

OBJETOS NULOS/PRONOMES PLENOS E TOPICALIDADE NO PORTUGUÊS BRASILEIRO

OBJETOS NULOS / PRONOMBRES PLENOS Y TOPICALIDAD EN EL PORTUGUÉS
BRASILEÑO

NULL OBJECTS/FULL PRONOUNS AND TOPICALITY IN BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE

Sonia Maria Lazzarini Cyrino*

Universidade Estadual de Campinas

RESUMO: Sabe-se que o português brasileiro (PB) permite objetos nulos cujos antecedentes são inanimados. Porém, há certas sentenças que parecem desafiar essa generalização. Essas sentenças também permitem pronomes plenos na posição do objeto. Neste trabalho, defendo que a lacuna nessas sentenças não é o objeto nulo característico do PB, ou seja, não há aí uma elipse de DP. A questão, portanto, é como diferenciá-las (i) daquelas contendo o verdadeiro objeto nulo; e (ii) daquelas que só permitem o pronome pleno. Para discutir essas questões, o trabalho tem como base o arcabouço teórico gerativista e parte de recentes propostas para diferentes tipos de tópico, dentro de uma visão cartográfica (FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ, 2007). Comparando os objetos nulos do PB com o hebraico (ERTESCHIK-SHIR *et al.*, 2013), assumo que diferentes tipos de tópico devem ser distinguidos em termos de seu papel no discurso. O PB, no entanto, não se assemelha ao hebraico em relação ao fenômeno de queda do tópico. Essa discussão embasa a proposta aqui apresentada acerca da distribuição do objeto nulo e pronome pleno no PB. Os objetos nulos animados vs. não-animados do PB são permitidos de acordo com o tipo de tópico presente na periferia à esquerda. O trabalho pretende contribuir para a discussão sobre a alternância objeto nulo/pronome pleno no PB.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Objeto nulo. Pronome pleno. Português brasileiro.

RESUMEN: Se sabe que el portugués brasileño (PB) permite objetos nulos cuyos antecedentes son inanimados. Sin embargo, hay ciertas oraciones que parecen desafiar esta generalización. Estas oraciones también permiten pronombres completos en la posición del objeto. En este trabajo, sostengo que la brecha en estas oraciones no es el objeto nulo característico de PB, es decir, no hay elipsis de DP. La pregunta, entonces, es cómo diferenciarlos (i) de aquellos que contienen el verdadero objeto nulo; y (ii) de aquellos que solo admiten el pronombre abierto. Para discutir esos temas, este trabajo tiene como base el marco teórico gerativista y parte de

* Livre-Docte, Departamento de Linguística, Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, Universidade Estadual de Campinas. Este trabalho recebeu o apoio da Bolsa de Produtividade em Pesquisa –CNPq, nível 1B (Processo n. 304574/2017-1). E-mail: cyrino@unicamp.br.

propuestas recientes para diferentes tipos de tópicos, dentro de una visión cartográfica (FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ, 2007). Comparando los objetos nulos del PB con el hebreo (ERTESCHIK-SHIR *et al.* 2013), asumo que los diferentes tipos de tópicos deben distinguirse en términos de su papel en el discurso. El PB, sin embargo, no se asemeja al hebreo con relación al fenómeno de caída del tópico. Esta discusión está en la base de la propuesta que se presenta acerca de la distribución del objeto nulo y pronombre pleno en el PB. Los objetos nulos animados *versus* no animados del PB se permiten de acuerdo con el tipo de tópico presente en la periferia a la izquierda. Este trabajo tiene la intención de contribuir con la discusión sobre la alternancia objeto nulo / pronombre abierto en PB.

PALABRAS-CLAVE: Objetos nulos. Pronombres plenos. Portugués brasileño.

ABSTRACT: It is a well-known fact that Brazilian Portuguese (BP) allows null objects whose antecedents are inanimate. However, there are certain sentences that seem to defy this generalization. These sentences also allow full pronouns in the position of the object. In the present work, I argue that the gap in these sentences is not the typical null object of BP, that is, there is no DP ellipsis. The question, then, is how to differentiate them (i) from those containing the true null object; and (ii) from those that only allow the full pronoun. To discuss these issues, the present paper follows the generativist framework and builds on recent proposals for different types or topics from a cartographic perspective (FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ 2007). By comparing BP null objects to Hebrew null objects (ERTESCHIK-SHIR *et al.* 2013), I assume that different types of topics must be distinguished in terms of their role in discourse. BP, however, is not similar to Hebrew with respect to the Topic Drop phenomenon. This discussion grounds the proposal on the distribution of the null object and full pronoun in BP advanced in this work. The paper intends to contribute to the discussion about the null object / full pronoun alternation in BP.

