Chapter 6: The syntax of polarity

6.1. Introduction
In this chapter we will discuss how the two different values of clausal polarity, namely positive and negative, are grammatically encoded and describe the particular manifestations of polarity distinctions in European and Brazilian Portuguese.

The chapter is organized in three main parts: (i) section 6.2, which is dedicated to the Portuguese answering system, with a particular focus on the different types of affirmative answers to yes/no questions; (ii) section 6.3, which deals with emphatic affirmation as the grammatical manifestation of positive disagreement; (iii) sections 6.4 to 6.8, which are concerned with negation, namely: regular negation in declarative clauses, emphatic negation and metalinguistic negation as instances of denial, expletive negation and, last but not least, negation in interrogatives. Section 6.9 gives a conclusive synthesis of the main facts discussed in the chapter, highlighting under a comparative view the common and the particular features of European and Brazilian Portuguese.

6.2. Answers to yes/no questions

Polarity-focus/Polar answering systems are of different types but are crosslinguistically organized around the dichotomies positive/negative and agreement/disagreement. Most languages display binary patterns, either centred in the positive/negative opposition, as in English, or in the agreement/disagreement opposition, as in Japanese:
English
(1)  A. Did you not go to school yesterday?
     B. Yes, I did.  
     C. No, I didn’t.  

Japanese\(^1\)
(2)  A. Did you not go to school yesterday?
     B. Yes, I did.
     C. No, I didn’t.

Ternary systems, as found in German or French (see (3) to (6)) – as well as the rarer quaternary systems\(^2\) – make salient both the positive/negative dichotomy and the agreement/disagreement dichotomy.

German
(3)  A. Ist er da?
     B. Ja, er ist da.
     C. Nein, er ist nicht da.

(4)  A. Ist er nicht da?
     B. Doch, er ist da.
     C. Nein, er ist nicht da.

French
(5)  A. Is he coming?
     B. Yes, he will come.
     C. No, he will not come.

(6)  A. Is he not coming?
     B. Yes, he will come.
     C. No, he will not come.

\(^1\) Example taken from Kuno (1994:273)
\(^2\) See on this matter Pope (1976) and Jones (1999).
B  b.  Si, il viendra.  
    yes, he will come

c.  Non, il ne viendra pas.
    no, he NEG will-come NEG
    ‘No, he isn’t coming.’

Under further inspection, however, languages in general can express distinctly the four values – *positive agreement* (PA), *positive disagreement* (PD), *negative agreement* (NA), *negative disagreement* (ND) –, though most of them not through four distinct lexical items. Take English, for instance. While bare *yes* expresses positive agreement, it cannot express positive disagreement, as illustrated in (7).3

(7)  
A  a.  He went, didn’t he?
    B  b.  Yes.  

(8)  
A  a.  He didn’t go, did he?
    B  b.  Yes, he did.
    c.  *Yes.

Thus the difference between English and German with respect to their answering systems is quite superficial. In fact, both languages grammatically express at least a three-way distinction, although only in German is the tri-partition lexically grounded. English displays a syntactic strategy to split PD from PA, as exemplified above.4

In this section we will describe the Portuguese answering system. We will firstly observe European Portuguese minimal and extended answers to yes/no questions (also known as polar questions). The distinction between bare verb answers and answers with the word *sim* ‘yes’ will be a topic of central concern. We will then contrast European Portuguese with Brazilian Portuguese. Although the two varieties broadly display similar answering systems, BP shows the effects of adaptation to the near loss of (non-emphatic) *sim*-answers.5

As the expression of positive disagreement is not restricted to question/answer contexts, the observations about the grammatical expression of PD in Portuguese introduced in the current section, will be pursued and completed in section 6.3 below.

Verbal answers like in (9b) constitute the unmarked pattern of minimal positive/affirmative answers to yes/no questions in Portuguese (both in EP and BP). But the word *sim* ‘yes’ can also occur in minimal positive/affirmative answers in EP (see (9c)). The negative word *não* ‘no’ represents the unmarked option for minimal negative answers to yes/no questions (see (9d)). Extended answers, like (9e) to (9g), are also available.

(9)  
A  a.  Comeste a sopa?
    ate-1SG the soup
    ‘Did you eat the soup?’
    B  b.  Comi.
    ate-1SG
    ‘Yes, I did.’

---

4 Pragmatic and Prosodic strategies are also available to distinguish PD from PA and ND from NA, but in this chapter we will be only concerned with lexical and syntactic ways of encoding polarity distinctions.
5 See on this matter the sociolinguistic study of Kato & Tarallo (1992), and Oliveira (1996).
A further pattern of minimal answer to yes/no questions is attested in Portuguese when certain aspectual, modal or focusing adverbs are present in the question. In this case an adverbial answer is, in general, available in addition to the other options for positive/affirmative answers:

(10) A  a. Já comeste a sopa?  
   already ate-2SG the soup  
   ‘Did you eat the soup already?’

   already

c. Comi.  
   ate-1SG

d. Sim. (EP)  
   yes

e. Sim, já. (EP)  
   yes already

 f. Já, sim. (BP)  
   already yes

g. Sim, comi. (EP)  
   yes ate-1SG  
   ‘Yes, I did.’

 h. Comi, sim. (BP)  
   ate-1SG yes (BP  
   ‘Yes, I did.’

Now that we have identified the different patterns of answer in Portuguese, we will be concerned with their contextual distribution and differential properties. We will start with European Portuguese, knowing that most (but not all) that will be said about European Portuguese covers Brazilian Portuguese as well. The similarities and contrasts between the two varieties will be explicitly addressed in section 6.2.6.

6.2.1. Minimal answers to yes/no questions in EP

Question/answer pairs constitute standard tests to establish how PA, PD, NA and ND are expressed in a given language. Positive yes/no questions, like “Is he going out today?”, or tags that anticipate a positive answer, like “He is going out today, isn’t he?”, give rise to utterances expressing positive agreement or negative disagreement.
Negative yes/no questions, like “Is he not going out today?”, or tags that anticipate a negative answer, like “He is not going out today, is he?”, give rise to utterances expressing positive disagreement or negative agreement. This is illustrated in (11) to (14).

(11) A a. Ele hoje vai sair?  
   ‘He is going out today?’
   B b. Vai.  
   go-3SG
   c. Sim.
   yes
   d. Não.  
   no
   positive agreement
   negative disagreement

(12) A a. Ele hoje não vai sair?  
   ‘He is not going out today?’
   B b. Vai.  
   go-3SG
   c. #Sim.
   yes
   d. Não  
   no
   positive agreement
   negative agreement

(13) A a. Ele hoje vai sair, não vai?  
   ‘He is going out today, isn’t he?’
   B b. Vai.  
   go-3SG
   c. Sim.
   yes
   d. Não.  
   no
   positive agreement
   negative disagreement

(14) A a. Ele hoje não vai sair, pois não?  
   ‘He is not going out today, is he?’
   B b. Vai.  
   go-3SG
   c. *Sim.
   yes
   d. Não.  
   no
   positive disagreement
   negative agreement

The data in (11) to (14) exhibit a first definite contrast between verbal answers and sim-answers. The fact that sim ‘yes’, in contrast to the verb, cannot constitute a positive answer to a negative question or a tag anticipating a positive answer (see (12) and (14)) shows that sim is unable to express positive disagreement (PD), a role
reserved to the verb. Bare *sim*-answers express positive agreement (PA). As an answer to a negative question (see (12)), *sim* could only be interpreted as expressing negative agreement. But this interpretation is difficult to get when *sim* occurs without a continuation7 (cf. section 6.2.2) and the availability of an alternative answer with *não* blocks the choice of *sim* to express negative agreement. As for the negative word *não* ‘no’, it can signal both agreement and disagreement (NA/ND).

The facts revealed by the data in (12) to (14) above are schematized in table 1.

| Table 1: Minimal answers to yes/no questions in EP |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|
| positive answer | agreement | disagreement |
| verb / *sim* (‘yes’) | verb |
| *não* (‘no’) | *não* (‘no’) |

By being restricted to the expression of polar agreement, the Portuguese word *sim* openly diverges from the word *sí* in close related languages, like Spanish or Catalan. In these languages, verbal answers are not available and the affirmative word *sí* expresses both positive agreement (PA) and positive disagreement (PD), as shown in (15) and (16) – cf. French, illustrated by example (4) above.

**Spanish**

(15) [A] a. ¿(No) va a ir al cine hoy Juan?
(not) goes to go to-the cinema today J.
‘Is John (not) going to the movies today?’

6 Negative interrogatives that are not standard questions but polite requests, invitations or comments may anticipate a positive answer. In this case, *sim*-answers are permitted because they are instances of PA:

(i) A a. Não me podes emprestar uma caneta, por favor?
not me can-2SG lend-INFIN a pen please
‘Could you lend me a pen, please?’

B b. Sim (claro).
yes (of course)
c. Posso (claro)
can-1SG (of course)
d. Empresto (claro)
‘Yes, of course.’

(ii) A a. Não está crescido o meu filho?
not is grown-up the my son
‘Isn’t my son so grown up?’

B b. Está.
is
c. Sim.
yes
‘Yes, he is.’

7 A probable continuation for the *sim* answer to a negative question would be the further question “*Sim, o quê?*” (‘yes, what’), which might be answered with an extended question introduced by *sim*:

(i) A a. Ele hoje não vai sair?
he today not goes go-out-INFIN

B b. #Sim.
yes

A c. *Sim, o quê?*
yes what?

B d. *Sim, não vai sair.*
yes not goes go-out-INFIN
‘Yes, he is not going out.’
Let us now turn to adverbial answers.\(^8\) Recall that we will be concerned with the pattern of answer that typically repeats an adverbial word present in the question, not with answers built with evidential adverbials like claro/evidentemente/sem dúvida (‘sure/evidently/of course’). Core adverbs defining the pattern that we will be discussing now are tambéim ‘also’, só ‘only’, já ‘already, yet’, ainda ‘still, yet’, quase ‘almost’, talvez ‘maybe’, sempre ‘always’.

Já and ainda do not necessarily repeat a word in the question; they can instead stand for each other in a question/answer pair. The degree adverb quase ‘almost’, the epistemic modal talvez ‘maybe’, and to a certain extent the temporal sempre may enter or escape the repetition pattern, since they can constitute an answer to a yes/no question even if they do not occur in the question. The contrast between adverbs like talvez ‘maybe’, quase ‘almost’, sempre ‘always’, that can escape the repetition pattern, and adverbs like tambéim ‘also’, só ‘only’, that are strictly subordinated to it, is illustrated in (17) to (21).

(17)  A  a.  Vais ao cinema?
       go-2SG to-the movies
       ‘Are you going to the movies?’

\(^8\) On this topic, see Santos (2002, 2003).

\(^9\) Santos (2002:453) offers the example in (i) as evidence that adverbial answers require that the relevant adverb be preverbal in the question. The second author agrees with Santos’ judgment but is aware of the fact that some EP speakers allow answers like (ib). Moreover, at least the temporal adverb sempre and the focusing adverb só ‘only’ seem to generally escape the proposed restriction (see (ii)-(iii)). Finally, note that with respect to já ‘already’, the postverbal position seems to be a right-dislocated marked position.

(i)  A  a.  Ele tem muitos já?
       he has many already?
       B  b.  *Já
               already
       c.  Tem.
           has
           ‘Yes.’

(iii) A  a.  Ele sempre gostou dela? / Ele gostou sempre dela?
            he always liked her / he liked always her
            B  b.  Sempre.
               always
               ‘Yes, always.’

(iv) A  a.  Ele só disse mentiras? / Ele disse só mentiras?
            he only said lies / he said only lies
            B  b.  Só.
              only
              ‘Yes.’
A a. Terminaste o trabalho de casa?
B b. Quase.

‘Did you finish the homework?’

A a. Lês poesia?
B b. Sempre.

‘Do you usually read poetry?’

A a. O Pedro pediu morangos. E tu, queres morangos?

‘Peter is going to have strawberries. Do you want strawberries too?’

A a. Ele gosta de morangos?
B b. *Só.

‘Does he like strawberries?’

We find some variation but a broad similarity in the behaviour of the answering adverbs we are considering, as the data in (22) to (37) reveal. All the relevant adverbs express positive agreement and negative agreement. In general, they express negative agreement in association with the negative marker, but talvez ‘maybe’, quase ‘almost’ and só ‘only’ can also do it by themselves. In association with the negative marker, most adverbs can also express negative disagreement (ainda ‘still, yet’, já ‘already, yet’, talvez ‘maybe’, sempre ‘always’, só ‘only’), while a few are exclusively agreeing words (também ‘also’, quase ‘almost’).

The crucial generalization about answering adverbs is that they are typically unable to express positive disagreement. In this respect adverbial answers are more akin to sim-answers than to verbal answers, as the data in (22) to (37) attest. The exception is the adverb já ‘already’ when it answers a question including the adverb ainda ‘yet’ (see (31)). In section 6.3, we will see that já is also the only adverb that can express positive disagreement through a reduplication pattern similar to the verb reduplication pattern

A a. Ele também vai viajar?
B b. Também.

‘Is he also travelling?’

A a. Ele também vai viajar?
B b. Também.

positive agreement

A a. Ele também vai viajar?
B b. *Também não.

also not
(23) A a. Ele também não vai viajar?
  he also not goes travel
  ‘Is he not going to travel either?’

  B b. Também não.  negative agreement
      also not

    c. *Também.  also

(24) A a. Só ele disse a verdade?
  only he said the truth
  ‘Was he the only one to tell the truth?’

  B b. Só.  positive agreement
      only

    c. Não só.  negative disagreement
      not only

(25) A a. Só ele não disse a verdade?
  Only he not said the truth
  ‘Was he the only one not to tell the truth?’

  B b. Só.  negative agreement
      only (= ‘He was the only one not to tell the truth’)

    c. Não só.  negative disagreement
      not only (= ‘He wasn’t the only one not to tell the truth.’)

(26) A a. Só ontem recebeste a minha carta?
  only yesterday received-2SG the may letter
  ‘Did you receive my letter only yesterday?’

  B b. Só.  positive agreement
      only

    c. *Não só.  negative disagreement
      not only

(27) A a. Só ontem não recebeste correio?
  only yesterday not received-2SG mail
  ‘Was it but yesterday that you didn’t receive any mail?’

  B b. Só.  negative agreement
      only

    c. *Não só.  negative disagreement
      not only (= ‘It wasn’t only yesterday that I didn’t receive any mail.’)

(28) A a. Ele já chegou a casa?
  he already arrived at home
  ‘Has he arrived home yet?’

  B b. Já.  positive agreement
      already

    c. Ainda não.  negative disagreement
      yet not
(29) A a. Ele já não vai viajar?
he already not goes travel-INFIN
‘Is he not travelling anymore?’

B b. Já não.
already not

c. *Ainda/*Já.
still/already

(30) A a. Tu ainda vais a casa?
you still go to home
‘Are you going home yet?’

B b. Ainda.
positive agreement
still

c. Já não.
negative disagreement
yet not

(31) A a. Tu ainda não foste a casa?
you yet not went to home
‘You haven’t been home yet?’

B b. Ainda não.
negative agreement
yet not

c. Já.
positive disagreement
already

(32) A a. Ele talvez venha?
he maybe come-3SG-SUBJUNCTIVE
‘Might he come?’ / ‘Might it be that he will come?’

B b. Talvez.
positive agreement
maybe

c. Talvez não.
negative disagreement
maybe not

(33) A a. Ele talvez não venha?
he maybe not come
‘Might he not come?’ / ‘Might it be that he won’t come?’

b. Talvez/Talvez não.
negative agreement
maybe/maybe not

(34) A a. Ele quase comeu o bolo todo?
he almost ate the cake all
‘Did he eat almost the all cake?’

B b. Quase.
positive agreement
almost

c. *Quase não.
almost not

(35) A a. Ele quase não conseguia ganhar a corrida?
She almost not get to-win the race
‘Is it true that she almost didn’t win the race?’

B b. Quase/*Quase não.
negative agreement
almost/almost not
We will return to the issue of minimal answers and their different types in sections 6.2.3 and 6.2.4. Before we go into that, we need to briefly consider the patterns of extended answers to yes/no questions.

6.2.2. Extended answers to yes/no questions in EP

Observing the patterns of extended answers to yes/no questions in EP may contribute to further clarify how sim-answers differ from verbal answers. Here we will approach extended answers in this perspective, postponing until sections 6.3 and 6.4.3 a thorough treatment of the different syntactic strategies available in Portuguese to express emphatic affirmation and emphatic negation (i.e. positive/negative disagreement in the context of a tag question or a declarative). In the present section we will not deal with adverbial answers either.  

Typically, if one of the relevant adverbs is present in the question, answers including the adverb and mirroring the patterns found with the verb add to the set of possible answers:

(i)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>O João já saiu?</td>
<td>Sim, saiu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the J. already left</td>
<td>yes left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Did John leave yet?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sim, já.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sim, já saiu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes already left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Yes, he did.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the J. yest not left</td>
<td>no not left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Didn’t John leave yet?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Não, ainda não.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no yest not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Não, ainda não saiu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no yet not left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Yes, he did.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In extended answers to yes/no questions, *sim* ‘yes’ and the verb or *não* ‘no’ and the negated verb co-occur, as illustrated in (38) to (41).

(38)  
A a. O João hoje vai sair?
the J. today goes go-out-INFIN
‘Is John going out today?’
B b. Sim, vai.
yes, goes
‘Yes, he does.’
c. Não, não vai.
no, not goes
‘No, he doesn’t.’

(39)  
A a. O João hoje vai sair, não vai?
the J. today goes go-out-INFIN, not goes
‘John is going out today, isn’t he?’
B b. Sim, vai.
yes goes
‘Yes, he does.’
c. Não, não vai.
no, not goes
d. Não vai não.
not goes no
‘No, he doesn’t.’

d. Não vai não.

(40)  
A a. O João não vai sair hoje?
the J. today not goes go-out-INFIN
‘Isn’t John going out today?’
B b. Vai (sim).
went, goes yes
‘Yes, he does.’
c. Não, não vai.
no not goes
d. Sim, não vai.
not goes no
‘No, he doesn’t.’

d. Não vai não.

(41)  
A a. O João não vai sair hoje, pois não?
the J. today not goes go-out-INFIN, *POIS*-CONFIRMATIVE no
‘John isn’t going out today, is he?’
B b. Vai, vai.
went, goes
‘Yes, he does.’
c. Vai sim.
went, goes yes
d. Vai pois.
went *POIS*-CONFIRMATIVE
‘Yes, he does.’
e. Não, não vai.
no not goes
‘No, he doesn’t.’

d. Não vai não.
f. Não vai não.
   not goes no
   ‘No, he doesn’t.’

Two facts are of particular interest. First, *sim* can express negative agreement if it
is associated with a verbal tag that clarifies its meaning (see (40d)). Second, in the
case of a tag question that anticipates a negative answer, *sim* can contribute to
express positive disagreement but it occurs in this case in final position (see (41c) and
section 6.3).

While the former fact indicates that polarity *sim* is basically an agreeing word (not
an inherently affirmative word) whose content must be established by its antecedent, the
latter fact seems to contradict this conclusion. The contradiction may be only apparent,
though. It is reasonable to admit that the antecedent of sentence-initial polarity *sim* is
the preceding interrogative sentence while the antecedent of sentence-final *sim* is the
(left-peripheral) constituent co-occurring with *sim* within the same sentence. In this
case, *sim* reinforces the assertive meaning of its antecedent.

The main result of this brief incursion in the domain of extended answers to
yes/no questions is the conclusion that *sim*-answers express agreement with the content
of a close antecedent. Verbal answers, in contrast, express an affirmative assertion;
because they are not bound to the polar properties of the interrogative sentence of a
question/answer pair, they can freely express both disagreement and agreement.

