However, already at Time I he could signal the different phases of single actions (or repeated actions of the same type) and encode a succession of reverse movements performed by himself. Session iv. contains a long sequence in which
his-going-up-and-down onto and off a table, on which finally he sits down, is accompanied by 'proper' encoding of almost every movement. To avoid a too long exemplification-text, we will give below part of the sequence without including his mother's and Cristina's comments on the scene:

(37) Quê descê/quê descê! Ih/Ih/ desceu! Agola sobe/agola sobe/agola sobe/eu estou subindo uh uh! Agola sobe/ Fê subiu! Eu quelo sentê/eu quelo sentê....

('Want to go down/want to go down! Ih/Ih/ went down! Go up now/go up now/go up now/ I am going UP uh! uh!/ Go UP now/ Fê went UP! I want to sit down/I want to sit down....')

At Time II the same sequence of concrete (spatial) reversible operations is done and signalled with cars, but in a different way: the cars' moving-and-stopping-and-moving-again are purposeful: they stop for the engine to be repaired, for it to have the tank filled with petrol, they move to go into the garage, etc. Numerous examples of purposeful movements described with preterite and progressive forms of verbs of a higher semantic complexity than 'go up' and go 'down', are found in Sessions xiv., xv., and xvi.

Simultaneously with the emergence of sequences of acting/encoding concrete actions done with cars, etc., there appears in the sample another subtype of these structural sequences of action and encoding: what characterizes them is the fact that they have as actors (or sources of movement/action) animates, such as cats, dogs, horses which
jump, fall down, cry and sleep, swim and plunge. Their actions, however, come to exist or be in the world - that is, are made observable - through Fernando's own actions and movements. The reasons why we mention 'simulated play' in this work are perfectly justifiable on linguistic grounds: it provides the first instantiations of a tense-form with a past-reference point: the imperfective. An example is:

(39) Ah/ah/ tá caindo/ caindo/ caiu éle/esse gato é alto/ éle chulo/ e.../---- tá af/éle tava af oí/ôi/...
(etc.etc.)

(vii. 1;11.0)

(Ah/Ah/ is falling down/ falling down/ he fell down/ this cat is tall/ he cried/ ouch.../---- is there/he was there/ look/look/....(etc.etc.)')

The use of the imperfective form as a negative counterpart of actual states is not a grammatical neologism of Fernando: in adult Portuguese, these forms (mainly in stative predications) share some contexts with conditional tense-forms and signal non-actuality (i.e. past or imaginary situations) in narratives.

Moreover, imperfective forms used as negation of actual states also occur, exactly as in Luciano's sample in juxtaposition with negative structures with Simple Present of 'stative verbs'. One of the examples of this not very frequent type of juxtaposition is não tem ponta, tinha ponta ('It does not have (a) point, it had (a) point!') said about a pencil which he wanted to have sharpened (session xiii. 2;1.1).

The facts mentioned above, plus the absence of
temporal adverbials (with the exceptions of agola ('now') and depoi(s) ('afterwards')) and the increase in the number of utterances with para ('for') expressing finality or purpose, provide some grounds for us to delineate the primitive 'temporal' system which was just emerging in Fernando's Portuguese at Time II.

In order to do this, one should, first of all, exclude any notion of pastness or future from this particular system: his difficulties in relating past events to the time of the utterance-act are too obvious for it to be plausible to assume that he had acquired these temporal concepts. On the other hand, Fernando's use of the imperfective to refer to imaginary events and to states which do not obtain at the time of the utterance-act, indicates that his system for encoding temporal relations was very simple and, indeed, based, on the same operators which have been proposed as underlying Luciano's first steps in his acquisition of Portuguese. That is, Fernando at Time II seemed to be starting to relate to the utterance-act states which have ceased to obtain and imaginary events. Indeed, other instances of imperfective tenses in Time II, such as the ones with the modals poder and querer, and with the existential ter, in a narrative context (Aquela vez, tinha uma balata... ('That time (?) there was a cockroach...') confirm the interpretation [-ACTUAL] or [-DEICTIC] as the only possible one to be assigned to Fernando's temporal notions as encoded by imperfectives.
The same hypothesis seems to explain the emergence at the second period of Time I and in the first period of Time II of a new type of *estar*-constructions in Fernando's sample: the so-called resultative passives or *estar* + past participle.