KEYWORDS: Null objects. Full pronouns. Brazilian Portuguese.

1 INTRODUCTION

As it is well known, Brazilian Portuguese (henceforth, BP) allows anaphoric null and overt direct objects, the latter being realized as full pronouns. Full pronouns may have animate or inanimate antecedents, but they are specific (CYRINO, to appear). Null objects, however, have [-animate] antecedents, as has been shown in the literature (DUARTE, 1986; CYRINO, 1994, 1997; among others), see the example in (1):

- (1) a. A Maria rasgou o casaco quando experimentou $\sqrt{\emptyset}$ / \sqrt{ele} .
 the Maria tore the coat when tried it
 ‘Maria tore the coat when she tried it on.’
- b. A Maria beijou o namorado quando encontrou $*\emptyset$ / \sqrt{ele} .
 the Maria kissed the boyfriend when met him
 ‘Maria kissed her boyfriend when she met him.’

Although the animacy specification of the object is relevant for the realization of the null object in BP as seen in (1), some sentences seem to challenge the generalization stated above, that is, that null objects must have a [-animate] antecedent, as in the following dialog:

- (2) A: Hoje eu levei a Maria no médico.
 today I took the Maria in-the doctor
 ‘Today I took Maria to the doctor.’
- B: A Maria, (ela) sempre reclama quando eu levo \emptyset no médico.
 the Maria she always complains when I take in-the doctor
 ‘Maria always complains when I take her to the doctor.’

The sentence in (2B) is also possible with a full pronoun in object position:

- (3) A Maria, (ela) sempre reclama quando eu levo **ela** no médico.
 the Maria she always complains when I take her in-the doctor
 'Maria always complains when I take her to the doctor.'

However, notice that, differently from (1) above, the antecedent of the object in (3) is in sentence-initial position.

In this paper, I defend that the sentence in (2B) does not have the null object that is peculiar to BP. I show that it is a case of Topicalization. To that end I follow Cyrino's (1994, 1997) work on the null object in BP as a case of DP ellipsis, and I show that there is no DP ellipsis in sentences like (2B); the gap is the result of movement of the topic to a left-periphery position.

The paper is organized as follows: I first briefly introduce the theory of null objects according to Cyrino (1994, 1997), and I present the typology of topics as proposed in recent literature (FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ, 2007). After that, I present the discussion about null objects in Hebrew as an instance of topic drop by going over the arguments presented in Erteschik-Shir *et al.* (2013). I then show that BP is not like Hebrew with respect to topic drop. Additionally, I show that different topics in BP are sensitive to animacy. Finally, I present my analysis of sentences similar to the one in (3), and I conclude the paper.

2 BP NULL OBJECTS AND ANIMACY

As seen in the introduction, null objects in BP seem to be sensitive to the animacy features of the antecedent. Considering the sentences below, it is possible to ascribe the grammaticality contrasts to the fact that null objects in BP do not allow [+animate] antecedents:

- (4) a. Ivo levou o livro para casa depois que a diretora tinha lido \emptyset .
 Ivo took the book to house after that the director had read
 'Ivo took the book home after the director had read it.'

- b. Ivo levou o livro para casa depois que a diretora tinha lido **ele**.
 Ivo took the book to house after that the director had read it
 'Ivo took the book home after the director had read it.'

- (4) a.*Ivo levou o aluno para casa depois que a diretora tinha expulsado \emptyset .
 Ivo took the student to house after that the director had expelled

- b. Ivo levou o aluno para casa depois que a diretora tinha expulsado **ele**.
 Ivo took the student to house after that the director had expelled him
 'Ivo took the student home after the director had expelled him.'

Null objects in BP have certain properties. Cyrino (2016, 2017) show that null objects are possible in several languages, but these elements do not have the specific and peculiar properties of the BP null object. According to the author, these main properties are (CYRINO, 2017): (a) null objects in BP can appear in islands for movement, as opposed to European Portuguese (RAPOSO, 1986) or Chinese (HUANG, 1984) ones; (b) the antecedent of the null object cannot be the matrix subject, as opposed to what has been shown in Turkish (ÖZTÜRK, 2008); (c) null objects in BP allow strict and sloppy readings, a property which is connected to ellipsis (FIENGO & MAY, 1984; among others).