The facts revealed by the data in (38) to (41) above are schematized in table 2.
Comparing table 1 above with table 2 below, shows that when we consider
extended answers (especially as they emerge in the context of tag questions), we obtain
a richer picture of how Portuguese grammar encodes the distinctions between PA, PD,
NA and ND. A four-way grammatical distinction corresponding to the four-way
conceptual distinction is now visible, although NA and ND, differently from PA and
PD, can still be expressed in a similar way. We will return to the issues of positive
disagreement and negative disagreement in sections 6.3 and 6.4.3 respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td><em>sim</em>, verb ‘yes, verb’</td>
<td>verb-verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb <em>sim</em> ‘verb-yes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb <em>pois</em> ‘verb-confirmative word’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td><em>não, não</em> verb ‘no-not-verb’</td>
<td><em>não, não</em> verb ‘no-not-verb’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sim, não</em> verb ‘yes-not-verb’</td>
<td><em>não</em> verb ‘not-verb-no’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.3. Verbal answers are not necessarily *echo-answers*

In most cases, Portuguese verbal answers repeat the finite verb occurring in the question
and can thus be thought of as *echo-answers* (see Jones 1999). In this section we will see
that verbal answers do not necessarily qualify as *repetitions* as the verbal form in the
answer can differ from the verbal form in the question in more than person/number features.

When the auxiliary verb *ter* ‘have’, forming a compound perfective tense, or an
epistemic modal like *poder* ‘can’, originating an infinitival structure, are part of the
interrogative sentence of a question/answer pair, the bare verb answer may be constituted by the auxiliary verb or instead by the main verb:¹¹

(42) A a. Eu não vos tinha contado isto?
I not you had told this
‘I had told you this, didn’t I?’
B b. Tinhas.
had-2SG

(c. Contaste.
told-2SG
‘Yes, you had.’

(43) A a. Ele tem tomado os comprimidos?
he has taken the pills
‘Has he been taking his pills?’
B b. Tem.
has
c. Toma.
takes
‘Yes, he has.’

(44) A a. Podes emprestar-me uma caneta?
can-2SG lend-me a pen
‘Could you lend me a pen?’
B b. Posso.
can-1SG
c. Empresto.
lend-1SG
‘Yes, I can.’

In Portuguese, the morphological present tense can semantically express future tense. Question/answer pairs may then display the morphological future in the question but the morphological present in the answer (which is more natural than repeating the morphological future in the answer):

(45) A a. Farás isso por mim?
will-do-2SG that for me
‘Will you do that for me?’
B b. Faço.
do-1SG-PRESENT
c. Farei.
will-do-1SG
‘Yes, I will.’

¹¹ The fact that verbal answers can pick up the main verb in the question instead of the auxiliary verb shows that verbal answers are not a mere instance of VP-ellipsis (see chapter xxx). On the differences between verbal answers and VP-ellipsis, see Jones (1999).
(46) A a. Mentirás para o encobrir?
   will-lie-2SG to him-ACC cover
   ‘Will you lie to protect him?’

   B b. Minto.
   lie-1SG-PRESENT
   c. ?Mentirei.
      will.lie-1SG
      ‘Yes, I will.’

Questions with a verbal sequence constituted by the auxiliary acabar por plus infinitive (literally: ‘finish by’ = ‘end up, after all, eventually’) do not license repetition of the auxiliary and are either answered with the main verb or with sim (cf. section 6.2.4 below).

(47) a. Ele acabou por ler o livro?
   he finished by read-INFIN the book
   ‘Did he end up reading the book?’ / ‘Did he read the book after all?’

   b. *Acabou.
      finished-3SG-PAST

c. Leu.
   read-3SG-PAST
   ‘Yes, he did’ = ‘He read the book.’

d. Sim.
   yes
   ‘Yes, he did.’ = ‘He ended up reading the book / He read the book after all.’

A particular kind of interrogative sentences include the morphological future or conditional with an epistemic modal value (of doubt, uncertainty, probability). Such interrogatives can only be answered by changing the tense of the verb form (into present or past), as the epistemic future/conditional is not admitted in bare verb answers (see (48) and (49)). Relevantly, sim-answers are unnatural in this context because sim, in contrast to the bare verb form, cannot (unambiguously) ‘undo’ the modal content of the preceding interrogative.

(48) A a. Estou tão nervosa. O João teria passado no exame?!
   am so nervous. the J. would-have passed in-the exam
   ‘I’m so nervous. Might John have passed the exam?’

      would-have-3SG

c. Passou. (Possible continuation: ‘It was him at the phone’.)
   passed-3SG

   d. #Sim. (Probable follow-up by A: Sim, o quê? ‘yes, what?’)12
      yes

   e. Sim, passou.
      yes, passed-3SG
      ‘Yes, he did.’

12 For some EP speakers, sim-answers are allowed in this context if they have a particular intonation (i.e. a strong prosodic accent on the word sim).
(49) [Context: A and B knocking at the door of their friends’ home]

A a. Eles (não) estarão em casa?
   they (not) will-be in home
   ‘Could it be that they are not at home?’

B b. *Estarão.
   will-be-3PL
   ‘They are.’

c. Estão. (Possible continuation: ‘I have just heard steps inside’.)
   are-3PL

d. #Sim. (Probable follow-up by A: Sim, o quê? ‘yes, what?’)
   yes

e. Sim, estão.
   yes are
   ‘Yes, they are.’

A bare verb answer, on the other hand, cannot have its assertive force weakened by retaining the modal import of the epistemic future/conditional. Only a verbal sequence including the epistemic modal dever ‘ought’ can (independently) introduce in the answer the doubt/uncertainty/probability meaning carried by the verbal form in the question.

(50) A a. Ela terá 30 anos?
   she will-have 30 years
   ‘May she be 30 years old?’

   will-have
   ‘She probably is.’ / ‘She might well be.’

c. Deve ter.
   may have-INFIN
   ‘She probably is.’ / ‘She might well be.’

d. Tem.
   is
   ‘Yes, (she is in her thirties/she is actually 31).’

Interrogative sentences that include the modal adverb talvez ‘maybe’ display subjunctive mood, which cannot surface in a bare verb answer (as subjunctive must be syntactically licensed). Three options are available in this case: an adverbial answer, a sim-answer and a verbal answer with indicative mood. Crucially, the interpretation of the verbal answer departs from the interpretation of the echo adverbial answer while the interpretation of the sim-answer does not. This shows that verbal answers have a higher degree of grammatical autonomy with respect to the antecedent-question than sim-answers.

(51) A a. O João talvez saia do hospital hoje?
   the J. maybe leave-SUBJUNCTIVE from-the hospital today
   ‘May John leave the hospital today?’

B b. Talvez. / Sim.
   maybe / yes
   ‘Yes, maybe. / Yes, he may.’

c. Sai. (Possible continuation: ‘They just called from the hospital.’)
   leaves
   ‘Yes, he will leave the hospital today.’
The fact that bare verb answers have a certain degree of structural autonomy with respect to the antecedent-question is particularly clear when we consider instances of fragmentary questions. Elliptical structures integrating only nominal elements can, in the appropriate discourse context, constitute a well-formed yes/no interrogative. A bare verb can in turn make up a well-formed answer, as illustrated in (51). A sim-answer is also appropriate in this context.  

(52) [Context: A and B are leaving to spend the Sunday out but haven’t quite decided where to go. When they get into the car, A says:]
A a. Para a praia?
to the beach
B b. Vamos.
go-1PL
c. Sim.
   yes
   ‘Yes, let’s go.’

---

13 Bare verb answers and sim-answers are not always in free variation in the context of fragmentary ‘nominal’ questions. In fact, bare verb answers seem to be excluded when a nominal complement or modifier alone makes up the question (cf. (i) with (ii)-(iii)). On the other hand, sim-answers appear not to be available when the constituent in the fragmentary question has a topic-like nature (see (iv)-(v)). This issue would need a dedicated investigation based on the observation of spoken language corpus data. We will not go further into it here.

(i)   A a. Café? / Vinho?
c       coffee? / wine?
B b. Quero/Queria. (Por favor)
   want-1SG-PRESENT/would-want-1SG-IMPERFECT (please)
c. Sim. (Por favor)
   yes (please)

(ii)  [Context: A is offering coffee to B]
A a. Com leite? / Sem açúcar?
   with milk? / without sugar?
B b. *Quero/*Queria.
   want-1SG-PRESENT/would-want-1SG-IMPERFECT
   c. Sim.
   yes

(iii) [Context: A is offering wine to B]
A a. Tinto?
   red?
B b. *Quero/*Queria.
   want-1SG-PRESENT/would-want-1SG-IMPERFECT
   c. Sim.
   yes

(iv)  [Context: A and B are going to watch a movie at B’s place. B is showing the different options]
A a. E filmes espanhóis?
   and Spanish movies?
B b. Tenho.
   have-1SG
   c. *Sim.
   yes

(v)   [A want to the supermarket and is showing B what he bought for their dinner-party]
A a. E bebidas?
   and drinks?
B. b. Comprei.
   bought-1SG
   c. *Sim.
   yes
The next section will offer a summary overview of the split between verbal answers and *sim*-answers in European Portuguese.

6.2.4. Bare verb answers vs. bare *sim* answers in EP: further observations and summary

In the preceding sections we have observed some clear-cut contrasts between *sim*-answers and verbal answers. The former revealed not to be associated with specified polarity features and to extract their interpretation from its antecedent as a whole. The latter showed to have a certain degree of structural autonomy with respect to its antecedent, be independently associated with affirmative features and have the assertive force typically displayed by declarative sentences.

The main empirical facts supporting this contrasting characterization are the capability of verbal answers to express positive disagreement (which *sim*-answers are unable to do) and, complementarily, the capability of (extended) *sim*-answers to express negative agreement. The different grammatical properties manifested by verbal answers and *sim*-answers can also account for their different behaviour with respect to yes/no interrogatives including an epistemic future/conditional (see above) and a few more empirical contrasts that we will now introduce.

Because *sim*-answers are interpreted by recovering their antecedent as a whole, they are unable to be interpreted as replies to embedded questions. Only a verbal question can play that role:

(53) A a. Sabes se o João foi à festa?
   know-2SG if the J. went-3SG to the party
   ‘Do you know whether John went to the party?’

   B b. Sim. (= ‘Sim, sei.’ / *‘Sim, foi’)
       yes (= yes, know-1SG / *yes, went-3SG)
       ‘Yes, I do.’ / *‘Yes, he did.’

   c. Foi. (= ‘Sim, foi.’)
      went-3SG (= yes, went-3SG)
      ‘Yes, he did.’

Portuguese *sim* thus behaves quite differently from the affirmative word *sí* in Spanish or Catalan, as in these sister-languages *sí* can constitute a reply to an embedded question:

(54) A a. ¿Sabes si Juan fue a la fiesta?
   know if J. went to the party
   ‘Do you know whether John went to the party?’

---

14 In this respect, the external negation word *não* ‘no’ behaves exactly like *sim* ‘yes’:

(i) A a. Sabes se o João foi à festa?
   know-2SG if the J. went-3SG to the party
   ‘Do you know whether John went to the party?’

   B b. Não. (= ‘Não, não sei.’ / *‘Não, não foi’)
      no (= no, not know-1SG / *no, not went-1SG)
      ‘No, I don’t.’ / ‘No, he didn’t.’

   c. (Não), não foi.
      no, not went-3SG
      ‘No, he didn’t.’
A b. ¿Saps si en Joan va anar al cine?
know if the J. went to the cinema
‘Do you know whether John went to the movies?’

B b. Sí. (= ‘Sí, ho sé.’ / ‘Sí, en Joan va anar al cine’)
yes (= yes, (I) it know / yes, the J. went to-the party)
‘Yes, I do’ / ‘Yes, he did.’

The fact that sim-answers must recover the whole antecedent also accounts for the data presented in (56) and (57). When a modal verb, like poder ‘can’, introduces a raising infinitival clause, a sim-answer necessarily recovers the modal predicate, while a verbal answer can include or exclude it, depending on which verb form is repeated:

(56) A a. Podes emprestar-me uma caneta?
can lend-me a pen
‘Can you lend me a pen?’
B b. Posso. / Sim.
can-1SG / yes
‘Yes, I can.’
c. Empresto.
lend-1SG
‘Yes, I will.’
d. Posso/sim/*empresto, mas não empresto.
can-1SG/yes/lend-1SG but not lend-1SG
‘I can but I won’t.’

(57) A a. Podes emprestar-me dinheiro?
can lend-me money
‘Can you lend me some money?’
B b. Empresto, embora não possa.
lend-1SG though not can-1SG-SUBJUNCTIVE
c. #Sim, embora não possa.
yes though not can-1SG-SUBJUNCTIVE
‘I can’t, but still I will.’

Verbal answers are consensually analysed in the literature as particular instances of VP-deletion (cf. chapter XXX). Hence, in verbal answers, the post-verbal (VP-internal) constituents are structurally recovered under identity with the antecedent. Preverbal (VP-external) constituents may be pragmatically recovered as illustrated in (58) and (59):

---

(58) A a. Ele ontem/sempre usou gravata?
   he yesterday/always wore tie
   ‘Did he wear a tie yesterday?’ / ‘Did he always wear a tie?’

   B b. Usou.
   wore-3SG
   ‘Yes, he did.’

(59) A a. Ele seguramente vai apoiar o Presidente?
   he certainly goes support-INFIN the President
   ‘Will he certainly support the President?’

   B b. Vai.
   go-3SG
   ‘Yes, he will.’

Recall, however, that verbal answers have a certain degree of structural autonomy with respect to the antecedent-question. So, as we saw before, verbal answers do not have to interpretatively hang on the whole antecedent. Actually, bare verb answers may be unable to pragmatically recover certain preverbal adverbs, as the examples in (60) to (63) attest.  

16 The trait linking together the set of relevant adverbs, namely, quase ‘almost’, mal ‘hardly, barely, scarcely’, só ‘only’, is the fact that they introduce negative implicatures.  

17 This observation is due to Santos (2002, 2003, 2009), who also notes the incompatibility between bare verb answers and yes/no cleft-interrogatives.  

As for só ‘only’, see Horn (1969) and von Fintel and Iatridou (2007). Horn’s analysis of only sentences argues for two distinct components, a negative assertion plus a positive presupposition. Von Fintel and Iatridou (2007) specifically propose that the exclusive operator only decomposes into negation and an exclusive other than component (i.e. a quantificational element).
Take for instance the adverb *só* ‘only’. As illustrated in (64) below, the reply to a yes/no interrogative including *só* decomposes into two parts: (i) the confirmation of a positive presupposition; (ii) a negative answer. The first component is an instance of positive agreement (PA) while the second is an instance of negative agreement (NA). The word *sim* can express both, but the verb cannot express but the PA confirmation. This is why the verb is not a possible answer to yes/no interrogatives carrying negative implicatures.

The contrast between the exclusive focusing adverb *só* and the inclusive focusing adverbs *até* and *também*, with respect to the issue under discussion, is very sharp and proves that it is not the structural position of the adverb alone (i.e., being VP-external and preverbal) that matters here but its polar properties, specifically its introducing a negative implicature or not.
(65) A a. Ele até/também ressa?
   he even/also snores
   ‘Does he even/also snore?’

   B b. Ressa.
   snore-3SG
   c. Sim.
   yes

(66) A a. Até/também ele sabe a verdade?
   even/also he knows the truth
   ‘Does [even him/he also] know the truth?’

   B b. Sabe.
   know-3SG
   c. Sim.
   yes

The evidence offered by data like (67) goes in the same direction. When the preverbal adverb *quase* ‘almost’ can be interpreted as having narrow scope with respect to the verbal predicate, a verbal answer is available:

(67) A a. Ele *quase* comeu o bolo todo? (= Ele comeu o bolo *quase* todo?)
   he almost ate the cake all (= he ate the cake almost all’)
   ‘Did he eat almost the all cake?’
   b. Comeu.
   ate-3SG
   c. Sim.
   yes

In conclusion, bare verb answers carry specified polarity features of their own, namely, affirmative features. Hence, they are usually unable to recover the content of adverbs introducing negative implicatures, as this would entail expressing negative agreement (NA).

Nonetheless, if such adverbs scope under the verbal predicate (or can be so interpreted), a bare verb answer becomes available. This is always the case when the relevant adverbs modify the verbal complement, as exemplified by (68). In (68), the adverb *só* is part of the VP-internal material that is structurally and interpretatively recovered in a VP-ellipsis structure (like (68b)). So, in this case, the bare verb elliptical structure carries with it (i.e. “contains”) the adverb *só*, that ensures the NA component of the reply.

(68) A a. Ele comeu *só* as batatas?
   he ate *only* the potatoes
   ‘Did he eat only the potatoes?’

   B b. Comeu.
   ate-3SG
   c. Sim.
   yes

Contrastive focus structures, like the yes/no cleft-interrogatives in (69a), also introduce negative implicatures and exclude bare verb answers (compare (69b) with
This straightforwardly follows from the above observations and supports the generalization that bare verb answers are strictly affirmative and unable to express any type of (implicated) negation.

(69) A  a.  Foi ele que contou tudo? / Quem contou tudo foi ele?
      was he that told everything / who told everything was he
      ‘Was it him who told everything?’
      presupposition: someone told everything

B  b.  *Contou.
      told

c.  Sim.
      yes
      ‘Yes, it was.’
      (i)  Sim, ele contou tudo.
           yes, he told everything
           (PA confirmation)
      (ii) Sim, ninguém senão ele contou tudo.
           yes, nobody but him told everything
           (NA answer)

Even when clefting is not involved, certain complex-sentence interrogatives are easily associated with a contrastive focus interpretation of its subordinate clause, as exemplified in (70), which includes a causal adverbial clause. Under such interpretation, the negative implicature carried by contrastive focus is introduced and a bare verb answer is again inappropriate.18

(70) A  a.  Ele está preso porque contou tudo?  presupposition: he is in jail
      he is imprisoned because told-3SG everything
      ‘Is he in jail because he confessed everything?’ (= ‘Is it because he confessed everything that he is in jail?’

18 Maybe the existence of a negative implicature also accounts for the fact that interrogatives with the auxiliary acabar por ‘end up, after all, eventually’ cannot be answered with repetition of the auxiliary verb (as noted in the previous section). Sentences with acabar por bear the implication that what eventually happened was somehow hard to obtain and could as well have not happened.

(i)  A  a.  Ele acabou por ler o livro?
      he finished by read-INFIN the book
      ‘Did he end up reading the book?’ / ‘Did he read the book after all?’

B  b.  *Acabou.
      finished-3SG

  c.  Leu.
      read-3SG
      PA

  d.  Sim.
      yes
      (i)  Sim, ele leu o livro
           yes, he read the book
           (PA)
      (ii) Sim, ele não queria ler o livro (for example)
           yes, he not wanted read-INFIN the book
           ‘Yes, he wasn’t willing to read the book.’
           (NA (implicated)}
b  b.  #Está.\footnote{19} (ok iff his being in prison was unknown/not presupposed) is
c  c.  Sim.
   yes
  (i)  Sim, ele está preso.  \hspace{1em} \text{PA confirmation}
      yes, he is imprisoned
  (ii) Sim, não está preso senão porque contou tudo.  \text{NA answer}
      yes, not is imprisoned other-than because told everything
      ‘Yes, it is because he confessed everything that he is in jail.’

In the preceding section, we have shown that when the presence of the modal adverb talvez ‘maybe’ in a yes/no question weakens the assertive potential of the answer, the verbal answer and the sim-answer have different interpretations. In fact, the sim-answer necessarily recovers the epistemic meaning of the adverb, which weakens the degree of commitment of the speaker with the truth of the asserted proposition. The verbal answer, to the contrary expresses a strong assertive commitment.

(71)  a.  O João talvez venha à festa?
      the J. maybe come-SUBJUNCTIVE to-the party
      ‘May John be coming to the party?’
   b.  Talvez. / Sim.
      maybe / yes
      ‘Yes, maybe he will come.’
   c.  Vem.
      come-3SG
      ‘He (certainly) will come.’

(72)  A  a.  O João talvez saia do hospital hoje?
      the J. maybe leaves-SUBJUNCTIVE of-the hospital today
      ‘May John be leaving the hospital today?’
   b.  *Contou.
      told
      ‘Yes.’
   c.  *Soube.
      knew-3SG
   d.  *Tinha.
      had-3SG
      ‘Yes.’

\footnote{19} Once indirect questions are excluded, a bare verb answer to a complex-sentence interrogative always picks up the higher verb.
B  b.  Sim. Mas também pode não sair.
   yes but also can not leave
     Sai. #Mas também pode não sair.
     leave-3SG but also may not leave
     ‘Yes, he may. But he may not, either.’

