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Abstract

In this paper, we investigate whether there is a correlation between the temporal properties of control verbs and the possibility of restructuring with obligatory control predicates, taking clitic climbing as a diagnostic for restructuring. We review the findings of previous studies on earlier stages of Portuguese and on (non-)standard varieties of contemporary European Portuguese. Additionally, we perform an analysis of both diachronic and synchronic corpus data, as well as of data collected through an acceptability judgement task. Based on our findings, we argue against a correlation between temporal dependence and restructuring and suggest that restructuring depends on the selectional properties of verbs, occurring when a functionally defective infinitive is selected. Diachronically, there is a change in the selectional properties of control verbs, whereas, synchronically, there is variation both across varieties and
across speakers in the set of restructuring control verbs. Factors like the type of clitic and the presence of proclisis triggers affect the acceptability of clitic climbing.
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### 1. Introduction

It has been proposed that there is a correlation between the temporal properties of control verbs and the possibility of restructuring, namely that only verbs that select a temporally dependent infinitival clause allow restructuring (e.g. Wurmbrand 2001; Gonçalves 1999; Gonçalves et al. 2010; Landau 2000). However, it has also been observed that there is variation both crosslinguistically and intralinguistically in the set of control verbs which allow restructuring, and that this correlation does not appear to hold with some verbs (e.g. Fiéis & Madeira 2012).

In this study, we consider data from European Portuguese (EP) to investigate whether there is indeed such a correlation. We analysed both diachronic and synchronic corpus data and we used an acceptability judgement task. We used clitic climbing (CC) as a diagnostic for restructuring, considering some of the factors that have been suggested to influence the acceptability of CC in EP, namely the type of clitic involved and the type of context.

The paper is organised as follows: in section 2, we present an overview of the analyses of restructuring with control verbs and a characterisation of the properties of these constructions; in section 3, we review the findings of previous studies on the diachrony of Portuguese and on (non-)standard varieties of contemporary European Portuguese, and present our analysis of corpus data from Old Portuguese (OP), Classical Portuguese (CIP) and standard contemporary EP; in section 4, we describe the results of the acceptability judgement task; and finally, in section 5, we discuss the main results and present our conclusions.

### 2. Restructuring and control

As noted by Kayne (1989), verbs that allow restructuring are either raising or (subject) control verbs. Different analyses have been proposed to explain restructuring. For example, Cinque (2004) proposes that restructuring verbs should be analysed as functional heads, which are merged in functional positions in the sentence structure, and do not select arguments. Therefore, for Cinque (2004), all restructuring verbs are raising verbs. However, verbs like *want*, which is a typical restructuring verb, clearly exhibit properties of control, given that, for instance, they select an external argument and do not allow for expletive and inanimate subjects. These properties indicate that the possibility of restructuring does not depend on the functional status of the verb. An alternative view is that verbs that allow restructuring are those that select a functionally defective complement. Being functionally defective, the infinitival domain does not have the functional categories needed to host a clitic or negation (Gonçalves 1999; Landau 2000; Martins 2000; Wurmbrand 2001; Gonçalves et al. 2010; Wurmbrand & Lohninger 2019). The absence of a functionally complete T and C in the infinitival domain accounts for the transparency effects observed in restructuring constructions, which, in languages such as EP, may be visible in the availability of CC, i.e., the possibility for a clitic that is selected by the infinitive to attach to the higher verb. See
the examples in (1), which show the contrast between *querer* ‘want’, which is a restructuring verb, and *decidir* ‘decide’, which, according to, for instance, Gonçalves (1999), is not.

(1) European Portuguese, Gonçalves (1999: 217)

a. O João não os quis ler.  
the João not CL.ACC.MASC.PL wanted read.INF  
‘João didn’t want to read them.’

b. *O João não os decidiu ler.  
the João not CL.ACC.MASC.PL decided read.INF  
‘João didn’t decide to read them.’

Furthermore, it is also well known that not all control verbs allow restructuring. According to Wurmbrand (2001), restructuring is conditional on the presence of certain semantic properties. In particular, she assumes that the temporal properties of the infinitive are a necessary condition for restructuring since it is only possible with verbs that select temporally defective complements (see also Gonçalves 1999; Gonçalves et al. 2010; and Landau 2000). In Gonçalves et al.’s (2010) analysis, the temporal defectivity of the infinitive selected by verbs such as *querer* ‘want’ implies that the embedded event is temporally located with respect to the matrix domain, that is, it is temporally dependent. It is this temporal dependence between the infinitive and the higher domain that makes it impossible for deictic temporal adverbials to occur in the infinitival domain. See the contrast between the verbs *querer* ‘want’ and *decidir* ‘decide’ (which selects a temporally independent complement, which can be located directly with reference to the speech time) in (2) below.