Cyrino (1994, 1997) propose that null objects in BP are, in fact, a phenomenon that can be related to ellipsis. The author shows that, because of their properties, the best analysis for null objects in BP is to understand them as DP ellipsis (see also CYRINO; LOPES,

2016). It is important to notice that ellipses are phenomena in which an unpronounced sequence of categories is possible only if they are licensed (that is, c-commanded) by a functional projection (LOBECK, 1995). Cyrino (2016, to appear) refines her previous proposal and analyzes null objects in BP as direct objects that can be elided if they are DPs c-commanded by the verb (V) that moves up to a functional projection internal to vP, namely, Inner Aspect (InnAsp). Indeed, the latter has been proposed in the literature (see MACDONALD, 2008) in order to syntactically instantiate an object-to-event mapping via an Agree relation between an Aspect head and a (direct object) DP. In this sense, the functional projection Inner Aspect is responsible for the fact that the internal argument can affect the telicity of the predicate (see (6) and (7)), while this is not the case for what is termed Outer Aspect (OutAsp) (8), the latter commonly considered to be merged outside vP.

(6) John ate cake for an hour/#in an hour.

(7) John ate a cake #for an hour/in an hour.

(8) John was eating (a) cake for an hour/#in an hour when...

In the case of BP, in addition to the possibility for VP ellipsis, licensed by (Outer)Aspect, Cyrino (2016, to appear) proposes that null objects are DP ellipsis licensed by the verb that has moved to Inner Aspect. Therefore, for a sentence as (9a) the proposed structure is seen in (9b)¹:

(9) DP ellipsis

- a. A Maria tem lido o livro para as crianças
 the Maria has read the book to the children
 e o Pedro tem também lido Ø para as mães
 and the Pedro has too read to the mothers
 ‘Maria has been reading the book to the children and Pedro has also been reading (it) to the mothers.’

- b. [_{CP} ... o livro para as crianças...] e o Pedro [_T tem] [_{VPaux} <tem> [_{AdvP} [_{Adv} também] [_{OutAsp} lido [_{vP} [_{InnAsp} [_{InnAsp+V} <lido> [_{VP} <V> [_{DP} ~~o livro~~] para as mães]]]]]

In (9b), the DP *o livro* ‘the book’ can be elided (represented in strikethrough) because it is licensed by the verb that has moved to the functional projection Inner Aspect (represented in boldface) before it continues to move up to the higher Outer Aspect projection.² The animacy effect is the result of general syntactic processes that have already been proposed in the literature in order to explain phenomena that are sensitive to animacy, such as Differential Object Marking (see ORMAZABAL; ROMERO, 2007; LÓPEZ, 2012; IRIMIA; CYRINO, 2017; ORDOÑEZ; ROCA, to appear; among others). These proposals postulate that inanimate objects stay *in situ*, whereas animate objects move out of VP and, in the case of languages like Spanish, receive a preposition-like marking *a* for reasons of Case (see the references above):

- (10) a. Vi a la niña.
 Saw to the girl
 ‘I saw the girl’

¹ In this paper, copies left by movement are represented with angle brackets (<>).

² Cyrino (2016, to appear) assumes a theory of phases as proposed by Carnie (2005), whereby phases must contain (i) only one argument; (ii) a predicative element (V or vP) which introduces the argument; (iii) a temporal operator (a functional category) that locates the predicate and the argument in space and time (that is, Asp or T). In Cyrino’s proposal, the licensing of the null object, DP ellipsis, occurs inside the phase that contains the internal argument, the verb and the temporal operator, Inner Aspect. By being in that position, the verb may license the DP ellipsis because this complex constitutes a phase, and the complement of the phase can be sent to Spell Out. The verb, being at the edge of the phase can move up to other functional categories in BP. Therefore, vP ellipsis is licensed by the verb in Outer Aspect (see CYRINO; MATOS, 2016 for vP ellipsis in Portuguese).