The fact that bare sim answers felicitously incorporate (weak) epistemic modal values while bare verb answers typically express unqualified assertions is confirmed by the data in (73) to (75). The data show that a bare sim answer may express a ‘weak-commitment’ agreement with what the speaker admits to be the expectation of the interlocutor. Once this general agreement is set, it can be nuanced by a continuation that weakens it. Such strategy is not available when a bare verb answer is chosen to express positive agreement.

(73) A  a.  Gostas de comida picante?
   like-2SG of food hot
   ‘Do you like hot food?’
B  b.  Sim, talvez goste.
   yes maybe likes-SUBJUNCTIVE
   Gosto, #talvez goste.
   like-3SG maybe likes-SUBJUNCTIVE
   ‘Well… maybe.’

(74) A  a.  E se saíssemos hoje à noite?
   and if went-out yes maybe likes-SUBJUNCTIVE today at night
   ‘What about going out tonight?’
B  b.  Sim, vamos pensar nisso.
   yes go-1PL think about-that
   Saímos, #vamos pensar nisso.
   go-out-1PL go-1PL think about-that
   ‘Why not, let’s think about it.’

(75) A  a.  Ele seguramente vai apoiar o Presidente?
   he undoubtedly goes support-INFIN the President
   ‘Will he undoubtedly support the President?’
B  b.  Sim, é possível que vá. / Sim, pode ser que apoie.
   yes is possible that goes-SUBJ. / yes can be that supports-SUBJ.
   Vai. #É possível que vá. / Vai. #Pode ser que apoie.
   goes is possible that goes-SUBJ. / goes can be that supports-SUBJ.
   ‘Well … he may support him.’

Table 3 summarizes what the main differences between bare verb answers and bare sim answers, while also showing why there are instances of free variation between the two types of answer. The contexts of fragmentary ‘nominal’ questions are left out of the picture, as they would require investigation beyond the limits of the current work.

Note that although bare sim answers, differently from extended sim answers, are unable to express negative agreement in the context of a negative question, they actually reveal compatibility with logical negation in the contexts that include adverbs like quase ‘almost’, mal ‘hardly’, só ‘only’, which introduce negative implicatures. It is clear in such contexts that bare verb answers cannot express NA but sim-answers can.
Table 3: Bare verb vs. bare sim answers to yes/no questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bare verb</th>
<th>Bare sim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>expresses positive agreement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expresses positive disagreement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expresses negative agreement in answers to questions that carry negative implicatures (scoping over the verbal predicate)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answers indirect/embedded questions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.5. A brief note on *ser*-answers (*‘be’*-answers) in EP

Besides verbal, adverbial and sim-answers, European Portuguese marginally allows answers made up of a 3rd person singular form of the copula *ser* ‘be’, that either surfaces with the invariable form é ‘is’ or inflects for tense/aspect (allowing a three way distinction between present tense, past perfect and past imperfect), as illustrated in (76).20

(76) a. Eles já encontraram as chaves?

he already find-3PL-PAST PERFECT the keys

‘Did he find the keys yet?’

b. Encontraram.

find-3PL-PAST PERFECT

verbal answer

c. Já.

already

adverbial answer

d. Sim.

yes

de. %Foi.

be-3SG-PAST PERFECT

*ser*-answer (past perfect)

e. %É.

be-3SG-PRESENT

*ser*-answer (invariable)

f. %*Foram*

be-3PL-PAST PERFECT

*ser*-answer (impossible inflection)

g. ‘Yes(, they did).’

*Ser*-answers are not universally accepted by European Portuguese speakers, who may judge such answers within a range from very unnatural (when tense/aspect inflection is present) to ungrammatical (when the invariable form é ‘is’ surfaces, like in (76f) above). The same speakers that distaste or reject *ser*-answers allow to a certain extent their counterparts as confirmations of a previous declarative sentence (especially the forms inflected for tense/aspect). *Ser*-confirmations may arise bare or coupled with the confirmative word *pois*, which suggests that the latter may well be the diachronic source for *ser*-answers.

(77) a. Eles já encontraram as chaves.

he already find-3PL-PAST PERFECT the keys

‘Did he find the keys yet?’

b. (Pois) encontraram.

POIS find-3PL-PAST PERFECT

verbal confirmation

---

20 Example adapted from Santos (2003, 2009). For an in-depth study of *ser*-answers, see Santos (2009).
c. (Pois) foi.  \textit{ser-confirmation}
\begin{quote}
\textit{POIS} be-3SG-PAST PERFECT
‘Yes, they did.’
\end{quote}

As for their discourse availability, \textit{ser}-answers differ from both verbal answers and \textit{sim}-answers, although with some qualification they are closer to the latter. Unlike verbal answers and more extensively than \textit{sim}-answers, \textit{ser}-answers unexceptionally express agreement with the question. So, they are fit to express negative agreement (NA) both in the context of a previous negative question and in the context of a previous negative implicature but unfit to express positive disagreement (PD), as exemplified in (78) and (79). These properties of \textit{ser}-answers are in accordance with their probable origin as confirmative utterances.

(78) a. Ele não vem?
\hspace{1cm} he not comes
\hspace{1cm} ‘Is he not coming?’
b. #Sim.
\hspace{1cm} yes
\hspace{1cm} (PD)
c. Vem.
\hspace{1cm} comes
\hspace{1cm} ‘Yes, he is coming.’
d. %É.
\hspace{1cm} is
\hspace{1cm} ‘No/Yes, he is not coming.’ / * ‘Yes, he is coming.’

(79) a. Ele só vem mais tarde?
\hspace{1cm} he only comes later
\hspace{1cm} ‘Isn’t he coming but later?’
b. Sim.
\hspace{1cm} yes
\hspace{1cm} (PA+NA)
c. #Vem.
\hspace{1cm} comes
\hspace{1cm} ‘Yes, he is coming.’
d. %É.
\hspace{1cm} is
\hspace{1cm} (PA+NA)
e. Só.
\hspace{1cm} only
\hspace{1cm} ‘Yes, he isn’t coming but later.’

Moreover, \textit{ser}-answers diverge from verbal answers in being not allowed as replies to indirect/embedded questions. In this context, \textit{ser}-answers do not behave as \textit{sim}-answers either. Unlike \textit{sim}-answers, which are in this case pragmatically inadequate, \textit{ser}-answers are sharply ungrammatical (compare (80c) with (80d)).

\footnote{They also differ in being unable to associate with predicative negation (i.e. \textit{não} ‘not’) in order to express negative answers, as exemplified in (i):}

(i) A a. Ele (não) gostou do filme?
\hspace{1cm} he not liked the movie
\hspace{1cm} ‘Didn’t he like the movie?’

B b. *(NÃO,) não foi.
(80) a. Sabem se ele telefonou ao pai?
    know-3PL if he called to-the father
    ‘Do you happen to know whether he called his father?’
b. Telefonou.
    called-3SG
    ‘Yes, he did.’
c. #Sim.
    yes
    ‘Yes, we do.’
d. *É/*Foi.
    is / was

The main characterizing properties of each type of minimal answer found in EP, i.e. bare verb answers, sim-answers and ser-answers are summarized in table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Bare verb answers, bare sim answers, and ser answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expresses positive agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expresses positive disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expresses negative agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answers indirect/embedded questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answers the main predicate of an indirect question structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ser-answers are also present in Brazilian Portuguese, where they acquired a more central role than in EP as a consequence of the evanescence of sim-answers in BP. In the next section we will describe the BP answering system in contrast to EP. It will become clear that ser-answers replaced sim-answers in the contexts where verbal-answers are not an option.

6.2.6. Minimal and extended answers in BP in contrast to EP

Minimal affirmative answers in Brazilian Portuguese are of three types: bare verb answers, which are central in the BP answering system, adverbial answers (that repeat an adverb from the question) and ser-answers. Minimal sim-answers are not part of the BP core grammar, although they are marginally preserved in formal registers. Hence, ser-answers necessarily appear in the contexts where bare verb answers and adverbal answers are not available, that is to say, in answers to all types of questions that carry negative implicatures (see section 6.2.4 above).

The properties of the different types of answers are similar in Brazilian and European Portuguese. The main difference between the two varieties is the strategy chosen to build an affirmative reply whenever answering with the verb is not an option.

---

22 For an overview of the BP answering system (including a diachronic inquiry), see Oliveira (1996).
Example (81) below shows how verbal and adverbial answers can alternate in BP. EP and BP display in this respect exactly the same pattern. The set of adverbs that can be repeated is also coincident in the two varieties (see section 6.2.1).

(81) A a. Você também vai pra Minas?
you also go to Minas
‘Are you going to Minas?’
B. b. Vou.
go-1SG
c. Também.
also
‘Yes, I am.’

In the absence of sim-answers, ser-answers are the only option whenever a bare verb answer is excluded, as illustrated in (82) and (83) below. In both examples the question carries a negative implicature, which is introduced by the adverb mal ‘barely, hardly’ in (83) and by the cleft structure in (84). As a bare verb answer is not an option in this context (see section 6.2.4 above), BP resorts here to ser-answers.23

(82) A a. Você mal dormiu essa noite?
you barely slept this night
‘Did you barely sleep tonight?’
B. b. *Mal.
barely
c. *Dormi.
slept-1SG
d. É.
is
‘Yes.’

(83) A a. Meu irmão que você viu abraçando a Neuzinha?
my brother that you saw hugging the N.
‘Was it my brother that you saw hugging Neuzinha?’
B b. #Vi.
saw-1SG
c. Foi.
was-3SG
‘Yes.’

The word sim appears in extend affirmative answers in BP. However, in contrast to EP, BP prefers the order verb-sim even when the answer expresses positive agreement (while EP reserves the sim-final pattern to express positive disagreement):

23 Although the confirmative word pois is no more found in BP in isolation, coupled with a main verb or in tag-questions, confirmations of a previous statement constituted by pois plus the 3rd person singular present tense of the ‘be’ copula are still available (see (i) below). So the origin of ser-answers might be the same in BP and EP (see section 6.2.5).

(i) A a. Isto vai acabar mal. / Isto não pode dar bom resultado.
B b. Pois é.
(84) A a. Seus pais gostam de viajar?
your parents like of travel-INFIN
‘Do your parents like to travel?’

B b. Gostam, sim.
like-3PL yes
‘Yes, they do.’

Apparently, there is some extent of overlapping between the word-order patterns that can express positive agreement and positive disagreement in the BP answering system (as if structures that formerly only expressed emphatic affirmation (see section 6.3) came to be used in a more extensive and ‘neutral’ way). The same happens when we observe negative answers. Although the pattern of extended answers with final *não* ‘no’ is mostly associated with the expression of negative disagreement, it is not totally excluded from the expression of negative agreement (see (85c)).

(85) A a. Você vai pra Minas?
you go to M.
‘Are you going to Minas?’

B b. Não, não vou.
no, not go-1SG

c. Não vou, não.
not go-1SG, no
‘No, I’m not.’

In European Portuguese, negative answers with final *não* ‘no’ are in general reserved to express negative disagreement. The exception are answers to indirect/embedded questions, as illustrated in (86). This context is also peculiar in that it allows the pattern of negative answer illustrated in (87b), which is for most speakers very unnatural (if not ungrammatical) as a reply to a direct question (compare (87b) with (88b)).

*European Portuguese*

(86) A a. Sabes se o João não vem?
know-2SG if the J. not comes
‘Do you know whether João is not coming?’

B b. Não vem, não.
not comes, no

c. Não, não vem.
no, not comes
‘No, he isn’t.’

(87) A a. Sabes se o João vem?
know-2SG if the J. comes
‘Do you know whether João is coming?’

B b. Não vem.
not comes

c. Não, não vem.
no, not comes
‘No, he isn’t?’
As for bare negative answers, there are no differences between BP and EP. In general, não ‘no’ expresses a minimal negative answer in both varieties. However, the word não is unable to constitute alone the reply to an indirect/embedded question, behaving in this way exactly like the EP word sim.

Table 5 offers an overview of the answering systems of European and Brazilian Portuguese. In the next sections, the expression of disagreement will be further inspected.

---

24 While não expresses both negative agreement and negative disagreement, ser-answers can only express negative agreement (see section 6.2.5).

(i) A a. Ele ama a mulher? he loves the woman ‘Does he love his wife?’
   B b. Não. ND no ‘No, he doesn’t.’
   c. É. PA is ‘Yes, he does.’

(ii) A a. Ele não ama a mulher? he not loves the woman ‘Doesn’t he love his wife?’
   B b. Não NA no ‘No, he doesn’t.’
   c. É. NA is ‘Yes, he does.’
### Table 5: EP and BP answering systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>European Portuguese</th>
<th>Brazilian Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimal affirmative answers</strong></td>
<td>PA (positive interrogatives)</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>sim (‘yes’) (repeated) adverb</td>
<td>%(ser-answer) (repeated) adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA (positive embedded interrogatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA + NA (positive interrogatives with negative implicatures)</td>
<td>sim (‘yes’) (repeated) adverb</td>
<td>%(ser-answer) (repeated) adverb</td>
<td>ser-3SG (‘is, was’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD (negative interrogatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimal negative answers</strong></td>
<td>NA (negative interrogatives)</td>
<td>não (‘no’) (repeated) adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ND (positive interrogatives)</td>
<td>não (‘no’) (repeated) adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA &amp; ND (embedded interrogatives)</td>
<td>No minimal answer available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmarked extended answers</strong></td>
<td>PA &amp; PD</td>
<td>sim, verb (repeated) adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA &amp; ND (negative interrogatives &amp; positive interrogatives)</td>
<td>não, não verb (‘no, not verb’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA &amp; ND (embedded interrogatives)</td>
<td>NA &amp; ND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>não, não verb (‘no, not verb’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>não verb, não verb (‘not verb, no’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>não verb (‘not verb’) ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. More on positive disagreement: European Portuguese vs. Brazilian Portuguese

European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese display quite similar answering systems when we look at neutral affirmative answers to yes/no questions (even if sim-answers are no more part of the BP core grammar). But EP and BP diverge in important respects when it comes to the syntactic expression of positive disagreement, which we will refer to as emphatic affirmation. In the present section the structures which EP and BP resort to in order to express emphatic affirmation will be described. Once superficial (lexical) differences between EP and BP are discarded, two main patterns emerge: the sim-final pattern (common to EP and BP), and the verb reduplication pattern (restricted to EP).

6.3.1. Syntactic patterns of emphatic affirmation

Emphatic affirmation emerges in the context of discourse interaction as a linguistic manifestation of disagreement with some previous assertion or presupposition. Specifically, emphatic affirmative answers to yes/no questions are felicitous in the context of a tag question anticipating a negative answer (as illustrated in (90)) and emphatic affirmative declaratives are appropriate as assertions of the untruth of a preceding negative statement (as exemplified in (91)). As the data displayed below also show, BP is more restrictive than EP with respect to the means it resorts to expressing emphatic affirmation, so sentences (90b) and (91b) are a grammatical option in EP but are excluded in BP.
(90) [A] a. *O João não comprou o carro, pois não? / comprou?*
the J. not bought the car POIS-CONFIRMATIVE no / bought
‘John didn’t buy the car, did he?’

bought bought
EP: OK; BP: *

bought yes
‘Yes, he (certainly) did.’
EP: OK; BP: OK

(91) [A] a. *O João não comprou o carro.*
the J. not bought the car
‘John did not buy the car.’

the J. bought the car bought
EP: OK; BP: *

the J. bought the car yes
‘John did buy the car.’
EP: OK; BP: OK

In BP reinforced affirmation (in order to express disagreement) is obtained by placing the word *sim* in sentence-final position (see (90c) and (91c) above). EP shares with BP this same strategy of reinforcing affirmation. But EP can alternatively implement the strategy of verb reduplication (see (90b) and (91b) above), which BP does not allow.

In emphatic answers to yes/no questions the word *sim* immediately follows the verb (see (90c) above), while in emphatic declaratives, it rather follows a full clausal constituent (see (91c) above). In these structures, *sim* acts as a reinforcing tag with respect to the truth-conditional content of the declarative sentence it is attached to (which constitutes the antecedent of *sim* for interpretative/licensing purposes).

There is a further more superficial contrast between EP and BP. In parallel with the sentences with sentence-final *sim*, EP also displays sentences with sentence-final *pois*, as illustrated in (92) and (93):

(92) [A] a. *O João não comprou o carro, pois não?*
the J. not bought the car POIS-CONFIRMATIVE no / bought
‘John didn’t buy the car, did he?’

bought POIS-CONFIRMATIVE
‘Yes, he (certainly) did.’
EP: OK; BP: *

the J. not bought the car
‘John did not buy the car.’

the J. bought the car POIS-CONFIRMATIVE
‘John did buy the car.’
EP: OK; BP: *

The tag part of a negative tag question is constituted by *pois não* (confirmative word + negative marker) in EP but not in BP, which displays instead a bare verb tag.
Differently from *sim*, the word *pois* cannot constitute a neutral answer to a yes/no question, as illustrated in (94), while it displays the ability to express agreement with both an affirmative and a negative declarative, as illustrated in (95)-(96). So *pois* is not an answering word but a word that expresses confirmation of a previous statement.

*European Portuguese:*

(94) [A] a. *O João comprou um carro?*
   the J. bought a car
   ‘Did John buy a car?’
   
   *POIS-CONFIRMATIVE WORD*
   EP: *; BP: *

(95) [A] a. *O João comprou um carro.*
   the J. bought a car
   ‘John bought a car.’
   
   *POIS-CONFIRMATIVE bought*
   ‘In fact he did.’

(96) [A] a. *O João não comprou um carro.*
   the J. not bought a car
   ‘John didn’t buy a car.’
   
   b. *Pois não (comprou).*
   *POIS-CONFIRMATIVE not bought*
   ‘In fact he didn’t.’

The confirmative word *pois* currently occurs in BP only in two grammaticalized expressions: *pois não?* ‘can I help you?’ and *pois é ‘so it is’* (*see footnotes xx and xx*). This is the reason why the *pois*-final sentences are not available in BP, although they are structurally akin to the *sim*-final sentences (*pois* and *sim* both reinforce the assertive force of the declarative sentence they tag on). Hence, it is just a lexical difference between EP and BP that makes the two varieties diverge with respect to the availability of the *pois*-final strategy to express emphatic affirmation.

At last, a comment on the singular behaviour of the adverb *já* ‘already’ is in order. As we observed in section 6.2.1, *já* is the only adverb that can (by itself) express positive disagreement when answering to a yes/no question. Moreover, *já* is the only adverb that can be reduplicated in EP as a means to express emphatic affirmation. Actually, the presence of preverbal *já* in a sentence blocks verb reduplication, as shown in (97).

---

26 A sentence like (ic) below with both the adverb *já* and the verb repeated is also ungrammatical. On the other hand, there is compatibility between *já* and the *V-sim* pattern (see (id)).

   the J. yet not left
   ‘John hasn’t left yet.’
   
   the J. already left already
   ‘Of course John has left already.’
   
   c. *O João já saiu, já saiu.* [with rising intonation]
   the J. already left already left
   ‘Of course John has left already.’
   
   d. *O João já saiu, sim.*
   the J. already left yes
   ‘Of course John has left already.’
(97) [A] a. O João ainda não saiu, pois não?
the J. yet not left, POIS-CONFIRMATIVE no
‘John hasn’t left yet, has he?’

left left
c. *Já saiu, saiu.
already left left
d. Já saiu, já.
already left already
‘Yes, he HAS.’

No other answering adverb besides já can be reduplicated in emphatic affirmation structures, as exemplified, in (98), by the ungrammaticality of the reduplicating sentence with sempre ‘always’ (see (98c)). This is not surprising if we recall (from section 6.2.1) that já is the only adverb that can express positive disagreement in minimal adverbial answers.

(98) [A] a. O João nem sempre apoiou a Maria.
the J. NEG always supported M.
‘John hasn’t always supported Mary.’

the J. always supported Mary supported
c. *O João sempre apoiou a Maria, sempre.
the J. always supported Mary always
‘Of course John has always supported Mary.’

Table 4 below summarizes the differences between European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese as for the syntactic expression of emphatic affirmation.

