

**THE QUANTIFIER *CADA* IN
BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE: Descriptive
and Comparative Analysis for Pedagogical
Purposes**



Luciane Maimone
Missouri State University

Abstract: This article presents a theoretically-based descriptive analysis of the universal quantifier *cada* in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) and a brief comparative analysis between *cada* in BP and Spanish. It advocates for the use of methodologies from descriptive and contrastive linguistics as a resource for second language (L2) teachers in the development of language teacher awareness and defends the importance of L2 grammar literacy for the delivery of effective L2 instructional practices.

1. Introdução

The universal distributive quantifier *cada* in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) closely matches the quantifier *cada* in Spanish and can be roughly translated to the English as *each* or *every*. Quantifiers are high frequency words in languages like English, Spanish, and Portuguese, but a review of second language (L2) Portuguese textbooks¹ shows that they do not receive much attention in L2 Portuguese pedagogical materials, except for the distinction *todo/tudo* "all/everything." In few textbooks, some emphasis is given to noun/gender agreement and the interplay between quantifiers and double negation. For the most part, however, explicit information about quantifiers is rarely provided, and they are introduced to the Portuguese learner implicitly or indirectly through reading and listening materials or as teacher-originated input.

One possible reason is that quantifiers are thought to be easily acquired and L2 textbooks favor form-focused practice involving language structures that teachers believe to be difficult. However, while the inaccurate choice of quantifier does not lead to significant communication breakdowns, errors in the choice of quantifier can cause confusion in interactions with Portuguese native speakers. These errors are many times caused by crosslinguistic influence, which is heightened in the case of typologically close languages (Kellerman, 1977; Ringbom, 2007). The quantifier *cada* in Spanish and Portuguese, for instance, share the same morphology but are only partial cognates. Consequently, Spanish speakers tend to overgeneralize the use of *cada* in BP by relying on their perception of similarity between the two languages, which paired with lack of negative evidence, can result in

¹ The textbooks evaluated were Tolman, Paiva, Parsons, and Jensen (1991); Lathorp and Dias (2004), Simões (2008, 2012); Burity (2009), Dias (2010), Rector, Santos, and Gerber (2010), and Barbosa and Schräge (2013).

production errors that persist in the speech of both intermediate and advance learners. One way to facilitate acquisition is to promote learner metalinguistic awareness by purposefully exposing learners to the use of *cada* in the relevant contexts in communicative or form-focused classroom activities (Brennan & Ireson, 1997; James, 2005; Svalberg, 2007; Roehr, 2007, 2010).

Promoting language awareness in the L2 classroom starts with the language instructors' understanding of the diverse target language phenomena. In other words, with the development of their own linguistic awareness and explicit knowledge of grammar. However, when preparing classroom activities many instructors rely solely on textbooks, simplified pedagogical grammars, or personal webpages as sources of grammatical knowledge. But even when information from these sources is suitable for the language learner in general, it may still present incomplete or inaccurate descriptions of language structures and features. It is important, then, that instructors locate more precise and comprehensive sources of information when engaged in their own professional development.

Nevertheless, instructors interested in creating materials to complement textbook content and provide extra practice on the use of Portuguese grammatical points are then faced with another problem. Pedagogical grammars written either for native speakers (e.g. Bechara, 2009; Cunha & Cintra, 2013; Castilho, 2010) or L2 learners of Portuguese (e.g. Whitlam, 2011; Perini, 2002) not always describe in full the morphosyntactic distribution, meanings, or pragmatic uses of certain forms. On the other hand, the large number of publications in theoretical linguistics focuses on explanatory models and language theory that are not always pertinent to the language classroom and are written in a style that reads too convoluted for the non-linguist.

The purpose of this paper is, therefore, to provide a more accessible, but still theoretically-based analysis of *cada* in BP that can be used in language teacher education and for pedagogical purposes. The analyses below borrow their methodology from the fields of descriptive and contrastive linguistics (as described in Chelliah & de Reuse, 2011; and Gast, 2012, 2013), but do not involve collection of primary language data. Instead, the corpus of data presented here is adapted from theoretical publications in linguistics. The first section presents a descriptive analysis of *cada*, a process defined as:

[...] an activity (and derivatively, its result), that formulates, in the most general way possible, the patterns underlying the linguistic data. Its purpose is to make the user of the description understand the way the language works.”(Lehmann, 1999, p.10)

The second section presents a brief comparative analysis between *cada* in BP and Spanish. Comparative analysis is understood here not in the same sense as in historical linguistics (e.g. in Rankin, 2013), but as a revised contrastive approach with no predictive aspirations (as in Sheen, 1996). Following the

conventions in linguistics, the asterisks placed before the examples in the text indicate ungrammaticality; interrogation marks indicate low or variable acceptability; and parentheses indicate optionality. The one-line English gloss provided below the sentences in Portuguese and Spanish is not a word-by-word translation, neither a completely idiomatic rendering in English, but rather something in between, a somewhat literal translation that preserves the original meaning in the target language.