Both the fact that in adult Portuguese these constructions occur in contexts which make them interpretable as expressing states resultative from the completion of processes, and the high frequency in Fernando's corpus at Time II, of *puquê* ('because' or 'why'), could be taken as arguments for assigning as an underlying component of these structures the notion of causality. There do not seem to be, however, any grounds for such a view. First of all, the only function which can be assigned to *puquê*, given its contextual properties at Time II and also at Time III, is that of a signal for the interlocutor to continue to talk about the same topic. This is, at least, what sequences such as the one partially reproduced below suggest.


This means that, similarly to the *¿* used by Luciano at the beginning of Time I, an interrogative *puquê* is the signal used by Fernando to inform his mother that he is attending to her utterance and is requesting her to supply the continuation of it. However, *¿* and *puquê*
can be said to differ in the same way as Luciano at Time I and Fernando at Time III differ as speakers and addressees: Fernando's *puqué*-utterances are signals of his, probably partial, understanding of the semantic content of his mother's utterances and of his request for her to go on providing more information about the same topic.

Another counter-argument to the assignment of meanings such as 'resultative' or 'inchoative' to the instantiations of *estar* + past participle in Fernando's sample at Time II (and III) is the characteristic discourse-contextual properties with which they occur. This feature of *estar* + past participle utterances could be described on the basis of a subset of occurrences of the form *tá quebado* ('is broken') in the first period of Time II. This subset is listed below and indicates the main expressions which were used in juxtaposition to *tá quebado* at that time:

a. *tá quebado* - num *tá bom*/num *tá bonito*/num isqueve. ('is not good'/'is not nice'/'it does not write')

b. *tá quebado* - *tá ruim*/*tá feio*/*tá sem ponta. ('Is bad/is ugly/is without point') (lit.tr.)
   (About pencils)

c. *tá quebado* - num *tá hom*/num *tá bonito*/num anda ('it does not move')

d. *tá quebado* - *tá ruim*/*tá feio*/*tá sem roda ('without wheel') (About cars)
One might go on using the data from Fernando's sample at the first period of Time II in order to establish more sets of implicational relations between his tê past participle and tê adjectives/prepositional phrases with com and sem ('with' and 'without'), as well as Simple Present and Present Progressive forms. No justification can be found, however, for aligning a resultative meaning to this construction. The glosses the child himself provides for it suggest that it is the negative operator that is the essential component of their semantic representations: tê quebado is equivalent to num isqueve/num anda, that is to say, to the negation of a state positively associated with entities such as pencils and cars, and estar expresses the observability of the negative state at the moment of the utterance act. Quebado is also semantically equivalent, at least, for Fernando, to feio or não bonito, or ruim or não bom, that is to say, to the negation of a state positively associated to the norm regarding the 'niceness' and 'goodness' of pencils and cars. Bonito vs. feio and bom vs. ruim are, indeed, the first 'adjectives' which appear in both samples, and as early as in Time I, in the case of Luciano. It is interesting to notice that their primitive meaning seems to remain almost unaltered till the end of both: they are no more than expressions of approval/disapproval. They have been learned by the children originally from their mothers in relation to their own behaviour, as it is approved or disapproved; and their polarity is determined at first by familial, and afterwards by social norms.
From what has just been pointed out, there does not seem to be any other 'meaning' underlying \textit{estar} + past participle/adjectives/prepositional phrase utterances in Fernando's sample than that of actualization (or location in the immediate perceptual space) of a state which, being variable (or movable) had as its necessary implication the negation of its negative counterpart; and this conclusion is in accord with our general hypothesis: that \textit{estar}-constructions of this type represent Fernando's first attempts in the direction of transferring his 'concrete' notion of reversibility to situations. The fact that cars can be fixed and be broken again is something that he learns; and it seems that it was this reversibility that he was trying to test by the substitution operations represented in a-d above. Such substitutions are, indeed, parallel to his going-up-and-down from the table to the chair and from the chair to the table. No evidence of his operating with a notion of resultant process or resultative state seems to be provided by the structures or discourse-segments just discussed.