Table 6: Emphatic affirmation in European and Brazilian Portuguese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>European Portuguese</th>
<th>Brazilian Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive disagreement in the context of tag-interrogatives and declaratives</td>
<td>sentence-final sim sentence-final pois verb reduplication, já-reduplication</td>
<td>sentence-final sim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.2. The European Portuguese verb reduplication pattern

Morphological reduplication has been long and extensively studied. Sentence-bound syntactic reduplication, on the other hand, only recently has become the object of attention. Nunes (2004) and Boskovic & Nunes (2007), among others, exploring the consequences of the Copy Theory of Movement (of Chomsky (1995)) have shown that syntactic reduplication is the multiple realization of a syntactic constituent in positions that could be, otherwise, alternative positions for that constituent (given word order variation).

It was shown in chapters xxx and xxx that BP displays in some domains more constrained word order than EP. The fact that emphatic affirmation can be syntactically expressed through verb reduplication only in European Portuguese is presumably related with the differences between the two varieties with respect to word order. That is, verb reduplication structures presumably imply the placement of one of the realizations of the reduplicated verb in a position not available to it in BP. That could be the sentence-initial position of the verb in VSO wh-interrogatives, which EP allows but BP does not (as proposed in Martins (2006, 2007)).

In the current work, we will restrict ourselves to describe the main properties of the verb reduplication structures in EP. In section 6.3.2.1, we will identify a set of constraints on verb reduplication; in section 6.3.2.2, we will offer empirical evidence showing their mono-sentential nature.

6.3.2.2. Sensitivity to morphological complexity: verb reduplication vs. V-sim

Although verb reduplication can occur with any type of verbal predicate, it is not unconstrained. We already noted that it is incompatible with preverbal já ‘already’.

---

27 See Inkelas and Zoll (2005), and references therein.
28 See Corver & Nunes (2007), and references therein.
29 The availability of emphatic verb reduplication in European Portuguese is not constrained by verb typology or by dialectal or idiolectal variation (as far as I am aware of). Examples of emphatic verb reduplication with a ditransitive verb (dar ‘give’), an unaccusative verb (chegar ‘arrive’), an unergative verb (sorrir ‘smile’), a restructuring control verb (querer ‘want’), a non-restructuring control verb (ousar ‘dare’), an existential verb (haver ‘be’), and a copular verb (ser ‘be’) are given below. The discourse context for each of the examples will not be set, so as to keep this footnote at a reasonable length.

(i) Eu dei ontem esse livro ao João, dei.
I gave yesterday this book to John gave
‘I did give John this book yesterday.’

(ii) O mau-tempo chegou (cã), chegou.

Moreover, verb reduplication is constrained by morphological complexity as compounds, future/conditional forms of the verb and verb-clitic sequences witness. Comparatively, sim-final sentences are not sensitive to morphological complexity, which sets a clear contrast between the two types of structures. The fact that verb reduplication is constrained by morphological complexity fits in with the cross-linguistic evidence on the properties of syntactic reduplication. In fact, all the cases studied in the literature display this same restrictive pattern.

Compound verbs like _fotocopiar_ ‘photocopy’, _radiografar_ ‘radiograph’, _manuscrever_ ‘handwrite’, _maniatar_ “hand-tie”, _bendizer_ “well-say”, _maldizer_ “bad-say”, _maltratar_ “bad-treat”, and verbs derived with stressed prefixes such as _contra_ (e.g. _contra-atacar_ ‘counter-attack’), _super_ (e.g. _super-enfatizar_ “super-emphasize”), _pré_ (e.g. _pré-inscrever_ ‘pre-register’), _pós_ (e.g. _pós-graduar_ ‘post-graduate’), make verb reduplication awkward. Both the adverb-like constituent present in the relevant compounds and the stressed prefixes are modifiers that left-adjoin to a word (not to the verbal root), giving rise to a complex prosodic word, i.e. a word with two word stress domains.\(^{30}\) Examples (100) to (103) below show that verbs with stressed prefixes and compound verbs make morphological reanalysis less smooth although still possible.\(^{31}\)

Sentences (100b) and (102b) illustrate verb reduplication with the ‘simple’ verbs _copiar_ ‘copy’ and _atacar_ ‘attack’. Contrasting with the sentences with ‘simple’ verbs, sentences (101b) and (103b) show how the complex verbs _fotocopiar_ ‘photocopy’ and _contra-atacar_ ‘counter-attack’ make verb reduplication marginal.

---

the bad-weather arrived here arrived
‘The bad weather did arrive (here).’

(iii) Tu sorriste, sorriste.
you smiled, smiled
‘You did smile.’

(iv) Ela quer-te beijar, quer.
she wants you-ACC kiss-INF wants
‘She does want to kiss you.’

(v) Ela ousou beijar-te, ousou.
she dared kiss-INF-you-ACC dared
‘She did dare to kiss you.’

(vi) Há demasiadas pessoas nesta sala, há.
is too-many people in-this room is
‘Of course there are too many people in this room.’

(vi) Dormir 8 horas é saudável, é.
sleep-INF 8 hours is healthy is
‘Of course to sleep 8 hours is healthy.’

\(^{30}\) Stressed prefixes can be coordinated (e.g. _Os contra e os anti-terroristas_ “the contra and the anti-terrorists”) and can appear in isolation (e.g. – _São contra-terroristas ou anti-terroristas?_ – _Contra_ – _Are they contra-terrorists or anti-terrorists?_ – “[They are] contra.”).

\(^{31}\) Note that verbs with four syllables (e.g. _comemorar_ ‘commemorate’, _considerar_ ‘consider’, _contaminar_ ‘contaminate’, _incentivar_ ‘encourage’, _incrementar_ ‘develop’) which are neither compounds nor prefixed forms (thus not complex prosodic words either) do not have the same effect:

(i) [A] a. Os pesticidas não contaminaram a água.
    the pesticides not contaminated the water
    ‘The pesticides did not contaminate the water.’

    contaminated contaminated
    ‘Of course they did.’
(100) [A] a. Ele não copiou o livro sem autorização, pois não?
he not copied the book without permission, POIS-CONFIRMATIVE no
‘He didn’t copy the book without your permission, did he’?

copied, copied
‘Yes, he DID.’

(101) [A] a. Ele não fotocopiou o livro sem autorização, pois não?
he not photocopied the book without permission, POIS no
‘He didn’t copy the book without your permission, did he?’

[B] b. ??fotocopiou, fotocopiou.
photocopied, photocopied
‘Yes, he DID.’

(102) [A] a. Ele não atacou o candidato, pois não?
he not attacked the candidate POIS no
‘He didn’t attack the candidate, did he?’

attacked, attacked
‘Yes, he DID.’

(103) [A] a. O candidato não contra-atacou, pois não?
the candidate not counter-attacked, POIS no
‘The candidate didn’t counter-attack, did he?’

[B] b. ??Contra-atacou, contra-atacou.
counter-attacked, counter-attacked
‘Yes, he DID.’

Differently from the verb reduplication sentences, the sim-final sentences in
(104b) and (105b) are perfectly grammatical, because the sim-final structures are not
affected by morphological complexity (in EP and BP as well).

(104) [A] a. Ele não fotocopiou o livro sem a tua autorização, pois não?
he not photocopied the book without your permission, POIS no
‘He didn’t photocopy the book without your permission, did he?’

photocopied AFF
‘Yes, he DID.’

c. ??Fotocopiou, fotocopiou.
photocopied, photocopied
‘Yes, he DID.’

(105) [A] a. O candidato não contra-atacou, pois não?
the candidate not counter-attacked, POIS no
‘The candidate didn’t counter-attack, did he?’

contra-attacked AFF
‘Yes, he DID.’

c. ??Contra-atacou, contra-atacou.
contra-attacked, counter-attacked
‘Yes, he DID.’
Future and conditional forms have a similar effect on verb reduplication sentences as compound and compound-like verbs.

EP futures and conditionals are the only verbal forms that allow mesoclisis, which indicates that futures and conditionals have a particular morphological structure among verbal forms. As illustrated in (106a) and (106c) clitics are in general enclitics in matrix clauses in EP, surfacing adjacent to the right edge of the verbal form, that is, right-adjacent to the agreement morphemes. When a future or conditional form of the verb occurs in a matrix clause, however, the clitic surfaces preceding the sequence formed by the tense morpheme (present or past) plus the agreement morpheme (see (106b) and (106d)).

(106) a. Ele ataca-o se puder.
   He attack-PRESENT-INDICATIVE-him if can
   ‘He will attack him if he can.’

b. Ele atacá-lo-á se puder.
   he attack-him-will/[T(present)+Agr morphemes] if can
   ‘He will attack him if he can.’

c. Ele atacava-o se pudesse.
   he attack-IMPERFECT-INDICATIVE-him if could
   ‘He would attack him if he could.’

d. Ele atacá-lo-ia se pudesse.
   He attack-him-will/[T(past)+Agr morphemes] if could
   ‘He would attack him if he could.’

The sentences in (107) to (110) below show that future and conditional forms of the verb are problematic in emphatic verb reduplication structures (see (107b) and (108b)) in contrast to the other forms of the verb (as exemplified with the present tense in (109b)). Sentence (110b) illustrates how emphatic declaratives without verb reduplication, that is, sim-final declaratives, are totally grammatical with futures and conditionals.

(107) [A] a. Ele não atacará o candidato, pois não?
   he not attack-will the candidate POIS-CONFIRMATIVE no
   ‘He will not attack the candidate, will he?’

   [B] b. ??Atacará, atacará
      attack-will/[T+Agr morphemes], attack-will/[T+Agr morphemes]
      ‘Yes, he WILL.’

(108) [A] a. Ele não atacaria o candidato, pois não?
   he not attack-would the candidate POIS no
   ‘He would not attack the candidate, would he?’

---

32 Vigário (2003) shows that verbal units that host a mesoclitic pronoun are complex prosodic words (with two word stress domains) like compound verbs and verbs with stressed prefixes. With respect to morphological/syntactic approaches to the internal structure of the future and conditional forms of the verb, see Roberts (1992), Roberts and Roussou (2002, 2003), Duarte and Matos (2000), Arregi (2000) and Oltra-Massuet and Arregui (2005). All the analyses converge on the idea that future and conditional are internally more complex than other verbal forms.
??Atacaria, atacaria
attack-would/[T+Agr morphemes], attack-would/[T+Agr morphemes]
‘Yes, he WOULD’

(109) [A] a. Ele amanhã não ataca o candidato, pois não?
he tomorrow not attack the candidate POIS no
‘He will not attack the candidate tomorrow, will he?’

[B] b. Ataca, ataca
attack-PRESENT-INDICATIVE, attack-PRESENT-INDICATIVE
‘Yes, he WILL.’

(110) [A] a. Ele não atacará o candidato, pois não?
he not attack-will the candidate POIS no
‘He will not attack the candidate, will he?’

[B] b. Atacará sim
attack-will/[T+Agr morphemes] AFF
‘Yes, he WILL’

The marginality of verb reduplication increases in a gradual way as morphological complexity grows. As a matter of fact, when a compound or a compound-like verb displays future or conditional morphology, a cumulative effect arises with the result that the verb reduplication structure becomes ungrammatical. This is exemplified with the prefixed verb contra-atacar ‘counter-attack’ in (111), and with the compound verb fotocopiar ‘photocopy’ in (112). Sentences (111c) and (112c) show once more that the emphatic sim-final sentences are exempt from morphological restrictions

(111) [A] a. O candidato não contra-atacará, pois não?
the candidate not contra-attack-will POIS no
‘The candidate will not contra-attack, will he?’

contra-attack-will/[T+Agr morphemes], contra-attack-will/[T+Agr]
‘Yes, he WILL.’

c. Contra-atacará sim.
contra-attack-will/[T+Agr morphemes] AFF
‘Yes, he WILL.’

(112) [A] a. Ele não fotocopiaria o livro sem a tua autorização, pois não?
he not photocopy-would the book without your permission, POIS no
‘He wouldn’t photocopy the book without your permission, would he?’

photocopy-would/[T+Agr morphemes], photocopy-would/[T+Agr]
‘Yes, he WOULD.’

c. Fotocopiaria sim.
photocopy-would/[T+Agr morphemes] AFF
‘Yes, he WOULD.’

Finally, we will see to conclude this section that the sequences of verb plus enclitic are not allowed in the EP emphatic verb reduplication structure either. The strong ungrammaticality brought by clitics to verb reduplication sentences contrasts
with the grammatical marginality induced by compound and compound-like verbs as well as by the future and conditional forms of the verb.

The examples in (113) and (114) show that the presence of a single clitic or of a clitic cluster in emphatic sentences with verb reduplication makes the sentences ungrammatical. The grammatical sentences without clitics in (113b) and (114b) are to be contrasted with the ungrammatical ones in (113c) and (114c)-(114d), which include clitics. Example (113) illustrates emphatic declaratives; example (114) shows emphatic answers to yes/no questions.

(113) [A] a. Não lhe trouxeste o livro que ele te pediu.
not him brought the book that he you-DAT asked
‘You didn’t bring him the book that he asked you.’

[B] b. Eu trouxe-lhe o livro que ele me pediu, trouxe.
I bought-him the book that he me asked, bought
‘Yes, I did bring him the book.’
c. *Eu trouxe-lhe o livro que ele me pediu, trouxe-lhe.
I bought-him the book that he me asked, bought-him
‘Yes, I did bring him the book.’

(114) [A] a. Não me devolveste o livro que eu te emprestei, pois não?
not me returned-2SG the book that I you-DAT lent, POIS no
‘You haven’t returned me the book I lent you, did you?’

returned, returned
‘Yes, I DID.’
returned-you, returned-you
‘Yes, I DID.’
d. *Devolvi-to, devolvi-to,
returned-you.it, returned-you.it
‘Yes, I DID.’

The presence of clitics in sim-final emphatic sentences does not induce ungrammaticality:

(115) [A] a. Não me devolveste o livro que eu te emprestei, pois não?
not me returned-2SG the book that I you-DAT lent, POIS no
‘You haven’t returned me the book I lent you, did you?’

returned-you.it AFF
‘Yes, I DID.’

It is also relevant to observe that clitics are not excluded from non-emphatic answers to yes/no questions. Although answering with a bare verb, like in (116b), is more natural in EP than answering with a verb+clitic sequence, like in (116c), the two options are grammatical.

(116) [A] a. Devolveste-me o livro que te emprestei?
returned-2SG-me the book that you-DAT lent-1SG
‘Did you return me the book I lent you?’
6.3.2.2. Verb-reduplication structures are mono-sentential

Let us observe sentences (117b) and (118b) below, which contradict a negative presupposition and a negative statement respectively.

(117) [A] a. O João saiu, pois não?
   the J. not left, POIS no
   ‘John didn’t leave, did he?’
   left left
   ‘Yes, he DID.’

   the J. not arrived late
   ‘John didn’t arrive late.’
   the J. arrived late, arrived
   ‘John did arrive late.’

The prosodic pattern exhibited by the (phonetic) sequences in (117b) and (118b) shows that we are not dealing with bi-sentential structures, that is, with instances of sentence repetition (in a reiterative manner). While sentence repetition would usually imply a prosodic break separating the two sentences and a falling intonation at the end of each sentence, in (117b) and (118b) there is no prosodic break (the comma being a conventional orthographic artifice) and the sequences are associated with an overall rising intonation. The inexistence of a prosodic break before the repeated verb in emphatic affirmative sentences can be tested on the basis of the behaviour of the dental fricative /s/ in EP. In EP the dental fricative /s/ is phonologically realized as [ʃ], [ʒ] or [z] when it occurs in coda positions. The voiceless palatal [ʃ] appears word-internally before a voiceless consonant and in word-final position before a pause (e.g. cestas [se∫tɐ∫] 'baskets'). The voiced palatal [ʒ] emerges before a voiced consonant, both word-internally or in word-final position sentence-internally, showing that the voice-assimilation process that turns [ʃ] into [ʒ] takes place across word boundaries as far as there is no prosodic break intervening between the two words (e.g. osgas grandes [ɔʒgɐʒgrɐdɛ] 'geckos big, ‘big geckos’). The voiced dental realization [z] shows up when the fricative coda is followed by a word-initial vowel and no pause breaks the fricative+vowel sequence (e.g. três amigos [trezɐmigui] ‘three friends’. The phonological realization of the dental fricative in coda position thus gives us the means to test whether there is a prosodic break before the second occurrence of the verb in the EP verb reduplication structures or not. As the emphatic affirmative sentence in (119) below shows the fricative coda is realized as [z] before the word initial vowel of the repeated verb. This clearly shows that there is no prosodic break there. If a pause would
intervene at the relevant position, a voiceless palatal realization of the fricative would emerge, as exemplified by the bi-sentential sequence in (120) below. Note that it is not impossible that repetitions of short (discrete) sentences are produced without the typical intonational phrase breaks associated with separate utterances, in which case the contrast we are describing will be bleached. But the crucial point here is that verb reduplication sentences like (119b) are necessarily mapped into one single intonational phrase. Hence the ungrammaticality of (97b) below, where the palatal realization of the coda fricative in V1 signals the existence of a break separating it from V2. (Sentence (121b) is to be contrasted with (120b)).

(119)  [A] a. Eu não ando a fazer nada de mal.
        I not go to do nothing of wrong
        ‘I’m not doing anything wrong.’
        go go
        ‘Of course you are.’

     (120) [A] a. Eu não ando a fazer nada de mal.
        I not go to do nothing of wrong
        ‘I’m not doing anything wrong.’
        go go SIM [= AFFIRMATIVE WORD]
        ‘You are. Of course you are.’

     (121) [A] a. Eu não ando a fazer nada de mal.
        I not go to do nothing of wrong
        ‘I’m not doing anything wrong.’
        go go
        ‘Of course you are.’

Another clear indication that emphatic verb reduplication in European Portuguese must be separated from sentence repetition is the fact that the latter does not convey emphatic positive disagreement. It would thus be excluded from the discourse contexts set by (119a) and (120a) above. Accordingly, it may express agreement, as in (122) below, which is not compatible with emphatic verb reduplication.

(122) [A] a. Felizmente, correu tudo bem.
        fortunately ran all well
        ‘Fortunately, everything went jus fine.’
        ran POIS-CONFIRMATIVE ran
        ‘It did. In fact it did.’
     c. #Correu, correu. [with rising intonation]
        ran ran
        ‘It DID.’

33 Parallel examples can be constructed to illustrate the alternation between [ʒ] in emphatic verb reduplication structures and [ʃ] in reiterative bi-sentential sequences.
Emphatic affirmative sentences with verb reduplication cannot include evidential adverbs such as realmente ‘really’, certamente ‘certainly’, efectivamente ‘effectively’, obviamente ‘obviously’ or the adverbial expression de facto ‘in fact’ (see example (123) below). To the contrary, reiterative sentence repetition appears totally in harmony with such adverbs (see example (124) below). Evidential adverbs reinforce the assertive force of the sentence where they occur and may express agreement with a previous statement or not. In any case, they are not allowed to coexist with emphatic verb reduplication within the same sentence. When assertive evidential adverbs express agreement (associated with affirmation), a semantic clash with verb reduplication arises (because the latter expresses disagreement). When evidential adverbs convey disagreement, semantic redundancy and possibly syntactic incompatibility with emphatic verb reduplication exclude sentences like (123b) below.

the J. likes of read / the J. not likes of read
‘John likes reading.’ / ‘John doesn’t like reading.’

B] b. *O João realmente gosta de ler, gosta. [with rising intonation]
the J. really likes of read-INFIN likes
‘John does like reading.’

the J. likes of read
‘John likes reading.’

[B] b. O João (realmente) gosta de ler. (Realmente) gosta.
the J. really likes of read. really likes
‘John (really) likes reading. He really does.’

The distinction between mono-sentential verb reduplication and bi-sentential reiterative repetition can be further tested by observing their contrastive behaviour with respect to sequences of a finite verb plus a nonfinite verb, be the finite verb an auxiliary (e.g. ser ‘be’) or a raising/control verb (e.g. ir ‘go’). While syntactic reduplication cannot target but the finite verb (see (125b) vs. (125c) and (126b) vs. (126c)), the whole verbal sequence can be reiteratively repeated (see (125c) vs. (125d) and (126c) vs. (126d)).

(125) [A] a. Eu não fui avisada.
I not was warned
‘I wasn’t warned.’