2. A Descriptive Analysis of the Operator *Cada* in BP

Languages use different devices to express quantity, which may include cardinal numbers, plural affixes, adverbs, phrases, adjectives, and even nouns. Some of these devices perform other language functions. For example, in (1a) the preposition *between* expresses quantity, while in (2a) it expresses place. Quantifiers, on the other hand, are words that exist in language exclusively to indicate a non-specific amount or quantity (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). There are several types of quantifiers. A universal quantifier, unlike words like *some* and *a few*, makes claims about the entire group of members of a restricted set, such as in (1c). Distributive quantifiers are a type of universal quantifier, but they either apply a predicate to each individual member of the set (rather than to the set as a whole) as in (1d), or associate members of the set to different subevents, as in (1e) (Frawley, 1992; Tunstall, 1998).

- (1) a. Between ten and fifteen people
 b. Between me and you
 c. I ate all the cookies you bought!
 d. Every person in the room was asleep
 e. The teacher gave each student a grade

The operator *cada* "every/each" in BP is typically interpreted as a universal quantifier with a distributive reading (Postma, 2000; Negrão, 2002; Pires de Oliveira, 2003; Legroski, 2015; Leal, 2006a²). It is thought to have inherently wide scope, irrespective of its grammatical function (Negrão, 2002). However, unlike the English quantifier *every*, collective readings are not available for *cada*, as shown in (2).

- (2) *Foi preciso cada bombeiro para apagar o fogo
 "It was needed each fireman to extinguish the fire"

Different theoretical accounts have been proposed to explain the syntactic distribution of *cada* (e.g. Postma, 2000; Negrão, 2002; Quadro Gomes, 2004; Lacerda, 2010; Legroski, 2015). While providing a theoretical account of *cada* in BP is not within the scope of this article, insights from theoretical linguistics are helpful as they identify multiple contexts in which the operator is licensed or not. For instance, *cada* can appear in adverbial phrases as in (3a)

² Leal has investigated European Portuguese, but his analyses also apply to BP.

(Bechara, 2009) or occupy a subject position (3b), but not a simple object position (3c). However, when an indefinite constituent is added to a simple object construction, the sentence becomes grammatical, as in (3d).

- (3) a. Uma ilusão gemia em cada quarto
 "An illusion groaned in each room"
 b. Cada aluno comeu um bolo
 "Every pupil ate a cake"
 c. *Os alunos comeram cada bolo
 "The pupils ate each cake"
 d. Os alunos comeram cada bolo que estava sobre a mesa
 "The pupils ate each cake that was over the table"

Following Ioup's (1975) hierarchy of quantifiers, *cada* stands at the left of the spectrum with inherently unambiguous wide scope. Also, unlike the BP quantifier *todo (o)* "all/ every", *cada* does not inflect for number or gender, as seen in the contrast between (4a) and (4b). Floating³ of *cada* is restricted to partitive *cada* constructions or cases in which *cada* modifies the subject, as in (4c).

- (4) a. Cada professora dá duas aulas
 "Each professor-fem teaches two classes"
 b. Cada século traz novos desafios
 "Each century-masc. brings new challenges"
 c. Elas comeram cada uma, uma empanada
 "They each ate one empanada"

The operator *cada* combines with singular (5a) but not with plural noun phrases (NPs). It also combines with cardinal numbers followed by plural NPs (5c) and with collective numerals,⁴ as in (5c). It may co-occur with other quantifiers, but the acceptability level of the resulting sentence varies depending on the adjoining quantifier. For example, (5e) reads somewhat awkward compared to (5d).

- (5) a. Cada pessoa tem um sonho
 "Each person has a dream"
 b. Passa um trem a cada dez minutos
 "A train goes by every ten minutes"
 c. Cada semana leio um livro
 "Every week I read a book"
 d. ?Cada vários anos viajo
 "Every several years I travel"
 e. ??O presidente agrada a cada muitos
 "The president appeals to every many"

³ Floating refers a structure being able to move to and occupy different positions in the sentence.

⁴ Collective numerals are nouns that denote fixed quantities (objects, time units, etc.) as in *novena* "nine days," *semana* "week," *ano* "year," *dezena* "ten units," etc.

Cada enters complex constructions by combining with the pronoun *qual* "which" and the indefinite article *um* "a." While both *cada qual* "each of which" and *cada um* "each one" can appear in referential constructions, as in (6a); *cada um* "each one" can also be used with the meaning of *cada pessoa* "each person, everyone" as in (6b). In modern BP, constructions like (6c) where the article *um* is dropped are very common, even though this use is not prescribed by some grammarians.

- (6) a. Os alunos chegaram, cada qual com seu livro
 "The pupils arrived, each with his (own) book"
 b. Cada um tem o que merece
 "Everyone has what they deserve"
 c. Os livros custam dez dólares cada
 "The books cost ten dollars each"

Cada can be headed by prepositions, such as *em* "in," and *por* "per/for" (7a-b)⁵. Canonically, it modifies countable (atomic) but not uncountable (not atomic) nouns, as in the contrast between (7c) and (7d).