(2) European Portuguese, Gonçalves (1999: 220)

a. *O João quis ir ao cinema amanhã.  
the João wanted go.INF to.the cinema tomorrow  
‘John wanted to go to the cinema tomorrow.’

b. O João decidiu ir ao cinema amanhã.  
the João decided go.INF to.the cinema tomorrow  
‘John decided to go to the cinema tomorrow.’

However, both the complements of *querer* ‘want’ and *decidir* ‘decide’ allow a temporal interpretation distinct from that of the matrix event (they have a prospective interpretation) and denote two events (they are ‘tensed’, according to Stowell 1982), which means that they are associated with a temporal domain distinct from that of the matrix (see the examples in (3) below). Nevertheless, as shown in (2) above, only *decidir* ‘decide’ allows the occurrence of conflicting deictic temporal adverbials in the matrix clause and in the infinitival complement, which seems to indicate that this complement is associated with an independent temporal domain, whereas the complement of *querer* ‘want’ is necessarily interpreted with reference to the matrix tense.
It is therefore fair to conclude that the control constructions under analysis exhibit different behaviours regarding their interpretative, namely temporal properties.

Following Gonçalves (1999), it is possible to sort control verbs in Portuguese into two distinct groups: those that allow restructuring (cf. (4a)) and those that do not (cf. (4b)).

(4) Gonçalves (1999: 220-221)


However, although verbs like prometer ‘promise’ and combinar ‘arrange’ (another verb that has been argued not to allow restructuring) behave like decidir ‘decide’ in allowing a temporally independent complement, verbs like esperar ‘expect’ (which is also argued not to allow restructuring) appear to behave more like querer ‘want’ with respect to their interpretative properties. See the examples in (5):

(5) a. O João prometeu ir ao cinema amanhã.  
‘John promised to go to the cinema tomorrow.’

b. O João combinou ir ao cinema amanhã.  
‘John arranged to go to the cinema tomorrow.’

c. *O João esperou ir ao cinema amanhã.  
‘John expected to go to the cinema tomorrow.’
In fact, some studies have questioned the existence of a correlation between temporal properties and the possibility of restructuring in EP, given that at least some native speakers allow restructuring with verbs such as decidir ‘decide’ and prometer ‘promise’ (Martins 2000; Duarte 2003; Fiéis & Madeira 2012; Reis 2022). More generally, it has been noted that the set of restructuring verbs is subject to both crosslinguistic and intralinguistic variation (see Table 1), suggesting that there are at least some verbs with which this correlation does not hold (Cinque 2004; Wurmbrand 2001).

Table 1. Crosslinguistic and intralinguistic variation in the set of restructuring verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
<th>DUTCH</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>ITALIAN</th>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>try</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forget, manage</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dare, seem</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow, permit</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decide, plan</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regret</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assume, claim</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wurmbrand (2001:7) (+ = restructuring predicate; - = non-restructuring predicate; % = subject to inter-speaker variation)

Some studies investigating CC with control verbs in EP have shown that it is optional but there appears to be a preference for attachment of the clitic to the infinitive (e.g. Reis, 2022). However, there is inter-speaker variation (Martins 2016; Vitorino 2017; Freixo 2021) and it has been suggested that this variation gives rise to a scale that ranks control verbs according to how widely CC is accepted by native speakers (Fiéis & Madeira 2012). There is also some evidence that CC may be more productive in oral than in written speech (Martins 2016; Barbosa et al. 2017; Vitorino 2017; Freixo 2021; Reis 2022). Furthermore, there are strong indications that the availability of CC may also depend on certain factors, such as the type of clitic (it appears to be less common with accusative than with dative clitics) and the presence of proclisis triggers1 in the matrix domain (there appears to be more CC in proclisis than in enclisis contexts) (Fiéis & Madeira 2012; Freixo 2021; Reis 2022).

1 In EP, clitic placement is context-sensitive, and not linked to finiteness (differently from Spanish or Italian). The unmarked pattern in independent affirmative clauses is enclisis (i) (Duarte & Matos 2000) with proclisis being triggered by the presence of certain constituents in preverbal position: e.g., negation (ii), certain adverbs (iii), and quantifiers (iv).