[B] b. Tu foste avisada, foste. [verb reduplication (rising intonation)]
you were warned were
‘Of course you were warned.’

c. *Tu foste avisada, foste avisada. [verb reduplication (rising intonation)]
you were warned, were warned.
‘Of course you were warned.’

d. Tu foste avisada. Foste avisada. Não finjas que não. [sentence repetition]
You were warned. were warned. not pretend that not
You were warned. I’m sure you were warned. Don’t pretend you were not.’
Finally, it must be pointed out that emphatic verb reduplication is incompatible with negation. EP verb reduplication is a grammatical strategy to express emphatic disagreement in affirmative sentences only. Negative sentences are ungrammatical with reduplication of the verb by itself (see (127b) below) or associated with the predicative negation marker (see (127c) below) — the latter qualifying as an instance of morphological complexity (cf. section 6.3.2.1 above). Because verb reduplication is distinct from sentence repetition, there is no constraint against repeating reiteratively (in a bi-sentential structure) the sequence negation marker plus verb (see (127d) below).

6.4. Negative declaratives

Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese display a similar behaviour in what concerns the expression of polarity in (non-emphatic) negative declaratives.

While the default (positive) polarity of a clause is not grammatically encoded through an overt affirmative marker (see (127a)), negation always has overt content. Moreover, standard (propositional) negation is necessarily expressed pre-verbally, as illustrated in (127) respectively by the predicative negation marker não ‘not’ (see (127b)), the negative coordination conjunction nem ‘nor’ (see (127c-d)), the negative focusing word nem ‘not even’ (see (127e)), and the negative prepositional complementizer sem ‘without’ (see 127f)).

In the next section, it will be shown that in Northern varieties of BP a single pos-verbal negation word can express emphatic negation. In section 6.5, we will see that metalinguistic negation is extensively expressed through particular post-verbal markers in EP and to some extent in BP as well.
immediately precedes the verb, only pronominal clitics being allowed to disrupt the adjacency between não and the verb (see (127g)). This positional restriction does not apply to nem (‘nor/not even’) or sem (‘without’), as shown in (127d) and (127e).

(127) a. O João saiu.
the J. went-out
‘John went out.’

b. O João não saiu.
the J. not went-out
‘John didn’t went out.’

c. O João não/nem saiu nem dormiu.
‘J. neither went out nor slept.’

d. Nem o João nem a Maria saíram
nor the J. nor the M. went-out
‘Neither John nor Mary went out.’

e. O João nem dormiu.
the John not-even sleep
‘John didn’t even sleep.’

f. O João não sai sem o filho chegar a casa.
the John not leaves without the son arrive-INFIN to home
‘John won’t leave before his son comes in.’

g. Ele não me viu.
he not saw me
‘He didn’t see me.’

The clause-internal negative predicative marker não ‘not’ is homophonous with the clause-external negative word não ‘no’. While the former is strictly dependent on the verbal form it precedes, the latter can occur in isolation (see (128a)), can occur in clause final position after the complementizer que ‘that’ (see (128b)), or expressing emphatic negation (see (128c)), can occur sandwiched between two occurrences of que in re-complementation structures (see (128d)), can occur in initial position in answers to yes/no questions, where it surfaces in tandem with the predicative negation marker não ‘not’ (see (128e)). In all respects, the negative clause-external word não ‘no’ syntactically behaves like its responsive-partner sim ‘yes’ (see (129)). To the contrary, the predicative negation marker não ‘not’ has no overt positive morpho-syntactic counterpart.

(128) a. – Ele vem? – Não.
he comes? no
‘– Is he coming? – No.’

b. – Ele vem? – Ele disse que não.
he comes? he said that no
‘– Is he coming? – ‘He said he isn’t’

35 Moreover, in a number of dialectal varieties the word não expressing predicative negation undergoes phonological weakening (the final diphthong being reduced to a single vowel that can be denasalized) while the clause-external não cannot:
(i) Eu nu/nun(BP)/na/nã(EP)/não quero não/*nu/*num/*nã.
I not want no
‘I do not want.’

36 The fact that the use of sim is quite restricted in Brazilian Portuguese is irrelevant here.
c. – Ele vem, não vem? – Não vem não.
he comes, not comes? not comes no
‘– He is coming, isn’t he? – No, he is not.’
d. – Ele vem? – Ele disse que não que não vem.
he comes? he said that no that not comes
‘– Is he coming? – He said that he is not coming.’
e. – Ele vem? – Não, não vem.
he comes? no not comes
‘– Is he coming? – No, he isn’t.’

(128) a. – Ele vem? – Sim.
he comes? yes
‘– Is he coming? – Yes.’
b. – Ele vem? – Ele disse que sim.
he comes? he said that yes
‘– Is he coming? – He said so.’
c. – Ele não vem. – Vem sim.
he not comes. Comes yes
‘– He is not coming. – Of course he is coming.’
d. – Ele vem? – Ele disse que sim que vem.
he comes? he said that yes that comes
‘– Is he coming? – He said he is coming.’
e. – Ele vem? – Sim, vem.
he comes? yes comes
‘– Is he coming? – Yes, he is.’

The requirement that predicative negation be pre-verbally marked can be satisfied by placing a negative polarity item (NPIs) like the indefinites *nenhum* ‘no-one’, *nada* ‘nothing’, *ninguém* ‘nobody’ or the adverb *nunca* ‘never’ in preverbal position (see (130)). Actually, in the relevant configuration the predicative negation marker *não* ‘not’ is not allowed to surface (see (131)). Its phonological realization becomes obligatory, though, whenever the negative indefinites or the adverb *nunca* come after the verb (see (132)). In this respect, there is a clear asymmetry between preverbal and postverbal NPIs as for their interaction with the syntax of negation.37

37 On the nature of negative polarity items in Portuguese and their interplay with negation, see Martins (2000). In Portuguese, in contrast to most Romance languages, NPIs are not allowed in *positive non-affirmative* contexts (e.g. questions, conditionals, complements of ‘prohibition’ predicates, ‘before’ clauses; see Huddleston & Pullum 2002:822ff), which suggests they are *strong* NPIs:
(i) a. **Italian**
   Si domandava se sarebbe venuto nessuno.
herself asked-3SG if would-be come no-one
   ‘She wondered if anyone would come.’
   b. **Portuguese**
   Perguntava-se se viria *ninguém/alguém.
   asked-3SG-herself if would-come nobody/somebody
   ‘She wondered if anyone would come.’
(ii) a. **Catalan**
   Si vols menjar res, avisa’m.
   if want-2SG eat-INFIN nothing warn-2SG me
   ‘If you want to eat anything, let me know.’
   b. **Portuguese**
   Se quiseres comer *nada/alguma coisa, diz-me.
   if want-2SG eat-INFIN nothing/something tell-2SG me
   ‘If you want to eat anything, let me know.’
(iii) a. **Spanish**
   El comandante prohibió que saliera nadie del cuartel.
   the commander prohibited that would-leave nobody from-the barracks
   b. **Portuguese**
   O comandante proibiu que *ninguém/alguém saísse do quartel.
   the commander prohibits that nobody/somebody would-leave from-the barracks
(130) a. Ninguém/Nenhum deles telefonou.
    nobody/none of them called
    b. Nunca telefonam
    never call-3PL
    ‘They never call.’
    c. Nada disseram.
    nothing said-3PL
    ‘They didn’t say anything.’

(131) a. *Ninguém não telefonou.
    nobody not called
    ‘Nobody called.’
    b. Nunca não telefonam.
    never not call-3PL
    ‘They never call.’

(132) a. Não telefonou ninguém.
    not called nobody
    ‘Nobody called.’
    b. *Telefonou ninguém.
    called nobody
    ‘Nobody called.’
    c. Não telefonam nunca.
    not call-3PL never
    ‘They never call.’
    d. *Telefonam nunca.
    call-3PL never
    ‘They never call.’

As the sentences in (132) reveal the co-occurrence within the same clausal domain of the predicative negation marker não ‘not’ and a negative polarity item does not give rise to a double negation reading. Instead, a negative concord reading always obtains, so that the whole sentence unambiguously expresses standard negation. Negative concord also emerges when two or more NPIs are stacked within the same clause:

(133) a. Nunca vês nada.
    never see-2SG nothing
    ‘You never see anything’
    b. Nunca ninguém vê nada.
    never nobody sees nothing
    ‘Nobody ever sees anything’

(iv)  a. French
      Pierre est parti avant que personne ait pu faire aucun geste.
      Peter is left before that nobody might-have been-able to do no move
      ‘The commander prohibited anybody from leaving the barracks.’

      b. Portuguese
      O Pedro partiu antes que *ninguém/algum pudesse fazer *nenhum/um gesto.
      the Peter left before that nobody/somebody could do-INFIN no/a move
      ‘Peter left before anyone could make a move.’
Moreover, Portuguese displays negative concord across clause boundaries in complex sentences with certain main predicates (compare (134a) with the predicate pedir ‘ask’, which allows long-distance negative concord, with (134b) with the predicate surpreender ‘surprise’, which does not allow long-distance negative concord). If long-distance negative concord arises, the requirement on preverbal negation is fulfilled by the matrix clause predicative negation marker (i.e. there is one single domain with respect to polarity computation); otherwise, the lack of preverbal negation within the embedded clause gives rise to ungrammaticality, as seen in (134b) in contrast to (134a).

(134) a. Não te pedi que me oferceses nada.
not you asked that me-DAT offered-SUBJUNCTIVE nothing
‘I didn’t ask you to give me anything.’

b. *Não me surpreende que (ele) me ofercesse nada.
not me surprises that he me-DAT offered-SUBJUNCTIVE nothing
‘I’m not surprised that he didn’t give me anything.’

Clause-bound double negation (involving cancelling of the negative meaning of a negative operator under the scope of another negative operator) can only emerge in Portuguese as the result of the interaction between não ‘not’ and sem ‘without’, the former scoping over the latter (but see footnote 45 below). Besides, either the former or the latter must express constituent negation, which is unable to enter negative concord relations.

The complex sentence (136) below displays the word string não sem ‘not without’, where não marks constituent negation (the negated constituent is the infinitival subordinate clause) and sem expresses propositional negation within the infinitival domain. That double negation is at stake here is evidenced by the fact that minimizer idioms (which are strong NPIs) are not licensed within the infinitival clause introduced by não sem while they are fine if sem alone introduces the subordinate clause (independently of the positive or negative polarity of the matrix clause).

(136) a. O Pedro saiu [não [sem antes dizer adeus]].
the P. left not without before say-INFIN goodbye
‘Peter didn’t leave without saying goodbye.’

---

38On this matter, see Peres (1995, 1997), Quer (1993), Klooster (1995), Giannakidou (1997), Giannakidou & Quer (1997), among others. Volitional, ‘believe’ and perception predicates, like querer ‘want’, acreditar/pensar ‘believe, think’ and ver/sentir ‘see, feel’, respectively, belong to the restricted set of predicates that license long-distance negative concord. This is illustrated in (i) to (iv); note that the minimizer idiom mexer um dedo (move a finger = 'lift a finger') is a strong NPI. Long-distance negative concord is more widespread across infinitival than finite clause boundaries (see (iii) below)).

(i) Eu não quero que lhe aconeteça nada.
I not want that him/her happens-SUBJUNCTIVE nothing
‘I don’t want that anything bad happens to him/her.’

(ii) Não acredito/penso que tenha mexido um dedo para me ajudar.
not believe/think-1SG that has-SUBJUNCTIVE moved a finger to me help
‘I don’t believe him/her to have lifted a finger to help me.’

(iii) Não vi que mexesse um dedo para ajudar ninguém /*para que socorressem ninguém.
not saw-1SG that moved-SUBJUNCTIVE a finger to help nobody / to that rescue-SBJ nobody
‘I didn’t see him/her lift a finger to help anybody.’

(iv) Não senti que esse tratamento me tivesse feito bem nenhum.
not felt that that treatment me had-SUBJUNCTIVE done well none
‘I didn’t feel that medical treatment did me any good.’
b. *O Pedro vai viajar não sem ter um tostão furado.
   the P. goes travel-INFIN not without have-INFIN a cent holed

c. O Pedro (não) vai viajar sem ter um tostão furado.
   the P. (not) goes travel-INFIN without have-INFIN a cent holed
   ‘Peter is (not) travelling without a red cent.’

In the simple sentences in (137) below, on the other hand, sem marks constituent negation and is under the scope of predicative negation expressed by não ‘not’ or a preverbal NPI (presumably (137b-c) only differ from (137a) in that in the former the predicative negation marker is covert while in the latter it is overt). Because negative concord does not involve constituent negation, a double negation reading arises here as well (similarly to (136)).

(137) a. Ela não sai sem chapéu.
   she not goes-out without hat
   ‘She doesn’t go out without wearing a hat.’
   (= ‘She always wears a hat when going out.’)

   b. Ela nunca sai sem chapéu.
      she never goes-out without hat
      ‘She never goes out without wearing a hat.’
      (= ‘She always wears a hat when going out.’)

   c. Aqui ninguém sai sem chapéu.
      here nobody goes-out without hat
      ‘Here, nobody goes out without wearing a hat.’
      (= ‘Here, everybody wears a hat when going out.’)

Double negation readings of complex sentences with independently negated clausal predicates are trivially found in Portuguese, as exemplified in (138):

(138) a. Não há um dia em que eu não pense nele.
   not is a day in that I not think of-him
   ‘There isn’t a single day I don’t think of him.’
   (= ‘I always think of him.’)

   b. Ele nunca lhe acontece não saber o que dizer.
      he never him-DAT happens not know-INFIN the what say-INFIN
      ‘It never happens to him not finding what to say.’
      (= ‘He always knows what to say.’)

6.5. Emphatic negation

European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese share one same construction to express emphatic negation that displays sentence-final não ‘no’. This emphatic negation structure parallels the sim-final pattern described above with respect to emphatic affirmation. While in the latter sentence-final sim amplifies an affirmative declarative, in the former sentence-final não amplifies a negative declarative. In these structures, não acts as a reinforcing tag with respect to the truth-conditional content of the declarative sentence it is attached to. Thus, two negation items surface in the emphatic negation sentences, namely the clause-internal predicative negation marker não ‘not’ and the clause-external negative word não ‘no’. Emphatic negation, like emphatic
affirmation, contradicts/denies a previous positive assertion, presented as a statement or as a tag question, as illustrated in (139) and (140) respectively.

(139) a. Vocês saíram sem pagar.
    you left without pay-INFIN
    ‘You left without paying.’

    b. A gente não saiu sem pagar não.
    we not left without pay-INFIN no
    ‘We did not leave without paying!’

(140) a. Ele gosta de bacalhau, não gosta?
    he likes of codfish, not likes
    ‘He likes codfish, doesn’t he?’

    b. Não gosta não.
    not likes no
    ‘No, he does not.’

Besides the emphatic negation pattern that unifies EP and BP, each variety displays an additional unshared pattern to syntactically express emphatic negation. In European Portuguese, the negative indefinite nada ‘nothing’ can be devoid of its primitive meaning to express just emphatic negation. In the Northern dialects of Brazilian Portuguese, sentence-final não can by itself, not coupled with predicative negation, syntactically encode emphatic negation. The two strategies that set apart EP and BP are exemplified below. In the EP sentences in (141)-(142), the verb appears sandwiched in between the predicative negation marker não ‘not’ and non-argumental nada (originated from ‘nothing’). In the BP sentence in (143), negation is marked only postverbally, which shows that the requirement that negation be preverbal in Portuguese has no exceptions when we are dealing with standard/unmarked negation but does not necessarily extends to emphatic negation structures. (In the next section, we will see that metalinguistic negation also escapes the preverbal requirement).

European Portuguese:

(141) a. Ontem cheguei cedo.
    yesterday arrived-1SG early
    ‘I arrived early yesterday’

    b. Não chegaste nada.
    not arrived-2SG nada
    ‘You did NOT’

39 Nada as a non-argumental negative word devoid (even if only partially) of the interpretation of the NPI nada ‘nothing’ shows up in some other constructions:

(i) Meninos, nada de comerem os bombons todos.
    children, nothing of eat-INFLECTED INFIN-3PL chocolates
    ‘Children, don’t you dare to eat all the chocolates.’

(iii) – Ele telefonou para te dar os parabéns?
    he called-3SG to you-DAT give-INFIN the congratulations
    ‘Did he call to congratulate you?’
    – Nada disso! (PE) / Que nada! (PB)
    nothing of-that (PB) / what nothing (PB)
    ‘Not al all!’
(142) a. Vi o teu namorado a beijar a Maria.
    saw-1SG the your boyfriend to kiss the Mary
  b. Não viste nada o meu namorado a beijar a Maria.
    not saw-2SG nada the my boyfriend to kiss the Mary
    ‘You did NOT see my boyfriend kissing Mary.’

Brazilian Portuguese, Northern dialects:
(143) a. Cê demorou pra chegar.
    you took-long to arrive
    ‘You took forever to arrive here.’
  b. Demorei não.
    took-long-1SG no
    ‘I did not take forever.’

In the dialects where sentences like (143) are found, they did not replace the more widespread pattern with preverbal plus sentence-final negation. The two different structures coexist in Northern Brazilian Portuguese and actually manifest a distinct behaviour in some respects, with the latter, but not the former, somehow overlapping with standard/unmarked negation. Evidence in this direction comes from the availability/unavailability of each type of structure in discourse and syntactic configurations that do not correspond to the typical contexts that license emphatic negation.

First, preverbal+sentence-final não, but not single sentence-final não, can surface in answers to standard yes/no questions, which are unbiased information requests:

(144) A  a. Por que você está desesperada? O que aconteceu?
        for what you are desperate? what happened?
        ‘Why are you desperate? What happened?’
    B  b. Eu não tô achando minha gatinha não.
        I not am finding my pussycat no
        am finding my pussycat no
        ‘I’m not finding my pussycat.’
        (Biberauer & Cyrino (2009), ex. (48))

Second, preverbal+sentence-final não, but not single sentence-final não, can occur in embedded clauses, as illustrated in (145). The grammaticality of (145a) is quite unexpected since emphatic-polarity structures (both affirmative and negative) are in general excluded from embedded domains.

(145) a. Ele disse que ele não comprou a casa não.
        he said that he not bought the house no
  b. *Ele disse que ele comprou a casa não.
        he said that he bought the house no
        ‘He said that he hasn’t bought the house.’
        (Biberauer & Cyrino (2009), ex. (49))

---

40 On the two different Brazilian Portuguese structures with postverbal não ‘no’, see Cavalcante (2007), Biberauer & Cyrino (2009), and the references therein.
Third, preverbal+sentence-final *não*, but not single sentence-final *não*, is available in standard unbiased yes/no questions and in interrogatives that are not standard questions but polite invitations, offers or requests:

(146) a. Você não comprou a casa não?
you not bought the house no

b. *Você comprou a casa não?* (*as an unbiased information request)*\(^{41}\)
you bought the house no
‘Haven’t you bought the house?’
(Biberauer & Cyrino (2009), ex. (50)

(147) a. Você não quer tomar um cafezinho não?
you not want take-INFIN a coffee no

b. *Você quer tomar um cafezinho não?* (*as an unbiased information request)
you want take-INFIN a coffe no
‘Wouldn’t you like to have some coffee?’
(Biberauer & Cyrino (2009), ex. (51)

When we compare Brazilian Portuguese with European Portuguese with respect to the ‘preverbal+sentence-final *não*’ construction, interestingly the EP sentences diverge from their BP syntactic equivalents and pattern with the Northern BP single-final-*não* sentences in being excluded from embedded clauses,\(^{42}\) yes/no questions, and answers to standard unbiased yes/no questions. These facts support the view that in BP the double-neg-marking structure is weakening its emphatic import and expanding over the grammatical space of standard/unmarked negation. In this respect BP strikingly contrasts with EP.

One last difference between double-neg-marking and single-postverbal-neg-marking sentences deserves being pointed out. Only the latter construction licenses minimizer idioms that are strong NPIs, as is illustrated in (148) with the minimizer *um tostão furado* ‘a red cent’.\(^{43}\)

(148) A a. O João é rico!
the J. is rich
‘John is rich!’

B b. O quê? Ele não tem um tostão furado não.
the what he not has a cent holed no

---

\(^{41}\) The sentence is grammatical as an interrogative-exclamative that comments on a statement the speaker resists to accept:

(i) Você comprou a casa não?
you bought the house no
‘You DIDN’T buy the house?! (I though you had!/I can’t believe it!’

Both emphatic negation constructions are not allowed in wh-interrogatives (see Cavalcante 2007).