- (7) a. Dois em cada dez alunos não estudam
 "Two out of ten pupils do not study "
 b. A Maria pagou um dólar por cada selo
 "Maria paid one dollar for each stamp"
 c. Cada rato entrou em uma caixa
 "Each mouse went inside a box"
 d. *Cada água tem um gosto
 "Every water has a taste"

Uncountable nouns can be mass nouns with cumulative properties (e.g. water, sand, flour) or abstract concepts (e.g. dignity, happiness) and do not inflect for number. In Portuguese, just as proposed by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik (1985) for English, subcategorical conversion is common in discourse when mass nouns indicate partition of form, type, or specimen, often implying the existence of a measurement unit, such as a cup or a bottle (Camacho & Pezatti, 1996). It is possible, then, to find constructions in BP such as "cada areia tem uma cor" ("each sand has a color") and "cada água foi coletada" ("each water was collected"), and poetic licenses like the in the famous 1954's song "Saca rolhas, as águas vão rolar" by Zé da Zilda.

Other syntactic-semantic restrictions of *cada* include the fact that it does not occur in contexts that require indefinite phrases, such as the complement of *haver* "there is/are" in (8a) (Although, see Leal, 2006b). Phrases with *cada* cannot have a generic interpretation, as in (8b), therefore expressions with *cada* generally do accept a relative clause with the verb in the subjunctive mood, as in (8c) (Duarte & Oliveira, 2003; as cited in Leal, 2006b,

⁵ The distributive nature of *cada* in constructions with cardinal numerals or *em/por* heads is explained in Leal (2006a) and Legroski (2015).

p.1579). Postma's (2000) points out that, like the English distributive quantifiers *each* and *every*, *cada* cannot be referential with NPs that are not c-commanded by it, as in (8d) where the fact that the subject of second sentence has the same referent as the subject in the first sentence is not acceptable. It is also not possible to combine *cada* with negative polarity items (8e-f).

- (8) a. *Há cada aluno na sala.
 "There is each pupil in the classroom"
 b. *Cada pinguim é uma ave.
 "Each penguin is a bird"
 c. ??Cada teoria que sustente essa hipótese é absurda
 "Each theory which supports-Subj that hypothesis is absurd"
 d. Cada professor comprou um livro. *Ele tinha dinheiro para isso
 "Each professor bought a book. He had money for this"
 e. *Nem cada menina comeu uma salada
 "Not each girl ate a salad"
 f. *Cada aluno não repetirá de ano
 "Each pupil will not fail the class"

One particular context where *cada* is unlicensed is shown in (9a). To understand what makes (9a) ungrammatical, it is easier to look at the contrast between *cada* and the BP quantifier *todo* "all, every," which is also distributive. Postma (2000) suggests that *cada* and *todo* have different syntactic and semantic properties and could be in complementary distribution, as seen in (9a-b). One way to explain their differences is to assume that *todo* does not have argumental requirements in its own scope (9b), while *cada* requires binding of an extra argumental position and binds two variable positions unselectively. That is to say that, to be grammatical, constructions with *cada* must be "not only distributive with respect to the subject, but also with the argument bound," such as the object (p. 243). This obligatory bi-distributive property of *cada* frequently generates pair-list readings. Therefore, (9c-d) can only be interpreted as the pupils having gone to different schools. The word *diferente* "different" in (9d) does not need to be expressed, as its meaning is already implied by *cada*. Overtly, the word *diferente* "different" is used for emphasis.

- (9) a. *Cada aluno foi à escola
 "Each pupil went to-the school"
 b. Todo aluno ia à escola
 "Every pupil went to school"
 c. Cada aluno foi a sua (própria) escola
 "Each pupil went to his (own) school"

- d. Cada aluno foi a uma escola (diferente)
 "Each pupil went to a (different) school
 e. *Cada aluno leu o livro Grande Sertão Veredas
 "Each pupil read the book Grande Sertão Veredas"

The extra argument requirement for *cada* can be satisfied in different ways. For example, as an anaphoric pronoun, such as *sua* "his" in (9c) that is coreferential with the antecedent *cada*. It can also be satisfied with an indefinite (open variable), as signaled by the indefinite article *um* "a" in (9d). If the distribution cannot happen in one of the argumental positions, the bi-distributiveness is not saturated and the sentence is ungrammatical. For example, in (9a) and (9e), respectively, the definite article in "a casa" and the proper name "Grande Sertão Vereda" in object position indicate unique (definite) entities, preventing the distributive reading.

Negrão (2002) complements this analysis by looking at constructions that should be grammatical under Postma's view but are not. She explains that the sentence in (10a) contains an individual-level predicate (*inteligente*), which does not allow for an event variable in argumental position. To be intelligent is a state, not an event, and cannot be distributed over a complex NP with space-time reference. The sentence in (10b), in turn, implies different "vacation events," licensing the use of *cada*. The stage-level predicate *férias* "vacations" creates an event position and the temporal adverbial clause that follows allows the event to fulfil the distributive requirement.

- (10) a. *Cada homem é inteligente num período do ano
 "Each man is intelligent at a time of the year"
 b. Cada funcionária tira férias num período do ano
 "Each employee take vacations at a time of the year"

Unlike *cada*, *todo* is insensitive to definiteness and can have either definite or indefinite articles in its predicate (11a-b), the difference being that the use of indefinite articles with *todo* (11b) allows for an ambiguous reading (non-distributive or distributive). The examples in (11c-d), taken from Postma (2000, p.248), show more clearly how each quantifier prompts one single and unambiguous interpretation. In (11c), *cada* requires an answer that lists a different book title for each pupil as a result of the distributive interpretation; whereas (11d) requires an answer that specifies one single book title for all pupils as result of the collective reading.