(i) O João leu-o.
the John read.PAST-CL.ACC.MASC.3SG
‘John read it.’

(ii) O João não o leu.
the John not CL.ACC.MASC.3SG read.PAST
‘John didn’t read it.’

(iii) O João já o leu.
the John already CL.ACC.MASC.3SG read.PAST
‘John has already read it.’

(iv) Todos o leram.
everyone CL.ACC.MASC.3SG read.PAST
‘Everyone has read it.’
In this paper, we examine some corpus and judgement data, seeking to contribute to the debate on the following two questions: (i) is there a correlation between the temporal properties of the verbs and the possibility of restructuring?; and (ii) what are the main factors behind the variation found with respect to CC in contemporary EP?

3. Corpus data

In this section, we examine some data taken from corpora to determine whether there have been changes in the behaviour of these verbs diachronically and whether there is variation in contemporary varieties. For this study, we used data extracted from the following computerised corpora: the Computerised Corpus of Medieval Portuguese (CIPM) and Tycho Brahe Corpus of Historical Portuguese (TB), for the diachronic data, and CetemPúblico, a corpus of written texts from the national newspaper Público, for standard contemporary EP.

We begin with data from OP and CIP in 3.1.; and in 3.2. and 3.3., we present data from contemporary EP, both standard and non-standard varieties, respectively.

3.1. Diachronic data

The data extracted from the medieval corpus (CIPM) show that subject control verbs strongly favour CC in OP, which is in line with what Martins (1994, 2000) also observes. This contrasts with the behaviour observed in standard contemporary EP, where these verbs are characterized by the optionality of the construction, with preference, in some cases, for the occurrence of the clitic in the infinitival domain (see section 2 above). With prometer ‘promise’, however, in the only example with a clitic, this occurs in the infinitival domain. See the examples with querer ‘want’ in (6) and with prometer ‘promise’ in (7) below.

(6) 1280? FR  

nô sabya aquelha razô per
not knew that reason for
que o queriã deytar
that CL.ACC.MASC.SG wanted.PST.3PL expel.INF

‘He didn’t know why they wanted to expel him’

(7) 1278 CA31  

prometo á ámala. e a
promise.1SG to love-CL.ACC.FEM.SG and to
querer ssa prol.
want.INF her offspring

‘I promise to love her and have offspring with her’
The properties of the constructions with control verbs like *querer* ‘want’ in OP (absence of clitics and negation in the infinitival domain) favor an analysis in which they select for a restructuring VP complement (Wurmbrand 2001; Landau 2000).

In CIP, on the other hand, we find sentences both with and without CC with verbs like *querer* ‘want’ (cf. (8)), which is evidence that, in the Classical Period, the predominance of CC in control contexts begins to decrease (cf. Salvi 1990; Martins 2000; Martins 2006; Andrade 2010a). This may indicate that the structure of the infinitival complement may be becoming functionally richer.

(8) 1608, F.M.de Melo, *Cartas Familiares*

(a) visto que por eles o quero inculcar
    since that by them CL.ACC.MASC.3SG want.1SG inculcate.INF
    sem o nomear.
    without it name.INF
    ‘because through them I want to inculcate it in the world without
    naming it.’

(b) e como não queres (quanto é hoje)
    and how not want.2PL (as is today)
    medir-vos com a minha grande discretion?
    measure.INF-CL.DAT.2PL with the my great discretion?
    ‘and how can you not want to measure yourself against my great
    discretion?’

3.2. Standard contemporary European Portuguese

As mentioned earlier, in standard contemporary EP, not all control verbs exhibit the same behavior with respect to restructuring. Furthermore, there is no consensus among native speakers over the acceptance of CC with these verbs. This is shown in the examples in (9) with the verb *ousar* ‘dare’, where CC is marked as ungrammatical by Martins (2000) but judged to be acceptable by Duarte (2003).

(9) a. *Não se ousava levantar.
    not CL.REFL dared stand.INF
    Não Ousava levantar-se.
    ‘He did not dare to stand up.’

    a’ Martins (2000:185)
    not dare stand.INF-CL.REFL
    ‘He did not dare to stand up.’

    b. Duarte (2003:857)
    O João não lhe ousa telefonar.
    the João not CL.DAT.SG dare call.INF
    ‘João does not dare to call her.’