Two utterances in Fernando's sample - one at session v. of Time I and the other at session xvi. of Time II, might be considered as milestones in Fernando's development of ways of encoding the co-ordination of situations in his progress towards the adult's way of encoding temporal relations. It is an interesting fact about these utterances that they both refer to toy-vehicles and share the same type of situational contexts.
They are as follows:

(40) Tá palado. Tá andando, tá palado.
   ('It has 'stopped', '/it is moving. It has stopped')
   (v. 1;10.15)

(41) O óto..tá palado..ele tá palado tocando rôba?
   ('The other..has stopped..has it stopped changing
   the wheel?') (lit. tr.)
   (xvi. 2;2,0)

In (40) the sequence estar + past participle and
estar + progressive there is a serialisation of two
different types of situations which refer to the same
entity: cessation of movement or static location/movement/
cessation of movement. The structure of (41) is much
more complex than that: the activity of 'changing the
wheel' is located within the situation 'being parked or
stopped'. One might say that Fernando is now starting to
locate up to events within the spatial frame defined by
another situation, whereas up to the end of Time II he
was reporting situations in his immediate perceptual field.

The significance of this linguistic accomplishment
of Luciano becomes even more important if one considers
it in the light of the development of a new type of
locative sentences in Time III: locative-existential
with ter.

In fact, in Time II the main function of ter-utterances
is not, as one might suppose, that of expressing possession
or ownership. The majority of the ter-utterances in the
initial phase have as their function that of assigning
to places, and the range of places Fernando seems
to refer to, as one can see from the situational context
in which ter-utterances occur, are containers such as the toy-chest, drawers, pencil-cases, under the bed, etc. It could be said that all those places belong to a single and specific category: they are definable as those in the dicitic space to which he is attending at the moment of the utterance-act, or as places where he looks for his cars, pencils, books, etc. At the end of Time II, another kind of behaviour comes to be associated with the searching-situation characteristic of Fernando's ter?utterances: the use of quantifiers following the existential copula. The following order of emergence of quantifiers in this linguistic and extralinguistic context can be approximately established:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tem oto/doi} & \quad ('\text{There is another/two}') \\
\text{tem mais} & \quad ('\text{There is more}') \\
\text{não tem mais} & \quad ('\text{There is no more}') \\
\text{tem mais um} & \quad ('\text{There is one more}') \\
\text{tem um só} & \quad ('\text{There is only one}')
\end{align*}
\]

It is almost always clear, given the properties of the situational context, which entity he is referring to or 'quantifying'. Though it is often difficult, however, to judge the correctness of his use of \text{tem um só}, this does not invalidate our interpretation of \text{um só} as one of the successors of \text{esse/ste} (that is, of the unmarked demonstrative pronoun already present in his sample at
Time I and was an equivalent of the gesture of pointing). Fernando's um só was, indeed, as context-bound as his êste (or his pointing); it was not used to refer to entities which were not contained in a more or less narrowly delimited container. No more will be said about this, however.

In Time III, Luciano's locative-existentials with ter come to be used to locate entities other than cars, car's wheels and pencils in more or less narrowly delimited areas of the deictic space. They are used to locate also situations in the field of attention of the addressee.

3.3. **Fernando's Time III: further steps towards the acquisition of a temporal system**

Time III covers the last eight sessions of Fernando's sample, which were recorded from September to November 1972; that is, from the second to the fifth month of his third year of life.