- (11) a. Todo aluno declamou uma poesia
 "Every pupil recited a poem"
 b. Todo aluno declamou a poesia
 "Every pupil recited the poem"
 c. Que livro (que) cada aluno lê?

distributive/*collective
 "What book does every pupil read?"

d. Que livro (que) todo aluno lê?

??distributive/collective

"What book does every pupil read?"

This hypothesis is corroborated by the fact that *todo* co-occurs with negative polarity (generally allowed with generic readings) as in (12a-b) but *cada* does not. The contrast between *cada* and *todo* is illustrated again in (12c-d). While it can be argued that the sentence in (12c) is in fact ambiguous and could also be interpreted as having the same meaning as (12d) (which conveys that one different outfit is used in every different occasion), the preferred reading for (12c) is one that restricts the number of outfits to one for all occasions.

- (12) a. (Nem) toda pessoa acorda cedo de manhã
 "(Not) every person wakes up early in the morning"
 b. Eles (não) acordam cedo toda manhã
 "They (do not) wake up early ever morning"
 c. Ela tinha uma roupa para toda ocasião
 "She had one outfit for every occasion"
 d. Ela tinha uma roupa para cada ocasião
 "She had one outfit for each occasion"

Postma (2000) also noticed that, while *cada* is insensitive to verbal aspect (13a-b), the singular *todo* typically occurs with imperfect tenses, as showed by the contrast between (13c) and (13d). The imperfect tense in (13b-c) conveys the idea of repetition and could be translated as *used to +verb* in English. When the perfect tense is used, constructions with *todo + definite article* are preferred, as in (13e)⁶ (for alternative accounts, see Pires de Oliveira, 2003; Müller, Negrão, & Quadros Gomes, 2006; 2007).

- (13) a. Cada turista foi a uma praia
 "Each tourist went-perf. to a beach"
 b. Cada turista ia a uma praia
 "Each tourist went-imperf. to a beach"
 c. Todo turista ia à praia
 "Every tourist went-imperf. to-the beach"
 d. * Todo turista foi à praia
 "Every tourist went-perf. to-the beach"
 e. Todos os turistas foram à praia
 "All tourists went to-the beach"

Postma explains this particularity of *todo* by postulating that it has the same bi-distributivity as *cada*, but the distributive requirement is satisfied with the presence of an indefinite variable that can be realized through aspect selection. Imperfect tenses satisfy the requirement of indefiniteness. When

⁶ Notice that *todo* and *todo+definite-article* display different syntactic behaviors and are semantic different (Muller et al., 2007).

the imperfect verb aspect is not present, other resources can be employed to indicate indefiniteness, including the word *já* "already" and *um dia* "one day" in (14a-b), reciprocal constructions with plurals (14c), or an additional indefinite dummy (e.g. *mundo* "one, everyone") (14d).

- (14) a. Todo brasileiro já foi à praia
 "Every Brazilian has already gone to the beach"
 b. Todo brasileiro foi à praia um dia
 "Every Brazilian went to the beach one day"
 c. Todos eles se amam
 "All of them love each other"
 d. Todo mundo se ama
 "Everyone loves each other"

Postma's (2000) framework could help explain the contrast of sentence pairs like (15a) and (15b), if we assume that in (15a), *cada* cannot distribute over the subject *Ana* and the sentence is ungrammatical, whereas the distributivity requirement of *todo* is satisfied by the imperfectiveness of the verb in the present tense by presuming a series of temporal events. Müller et al. (2007) offer a parallel explanation, proposing that *todo* differs from *cada* in that it can distribute subparts of both its predicate and the nominal predicate. It is also possible that the *todo* is licensed in adverbial position only because it allows for a collective reading, while *cada* does not. This becomes more evident if we compare the types of adverbs that can co-occur with each quantifier. While *cada* can only be modified by adverbs that emphasize the singularity of the parts in a set (15c), *todo* is modified by adverbs that emphasize references to the whole group, such as *quase* "almost," *aproximadamente* "nearly" etc., as in (15d).

- (15) a. *Ana vai ao cinema cada mês
 "Ana goes to the movies every month"
 b. Ana vai ao cinema todo mês
 "Ana goes to the movies every month"
 c. Cada aluno interpretou o livro distintamente
 "Each pupil interpreted the book distinctively"
 d. Praticamente todo aluno leu este livro
 "Virtually every pupil read this book"

In addition, the operator *cada* can enter partitive constructions when combining with indefinite articles, followed by the preposition *de* "of," which in turn can contract with definite articles and pronouns (e.g. *cada uma das*, *cada um deles*). Partitives are words or phrases that refer to an amount of or part of something. While distributive quantifiers are said to refer to individual instances of a collection of elements, partitive constructions express a quantified relationship between the part and the whole. In other words, partitives select a more restricted set, a subset of the original set (Radden & Dirven, 2007). The partitive *cada* behaves differently syntactically compared

to simple *cada* constructions. It selects a plural NP as the subject of its complement, but the verb agrees with *cada*, remaining in the singular (16a). The indefinite article *um* inflects for gender, agreeing with the head noun of the NP. The partitive *cada* is a floating operator, it can occupy different positions in the sentence, which results in subject-verb agreement changes and allows for different types of elision, as in (16b-d) (Bechara, 2009).