\(^{42}\) Recall that also emphatic affirmation structures are limited to matrix clauses.

\(^{43}\) According to Cavalcante (2007), nevertheless, the single-final-*não* sentences can license standard NPIs:

(i) Veio ninguém não
came nobody no
‘In fact, nobody came.’

(ii) Ele falô nada não.
he spoke nothing no
‘He did not say a word.’
Table 7 below summarizes the similarities and contrasts between European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese with respect to the syntactic encoding of emphatic negation.\textsuperscript{45}

Table 7: Emphatic negation in European and Brazilian Portuguese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative disagreement in the context of tag-questions and declaratives</th>
<th>European Portuguese</th>
<th>Brazilian Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preverbal+sentence-final negation</td>
<td>não ‘not’-V-(X)-não ‘no’</td>
<td>preverbal+sentence-final negation: não ‘not’-V-(X)-não ‘no’*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal+postverbal negation</td>
<td>não ‘not’-V-nada [former ‘nothing’]</td>
<td>single sentence-final negation: V-(X)-não ‘no’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Northern BP dialects)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Northern BP dialects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 The sentence is only permitted if um tostão furado has a literal reading, that is, ‘a cent with a hole’.

45 In this section, we restricted our attention to the more general case of emphatic negation, that is, denial of a previous positive assertion. Nonetheless, emphatic negation sentences may also contradict a previous negative statement, as shown in (i) below. (ib) and (ic) are interpretatively cases of double negation. Note, however, that (ic) only gets the double negation reading when associated with a special flat intonation (instead of the rising intonation characteristic of denial). Otherwise, it has the negative concord interpretation described above (in the present section). (id) displays the same kind of flat intonation that characterizes (ic), which is perhaps a prosodic indicator/clue for irony.

(i)  

A  

a. Ele não gosta disso.  
   he not likes that  
   ‘He doesn’t like that.’

B  

b. Não que não gosta.  
   no that not likes

c. Não gosta não.  
   not likes not

d. Gosta pouco gosta.  
   likes little likes  
   ‘Of course he does like it.’

6.6. Metalinguistic negation

The phenomenon of \textit{metalinguistic negation} has been brought to prominence by the work of Laurence Horn (1985, 1989), who characterizes it as a marked, nondescriptive use of negation – one that falls within the range of denial (like emphatic negation) but signals a particular kind of disagreement.

While two distinct uses of sentential negation must indeed be admitted, the marked, nondescriptive variety is not a truth-functional or semantic operator on propositions, but rather an instance of the phenomenon of METALINGUISTIC NEGATION – a device for objecting to a previous utterance on any grounds whatever (…), a speaker’s use of negation to signal his or her unwillingness to assert, or accept another’s assertion of, a given proposition in a given way; \textit{metalinguistic negation} focuses not on the truth or falsity of a proposition, but on the assertability of an utterance. (Horn 1989:363)
It should be acknowledged that the notion ASSERTABLE, as employed by Grice, Dummett, and me, must be taken as elliptical for something like ‘felicitously assertable’ or ‘appropriately assertable’, where the adverbial hedge is broad enough to cover the wide range of examples (…). But the distinction drawn by Grice and Dummett between rejecting a claim as false and rejecting it as (perhaps true, but) unassertable suggests the proper approach for characterizing the two uses of negation (Horn 1989:379)

The examples in (149)-(150) are borrowed from Horn (1989:368ff) and show that differently from regular (unmarked) negation, metalinguistic negation does not (necessarily) entail the untruth of the corresponding affirmative proposition.46

(149) a. A Chris managed to solve some problems. 
   B Chris didn’t manage to solve some problems – he solved them easily.
   b. A He is meeting a woman this evening. 
   B No, he’s not (meeting a woman this evening) – he’s meeting his wife!
   c. A Were you a little worried? 
   B I wasn’t a little worried, my friend; I was worried sick.

(150) a. Some men aren’t chauvinists – all men are chauvinists.
   b. I didn’t manage to trap two mongooses – I managed to trap two mongooses.
   c. They didn’t have a baby and get married, they got married and had a baby.
   d. I didn’t spend the night with Mary – I spent the night with Mary and her husband.
   e. Around here, we don’t like coffee, we love it.
   f. That wasn’t a bad year, it was horrible.
   g. You didn’t eat some of the cookies, you ate all of them.
   h. It isn’t possible she’ll win, it’s downright certain she will.
   i. It’s not warm out; it’s downright hot.

Horn (1989:366ff) calls attention to the fact that no natural language seems to employ two distinct negative markers which correspond directly to standard/regular and metalinguistic negation. While Portuguese at a first glance seems to conform to Horn’s claim, it actually possesses unambiguous markers of metalinguistic negation (which given their colloquial nature have passed unnoticed in Portuguese grammars). The sentences in (151) illustrate how the European Portuguese translations of Horn’s example (149d) above display either the standard negative marker não ‘not’ or the negative markers lá/cá, agora (originated respectively in the locative deictics lá/cá ‘there’/‘here’ and the temporal deictic agora ‘now’, which coexist with the homonym negative markers). Lá/cá and agora occur immediately after the verb while não, expressing standard or metalinguistic negation, immediately precedes the verb. Because lá/cá and agora express but metalinguistic negation, the descriptive generalization that standard (propositional) negation has to be marked preverbally in Portuguese (cf. section 6.4) is maintained and exceptionless.47

---

46 Cf. Horn (1989:392): “negation is used metalinguistically to deny the appropriateness of using a predicate which would yield a true but misleading assertion (one which would induce false conventional or conversational implicata)”.

47 That the metalinguistic negation markers lá/cá, agora are not (logical) propositional negation operators is confirmed by the contrast in (i) below. Because corrective mas ‘but’, in the relevant structure, is only licensed when preceded by (logical) propositional negation, it is licensed by não ‘not’ but excluded by
**European Portuguese:**

(151) A Tu estavas um pouco preocupado?
you were a little worried
‘Were you a little worried?’

B a. Eu não estavas um pouco preocupado. Estava morto de preocupação.
I not was a little worried. was dead of worry
b. Eu estava lá/cá/agora um pouco preocupado. Estava morto de
I was lá/cá/agora a little worried. was dead of
preocupação.

worry
‘I wasn’t a little worried, my friend; I was worried sick.’

In the present section, we will be concerned with clarifying the grammatical behaviour of lá and agora as metalinguistic negation markers in Portuguese (we will restrict our attention to the more productive of the two negative markers originated in the locative deictics lá ‘there’, cá ‘here’). Because this particular way of encoding metalinguistic negation is a hallmark of European Portuguese while it is scarcely represented in Brazilian Portuguese, we will first handle European Portuguese data. Then we will compare the two varieties of Portuguese.

6.6.1. Metalinguistic Negation in European Portuguese

There are a number of standard tests to identify metalinguistics negation, which we will apply to confirm that the EP words lá and agora do indeed exclusively signal this kind of negation.

Metalinguistic negation must be licensed by the discourse context, since it is always denial of the assertability of an (earlier) utterance. Uttered out of the blue to initiate a conversation, the sentences in (152) to (154) are descriptions of a state of affairs and the negative marker in them can only encode standard/regu lar descriptive negation. As expected and confirmed by the grammaticality contrast between the (a) and (b) examples in (152)-(154), the unambiguous metalinguistic negation markers lá, agora have no place in such sentences.

(152) a. Ah, não trouxe a carteira. Pagas-me o café?
ah not brought-1SG the wallet pay-2SG-me-DAT the coffee
b. *Ah, trouxe lá/agora a carteira. Pagas-me o café?
*ah brought-1SG lá/agora the wallet pay-2SG-me-DAT the coffee
‘Ah, I didn’t bring my wallet. Will you pay me a coffee?’

lá/cá, agora. Note that even if ‘not’ can crosslinguistically have a metalinguistic use, it crucially is not semantically ambiguous – see Horn (1989) on the pragmatic, not semantic, ambiguity of ‘not’.

(i) a. Ele não tem três filhos, mas quatro.
he not has three children but four
*he has lá/cá/agora three children but four
‘He doesn’t have three children, but four.’

48 The measure for productivity here are the judgments of the second author, as well as the fact that lá signals metalinguistic negation in European and Brazilian Portuguese whereas cá is restricted to European Portuguese.
The licensing of positive polarity items (PPIs) constitutes a robust test to set apart standard/regular negation and metalinguistic negation. While the former excludes PPIs, the latter is fully compatible with them. The examples in (155) and (156) show that do diabo and e peras are PPIs in European Portuguese (see the (a) to (c) examples) and in addition confirm that such PPIs are barred/excluded from standard/regular negative sentences with preverbal não but allowed in sentences with postverbal lá/ágora that express metalinguistic negation (see the (d) examples).

(155) a. Ele é um nadador e peras
   ’He is a great swimmer.’
   b. *Ele não é uma nadador e peras. (não interpreted as standard negation)
   ’He isn’t a great swimmer.’
   c. *Ele é um nadador e peras?
   ’Is he a great swimmer?’
   d. Ele é lá/ágora um nadador e peras. (as a reply to (155a))
   he is lá/ágora a swimmer and pears
   ’He isn’t a great swimmer.’

(156) a. Tiveste uma sorte do diabo.
   had-2SG a good-luck of-the devil
   ’So lucky you were!’
   b. *Não tiveste uma sorte do diabo. (não interpreted as standard negation)
   not had-2SG a good-luck of-the devil
   ’You were not that lucky.’
   c. *Tiveste uma sorte do diabo?
   had-2SG a good-lucf of-the devil
   ’Were you really lucky?’

49 Sentences (155b) and (156b) could be interpreted as instances of metalinguistic negation only if they were associated with a continuation/rectification (see (i) below), which is not a necessary condition for the availability of sentences (155d) and (156d), since the negative markers lá/ágora can only signal metalinguistic negation.

(i) a. Ele não é uma nadador e peras – ele é o melhor nadador do mundo.
   he not is a swimmer and pears – he is the best swimmer of the world
   ’He isn’t a great swimmer – he is the best swimmer in the world.’
   b. Não tiveste uma sorte do diabo – tiveste o que merecias.
   not had-2SG a good-luck of-the devil – had-2SG the what deserved-2SG
   ’You weren’t so lucky – you just got what you deserved.’
d. Tive lá/agora uma sorte do diabo. (as a reply to (156a))
   had-1SG lá/agora a good-luck of-the devil
   ‘I wasn’t so lucky!’

As for their denial nature (associated with a characteristic rising intonation\(^{50}\), and
the capability to license PPIs, metalinguistic negation and emphatic negation (see
section 6.5 above) are similar.\(^{51}\) But the two types of marked negation also display
particular contrasting properties.

While metalinguistic negation expressed by lá, agora is totally incompatible with
any type of negative polarity items (NPIs), emphatic negation licenses NPIs either
generally (in the case of the emphatic negation pattern common to EP and BP) or to
some extent (in the case of the patterns of emphatic negation belonging to EP or BP in
particular). Sentences (157) to (160) illustrate the incompatibility of the metalinguistic
negation markers lá/agora with NPIs, showing their divergent pattern with respect to
standard/regular negation. Sentences (161) to (162) confirm the contrast between
emphatic negation and metalinguistic negation in this respect, as the former may license
NPIs.


\(^{51}\) Metalinguistic negation and emphatic negation are also similar in being excluded from embedded
domains as exemplified in (i) below. Recall that, as pointed out in section 6.3, also emphatic affirmation
is restricted to matrix domains – see (ii).

(i) a. *?O João disse-me que ela não vai viajar com o marido não.
   the J. told-me that she not going travel-INFIN with the husband not
   the J. told me that she is not travelling with her husband.

b. * O João disse-me que ela vai lá/agora viajar com o marido.
   the J. told me that she goes lá/agora travel-INFIN with the husband
   ‘John told me that she is indeed travelling with her husband.’

(ii) a. *O João disse-me que ela vai viajar com o marido, vai.
   the J. told me that she goes travel-INFIN with the husband goes
   the J. told me that she is indeed travelling with her husband.

b. *?O João disse-me que ela vai viajar com o marido sim.
   the J. told me that she goes travel-INFIN with the husband yes
   ‘John told me that she is indeed travelling with her husband.’
(159) **A** Hoje vais sair comigo.
 today go-2SG go-out with-me
 ‘Today we are going out together.’

**B**

a. Eu não saio contigo nem morta.
 I not go-out-1SG with-you not-even dead

b. *Eu saio lá/agora contigo nem morta.
 I go-out-1SG lá/agora with-you not-even dead
 ‘No way I will go out with you.’

(160) **A** Eu sei que tu gostas de marisco.
 I know-1SG that you like-2SG seafood

**B**

a. Eu não gosto de marisco de todo.
 I not like-1SG of seafood at all

b. *Eu gosto lá/agora de marisco de todo.
 I like-1SG lá/agora of seafood at all
 ‘I don’t like seafood at all.’

(161) **A** Vou convidar os meus amigos todos para virem jantar.
 go-1SG invite-INFIN the my friends all to come-INFL.INFIN-3PL dine-INFIN
 ‘I’m inviting all my friends to come and have dinner with us.’

**B**

Não vais convidar ninguém.
 not go-2SG invite-INFIN nobody
 ‘You aren’t inviting anybody.’

(A) Vou sim.
 go-1SG yes
 ‘Yes I am.’

**B**

a. Não vais convidar ninguém não.
 not go-2SG invite-INFIN nobody no

b. *Vais lá/agora convidar ninguém.
 go-2SG lá/agora invite-INFIN nobody
 ‘You are not inviting anybody.’

(162) **A** Anda, dá um beijo à tua amiga para fazerem as pazes.
 come, give-2SG a kiss to-the your friend to make-INFL.INFIN the peace
 ‘Come on, give a kiss to your friend and make your peace with her.’

**B**

a. Não lhe dou nada beijo nenhum.
 not her give-1SG nada kiss none

 give-1SG-her lá/agora kiss none
 ‘No way. I won’t give her a kiss.’

Strikingly contrasting with standard negation and emphatic negation, the metalinguistic negation markers *lá, agora* do not enter negative concord relations, as shown above by their inability to license NPIs. Thus, metalinguistic negation does not display patterns of ‘discontinuous negation’, unlike emphatic negation that typically gives rise to multiple marking of (a single instance of logical) negation. Besides being incompatible with NPIs, the metalinguistic negation markers *lá, agora* are also unable to establish negative concord with the negative marker *não* ‘not’ or with members of a different set of metalinguistic negation markers – illustrated in (163d,f) by *uma ova* ‘a roe’ – that appear in clause-final or clause-initial position.
(163) A  Tens de pedir-lhe desculpa.
   have-2SG to ask-INFIN-him apology
   ‘You must apologize to him.’
   B  a.  Peço-lhe lá/ágora desculpa.
      ask-1SG-him lá/ágora apology
      b.  Não lhe peço desculpa(, não).
         not him ask-1SG apology no
      c.  *Não lhe peço lá desculpa(, não).
          not him ask-1SG lá apology
      d.  Peço-lhe desculpa uma ova.
          ask-1SG-him apology a roe
      e.  *Peço-lhe lá desculpa uma ova.
          ask-1SG-him apology a roe
      f.  Uma ova é que lhe peço desculpa.
          a roe is that him ask-1SG apology
      g.  *Uma ova é que lhe peço lá desculpa
          a roe is that him ask-1SG lá apology
   ‘I will not apologize to him.’

Lá diverges from agora in that it totally excludes the presence of não ‘not’ (see (163c)) while agora, at least for some EP speakers, can co-occur with não, but in this case it objects to a previous negative utterance and induces a double negation interpretation. So, negative concord is not available for agora as it is not for lá.

(164) A  Eu não vou pedir-lhe desculpa.
   I not go-1SG ask-INFIN-him apology
   ‘I will not apologize to him.’
   B  Não vais agora pedir-lhe desculpa.
      not go-2SG agora ask-INFIN-him apology
      ‘You certainly will apologize to him.’

With respect to word order, the postverbal metalinguistic negation markers lá and agora require adjacency with the verb. In this respect, they set a clear contrast both with negative-words (see (165)-(166)) and with their homonyms lá, agora, respectively locative and temporal deictics (see (167)-(168)), as illustrated below.

(165) a.  Eu não vivi nunca nessa cidade.
       I not lived never in-that city
 b.  Eu não vivi nessa cidade nunca.
     I not lived in-that city never
       ‘Ive never lived in that city.’

(166) A  Ele viveu sempre em Paris.
       he lived always in Paris
       ‘He has always lived in Paris.’
      he lived lá/ágora always in Paris
    he lived always lá/ágora in Paris
he lived always in Paris lá/agora  
‘I don’t think he has always lived in Paris.’

(167) a. Ele esteve lá todo o dia, em casa da Maria. 
he was there all the day in house of-the M.
b. Ele esteve todo o dia lá, em casa da Maria. 
he was all the day there in house of M.  
‘He was there, at Mary’s place, all day long.’

(168) A Ele esteve todo o dia em casa da Maria. 
he was all the day in house of M. 
B a. Ele esteve lá/agora todo o dia em casa da Maria.  
he was lá/agora all the day in house of-the M.  
b. *Ele esteve todo o dia lá/agora em casa da Maria.  
he was all the day lá/agora in house of-the Mary  
‘I don’t think he was at Mary’s place all day long.’

The two metalinguistic negation markers can cluster together irrespective of their relative ordering:
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52 Some EP speakers, including the second author, judge clause-final agora marginally acceptable: 
(i) a. ??Ele viveu sempre em Paris agora.  
he lived always in Paris agora  
‘He has always lived in Paris.’
he lived always in Paris lá  
‘I don’t think he has always lived in Paris.’

53 The third metalinguistic negation marker, i.e. cá (literally, ‘here’), can also cluster together with agora (literally, ‘now’) but not with lá (literally, ‘there’): cá agora, agora cá, *cá lá, *lá cá. Thus, clusters made up of two primitive locatives are ill-formed.

54 See Cyrino and Matos (2002, 2005, 2006) and chapter XXX. VP ellipsis in Portuguese requires lexical and structural parallelism between the verb in the antecedent sentence and the verb locally licensing the omitted constituent.
(170) A  O João estará em casa?
the John will-be at home
‘Could John be at home?’
  a.  Sei lá.
      know-1SG lá
  b.  *Sei agora.
      know-1SG agora
      ‘I don’t know. (Why am I supposed to know?)’

(171) A  Vem para o nosso grupo de filosofia.
come-2SG to the our group of philosophy
‘Join us in our philosophy group.’
B  Vou agora. Eu sei lá alguma coisa de filosofia.
go-1SG agora. I know-1SG lá something of philosophy
      ‘I don’t think so. I do not know a thing about philosophy.’

(172) A  Ele pagou o jantar? he paid the dinner
‘Did he pay for the dinner?’
B  a.  Agora.
  b.  *Lá.
      ‘He didn’t. (What made you think he might?’)

(173) A  O João vai comprar mas é a bicicleta.
the J. goes buy-INFIN but is the bicycle
‘It is the bike that John is going to buy.’
B  a.  Agora a bicicleta.
      agora the bicycle
  b.  *Lá a bicicleta.
      lá the bicycle
      ‘I don’t think so.’

(174) A  O João tem lido todos os livros.
the J. has read all the books
‘John has been reading every book.’
      has lá
  b.  Tem agora.
      has agora
  c.  O João tem lá lido todos os livros.
      the J. has lá read all the books
      ‘I don’t think so.’

55 Clusters with agora are also permitted in isolation:
(i) A  Ele pagou o jantar?
he paid the dinner
‘Did he pay for the dinner?’
B  a.  Agora lá.
  b.  Agora cá.
      ‘He didn’t. (What made you think he might?’)
(175) A  O João ofereceu um cão à filha.
B  a.  *Ofereceu lá.
b.  Ofereceu agora.
c.  O João ofereceu lá um cão à filha.

6.6.2. Metalinguistic negation in BP in contrast to EP

Here, like in the previous section, we will limit our attention to the expression of metalinguistic negation by means of unambiguous markers, thus leaving aside sentences with *não ‘not’, since the syntax of the predicative negation marker *não ‘not’ is exactly the same in its standard/regular and metalinguistic use (presumably, a linguistic universal).