In data from standard contemporary EP corpora, CC is found with many control verbs, both with verbs which have been assumed to allow restructuring, such as *querer* ‘want’ and *tentar* ‘try’, as in (10) to (12), and verbs which have been described as non-restructuring, such as *decidir* ‘decide’, *esperar* ‘expect’ and *prometer* ‘promise’, as in
(13) to (15). Nevertheless, several corpus-based studies have shown that the rates of occurrence of CC are substantially higher with verbs such as querer ‘want’ than with, for example, esperar ‘expect’ (Andrade 2010b) and decidir ‘decide’ (Reis 2022).

(10) Onde é que eles encontravam uma mulher jovem e bonita que quisesse casar com eles?

‘Where would they find a young, beautiful woman who would marry them?’

(11) Não lhes quero dizer antes do Ano Novo…

‘I don't want to tell them before the New Year…’

(12) CETEMPúblico corpus

Já o tentaram demover dessa decisão, mas sem sucesso.

‘They've tried to talk him out of it, but to no avail’

(13) …e qual é o nome que lhe decidem dar?

‘…and what do you decide to call it?’

(14) Era aí que o seu advogado a esperava encontrar.

‘That's where her lawyer was waiting to meet her.’

(15) CETEMPúblico corpus

As principais lutas em que a nova direcção do SBSI se promete empenhar…

‘The main struggles in which the new SBSI management promises to engage…’

We conducted an analysis of CETEMPúblico with the goal of making a systematic comparison between querer ‘want’ – the control verb which unarguably allows restructuring – and four of the verbs which have been described in the literature as disfavouring restructuring – decidir ‘decide’, esperar ‘expect’, prometer ‘promise’ and combinar ‘arrange’. We extracted all the sentences containing these five verbs that were potential contexts for CC, i.e., sentences in which the verb selected an infinitival complement and where the direct or indirect object of the infinitive was realized as a clitic object. For the purposes of this study, we only considered sentences with 3rd
person dative and 3rd person masculine accusative clitics. A total of 4,876 sentences were analysed: in 2,858 of these (58.6%) the clitic was attached to the infinitive and 2,018 sentences (41.4%) displayed CC. The distribution of the two constructions with each of the verbs is shown below in Table 2.

Table 2. Total number and percentage of sentences with and without CC by verb and by type of clitic in CETEMPúblico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>no CC</th>
<th></th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acc</td>
<td>dat</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>querer ‘want’</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decidir ‘decide’</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esperar ‘expect’</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prometer ‘hope’</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combinar ‘arrange’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* in the case of prometer ‘promise’, only sentences with accusative clitics were included in the analysis of CC contexts, given that this verb may select a dative argument)

Although CC is found with all the verbs except combinar ‘arrange’, it is not equally productive with all of them. There is a clear asymmetry between querer ‘want’, which favours CC over non-CC, on the one hand, and the other four verbs, with which CC appears to be residual. Altogether, out of the 2,018 sentences with CC, 1,360 (67.4%) contain accusative clitics and 658 (32.6%) contain dative clitics. This would appear to indicate that, in CC constructions, speakers have a preference for accusative over dative clitics. However, it must be noted that, in general, the ratio of accusative clitics in the subcorpus that we analysed is higher than that of dative clitics (66.3% of the clitics are accusative and 33.7% are dative) and this is also the case if we consider only the sentences without CC (65.5% of the clitics in these sentences are accusative and 34.5% are dative).

It is also worth noting that, in these sentences, CC is found almost exclusively with proclisis (there were only 39 occurrences of enclisis in total, 38 with querer ‘want’ and 1 with decidir ‘decide’). These observations will be relevant for the design of the acceptability judgement experiment, as we will see in the next section.

3.3. Non-standard contemporary European Portuguese

In data from CORDIAL-SIN (a corpus of non-standard varieties of Portuguese, CC is also allowed with a larger number of verbs than has been assumed for standard EP, including verbs that are generally considered to be non-restructuring verbs, such as adorar ‘love’ and pensar ‘think’ (Magro 2004). See the examples in (16) and (17)

(16) Porto, northern Portugal; Magro (2004:18)
Ela adora-me chamar puto
she loves-cl.DAT call-INF kid
‘She loves to call me a kid’
Overall, the different behaviours of control verbs that we observed in the corpus data, both synchronically and diachronically, lead us to consider the hypothesis that, diachronically, there has been a change in the selection properties of these verbs. Verbs such as querer ‘want’, with which restructuring became optional, develop the ability to select both a functionally defective complement and a functionally complete complement. Verbs such as prometer ‘promise’, which did not occur with CC in our data from OP, became able to select also a defective infinitival complement in the non-standard and in the standard varieties of EP. Additionally, data from contemporary varieties of EP suggest that other factors may influence the acceptability of CC, possibly the type of clitic involved and also the type of context, namely whether there is a proclisis trigger or not.