- (16) a. Cada um dos alunos leu dois livros
 "Each one of the pupils read two books"
 b. Os alunos leram dois livros cada (um)
 "The pupil read two books each"
 c. Os alunos leram cada um (deles) dois livros
 "The pupil read each two books"
 d. Os alunos cada um (deles) leram dois livros
 "The pupil each read two books"
 e. Cada aluno leu dois livros
 "Each pupil read two books"

The semantic distinctions between *cada* and partitive *cada* in BP are subtle. The partitive *cada* is mostly used for emphasis, as seen by the contrast between (16a) and (16e). The partitive *cada* is also bi-distributive, as illustrated by the contrast between (17a) and (17b), where the subject in (17a) is definite and cannot be distributed, rendering an ungrammatical sentence.

- (17) a. *Ela lavou cada *duas* das roupas
 "She washed every two the clothes"
 b. De cada três alunos na sala, dois são mulheres
 "Out of every three pupils in the room, two are women"

We can summarize the uses of *cada* by grouping constructions with *cada* according to their semantic and pragmatic readings. The most common category includes sentences that generate *pair-list readings*, like (18a-b). Another category includes constructions that convey *periodicity*, having *cada* followed by numerals, and that convey the idea of a successive number of events distributed over time, as in (18c). *Cada* also yields *cumulative readings*, as in (18d), where it does not distribute over distinct physical elements of a set but over non-overlapping events or increments of time and involve some type of increment or change in quantity or intensity of one or the arguments. *Cumulative readings* are often formed with the expressions *cada vez mais/menos* (18e), which are also called *comparative serial constructions* (Leal, 2006a). The sentence in (18f), although similar, yield another type of reading, one that quantifies over the *frequency* of events, not their intensity. The sentence in (18g), on the other hand, is ambiguous, it can generate either a *cumulative reading* or a *+frequency reading*.

- (18) a. Dei um livro a cada aluno
 "I gave a book to each pupil"

- b. Cada mês ele tem uma namorada nova
"Each month he has a new girlfriend"
- c. Viajo a cada dois meses
"I travel every two months"
- d. Cada ano que passa ela fica mais bonita
"Every year that goes-by she gets more beautiful"
- e. Cada vez a TV mostra mais violência
"Each time the TV shows more violence"
- f. Cada vez mais a TV mostra violência
"Each time more the TV shows violence"
- g. A TV mostra cada vez mais violência
"The TV shows each time more violence"

The *emphatic reading* of *cada* is attained with the use of *partitive cada*, as in (16a-d), as discussed above. Finally, a set of constructions with *cada* are said to have an *exclamative reading*. These constructions violate several of the syntactic restrictions normally applied to *cada* (Moreira, 2001; Negrão, 2002; Quadro Gomes, 2004). In exclamative sentences, *cada* acts as both an adjective of gradation and an intensifier, not a quantifier. It can communicate appreciation, dislike, or surprise. Legroski (2015) points out that this reading has greater pragmatic than semantic weight. Depending on the speaker's intonation, the sentence in (19a) can be interpreted as having a positive or negative denotation, roughly corresponding to the meaning in (19b) or (19c), respectively. However, both (19b) and (19c) show lower emphasis and exclamatory power compared to (19a).

- (19) a. Você tem cada ideia!
"You have each idea!"
- b. Você tem ideias excelentes
"You have excellent ideas"
- c. Você tem ideias horríveis
"You have horrible ideas"
- d. As ideias que você tem!
"The ideas you have!"

Quadro Gomes (2004) postulates three conditions for the *exclamative reading* of *cada* to occur. First, *cada* must appear in syntactic contexts where it is normally disallowed (ungrammatical). Second, it must be accompanied by exclamative or reticent intonation. Third, additional stress characterizes the pronunciation of *cada*, working as a topicalization/focus device (p.280). She also indicates that the paradigmatic bi-distributivity of *cada* is not completely lost in these constructions. For example, the interpretation of (19a) can still allude to an open or unfinished list of events on a grading scale. The topicalization function of *cada* in *exclamative readings* is confirmed when we compare it to another topicalization resource in BP, where focalized components are moved to the beginning of the sentence, as in (19d).

3. Comparing the operator *Cada* in BP to *Cada* in Spanish

This section presents a brief comparative analysis of the quantifier *cada* in BP and Spanish. The purpose here is to provide a description of contrasts that are pedagogically relevant to Portuguese learners in the U.S. Due to space limitations, I will not describe Spanish distributive quantifiers in detail or address all their syntactic restrictions. Also, because few empirical studies have examined Portuguese errors by Spanish speakers (e.g. Sepúlveda-Torres & Aluisio, 2014) and, to my knowledge, none have looked at L2 learning of BP quantifiers, I will focus on crosslinguistic issues I have identified anecdotally as an L2 Portuguese instructor, such as the examples in (20), which range from ungrammatical to non-idiomatic sentences. Again, not many crosslinguistic influence (CLI) errors are associated with L2 BP production, but they should be enough to serve as an example of comparative analysis.