In Brazilian Portuguese, only *lá (literally, ‘there’) can signal metalinguistic negation in declarative sentences, as shown in (176). In contrast to European Portuguese, though, the availability of *lá in declaratives is restricted to the idiomatic combination with the verb *saber ‘know’ inflected for the 1st person of the present indicative – contrast (176a-c) with (176d-f) and (177). Also differently from European Portuguese, *lá (in the idiomatic combination with *saber ‘know’) is not necessarily postverbal, being allowed to precede the verb immediately or followed by the complementizer *que ‘that’. The preverbal placement of *lá is totally excluded in European Portuguese. (On the other hand, sentences (176d) and (177a) are perfectly grammatical in European Portuguese).

(176) A  Eles vão se casar?
    they go se-REFL marry-INFIN
B  a.  Eu sei lá.
       I know-1SG lá
b.  Eu lá sei.
       I lá know-1SG
c.  Eu lá que sei.
       I lá that know-1SG
       ‘I don’t know. (What made you think I would).’
d.  *Eles vão lá casar.
       they go-3PL lá casar-INFIN
e.  *Eles lá vão casar.
       they lá go-3PL casar-INFIN
f.  *Eles lá que vão casar.
       they lá that go-3PL casar-INFIN
       ‘I don’t think they are going to get married.’

(177) A  Porque você *não me contou que eles iam se casar?
    why you not me told that they were-going se-REFL marry-INFIN
       I knew lá
b.  *Eu lá sabia.
       I lá knew
c.  *Eu lá que sabia.
       I lá that knew
       ‘I didn’t know. (What made you think I would).’
Brazilian Portuguese allows, to a certain extent, the presence of lá and agora in rhetorical questions produced as contradicting responses to a previous affirmative utterance. As exemplified by (178)-(179), we are dealing here with the type of discourse context that licenses metalinguistic negation. As rhetorical questions characteristically carry a negative implicature, they are fit to act as denials.

(178) A  Eu trouxe esses exercícios pra você resolver.
I brought these exercises for you solve
‘These exercises are for you to solve.’

B  a.  Eu agora entendo de matemática?!
I now understand of mathematics
b.  *Eu entendo agora de matemática?!
I understand now of mathematics
   ‘Am I supposed to know about mathematics?!’

(179) A  Eu pensei que você tinha mentido pra mim.
I thought that you had lied for me
   ‘I thought that you were lying to me.’

B  a.  E eu sou lá de fazer essas coisas?!
and I am lá of do-INFIN those thinks
b.  ?? E eu lá sou de fazer essas coisas?!
and I am of do-INFIN thoses thinks
   ‘How could you think I would do that?! (Am I the kind of person to
do that?!)’

As shown by the examples above, there is not a common syntax for rhetorical agora and lá in Brazilian Portuguese, as the former precedes the verb while the latter preferably follows it (i.e. they display their usual sintax as temporal and locative adverb respectively). Moreover, agora and lá are unable to co-occur with all types of verbs (in contrast to European Portuguese), as illustrated in (180) by the near exclusion of lá from sentences with transitive verbs. Under closer scrutiny, we also observe that rhetorical questions with agora or lá do not actually behave as metalinguistic negation environments with respect to the interaction with polarity items. Example (181) shows that the positive polarity item paca ‘very’ is not licensed but excluded from rhetorical questions no matter whether lá is present or not.

(180) A  Você acha que o João quer vir com a gente?
you think that the J. wants come-INFIN with we
   ‘Do you think John will be willing to go there with us?’

B  a.  *Ele compra lá roupa barata?!
he buys lá clothes cheap
b.  ?? Ele lá compra roupa barata?!
he lá buys clothes cheap
   ‘Do you see John buying cheap clothes? (I don’t think he will.)’
(181) A  Ela é antipática mas é bonita paca.
        she is unpleasant but is pretty very
B  a.  *Ela é lá bonita paca?!
        she is lá pretty very
   b.  *Ela é bonita paca?!
        she is pretty very
        ‘How come she is very pretty?!’

The Brazilian Portuguese data discussed in this section appear to indicate that in actual fact the expression of metalinguistic negation through an unambiguous marker is restricted in BP to the idiomatic combination Eu sei lá and its syntactic variations.56

6.7. Expletive negation in exclamatives

Crosslinguistically, expletive negation is optionally found in the type of (positive non-affirmative57) contexts where weak negative polarity items are licensed and has accordingly been treated as a polarity item of the weak type.58 A characteristic feature

56 In both Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese, lá can be a degree-expressing negative polarity item, in which case it is only licensed in negative clauses and is interpreted, within the scope of negation, as a paucal degree word. In EP, but not in BP, the NPI lá necessarily precedes a degree adverb (usually muito ‘very’). In both BP and EP the NPI lá is obligatorily postverbal. But differently from the metalinguistic negation marker lá, the NPI lá does not have to be adjacent to the verb (see (ivb)). Besides, the NPI does not have to be licensed by a discourse context of denial.
Brazilian Portuguese
(i)  a.  Eu não sou lá de fazer essas coisas (mas vou tentar).
        I not am lá of do-INFIN those thing but go-1SG try-INFIN
   b.  *Eu não lá sou de fazer essas coisas (mas vou tentar).
        I not am of do-INFIN those things but go-1SG try-INFIN
        (wrong word order)
   (ii) a.  Ele não é lá de trabalhar muito.
        he not is lá of work-INFIN much
   b.  *Ele não lá é de trabalhar muito.
        he not lá is of work-INFIN much
        (wrong word order)
   c.  *Ele é lá de trabalhar muito.
        he is lá of work-INFIN much
        (unlicensed NPI)
        ‘He doesn’t particularly/especially like to work.’
European Portuguese
(iii) a.  Ele não gosta lá muito de trabalhar.
        he not likes lá much of work-INFIN
   b.  *Ele não gosta lá de trabalhar.
        he not likes lá of work-INFIN
        (lack of degree-word combining with lá)
   c.  *Ele não gosta muito de trabalhar.
        he not lá likes much of work-INFIN
        (wrong word order)
        ‘He doesn’t particularly/especially like to work.’
(iv) a.  Ele não fala lá muito bem inglês.
        he not speaks lá very well English
   b.  Ele não fala inglês lá muito bem.
        he speaks lá very well
        (unlicensed NPI)
        ‘He doesn’t speak English particularly well. / He speaks English not so well.’
57 See Huddleston & Pullum (2002), chapter 9. Non-affirmative includes negative but also all kinds of positive clauses that do not assert a positive proposition, as for example interrogatives, conditionals and the types of subordinate clauses illustrated in (182) to (185).
58 See van der Wouden (1994), Espinal (2000), among others, for this type of approach, and Portner & Zanuttini for a different view.
of Portuguese, in contrast to other Romance languages, is the fact that it extensively disallows expletive negation. Sentences (182) to (185) exemplify the contrast between Portuguese, on the one hand, and, respectively, Galician, Italian, Spanish and French, on the other, with respect to the availability of expletive negation in ‘until’-clauses, comparatives and complement clauses selected by ‘fear’-type verbs.

(182) a. Non che podemos face-los trámites ata que (non) teñas entregado todos papeles
   not you-DAT can-1PL do-INFIN-the procedures until that (not) have-2SG Galician
   delivered all-the documents
   b. Não podemos fazer seguir o processo até que (*não) tenhas entregado todos os papéis.
      not can do-INFIN pursue-INFIN the process until that (not) have-2SG delivered all the documents
   c. ‘The process will not be concluded until you deliver all the documents.’

(183) a. L’ ho fermato, prima che (non) si facesse male.
   Italian
   him have-1SG locked before that (not) himself would-make-3SG harm
   b. Fechei-o antes que (*não) se magoasse
      locked-1SG him before he would harm himself
   c. ‘I locked him in before he would harm himself’

(184) a. Ernesto prefiere ser escéptico que (no) tragarse semejantes disparates.
   Spanish
   Ernesto prefers be-INFIN sceptical than (not) swallow-INFIN such nonsense
   b. O Ernesto prefere ser céptico do que (*não) engolir tais disparates.
      EP
      Ernesto prefers be-INFIN sceptical than (not) swallow-INFIN such nonsense
   c. ‘Ernesto prefers to be sceptical rather than swallowing such nonsense’

(185) a. Je crains qu’il (ne) vienne.
   I fear that he NEG comes
   b. Temo que ele (*não) venha.
      I fear that he NEG comes
   c. ‘I fear he will come.’

Only in exclamative sentences is expletive negation commonly found in Portuguese, acting there as a device to reinforce emphasis:

(186) a. O que um dono (não) faz pelo seu cão!
      the what a owner (not) does for his dog
   b. ‘What a dog’s owner is able to do for (the wellbeing of) his dog!’
   c. ‘The things a dog’s owner is able to do for (the wellbeing of) his dog!’

59 On exclamatives and negation, see Portner and Zanuttini (2000) and González Rodríguez (2007).
In European Portuguese, exclamatives that license expletive negation are of two types: (i) degree exclamatives, containing a wh- phrase, a relative clause or a quantifier – see (187);\(^{60}\) degree exclamatives display the verb in the indicative and their unmarked word order is SV, although VS is also allowed (see (187a) vs. (187b) and (187g) vs. (187h)); (ii) non-quantifying exclamatives, either with subjunctive mood and obligatory subject-verb inversion (see (188)) or introduced by the sequence não é que ‘not is that’ and displaying indicative in tandem with unmarked word order (see (189))\(^{61}\). Only exclamatives with indicative mood and SV order are found in BP (see (190)). While expletive negation is optional in degree exclamatives, it is obligatory in non-quantifying exclamatives.

*European Portuguese:*

(187) a. O que o João (não) faz pelo cão!
the what the J. (not) makes for-the dog
‘I’m amazed on what John is able to do for (the wellbeing of) his dog!’
‘The things John is able to do for (the wellbeing of) his dog!’

b. O que (não) diria o teu pai se soubesse!
the what (not) would-say-3SG your father if knew-3SG
‘What your father would say if he knew about that!’

c. Quantos acidentes (não) se podiam evitar!
how-many accidents (not) se-PASSIVE could avoid-INFIN
‘So many accidents could be avoided!’

d. Quantos livros ele (não) lê!
how-many books he (not) reads
‘So many books he reads!’

e. Os livros que ele (não) lê!
the books that he (not) reads
‘So many books he reads!’

f. As coisas que ele (não) me disse!
the things that he (not) me-DAT told
‘What things he has told me!’

g. Muito ele (não) lê!
much he reads

h. Muito (não) lê ele!
much reads he
‘How much he reads!’ / ‘So much he reads!’

i. Por pouco não me caía do telhado!
for little not me-DAT would-fall-3SG of-the roof

j. Por pouco caía-me do telhado!
for little would-fall-3SG-me-DAT of-the roof
‘He almost fell down from the roof!’

\(^{60}\) Cf. González Rodríguez (2007:117): “Exclamative wh- phrases are extreme degree quantifiers. As such, they affirm emphatically the degree to which a property is held, and the sentences containing them constitute emphatic assertions. My proposal is that this denotation explains that extreme degree quantification patterns with PPIs”.

\(^{61}\) The EP idiomatic sentence in (i) also combines expletive negation with indicative mood in a non-quantifying exclamative (lá is in (i) an emphatic marker).

(i) Não querem lá ver o idiota!
not want-3PL LÁ see-INFIN the idiot
‘Mind you, the idiot!’
(188) a. Cuidado, não me caias daí!
    watch-out not me-DAT fall-SUBJUNCTIVE-2SG from-there
    ‘Watch your step, you may fall down!’

    b. Vai lá depressa, não me compre ele o livro errado!
    go-2SG there quickly not me-DAT buy-3SG he the book wrong
    ‘Catch him or he may buy the wrong book!’

(189) a. Não é que sabia a resposta!
    not is that knew-3SG the answer
    ‘(How come) he knew the answer!’

    b. Não é que comeu tudo!
    not is that ate-3SG everything
    ‘He has eaten everything!’

**Brazilian Portuguese:**

Expletive negation in Portuguese may be thought of as a modal emphatic marker. Empirical evidence supporting the view that expletive *não* is not (true) negation is of three types: (i) expletive negation does not license negative polarity items (as shown in (190)-(191)) and is compatible with positive polarity items (like the idiomatic PPI *dos diabos* in (192)); (ii) coordination structures reveal that clauses including expletive negation do not count as negative clauses, as pointed out by Matos (2003:785) – see (193)-(194); (iii) expletive negation is incompatible with the EP emphatic negation construction with postverbal *nada* (originated from ‘nothing’; see (195) and section 6.5 above).

(190) a. O que não faz um dono pelo seu cão!
    the what not make a owner for-the his dog

    b. *O que não faz nenhum dono pelo seu cão!
    the what not makes no owner for-the his dog
    ‘What a dog’s owner is able to do for (the wellbeing of) his dog!’

    ‘The things a dog’s owner is able to do for (the wellbeing of) his dog!’

(191) a. Cuidado, não vá alguém cair daí!
    watch-out not go-SUBJUNCTIVE-3SG somebody fall-INFIN from-there

    b. *Cuidado, não vá ninguém cair daí!
    watch-out not go-SUBJUNCTIVE-3SG nobody fall-INFIN from-there
    ‘Pay attention, somebody may fall down from there!’

62 Quantificational exclamative sentences can be divided into two groups according to the type of quantification denoted: quantitative and qualitative exlamatives. The former express quantities, the latter measure the degree to which a property (of an item associated with a scale) is held. While both groups of exclamatives may display expletive negation, only quantitative exclamatives can be (truly) negated. This being so, in (i) below the word *não* ‘not’ expresses true negation, not expletive negation. See, on this matter, González Rodríguez (2007).

(i) a. Quantos livros ele não lê e o irmão também não.
    how-many books he not reads and the brother also not

    b. Os livros que ele não lê e o irmão também não.
    the books that he not reads and the brother also not
    ‘The books he doesn’t read! So doesn’t his brother!’
(192) Quantos imbecis não têm uma sorte dos diabos!
how-many idiots not have-3PL a luck of-the devils
‘So many idiots are the luckiest guys!’

(193) a. O que não diria o teu pai se soubesse e o meu também.
the what not would-say-3SG the your father if knew-3SG and the mine also
b. *O que não diria o teu pai se soubesse e o meu também não.
the what not would-say-3SG the your father if knew-3SG and the mine also not
‘What your father would say if he knew about that! And mine too!’

(194) a. Cuidado, não me caias tu daí e o teu irmão também.
watch-out not me-DAT fall-SUBJUNCTIVE-2SG from-there and the your brother also
b. *Cuidado, não me caias tu daí e o teu irmão também não.63
watch-out not me-DAT fall-SUBJUNCTIVE-2SG from-there and the your brother also not
‘Watch your step, you may fall down! And so may your brother!’

(195) A Nunca vais lá.
‘You never go there’
B a. Eu?! Quantas vezes não vou lá!
how-many times not go-1SG there
b. Eu?! *Quantas vezes não vou nada lá!
how-many times not go-1SG nothing there
‘Me?! I go there all the time!’

6.8. Negative interrogatives and tags

A yes-no question, or polar question, has as answers a pair of polar opposites, positive and negative. The propositional content of the agreeing answer (cf. section 6.1) is expressed in the question itself, and that of the disagreeing answer is obtained by reversing the polarity. Polar questions may be positive or negative, but the latter is a marked option. As a matter of fact, negative polar questions, in contrast to positive ones, are always biased towards a particular answer, that is to say that the speaker is predisposed to accept as the right answer either the positive or the negative one. Neutral questions, in contrast, do not anticipate a particular answer.

In the present section we will briefly handle two types of biased polar questions, namely simple negative interrogatives and tag interrogatives. Linking them together is the presence of negation, which certainly plays a role in their carrying a bias.

---

63 As for exclamatives introduced by não é que ‘not is that’, observe the contrast exemplified below:

(i) a. Não é verdade que o Pedro sabe tudo e a Maria também não sabe.
not is true that the P. knows everything and the M. also not knows
‘It’s not the case that Peter knows everything and Mary doesn’t either.’
b. Não é que o Pedro sabe tudo e a Maria também (*não) sabe!
not is that the P. knows everything and the M. also knows
‘(How come) Peter knows everything and Mary does too!’
6.8.1. Negative interrogatives

Questions with negative interrogative form are always biased and denote in one way or other the questioner’s point of view. In fact, they may have the illocutionary force of declaratives. Take (196), for example. Through a negative polar question, B tells A that he/she would prefer to have lunch outside, and through the same linguistic device A let’s B know that he/she doesn’t (fully) agree.

(196) A  Vou pôr a mesa para o almoço.  
1SG go put-INFIN the table for the lunch  
‘I’m setting the table for lunch.’

B  Não vamos comer lá fora?  
not go-1PL eat-INFIN outside  
‘Aren’t we eating outside?’

A  Não tens frio?  
not have-2SG cold  
‘Aren’t you cold?’

The biased nature of negative polar questions is confirmed by the fact that the interlocutor may feel allowed to skip the answer and continue the conversation, because he/she takes for granted that the answer is implied by the question:

(197) A  O João não terminou já o curso?  
the J. not finished already the graduation  
‘Hasn’t John graduated already?’

B  Mas ainda não arranjou trabalho.  
but yet not found job  
‘But he hasn’t found a job yet.’

(198) A  Não sabes que é preciso ajudá-lo a levantar-se?  
not know that is necessary to help him to get-up  
‘Don’t you know he needs help to get up?’

B  Mas ele quer levantar-se sozinho.  
but he wants get-up-INFIN alone  
‘But he want to get up by himself.’

(199) A  Não está tão crescido o meu filho?  
not is so grown up the my son  
‘Isn’t my son so grown up?’

B  E bonito também.  
and beautiful also  
‘And beautiful as well!’

(200) A  Estou com fome.  
am with hunger  
‘I’m hungry.’

B  Não há comida no frigorífico?  
not is food in-the refrigerator  
‘Isn’t there food in the refrigerator?’
A Mas não há nada que me agrade.
   but not is nothing that me-DAT pleases
   ‘But there’s nothing I like.’

Typically, negative interrogatives allow a range of interpretations, and the bias can be towards either the negative or the positive answer. The bias may be reflected in the prosodic properties of the question but it may as well be simply inferred from the discourse context, together with assumptions about the speaker’s intentions and beliefs.

Confirmation questions, for example, favour a positive bias in contexts where there is evidence for (or a strong belief in favour of) a certain state of affairs and a negative bias in contexts where there is evidence against it; so the same question may be intended for a positive or a negative answer, as illustrated in (201). The presence of polarity-sensitive words can be a disambiguating factor – see the pairs já/ainda ‘already/yet’ in (202) and um/nenhum ‘a/none’ in (203), where the first item in each pair is positively-oriented and the second is negatively-oriented.

Questions expressing an indirect reproach also allow both sides of the polar bias, as exemplified in (204) and (205). In (204c), já ‘already’ swings the balance for the positive bias whereas in (205b) and (205c), ainda ‘yet’, nothing ‘nada’ and nem ‘not even’ swing the balance for the negative bias.

Confirmation questions
(201) a. Não vens cá amanhã? positive or negative bias
   not come-2SG here tomorrow
   ‘Aren’t you coming tomorrow?’
   b. A Maria não gostou do bacalhau? positive or negative bias
   the M. not liked-3SG the codfish
   ‘Didn’t Mary like the codfish?’

(202) a. Ele não comeu já a sopa? positive bias
   he not ate-3SG already the soup
   ‘Hasn’t he eaten the soup already?’
   d. Ele ainda não comeu a sopa? negative bias
   he yet not ate-3SG the soup
   ‘Hasn’t he eaten the soup yet?’

(203) a. Não há um restaurante tailandês aqui perto? positive bias
   not is a restaurant Tai here close
   ‘Isn’t there a/some Tai restaurant around here?’
   b. Não há nenhum restaurante tailandês aqui perto? negative bias
   not is none restaurant Tai here close
   ‘Isn’t there any Tai restaurant around here?’

Questions expressing an indirect reproach
(204) a. Não te disse para estares calado? positive bias
   not you-DAT said-1SG to be-INFL.INFIN-2SG silent
   ‘Didn’t I ask you to be quiet?’
   b. Não sabias que era o teu dia de fazer o jantar? positive bias
   not knew that was the your day of do-INFIN the dinner
   ‘Didn’t you know it was your turn to make dinner?’
c. Não tens já o que querias?  
not have-2SG already the what you wanted  
‘Haven’t you what you wanted already?’