4. The study: judgement data

The data considered for contemporary EP in section 3 is corpus data, which means that the patterns that have been identified in these data regarding the productivity of restructuring with different types of verbs, as well as the factors that influence the acceptability of CC, should be confirmed by examining more controlled data. With this goal in mind, we conducted a small exploratory study using an acceptability judgement task. In section 4.1. we present the methodology of the study, followed, in section 4.2., by a description of the results.

4.1. Methodology

Four variables were considered: occurrence of CC (CC / no CC), type of verb (querer ‘want’ / esperar ‘expect’ / prometer ‘promise’ / decidir ‘decide’ / combinar ‘arrange’), type of clitic (3rd person accusative / 3rd person dative), and type of context (enclisis / proclisis). The verbs were selected taking into consideration the evidence from previous studies regarding their compatibility with restructuring and their temporal properties: whereas querer ‘want’ allows restructuring and selects a temporally dependent infinitival complement, the other four verbs are assumed by, for example, Gonçalves (1999) not to be compatible with restructuring (although instances of CC with at least some of these have been found in corpus data and in previous studies; see sections 2 and 3); however, only prometer ‘promise’, decidir ‘decide’ and combinar ‘arrange’ select temporally independent complements. Regarding clitic type and type of context, as mentioned in section 2, there are suggestions from previous studies that these are factors that may influence the acceptability of CC, with indications that this construction is more acceptable with accusative than with dative clitics, and in proclisis than in enclisis contexts (Fiéis & Madeira 2012; Freixo 2021; Reis, 2022). With the verb prometer ‘promise’ only accusative clitics were used, as this verb selects a dative object, which results in ambiguity (the dative object may be associated with the matrix verb or with the embedded infinitive). Given that native speakers of EP
appear to optionally allow enclisis in some proclisis contexts, all the sentences with proclisis used in the task are negative sentences, as this appears to be the context that is less subject to variability (Costa, Fiéis & Lobo 2016).

The task was an acceptability judgement task administered through Google forms, consisting of 72 sentences. The order of presentation was randomised. The task used a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 was completely unacceptable and 5 completely acceptable. Two sample items are shown in (18) and (19):

(18) Context with CC / decidir ‘decide’ / accusative clitic / enclisis:
O réu preparou uma declaração e decidiu-a ler em tribunal.
‘The defendant prepared a statement and decided to read it in court.’

(19) Context with CC / esperar ‘expect’ / dative clitic / proclisis:
O avô convidou a neta mas não espera fazer o jantar.
‘The grandfather invited his granddaughter but does not expect to cook dinner for her.’

The participants were 21 adult native speakers of standard contemporary EP, aged 18-55 years (average 23.5, SD 7.7). Fourteen participants were born and raised in the Lisbon area and seven of them originated from other regions in Portugal. All of them were either university graduates or undergraduates at the time of the study. Although there is some debate on the potential relevance of sociolinguistic variables such as the speaker’s age and geographical origin to the productivity of CC (e.g., Magro 2005; Barbosa et al. 2017; Reis 2022), these factors will not be considered in the present study.

4.2. Results

Bearing in mind that one of our goals was to determine whether there is a correlation between the selectional properties of the predicates (namely whether they select a temporally dependent complement clause) and their compatibility with restructuring, we start by comparing the two verbs which select a temporally dependent complement, i.e., querer ‘want’ and esperar ‘expect’, with prometer ‘promise’, decidir ‘decide’ and combinar ‘arrange’, all of which select a temporally independent complement, as described in section 2. These results are shown in Figure 1. No differences are found with respect to non-CC, but the overall acceptance of CC is consistently higher with

---

2 The task included other sentence types, including restructuring sentences with modal and aspectual verbs, which made a total of 120 sentences. Given that our focus in this paper is on restructuring with control verbs, these results are not described here. No fillers were included.