- (20) a. *Cada quem, uma cabeça
 "To each one, his own mind"
 b. Só entram três pessoas *a cada vez
 "Only three people come in at a time"
 c. *Vejo minha mãe cada semana
 "I see my mother every week"
 d. ?Só cada muitos anos tem um bom jogador
 "Only every many years there is a good player"
 e. ?Eu queria trabalhar menos cada dia⁷
 "I wanted to work less each day/ I wanted to work each day less"

The universal distributive quantifiers *cada* in Spanish and BP are very similar, sharing several of the same syntactic restrictions and semantic characteristics, including the use of *partitive cada*, complex constructions (*cada cual*, etc.), and the exclamative *cada*. The *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española* (Real Academia Española, 2010) describes some of these properties for Spanish. One of the crosslinguistic differences illustrated in (21) refers to the combination of *cada* and other BP quantifiers, such as *muito* "many," *pouco* "few," *vários* "several," and *tanto* "as/so many." In Spanish, these quantifiers (*mucho*, *poco*, *varios*, and *tanto*, respectively) combine more freely and productively with *cada*. For example, constructions with *cada mucho* are generally accepted in Spanish, as in (21a), but have a low level of acceptability in BP (21b). The acceptability of these combinations in BP depend on the quantifier that adjoins *cada* (21d, 21f), and the existence of paraphrastic or homologous constructions, such as *de poucos em poucos* "every few" and *de muitos em muitos* "every many" that are often preferred.

⁷ Here, the placement of the comparative adverb *menos* "less" at the end of the sentence would render a more acceptable sentence: "Eu queria trabalhar cada dia menos."

- (21) a. Lavamos el patio cada muchos meses SPAN
 "We-wash the patio every many years"
 b. *Lavamos o pátio (a) cada muitos meses
 "We-wash the patio every many years"
 c. Nos vemos cada pocos días SPAN
 "We-see each-other every few days"
 d. ??Nos vemos (a) cada poucos dias
 "We-see each-other every few days"
 e. Seguía una dieta cada tantas semanas SPAN
 "He/she-followed a diet every many weeks"
 f. ?Seguia uma dieta (a) cada tantas semanas
 "He/she-followed a diet every many weeks"

The same can be said about the combination of *cada* and the interrogative pronoun *quem* "who" in BP shown in (22a); it does not share the same level of acceptability as in Spanish (22b). In BP, constructions such as *cada um/cada pessoa* "every/each person" are preferred (22c), an option that is also available in Spanish (22d).

- (22) a. *A cada quem sua luta
 "To each one his own battles"
 b. Cada quién, su lucha SPAN
 "To each one his own battles"
 c. Cada um sabe o que faz
 "Everyone knows what they do"
 d. Cada uno sabe lo que hace SPAN
 "Everyone knows what they do"

Another construction where *cada* and *todo* are acceptable in Spanish but questionable in BP are those shown in (23). The contrast between (23a) and (21b) shows that, in Spanish, *cada* is employed with a collective reading not available in BP. The reason for the grammaticality of (23a) might be that Spanish speakers tend to interpret the sentence as a partitive construction with an elided article, accompanied by stress on *cada*, for emphasis. The traditional paradigm in BP, however, only allows for the option in (23e).

- (23) a. Cada tren se retrasó SPAN
 "Every train was late"
 b. *Cada trem se atrasou
 "Every train was late"
 c. ?Cada um dos trens se atrasou
 "Each of the trains was late"
 d. ?Todo trem se atrasou
 "Every train was late"
 e. Todos os trens se atrasaram
 "All trains were late"

Perhaps the most salient contrast between the use of *cada* in BP and Spanish

is a process, and it contributes to the teacher's continuing education, serving as what Johnson (2009) calls an intellectual tool of inquiry, especially when aligned with the instructor's professional goals and focused on maximizing student learning. Grammar literacy is also not equal to adopting form-focused approaches to teaching or to prioritizing activities that involve explicit instruction. For Edge (1998, p.10, as cited in Andrews, 2007, p. 24), teacher language awareness (TLA) is “essentially concerned with subject-matter knowledge and its impact upon teaching. In other words, it relates to the L2 teacher’s needs to be able to function effectively as and *analyst* of language.” Examining its impact on pedagogical practices, Andrews (2001) points out that TLA affects instruction by mediating the three sources of input for the learner (pedagogical materials, teacher input, and other-learners input) and helping bridge the teacher’s content knowledge and communicative language ability. In that sense, explicit knowledge of grammar does not limit the language teacher; on the contrary, it offers foundational support for the implementation of high-leverage teaching practices, supporting the adequate selection and design of pedagogical materials, informing learner feedback, and optimizing lesson planning.