(205) a. Não tens vergonha?  
not have-2SG shame  
‘Aren’t you ashamed?’ (= ‘You ought to be ashamed of yourself’)

b. Ainda não estás satisfeito? Nada te satisfaz?  
yet not are-2SG satisfied? nothing you-DAT satisfies  
‘Aren’t you satisfied yet? Isn’t there anything that satisfies you?’

c. Não queres nem um café?  
not want-2SG not-even a coffee  
‘Don’t you even accept a coffee?’

When negative interrogatives express a polite request or offer (see (206)), they favour a positive bias. The speaker wants/wishes a positive answer and makes that known to the interlocutor through the negative turn of the question (even if, or in spite of the fact that, the speaker does not have evidence for a positive answer).

Questions expressing polite requests and offers  
(206) a. Não me dás aqui uma ajuda?  
not me-DAT give here a help  
‘Couldn’t you give me some help?’

b. Não me compras o jornal quando fores à rua?  
not me-DAT buy-2SG the newspaper when go-2SG to-the street  
‘Couldn’t you buy and bring me the newspaper when you go outside?’

c. Não queres um cafezinho?  
not want-2SG a coffee-little  
‘Wouldn’t you care for a little coffee?’

Finally, certain negative interrogatives unambiguously carry a positive bias. This is the case of questions expressing evaluative comments, as exemplified in (207), and challenge/denial questions, that provide counterevidence to an earlier assertion by the interlocutor, as illustrated in (208). This type of questions, where the speaker shows his/her commitment to a positive answer, is compatible with PPIs, like dos diabos in (207c) and (210).64

Questions expressing evaluative comments  
(207) a. Não está tão crescido o meu filho?  
not is so grown-up the my son  
‘Isn’t my son so grown up?’

b. Não está horrível esta sopa?  
not is horrible this soup  
‘Isn’t this soup horrible?’

64 Reese calls them evidence questions: “the question B asks is what evidence is there for the assertion.” (Reese 2006:349).
Maybe evaluative comments are only a variant of challenge/denial questions as the speaker is reacting to the silence of the interlocutor with respect to a relevant issue and putting forward the comment that the interlocutor might have but did not produce.
c. Não está um frio dos diabos?
not is a cold of-the devils
‘Isn’t it freezing today?’

**Challenge/denial questions**

**(208)**

A  Estou com fome.
am with hunger
‘I’m hungry.’

B  Não há comida no frigorífico?
not is food in-the refrigerator
‘Isn’t there food in the refrigerator?’

A  Mas não há nada que me agrade.
but not is nothing that me-DAT pleases
‘But there’s nothing I like.’

**(209)**

A  Ele é tão desinteressante
he is so boring

B  Ele não escreveu um bestseller?
he not wrote-3SG a bestseller
‘Hasn’t he written a bestseller?’

**(210)**

A  Toda a gente gosta dele.
all the people likes him
‘Everybody likes him.’

B  Ele não é um sacana dos diabos?
he not is a scoundrel of-the devils
‘Isn’t he an utter scoundrel?’

Reese (2006) shows that challenge/denial questions are instances of metalinguistic negation. Their compatibility with PPIs is thus expected (see section 6.6).

### 6.8.2. Tag interrogatives

Tag-questions are a particular type of polar question made up of a **declarative anchor** and an **interrogative coda** – that is, the *tag* stricto sensu, although the term *tag-question*, or simply *tag*, is used lato sensu to designate the whole sequence. Tag-questions are always strongly biased: if the declarative-anchor is positive, a positive answer is anticipated; if the declarative-anchor is negative, the speaker expects a negative answer.

Tag-questions may display an invariable interrogative coda, like in (211), or an interrogative coda that shows sensitivity to the polarity and to the tense and verbal agreement features of the declarative-anchor, like in (212). EP and BP are alike with respect to the former type of tag-questions, but partially differ with respect to the latter, as illustrated below.

---

65 Alternative invariable interrogative codas are *não é assim?* (literally, not is so?), *não é?* (literally, not is) or simply *não?* (literally, no), *é?* (literally, is?), which can be translated, depending on the interpretation of the declarative anchor, as ‘don’t you think so?’, ‘wouldn’t you say?’, ‘am I right?’, and the like.
The variable type of tag-question constitutes the standard option in both Brazilian Portuguese and European Portuguese. The BP system is symmetric in two respects: (i) the declarative anchor and the interrogative coda always display similar tense and verbal agreement features; the interrogative coda always displays reversed polarity with respect to the declarative anchor. The EP system is asymmetric since the interrogative coda displays reversed polarity when the declarative anchor is positive but constant/non-reversed polarity when the declarative anchor is negative. Moreover, the tag that follows a positive anchor is verbal and duplicates the tense and agreement features of the anchor while the tag that follows a negative anchor does not include a verb form and is therefore unable to show sensitivity to such features.  

Leaving aside for the moment the differences between EP and BP, Portuguese standard tag-questions bear a strong similarity with the patterns of positive answers to yes/no questions described in section 6.2 above. So Portuguese is one of the few Romance languages with verbal tag interrogatives as it is one of the few Romance languages with bare verb answers to polar questions (the unmarked option for positive answers as we saw before). Moreover, just like in the answering system, tags may vary between a verbal and an adverbial option when the adverb já is present in the

---

66 In Northern EP dialects, tag-questions may display generalized constant polarity, as illustrated in (i) and (ii) below. The system is symmetric in the sense that the item expressing negation/affirmation in the declarative anchor is the item duplicated in the tag (following the confirmative word pois).

(i) O João não comeu a sopa, pois não?
   the J. not ate the soup, POIS-CONFIRMATIVE no
   ‘John hasn’t eaten the soup, has he’?

(ii) O João comeu a sopa, pois comeu?
    the John ate the soup, POIS-CONFIRMATIVE ate
    ‘John has eaten the soup, hasn’t he’?

declarative anchor – see (see (213) and section 6.2.1).68 Like in the answering system as well, if an element present in a positive declarative anchor carries a negative implicature (e.g. the adverb só ‘only’ or a cleft structure), the appropriate interrogative coda does not repeat the verb (cf. section 6.2.1). Instead a SER tag necessarily appears/comes in, as illustrated in (214) and (215).69

(213) a. A Maria já regressou de Paris, não regressou?
the M. already returned-3SG from Paris, not returned-3SG
b. A Maria já regressou de Paris, não já?
the M. not returned-3SG from Paris, no already
c. *A Maria já regressou de Paris, não já regressou?70
the M. already returned-3SG from Paris, no/not already returned
‘Mary has already returned from Paris, hasn’t she?’

(214) a. Só a Maria chegou hoje de Paris, *não chegou?
only the M. arrived-3SG today from Paris, not arrived-3SG
b. Só a Maria chegou hoje de Paris, não foi?
only the M. arrived-3SG today from Paris, not was-3SG
‘Only Mary arrived today from Paris, isn’t that so?’

---

68 Tag-questions, however, differ from polar question-answer pairs as in the former only the adverb já occurring in the anchor can be repeated in the interrogative coda, while in the latter a larger set of adverbs occurring in the polar question can be repeated in the answer. Interestingly, the adverb já is also the only adverb that can be reduplicated to express emphatic affirmation in EP, being in this respect as well a closer match to the verb than any other adverb. See section 6.3.2 above.

69 The main difference between polar answers and tags is the role played by the word sim ‘yes’ in the former (in particular in EP) in contrast to its absolute exclusion from the latter (see (i) below). In Galician, differently Portuguese, sim is allowed in tags (see (ii)) – an interesting contrast in view of the fact that Portuguese and Galician are closely related sister languages (see Martins 2006).

(i) O João já comeu a sopa, não comeu / não foi? / não já? / *não sim?
the John already ate the soup, not ate / not was / no already / no yes
‘John has eaten the soup already, didn’t he?’

(ii) ¿Este menino é o neto de Carmela, non é? / non si?
this boy is the grandson of Carmela, not is / no yes
‘This little boy is the grandson of Carmela, isn’t he?’

70 The exclusion of tag interrogatives with repetition of both the verb and the adverb já partially parallels what we observed in section 6.3.2 above with respect to the EP reduplication pattern of emphatic affirmation:

(i) A Maria ainda não regressou de Paris.
the M. yet not returned from Paris
‘Mary hasn’t returned from Paris yet.’

the M. already returned from Paris, already.
b. A Maria regressou de Paris, regressou.
the M. returned from Paris, returned.
c. *A Maria já regressou de Paris, já regressou.
the M. already returned from Paris, already returned
d. *A Maria já regressou de Paris, regressou.
the M. already returned from Paris, returned
‘Mary did return from Paris.’
(215) a. Ontem é que a Maria regressou de Paris, *não regressou?
yesterday is that the M. returned-3SG from Paris, not returned-3SG
b. Ontem é que a Maria regressou de Paris, não foi?
yesterday is that the M. returned-3SG from Paris, not was-3SG

‘It was yesterday that Mary returned from Paris, wasn’t it?’

In (211) and (212), we introduced the two maximally separate types of Portuguese tag-questions in what concerns the degree of morpho-syntactic cohesion/autonomy between the declarative anchor and the interrogative coda. On one extreme, we find tag-questions where the form of the tag is in no way conditioned by the (morpho-syntactic) form of the anchor; on the other extreme, morpho-syntactic cohesion is manifested in two ways: the inflected verbal form present in the anchor is duplicated in the tag and polarity is systematically reversed. In between these two extremes stay SER tags, which bridge the gap by bringing in a certain extent of gradation. To start with, tag-questions that use the copula SER (‘be’) involve the substitution, not the repetition, of the inflected verb occurring in the declarative anchor. In turn, they may display sensitivity to verbal inflection features and polarity, to polarity only or be of an invariable type. More generally, in fact, it can be observed that a series of different degrees of morpho-syntactic connectivity between the anchor and the coda are present across the different options for tag-questions formation in Portuguese. This is illustrated below, from (216) to (220).

I – STRONG MORPHO-SYNTACTIC CONNECTIVITY – verbal tags
[Sensitivity to tense, verbal agreement and polarity (entailing reversed polarity). Repetition of the inflected verb]

(216) a. Vocês pedem bacalhau, não pedem?
you ask-PRESENT-3PL codfish, not ask-PRESENT-3PL
‘You will order codfish, won’t you?’
b. Vocês pediram bacalhau, não pediram?
you asked-PAST-3PL codfish, not asked-PAST-3PL
‘You have ordered codfish, haven’t you?’
c. Vocês tinham pedido bacalhau, não tinham?
you had-PAST-3PL asked codfish, not had-PAST-3PL
‘You ordered codfish, didn’t you?’
d. Vocês não pedem bacalhau, pedem? (BP)
you not ask-PRESENT-3PL codfish, ask-PRESENT-3PL
‘You won’t order codfish, will you?’
e. Vocês não pediram bacalhau, pediram? (BP)
you not asked-PAST-3PL codfish, asked-PAST-3PL
‘You haven’t ordered codfish, have you?’
f. Vocês não tinham pedido bacalhau, tinham? (BP)
you not had-PAST-3PL asked codfish, had-PAST-3PL
‘You didn’t order codfish, did you?’

II – STRONG MORPHO-SYNTACTIC CONNECTIVITY – SER (‘be’) tags
[Sensitivity to tense, verbal agreement and polarity (entailing reversed polarity). Substitution of the inflected verb in the anchor by an inflected form of ser ‘be’]
(217) a. Vocês pedem bacalhau, não é?
   ‘You will order codfish, won’t you?’
   Vocês pediram bacalhau, não foi?
   ‘You have ordered codfish, haven’t you?’
   Vocês não pedem bacalhau, é?
   ‘You won’t order codfish, will you?’
   Vocês não pediram bacalhau, foi?
   ‘You haven’t ordered codfish, have you?’

III – WEAK MORPHO-SYNTACTIC CONNECTIVITY – SER-PRESENT-3SG (‘is’) tags
[Presence of sensitivity to tense and verbal agreement. Sensitivity to polarity (entailing reversed polarity). Substitution of the inflected verb in the anchor by a constant form of ser ‘be’]

(218) a. Vocês pedem bacalhau, não é?
   ‘You will order codfish, won’t you?’
   Vocês pediram bacalhau, não foi?
   ‘You have ordered codfish, haven’t you?’
   Vocês não pedem bacalhau, é?
   ‘You won’t order codfish, will you?’
   Vocês não pediram bacalhau, foi?
   ‘You haven’t ordered codfish, have you?’

IV – WEAK MORPHO-SYNTACTIC CONNECTIVITY – POIS-CONFIRMATIVE tags
[Presence of a verbal form in the interrogative coda (thus, absence of sensitivity to tense and verbal agreement). Sensitivity to polarity (entailing constant polarity)]

(219) a. Vocês não pedem bacalhau, pois não?
   ‘You won’t order codfish, will you?’
   Vocês não pediram bacalhau, pois não?
   ‘You haven’t ordered codfish, have you?’
   *Vocês pedem/ pediram bacalhau, pois não?
   ‘You have ordered codfish, haven’t you?’

71 Sentences (218c-d) are grammatical in EP because they are non-distinct (at least superficially) from the sentences with an invariable tag exemplified in (220).
Different degrees of cohesion/autonomy are thus found between the two parts that make up tag-questions, the declarative anchor and the interrogative coda, which may reveal that some tag interrogatives are mono-clausal structures in Portuguese while others are bi-clausal.

6.9. Affirmation, negation and emphasis in European and Brazilian Portuguese

This chapter describes how the two opposite values of clausal polarity, namely positive and negative, are grammatically encoded in European and Brazilian Portuguese. Both neutral and marked instantiations of affirmation and negation were considered, the latter often resulting in emphasis (in a broad sense).

Table 8 below summarizes the main results of the empirical inquiry and discussion in the chapter. It highlights the core grammatical patterns displayed by EP and BP in the domain of polarity (abstracting from some more marginal dialectal or idiolectal options that were also considered in the chapter) and is intended to offer a clear picture of the central similarities and contrasts between European and Brazilian Portuguese.

The polar answering system is essentially alike in European and Brazilian Portuguese. Bare verb answers constitute the unmarked pattern of minimal affirmative answer in both varieties. The main difference to be pointed out is the near exclusion of the word sim ‘yes’ as an alternative to a neutral verbal answer in Brazilian Portuguese. The presence of sim in BP is restricted to extended answers, especially those expressing emphatic affirmation (in the context of a previous tag-question with a negative anchor).

As for the polar expression of denial (subsuming here emphatic affirmation, emphatic negation and metalinguistic negation), European Portuguese displays a richer variety of syntactic strategies to encode polarity-related disagreement than BP. Hence some EP grammatical options are not available in BP, among which: the verb-reduplication pattern to express emphatic affirmation, the pattern with non-argumental nada (literally, nothing) to express emphatic negation and the well-grounded general use of the markers lá/cá/agora (originated in the deictics ‘there/here/now’) to express metalinguistic negation. Nonetheless, only (Northern) Brazilian Portuguese can encode emphatic negation through the single negative clause-final marker não ‘no’.

72 On the relations between polarity, modality and emphasis, see Batllori & Hernanz (forthcoming) and Hernanz (2007).
73 Although the postverbal-negation-only option is usually considered as a characteristic property of BP that would set it totally apart from EP, in fact such option is not unknown in EP (but is restricted to non-argumental nada, originated in ‘nothing’). The EP pattern with postverbal nada exemplified in (i) to (iii) below appears to be marginal and subject to dialectal and idiolectal variation. It is licensed by the kind of denial discourse contexts that license the EP emphatic negation pattern with preverbal ‘not’ coupled with postverbal nada.
standard/neutral negation is obligatorily preverbal in both EP and BP; the more common pattern of emphatic negation displays/carries in both varieties a preverbal and a clause-final negation marker; unambiguous metalinguistic negation is usually signalled only postverbally, but this is mainly an EP option).

Standard tag-question formation is symmetric in BP but asymmetric in EP (only in BP strong morpho-syntactic connectivity and reversed polarity are found with both positive and negative anchors), whereas both varieties converge with respect to the availability of a series of invariable tags (e.g. *não é verdade?* (not is true – ‘am I right?’), *não é?/não?/é?* (not is/no/is – ‘isn’t that so?’)).

Expletive negation, which was left out of Table 8, is basically the same in EP and BP, being restricted in both varieties to exclamative sentences. The few differences found in this domain are independent of expletive negation itself. Thus BP, in contrast to EP, does not allow degree exclamatives with expletive negation, subjunctive mood and VS order because the availability of both subjunctive mood and subject-verb inversion is severely limited in BP.

A general contrast between European and Brazilian Portuguese could be identified: in BP, but not in EP, there is some overlapping between neutral and emphatic patterns of affirmation and negation. In fact, as shown in section 6.5, the discontinuous negation pattern typical of emphatic negation (namely, ‘not-verb-(X)-no’) may emerge in BP to express unmarked negative answers as well as neutral polar negative interrogatives, which is not allowed in EP. Moreover, *sim*-final sentences may constitute unmarked extended affirmative answers in BP while in EP the *sim*-final pattern is reserved to express emphatic affirmation (see sections 6.2.6 and 6.3). This might be an indication that some polar emphatic structures are in the process of attenuating their emphatic import in BP.

---

(i) E eu dizia para ele: “Ó senhor doutor isso mata-o”! “*Mata nada*. Não faz mal”!
and I would-say to him: “Oh Lord doctor that kills-you”! “kills *nada*, not does bad”!
‘I used to tell him: “My dear doctor, that [i.e. smoking so much] will end up killing you”’!
“It will NOT! Don’t worry”!
(CORDIAL-SIN, COV)

(ii) Interviewee: Já estou muito velha! (CORDIAL-SIN, PIC)
already am very old
‘I’m too old!’

Interviewer: Está velha?! *Está nada* velha!
is old? *is nada* old
‘Nonsense, you are NOT old!’

(iii) Interviewee: Eu estou despachado qualquer uma hora para fazer uma viagem à lua
I am dispatched any a hour to make a trip to-the moon
‘I will probably die soon.’

Interviewer: *Está nada!* (CORDIAL-SIN, MLD)
is *nada*
‘Nonsense, you will NOT!’
Table 8: Positive and negative polarity in EP and BP (disregarding marginal patterns)
[PA/PD: positive agreement/disagreement; NA/ND: negative agreement/disagreement]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>European Portuguese</th>
<th>Brazilian Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimal affirmative answers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA (positive interrogatives)</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>sim ('yes')</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(repeated) adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td>(repeated) adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA (positive embedded interrogatives)</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA + NA (positive interrogatives with negative implicatures)</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>sim ('yes')</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>ser-3SG ('is, was')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(repeated) adverb</td>
<td></td>
<td>(repeated) adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimal negative answers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA (negative interrogatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>não ('no')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND (positive interrogatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>não ('no')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA &amp; ND (embedded interrogatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No minimal answer available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmarked extended answers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA &amp; PD</td>
<td></td>
<td>sim, verb</td>
<td>verb</td>
<td>sim, (repeated) adverb, sim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA &amp; ND (negative interrogatives &amp; positive interrogatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td>não, não verb ('no, not verb')</td>
<td>não, não verb ('no, not verb')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA &amp; ND (embedded interrogatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td>não, não verb ('no, not verb')</td>
<td>não verb, não ('not verb no')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>não verb ('not verb')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmarked positive declaratives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no visible marking of affirmative polarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unmarked negative declaratives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD (in the context of a previous negative assertion, and similar cases)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic affirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td>sentence-final sim/pois* (verb-(X)-sim/pois)</td>
<td>sentence-final sim (verb-(X)-sim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb reduplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>já*-reduplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pois = confirmative word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*já ('already')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic negation</td>
<td></td>
<td>preverbal+sentence-final não (não 'not'-verb-(X)-não 'no')</td>
<td>preverbal+sentence-final não (não 'not'-verb-(X)-não 'no')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>não-verb-nada*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*nada (literally: 'nothing')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic negation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in the context of a previous positive assertion, and similar cases)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb-lá (literally: 'there')</td>
<td>verb-lá or lá-verb (with restricted availability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb-cá (literally: 'here')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verb-agora (literally: 'now')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>preverbal não (not-verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in the context of a previous negative assertion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>não-verb-agora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive assertion+tag</td>
<td></td>
<td>[positive clause], não-verb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative assertion+tag</td>
<td></td>
<td>[negative clause], pois* não</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pois = confirmative word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative interrogatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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