So many areas related to the topic of this work seem to be moving towards a higher degree of complexity at that time, that it becomes necessary to restrict our scope to two aspects of this development. Just to give a general view of Fernando's speech at Time III one could mention: the emergence of other auxiliaries with present progressive forms (ficar ('keep') and ir ('go'), the generic use of the simple present (already 'established' at the end of Time II); the increase in number of pseudo-cleft sentences with ser, the encoding of more types of relative position (em frente de ('in front of') and
atrás de ('behind'), the use of tag-questions, with ser. Also registered in Time III is his more systematic use of eu ('I') to replace Fê and Finando.

One of the points which seems to be more closely related to our hypothesis about the relation of estar and ter in Brazilian Portuguese is the transition mentioned above in relation to ter-locative-existentials in Fernando's speech at Time III.

First of all, the overlapping of estar- and ter-locatives is noticeable in Fernando’s speech already in Time II. In session xiii. he wants to know if Cristina has children; that is, if she is a mother like his own. The question he puts to her is indicative of his ego-centred and diéctic-centred concept of motherhood: 'Onde está o ten Finando? Você nunca viu o teu Finando?'

('Where is your Finando? Have you ever seen your Finando?')

The following utterance registered in the last session of the sample shows another phase in Fernando's use of existentials:

(43) Tá saindo dai...vo...vum...om...
Tá...tem arreia saindo dél!

('It is coming off from there...vu...vum...om.
It is...there is sand coming off of it!
Playing with a truck loaded with sand.)

(Session xxiv. 2:4.21)

The reason why we are mentioning the use of ter-existentials by Fernando as expressions of the assignment of activities to places - is that the converse of this (the assignment of places to activities) is something that he had been doing since Time II (with present-progressive
utterances followed by a locative adverbial). The fact that he can now control the expressions for the assignment of activities to places demonstrates that a higher degree of complexity was reached by him at Time III in the encoding of concrete spatial relations. Indeed, the fact that he was starting to encode relations between place and activities as distinct from those between activities and places is suggestive of his reversing the 'natural' order in which events are perceived to give priority to discourse rules. It is probable that, in the case of (43) above, the rule which could explain his use of ter in a context in which his familiar estar was possible, was that concerning the focus of the addressee's attention at the moment of the utterance act. Even if it is a very controversial matter to decide to what extent children make presuppositions concerning the adult's attention in situations such as the ones implicit in the utterances above, this does not invalidate our view on ter-utterances.

Although ter-existentials are not so frequent as estar-utterances in Time III, their emergence seems to be important in the sense that they represent a new type of encoding spatial relations which would allow him to refer to entities not present in his immediate perceptual field, as it is the case when adults make use of them. That is tantamount to saying that the use of ter-constructions represents another step in the direction of the acquisition of a system to signal temporal relations between events.

As a matter of fact, it is also in Time III that the
### TABLE IX

**FERNANDO - NON-STATIVE PREDICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>L.A. FUT.</th>
<th>PRETERITE</th>
<th>PROGRESSIVE</th>
<th>SIMPLE PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME I</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;9.5-1;11.6</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME II</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11.15-2;2.0</td>
<td>xii</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME III</td>
<td>xvii</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>xviii</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;2.5-2;4.21</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. R stands for 'regularly used'. However, no claim is made that there is a one-one correspondence holding between the 'regular' use of the item by the child in restricted contexts and the set of contexts in which it appears in adult Portuguese. The term 'regular', as used here, implies nothing more than the following: The form in question occurs with considerable frequency and its use by the child presents no immediately obvious discrepancies with adult usage, as far as the aims and scope of the present work are concerned. We have little doubt that further investigation of many of the utterances here described as 'regular' (and in particular those containing the Simple Present at Time III) would reveal many additional features of interest.
TABLE X

FERNANDO - STATIVE PREDICATIONS WITH SER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>SER+NP</th>
<th>SER+NP (Poss.)</th>
<th>SER+Adj.</th>
<th>SER+Adv. (locative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME I</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;9.5-1;11.6</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME II</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11.15-2;2.0</td>
<td>xii</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xii</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME III</td>
<td>xvii</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>xviii</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;2.5-2;4.2</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxiii</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Seventy per cent of the number of occurrences of type ser + Adj are 'colour-naming' utterances elicited by the adult. The child's systematically incorrect responses allow us to assign only a 'place-holder' function either for the adjective or for the utterance.
### TABLE XI