This paper argues that knowledge of linguistics and metalanguage is a component of subject-matter knowledge and grammar literacy and, as such, should not be disregarded in language teacher training. TLA becomes increasingly pertinent to language educators, as findings from second language acquisition research show benefits associated with explicit language instruction (Ellis R., 1997, 2005; Long & Robinson, 1998; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Housen & Pierrard, 2005; De Graaff & Housen, 2009) and as research-based language pedagogies suggest that conscious-raising activities can be used in meaning-focused instruction to avoid shortcomings of communicative language teaching approaches (Fotos, 1994; Ellis, 2006, 2011; Spada, 2007; Laufer & Girsai, 2008; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; Ellis & Shintani, 2014; Loewen, 2015). TLA helps teachers become discerning consumers of language research and literature (Perry, 2011). More importantly, it may also help them engage in their own research about language and formulate their own descriptive and comparative analyses for language structures that apply specifically to their teaching contexts.

5. Bibliographic References

- Andrews, S. (1999). Why do L2 teachers need to ‘know about language’? Teacher metalinguistic awareness and input for learning. *Language and Education*, 13(3), 161–177.
- Andrews, S. (2001). The language awareness of the L2 teacher: Its impact upon pedagogical practice. *Language Awareness*, 10 (2-3), 75-90.
- Andrews, S. (2007). Researching and developing teacher language awareness. In: J. Cummins, & C. Davison (Eds.), *International*

- handbook of English language teaching, vol 15.* (pp.945-959). Boston, MA: Springer.
- Bechara, E. (2009). *Moderna gramática portuguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira.
- Brennan, F., & Ireson, J. (1997) Training phonological awareness: A study to evaluate the effects of a program of metalinguistic games in kindergarten. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 9, 241–263,
- Buriti, T. (2009). *Aquarela: Portuguese for foreigners*. Washington, DC: Signature Book Printing.
- Camacho, R. G., & Pezatti, E. G. (1996). Nomes contáveis e não-contáveis. *Alfa* (São Paulo), 40, 59-74.
- Castilho, A. T. De. (2010). *Nova gramática do português brasileiro*. São Paulo: Editora Contexto.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chelliah, S. L., de Reuse, W. J. (2011). Definition and goals of descriptive linguistic fieldwork. In S. L. Chelliah & W. J. de Reuse (Eds.), *Handbook of descriptive linguistic fieldwork* (pp.7-31). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Cunha, C., & Cintra, L. (2013). *Nova gramática do português contemporâneo*. 6th Ed. São Paulo: Lexikon Editorial.
- De Graaff, R. & Housen, A. (2009). Investigating the effects and effectiveness of L2 instruction. In M. H. Long, & J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp.726-755). New York: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dias, A. C. (2010). *Entre nós: Método de português para hispanofalantes. Vol. 1 & 2*. Lisbon: Lidel.
- Duarte, A. A. (2005). *Diferencias de usos gramaticales entre español/portugués* (2nd Ed.). Madrid: Edinumen.
- Duarte, I. & Oliveira, F. (2003 [1983]). Referência nominal. In, Ms. H. Mateus et al., *Gramática da língua portuguesa* (pp.205-242). Lisboa: Caminho.
- Ellis, R. & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review* [Report]. Wellington: Ministry of Education, New Zeland. Retrieved from [https://web.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Courses/Ed205X%20Website/Resources/Ellis%20Instructed-second-language%20\(2\).pdf](https://web.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Courses/Ed205X%20Website/Resources/Ellis%20Instructed-second-language%20(2).pdf)
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: AN SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (1), 83-107.

- Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge, and instruction. In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, H. Reinders, R. Erlam, & J. Philip (Eds.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing, and teaching* (pp.3-26). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2011). A principled approach to incorporating second language acquisition research into a teacher education program. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 9 (1), 1–17.
- Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2), 323-351.
- Frawley, W. (1992). *Linguistic semantics*. Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gast, V. (2012). Contrastive analysis: Theories and methods. In B. Kortmann (Ed.), *Dictionaries of linguistics and communication science: Linguistic theory and methodology* (n.p.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Retrieved from: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/dd1b/c273c9cbea5750e182e4a632cab4690c8af1.pdf?_ga=2.198059622.894846356.1560797629-747292656.1559338571
- Gast, V. (2013). Contrastive analysis. In M. Byran, & A. Hu (Eds.), *The Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning* (pp. 153-158). London: Routledge.
- Hawkins, E. W. (1999). Foreign language study and language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 8 (3-4), 124-142.
- Housen, A., & Pierrard, M. (2005). Investigating instructed second language acquisition. In A. Housen, & M. Pierrard (Eds.), *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition* (pp.1-27). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Ioup, G. (1975). Some universals for quantifier scope. In J. Kimball (Ed.), *Syntax and semantics*. V. 4 (pp. 37-58). New York: Academic Press.
- James, C. (2005). Contrastive analysis and the language learner: A new lease of life? In D. J. Allerton, C. Tshichold, and J. Wieser (Eds.), *Linguistics, language learning and language teaching. The International Cooper Series on English Language and Literature (ICSELL)* 10 (pp. 1-20). Seiten: Broschiert.
- Johnson, K. J. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Jouët-Pastré, C., Klobucka, A. M., Sobral, P. I. S., Moreira, M. L. B., & Hutchinson, A. P. (2013). *Ponto de Encontro: Portuguese as a world language. 2nd Ed*. New York: Pearson.
- Kellerman, E. (1977). Towards a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht*, 2