3 We have not conducted a statistical analysis of the data, as the sample was too small to run such an analysis. We plan to collect more data in the future.
*querer* ‘want’ and *esperar* ‘expect’ than with *prometer* ‘promise’, *decidir* ‘decide’ and *combinar* ‘arrange’, particularly in proclisis contexts.

**Figure 1.** Median acceptance rates by type of predicate

![Figure 1](image1.png)

We turn now to the results by verb and by clitic type. The results for the sentences without CC and with CC are shown in Figures 2 and 3, respectively. Comparing the two figures, speakers clearly prefer attaching the clitic to the infinitive to attaching it to the higher verb: the median acceptance of sentences without CC ranges between 3 and 5, whereas that of sentences with CC oscillates between 1 and 5, showing wider variation. The only exception to the generalised preference for no CC over CC is found with the verb *querer* ‘want’ in proclisis contexts, where there is a preference for CC with dative clitics and no preference for either option with accusative clitics (see Figure 4).

**Figure 2.** Median acceptance rates of sentences without CC

![Figure 2](image2.png)
In these sentences, similarly to what was found in the corpus data (section 3.2), there is an effect of context type, as CC tends to be more acceptable with proclisis than with enclisis (the only exception appears to be with dative clitics with the verb esperar ‘expect’). There is also an effect of clitic type, which shows an interaction with context: dative clitics tend to be more acceptable than accusative clitics in enclisis contexts (with verbs which allow CC with enclisis, namely querer ‘want’ and esperar ‘expect’), and accusative clitics tend to be more acceptable than dative clitics in proclisis contexts (with verbs which allow CC with proclisis, particularly with decidir ‘decide’ and esperar ‘expect’) (see also Reis 2022).

Moreover, there is an effect of verb type, as CC is more acceptable with some verbs than others – querer ‘want’, then decidir ‘decide’ and esperar ‘expect’, and finally prometer ‘promise’ – and excluded with the verb combinar ‘arrange’. This effect was also found in the corpus data (section 3.2). Except for querer ‘want’, which allows CC equally with both accusative and dative clitics, CC appears to be favoured in proclisis contexts with accusative clitics.
However, there is considerable variation in the judgements of native speakers regarding CC, as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>acc</th>
<th>ENCL</th>
<th>5-4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>querer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'want'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCL</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>76.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>95.45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCL</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decidir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'decide'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCL</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>80.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCL</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esperar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'expect'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCL</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCL</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prometer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'promise'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCL</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combinhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'arrange'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCL</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>85.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCL</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering, for example, accusative clitics in proclisis contexts, it is clear that, although global ratings show acceptance of CC with all verbs except combinhar 'arrange', there is considerably less variation in judgements with querer 'want' than with the other three verbs – whereas 95.45% of the participants assign ratings of 5 or 4 to querer 'want', only 55% do so with decidir ‘decide’, 50% with prometer ‘promise’ and 40.9% with esperar ‘expect’. In other cases, while there are contexts where speakers’ judgements appear to be fairly consistent (for example, regarding the use of accusative clitics in enclisis contexts with the verbs querer ‘want’, decidir ‘decide’ and esperar ‘expect’, as well as combinhar ‘arrange’ in all contexts), there are also contexts where there is a wide range of variation (for example, with the verb prometer ‘promise’, as well as with esperar ‘expect’ with dative clitics in enclisis contexts, which is the only case where speakers globally rate CC as being more acceptable with enclisis than with proclisis).

In general, the results reveal a wide range of individual variation. Figure 5 shows the overall percentages of acceptance of the sentences with CC (where a rating of 4 or 5 is considered to indicate acceptance). Out of the 21 participants, only 6 accepted above 40% of the sentences (and, out of these 6, only 1 accepted 100% of the sentences). As for the speakers who accepted less than 40% of the sentences with CC,
they tended to accept it only with querer ‘want’, followed by esperar ‘expect’ or decidir ‘decide’.

**Figure 5.** Distribution of participants by percentages of acceptance of CC

![Distribution of participants by percentages of acceptance of CC](image)

**5. Discussion and conclusions**

Following previous analyses that propose that, in restructuring constructions, the infinitival domain selected by the verb is an impoverished one, which explains the transparency effects which characterise these constructions, and given that restructuring is always optional with control verbs, we assume that control verbs which allow restructuring have the ability to select two types of infinitival complements, which differ in their degree of deficiency (cf. Gonçalves 1999).