**FERNANDO - STATIVE PREDICATIONS WITH ESTAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME I</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;9.5-1;11.5</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME II</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11.15-2;2.0</td>
<td>xii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME III</td>
<td>xvii</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age:</td>
<td>xviii</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;2.5-2;4.21</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxii</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxiii</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxiv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
first conjunctions of preterites referring to actions performed by him before the time of the utterance-act appear in his sample. Both have as their first conjunct the preterite of *ir* ('go') - *fui lá e diligui* ('I went there and switched it off') and *fui lá e pegui* ('I went there and got it'), which seems again to suggest how much his encoding of non-actual relations was restricted to movements performed in a little enlarged deictic space.

A final remark before setting forth some conclusions on the basis of the comparison between Luciano's and Fernando's data on the acquisition of aspectual operators. At the end of both samples, in spite of their different rate of development in certain areas and in spite of their presumably different strategies and approaches to language use, no temporal relations between events or situations are encoded by Luciano's and Fernando's already relatively long utterances.

4. Some tentative conclusions

4.1. Comparison between the sequences of emergences of aspectual markers in Luciano's and Fernando's samples

A rather similar pattern of development arises from the comparison of the data concerning acquisition of tense-markers in the two samples:
### TABLE XII

**NON-STATIVE PREDICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (appr.)</th>
<th>Luciano</th>
<th>Fernando</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1;9</td>
<td>modal qué</td>
<td>modals <em>(querer and poder)</em> (perm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immediate fut.</td>
<td>immediate fut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perfective <em>(large no. of verbs)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10</td>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(instantaneous and semi-generic)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;0</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td>simple present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>poder</em> (perm.)</td>
<td><em>(generic)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;2</td>
<td>simple present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(generic)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XIII

**STATIVE PREDICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (appr.)</th>
<th>Luciano</th>
<th>Fernando</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1;9</td>
<td><em>estar</em> (locative)</td>
<td><em>estar</em> (locative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ser</em> (locative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ser</em> (normative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;10</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ser</em> (possessive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;0</td>
<td><em>ser</em> (possessive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ser</em> (locative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ser</em> (generic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;1</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ter</em> (exist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;2</td>
<td><em>estar</em> - <em>adje</em></td>
<td><em>estar</em> - past, partic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ter</em> (exist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;4</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>estar</em> - <em>adje</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the tables above are not intended to represent more than a very superficial view of the rapid development of a system of aspectual markers in a period of six months around the transition from the second to the third year of life of both children, they seem to show a certain consistency in the general lines of development.

As for the opposition between ser and estar, it is very interesting to notice that the acquisition of estar follows very closely its development as a 'copula' and as an 'auxiliary' in the Iberian Romance as reported by Bouzet (1953): estar in locatives and estar as an auxiliary of the progressive emerge almost simultaneously, while estar - past participle, followed by estar-adjective (as in Fernando's sample) are later developments.

As for the difference represented in the Table between the position of ser-predications in the sequence of emergence of aspectual markers in Fernando's sample relatively to that of Luciano it can be considered as evidence for our view on ser as unmarked for actuality, that is, as expressing a relation which is unordered relatively to the perceptual field of the speaker and/or of the addressee. In Fernando's sample, the non-actuality of ser is a function of the normative contexts in which it is used as a marker of the non-observability of the relation at the moment of the utterance act. And this is consistent with the emergence of the Simple Present of activities to encode non-generic, i.e. either instantaneous
or normative activities. This also explains the earlier emergence of these forms in the child's sample: it would be, indeed, very difficult to justify, from the point of view of the child's cognitive development, the assignment of generic interpretations to utterances produced by Fernando in Time I.

As for Luciano's late use of *ser*-structures (and of Simple Present forms), this should be explained by relating them to other features of his verbal behaviours at the time: that is, his interest in finding out characteristic attributes of a very small number of classes of entities (cf. our discussion of the use of Simple Present by Luciano in 2.3.). The non-actuality of his *ser*-predications could be interpreted indeed, as his first instantiations of descriptive normatives or generics.