- b. Vi el coche.
Saw the car
'I saw the car'

In order to explain BP null objects, Cyrino (2016, to appear), based on Richards (2008), relate animacy features to $[\pm\text{Person}]_{\text{SEP}}^{\text{[11]}}$ features. Table 1 shows the animacy/person encoding proposed by the author:

1 st . / 2 nd . person	[+person]
3 rd . person [+animate]	[-person]
3 rd . person [-animate]/ Bare plurals	'person-less'

Table 1: [Person] and [animacy] (Adapted from Cyrino, 2016)

In addition to that, the author proposes that there is a functional projection above Inner Aspect, which is responsible for the licensing of [+animate] DPs. Animacy in syntax is, then, the result of the movement of a $\text{DP}_{[\pm\text{Person}]}$ to a position outside VP. On the other hand, DPs that are not specified for this feature remain *in situ*. By being in that position, these DPs may be elided, since they can be licensed as ellipsis by the verb that has moved up to Inner Aspect, as shown in (11a,b) or a pronoun can be used (11c).

- (11) a. Ivo levou o livro para casa depois que a diretora leu **Ø/ele**
Ivo took the book to house after that the director read it
'Ivo took the book home after the director had read (it).'

b. $[_{VP} \text{ a diretora } v [_{\text{InnAspP}} [_{V+\text{Asp}} \text{ leu } [_{VP} \langle V \rangle \text{ ~~o livro~~]]]]$
| *DP ellipsis licensing* |

c. $[_{VP} \text{ a diretora } v [_{\text{InnAspP}} [_{V+\text{Asp}} \text{ leu } [_{VP} \langle V \rangle \text{ ele}]]]$

Now, in the case the DP object has $[\pm\text{Person}]$ person features, for example, a 3rd person animate direct object as in (12a), the DP will move up to a higher functional head (dubbed F here); hence, the ellipsis of the DP cannot be licensed (12b).

- (12) a. Ivo levou o aluno pra casa depois que a diretora tinha expulsado ***Ø/ele**.
Ivo took the student to house after that the director had expelled him
'Ivo took the student home after the director had expelled him.'

b. $[_{VP} \text{ a diretora } v [_{\text{FP}} \text{ ele}_{[-\text{person}]}] \text{ F } [_{\text{InnAspP}} [_{V+\text{AspInn}} \text{ expulsado } [_{VP} \langle V \rangle \langle \text{ele}_{[-\text{person}} \rangle]]]]]$

This way, the animacy effects on the possibility for null objects in BP are explained. Furthermore, the proposal that null object are ellipsis in this language is further backed up by the fact that strict and sloppy readings, a property of ellipsis in general, are also present in this null argument, as mentioned above.

However, as discussed above, there still remain sentences such as (2B), here repeated as (13), which seem to indicate that null objects are possible when the antecedent is animate:

- (13) A Maria, (ela) sempre reclama quando eu levo **Ø/ela** no médico.
the Maria she always complains when I take her in-the doctor.
'Maria always complains when I take (her) to the doctor.'

In what follows, I will show that the proposal for null objects in BP as DP ellipsis when the antecedente is inanimate can be maintained with the investigation of the different types of topics that are possible in the language, and the possibilities of realization of the resumed DP in a topical construction.

3 TYPOLOGY OF TOPICS

The literature proposes different types of topics (FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ, 2007; ERSTERCHIK-SHIR *et al.*, 2013; among others). Although there is a slight difference in the terms used in the literature, we can think of three types, which I will describe below: (i) *contrastive topics*; (ii) *shifting topics*; and (iii) *familiar/continued topics*.

Moreover, another important question is: how can we identify topics? Usually, topics can be identified by: (i) topicalization (that is, the movement of an element to the front position of a sentence); (ii) clitics, that is, in languages in which clitics or weak pronouns resume a dislocated topic (the former being the so-called ‘Clitic Left Dislocation’, CLLD; the latter, ‘Left Dislocation’, LD), that is, when there is no movement of an element to the front position of the sentence, the topic is base-generated, and there is a pronoun referring back to it; (iii) intonation (including *de-stressing*). I will come back to these distinctive ways of identifying topics below.

Contrastive Topics are those elements in the initial position of the sentence that introduce alternatives that bring no impact into the focal value of the utterance and it creates pairs of opposition or contrast with other topics. Consider the dialog in (14):

(14)A: O Paulo vai visitar a Rosa amanhã?
The Paulo go visit the Rosa tomorrow?
‘Is Paulo going to visit Rosa tomorrow?’

B: **A Rosa**, eu não sei. A Maria, o Paulo vai visitar \emptyset com certeza
the Rosa I not know the Maria the Paulo go visit with certainty
lit. ‘Rosa, I don’t know. Maria is going to visit for sure.’
‘Rosa, I don’t know. Maria is going to visit her for sure.’