- (1), 58-145.
- Lacerda, R. (2010). Quantified expressions in Brazilian Portuguese: to float or not to float? Paper presented at the *IV Workshop Projeto Temático 'Sintaxe gerativa do português brasileiro na entrada do século XXI: minimalismo e interfaces.'* USP, São Paulo, SP.
- Lathrop, T. & Dias, E. M. (2004). *Brasil! Língua e cultural* (3rd ed.). Newark (DE): Linguatext, Ltda.
- Laufer, B. & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case of contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics*, 29 (4), 694-716.
- Leal, A. (2006a). Cada vez mais/menos: comparative construction or quantification over eventualities?. In *Actes du Colloque La Quantification et ses Domaines. Presses Universitaires de Caen, Collection Syntaxe et Sémantique* (pp. 151-158). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1881404/Cada_vez_mais_menos_comparative_construction_or_quantification_over_eventualities
- Leal, A. (2006b). Some observations about the quantifier cada. In M. V. Llamazares (Ed.), *Actas del XXXV Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* (pp. 1576-1593). Universidade de León, León. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/1881337/Some_observations_about_the_quantifier_cada
- Legroski, M. C. (2015). Todo, qualquer, cada: uma proposta de análise semântica (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba.
- Lehmann, C. (1999). *Documentation of endangered languages. A priority task for linguistics*. ASSIDUE, Working Papers of the Seminar for Linguistics of the University of Erfurt No. 1. College of Philosophy. University of Erfurt, 1-15.
- Loewen, S. (2015). *Introduction to instructed second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- Long, M. H. & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus of form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.15-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moreira, B. (2001). Para uma caracterização unitária de cada. In *Actas do Encontro Nacional da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística, 16., 2000, Coimbra* (pp. 377-386). Lisboa: APL.
- Müller, A. L. De P., Negrão, E. V. & Quadros Gomes, A. P. (2006). Todo in Brazilian Portuguese: All or every or neither? In *Proceedings of SULA3: UMass Occasional Papers, vol 33* (pp. 71-86). Amherst, UMass.
- Müller, A. L. De P., Negrão, E. V., & Quadros Gomes, A. P. (2007).

- "Todo" em contextos coletivos e distributivos. *D. E. L. T. A.*, 23 (1), 71-95.
- Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. New York: Routledge.
- Negrão, E. V. (2002). Distributividade e genericidade nos sintagmas introduzidos por cada e todo. *Revista do GEL, São Paulo*, n. especial, 185-205.
- Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417-528.
- Ortiz Díaz, J. A. (2012). *Para entender y usar el subjuntivo en portugués*. Ciudad de México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Perini, M. (2002). *Modern Portuguese: A reference grammar*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Perry, F. L Jr. (2011). *Research in applied linguistics: Becoming a discerning consumer*, 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.
- Pires de Oliveira, R. (2003). Is *todo* N in Brazilian Portuguese a quantifier? In *Proceeding of SULA 2* (pp.99-116). Vancouver, BC.
- Postma, G. (2000). Distributive universal quantification and aspect in Brazilian Portuguese. In J. Costa (Ed.), *Portuguese syntax: New comparative studies* (pp.241-265). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quadros Gomes, A. P. (2004). *Todo, cada e qualquer: Exigência sobre a denotação nominal e verbal* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.
- Quadros Gomes, A. P. (2006). A chave da distributividade de "todo" está na análise de DPs como as *measure phrases* de Krifka. *Revista Letras, Curitiba*, 69, 117-132.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Radden, G., & Dirven, R. (2007). *Cognitive English grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rankin, R. L. (2013). The comparative method. In B. D. Joseph, and R. D. Janda (Eds.), *Handbook of historical linguistics* (pp.183-212). New York: Blackwell.
- Real Academia Española (2010). *Nueva gramática de la lengua española: Manual*. Mexico: Planeta Mexicana.
- Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Roehr, K. (2007). Metalinguistic knowledge and language ability in university-level L2 learners. *Applied Linguistics* 29 (2), 173-199.
- Roehr, K. (2010). Explicit knowledge and learning in SLA: A cognitive perspective. *AILA Review*, 23, 7-29.

- Sepúlveda-Torres, L. Rodrigues, R. and Aluísio, S. (2014). Espanhol-acadêmico-Br: A corpus of academic Portuguese learners produced by native speakers of Spanish. In: S. M. Aluisio, & S. E. O. Tagnin. (Eds.), *New languages technologies and linguistic research: a two-way road* (pp. 98—111). Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Sheen, R. (1996). The advantage of exploiting contrastive analysis in teaching and learning a foreign language. *IRAL*, 34 (3), 183-198.
- Simões, A. R. M. (2008). *Pois não: Brazilian course for Spanish speakers*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spada, N. (2007). Communicative language teaching: Current status and future prospects. In J. Cummins, C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp.271-288). Boston: Springer.
- Svalberg, A. M-L. (2007). Language awareness and language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 40, 287-308.
- Svalberg, A. M-L. (2013). Teaching for language awareness. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp.1-5). New York: Blackwell.
- Thornbury, S. (2001). *Uncovering grammar*. Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann.
- Tunstall, S. L. (1998). *The interpretation of quantifiers: semantic & processing* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Whitlam, J. (2011). *Modern Portuguese grammar: A practical guide*. New York: Routledge.