Although it is outside the scope of this work to compare and discuss data on the acquisition of aspectual markers in relation to languages other than Brazilian Portuguese, it is worth pointing out the contrast between our findings with respect to the acquisition of Portuguese by Fernando and Luciano and Brown's data on the acquisition of grammatical morphemes by Adam, Sarah and Eve. The main point of divergence (between the facts represented in Tables XII and XIII and Brown's data (1973:271) refers to the late emergence of past tense in the process of acquisition of English comparatively to the acquisition of Portuguese by Luciano and Fernando. Apart from the problem of comparing data which have been analysed with different criteria, the hypothesis that such a divergence is a function of the language acquired, or is language-dependent,
seems plausible. The perceptual salience of the unmarked form of the preterite in Portuguese (cf. our discussion about the origin of bó in Luciano's Time I, 2.1.) could be considered a factor coadjuvant in the earlier acquisition of such morpheme in Portuguese. On the other side, aspectually-marked character of the Portuguese verbal system, of which the ser vs. estar opposition is a manifestation, can also explain the earlier emergence of operators or markers to signal the distinctions which are basic in the adult language.

4.2. **Concluding remarks**

In the discussion of Luciano's and Fernando's data in Part II of this work a contrast was drawn informally between the contextual distribution of a certain form in the sample and its function in the adult use of language. Generally, a hyponymous relation was hypothesised between the contextual extension of the form in question and that of the adult's, pointing to the over-inclusive character of units of different size and origin in the adult language. Of course, Luciano's first bó, at Time I, is an example of it, as well as other forms which in both samples have later been replaced. The reverse process can be said to characterise the child's use of nouns. The under-inclusive character of naming in the child's language is, indeed, rather uncontroversial.

What we would like to emphasise, in fact, to make the main conclusion, is the basic nature of these processes, which sets the investigator the task of following through
time the diverse degrees of specification and generalisation that are required of the child as the deictic coordinates of its utterance-acts are gradually enlarged. This justifies the importance given in the analysis of Luciano's data to the operators o and bo, that is, to the holophrastic period, regarded by some investigators as of no linguistic significance.

But by leaving aside, or by not relating to the "syntactic period", the data from the holophrastic stage, a great amount of information seems to be lost, namely situational-distributional properties of the major operators in the holophrastic period. In the subsequent stage these operators are replaced by new forms, but investigations that do not make the above mentioned connection have the obvious result that the new forms, which can be assigned only a little degree of complexity in relation to its precursor, is seen as a completely new function and is given labels according to the theoretical assumptions of the investigator about the adult's language, e.g. Pivot, Agent, Object, NP, etc.

It is my contention that [+ ACTUAL] or [+ LOC] and [+ NEG] [+ LOC] being defined by [+EGO] are adequate interpretations of the relations encoded by Luciano and Fernando, although they encode these relations by means of adult language, using what are apparently prospective, progressive and preterite tenses. These are to be taken as representing the child's encoding or situations as observable or non-observable; that is, of their primitive notion of existence as location in their perceptual field.
If we had excluded from my investigation the holophrastic stage, we would not, probably, have arrived at this more fundamental interpretation of these "tense forms".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHL</td>
<td>Bulletin Hispanique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>Bulletin of Hispanic Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSL</td>
<td>Bulletin de la Societe de Linguistique de Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Cahier de Ferdinand de Saussure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWPL</td>
<td>Edinburgh Working Papers in Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Foundations of Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hisp.Calif</td>
<td>Hispania California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Indian Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.Child Lang.</td>
<td>Journal of Child Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Journal of Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Linguistiche Berichte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lg.</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ling.Inqu.</td>
<td>Linguistic Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLJ</td>
<td>Modern Languages Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMLA</td>
<td>Publications of Modern Languages of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFE</td>
<td>Revista de Filologia Espanola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRLing</td>
<td>Revue Rumanie de Linguistique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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