The corpus data examined in the present study show that there was a change in the selectional properties of some control verbs: diachronically, restructuring, which was generalised with verbs such as querer ‘want’ in OP, became optional, meaning that these verbs acquired the ability to select both functionally defective and complete complements. On the other hand, verbs such as prometer ‘promise’, which did not allow restructuring in OP, became able to select a defective infinitival complement.

As for contemporary EP, we also find variation in the set of control verbs that allow restructuring, that is, in the lexical selection properties assigned to different control verbs, which determine the functional complexity associated with their infinitival complements. This variation is found both across varieties (sections 3.2. and 3.3) and across speakers, as evidenced by the results of our acceptability judgement task (section 4) and by some previous studies (e.g., Freixo 2021).

The data examined in the present study confirm what has been suggested in previous work (Martins 2000; Duarte 2003; Fiéis & Madeira 2012; Reis 2022): although there may be a correlation between the temporal properties of the control verb and the possibility of restructuring, as suggested by the contrast between the two verbs that select temporally dependent complements and the three that do not (see section 2), this correlation may be weaker than what has been proposed by, e.g. Gonçalves (1999) and Wurmbrand (2001), as shown by the behaviour of the individual verbs, which suggests that the temporal dependence of the infinitival domain is not a necessary condition for restructuring. Hence, such a correlation would account for the contrast between querer ‘want’ and combinar ‘arrange’, but not for the behaviour of the other control verbs analysed in the present study. For example, we have shown that verbs such as querer ‘want’ and decidir ‘decide’, which select a temporally dependent
and a temporally independent complement, respectively, both allow restructuring, whereas *combinar* ‘arrange’, which patterns with *decidir* ‘decide’ with respect to its temporal properties, does not.

The judgement data described in section 4 confirms that native speakers of EP accept restructuring more with some verbs than with others, thus confirming the existence of a scale of acceptability of CC with the control verbs tested, as shown in Figure 6 below (where the acceptability decreases as we move from the +CC end to the -CC end of the scale).

**Figure 6.** Scale of acceptability of CC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+CC</th>
<th>-CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>querer</em> ‘want’</td>
<td><em>combinar</em> ‘arrange’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>decidir</em> / <em>esperar</em> ‘decide’ / ‘expect’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>prometer</em> ‘promise’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the verbs that registered the highest and the lowest acceptance rates, i.e., *querer* ‘want’ and *combinar* ‘arrange’, respectively, are those that display the least inter-speaker variation, as shown in section 4.2. Variation is mostly found with the three verbs in the middle of the scale, which, according to the analysis that we are assuming, appear to be associated with dual selection properties for some speakers, allowing optional restructuring; for other speakers, however, these verbs only select a functionally complete infinitival complement, thus disallowing restructuring. Remember that these three verbs registered very low rates of CC in the written corpus data, which may be an effect of modality. It may be the case that the association between CC and oral speech observed in previous studies (Martins, 2016; Barbosa et al. 2017; Vitorino 2017; Freixo 2021; Reis 2022; see section 2) is stronger for those verbs with which CC is generally less acceptable and more subject to variation.

We also considered the question as to what properties other than the nature of the selecting verb (restructuring vs. non-restructuring) contribute to the acceptability of CC in contemporary EP. There are strong indications that the acceptability of this construction depends also on the interaction with other factors: the type of clitic and the type of context. The results of the judgement task confirm the patterns suggested by the corpus data, as well as in previous studies, showing that both accusative clitics and the availability of proclisis triggers favour the acceptance of CC. This may be explained by morphophonological factors, as placing the 3rd person accusative clitic in enclisis onto the higher verb requires specific morphophonological alternations on the verb and/or on the clitic (Luís & Kaiser 2016). See the examples in (20), showing the allomorphic variation on the clitic in (a) and the allomorphic variation both on the verb and on the clitic in (b).

(20)  
\[ \text{Eles querem-no ajudar (vs. Eles não querem ajudar)} \]
\[ \text{‘They want to help him (vs. They don’t want to help him)’} \]
Many questions remain open regarding restructuring with control verbs. For example, why are some verbs more affected by variation than others? Which factors determine inter-speaker variation? What is the role played by clitic allomorphy in the acceptability of CC? To answer these questions, a larger study needs to be conducted, covering more data, and including more participants. Given that CC has been linked particularly to oral registers, it is also important to consider spoken language, as well as a larger set of control verbs and variables.
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