This type of topic (represented in boldface in (14B)) allows *Clitic Left Dislocation* (CLLD) in the languages that have the phenomena, for example, European Portuguese (15):

(15) A: Você vai comprar a garrafa de vodka?
You go buy the bottle of vodka?
‘Are you going to buy the bottle of vodka?’

B: A garrafa de vodka, eu não sei.
the bottle of vodka I not know.
A garrafa de whisky, vou comprá-la com certeza.
the bottle of whisky go buy-it.3CL with certainty.
‘The bottle of vodka, I don’t know. But the bottle of whisky, I am going to buy it for sure.’

I will not deal with this type of topic in this paper; I refer the reader to Menuzzi and Roizemberg (2010) and the literature cited therein.

The other type of topic mentioned above is the so-called *Shifting Topic*. In this case, the topic refers to a newly introduced, recently changed or recently resumed constituent in the discourse. It is sometimes referred to as ‘aboutness topic’ (‘what the sentence is about’) or ‘continued topic’. This topic signals a *shift in the conversation*. Examples, where the topic is represented in boldface, are

provided in (16) in European Portuguese (MACHADO, 2010) and (17) in Italian (FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ, 2007). In the latter language, when the topic is the direct object, it is always resumed by a clitic (CLLD).

(16) **Sobre a Inês**, não sei se vocês sabem alguma coisa.
 about the Inês not know if you know any thing.
 ‘About Inês, I don’t know if you know anything.’

(17) **L’ultima unit** *la* sto facendo.
 the last unit it.3CL am doing.
 ‘The last unit, I am doing it.’

Finally, *Familiar Topics/ Continued Topics* are topics that refer to a certain constituent linked to discourse, usually used as a continued topic of conversation. In (18), there is an example from European Portuguese without CLLD, and in (19) an example showing that these topics allow CLLD (MACHADO, 2010, p. 29) in the language. The clitic seems to be optional in European Portuguese, but not in Italian, where CLLD is always obligatory, except for Right Dislocated *Familiar Topics*. In (20) (from FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ 2007, p. 98), the right-dislocated topic is not resumed by a clitic:

(18) [...] **o resto que eu vos disse sobre a atuação de D. Pedro**
 the rest that I you.PL.CL said about the performance of D. Pedro
 também sabemos que é verdade [...]
 also know that is true
 ‘as for the rest that I told you about D. Pedro’s performance, we also know that (it) is true’

(19) [...] **o resto que eu vos disse sobre a atuação de D. Pedro**
 the rest that I you.PL.CL said about the performance of D. Pedro
 também *o* sabemos que é verdade [...]
 also it.3CL know that is true
 ‘as for the rest that I told you about D. Pedro’s performance, we also know that it is true’

(20) Non ti preoccupare, faccio io **un colpo di telefono**.
 not you worry make I a call of telephone.
 ‘Don’t worry: I will make a phone call.’

Let us now turn to null objects in Hebrew, which Erteschik-Shir *et al.* (2013) have analyzed as being instances of ‘topic drop’.

4 MISSING OBJECTS AS ‘TOPIC DROP’ IN HEBREW

Erteschik-Shir *et al.* (2013) propose that “missing objects” in Hebrew (and Russian) should be analyzed in terms of Information Structure. They specifically propose that these elements in these languages are instances of ‘topic drop’. Consider the dialog in (21) from Hebrew (sentence (2) in ERTESCHIK-SHIR *et al.*, 2013, p. 146):

(21) A: macata et ha-maftexot?
 found.2SG ACC the-keys
 ‘Did you find the keys?’

B: ken, macati Ø / otam
 yes found.1SG them

‘Yes, I found them.’

As mentioned previously, there are three ways in which topics can be identified: (i) topicalization (movement); (ii) CLLD or LD (no movement); (iii) intonation.

The authors show the difference between *shifting* and *familiar/continued topics* in Hebrew as evidence for their proposal that “missing objects” are only possible with the latter type of topic in Hebrew. They assume that this difference is due to the presence or absence of movement.

According to the authors, in Hebrew, movement (‘topicalization’) is only possible with *shifting topics*. If a *familiar/continued topic* is present, the sentence is only possible with a pronoun referring back to the topic. This can be done, according to the authors, either by a pronoun *in situ* or by a null pronoun *pro*; the latter being the “missing object”, the ‘topic drop.’

Thus, (22) is an example of a *shifting topic* in Hebrew, where movement is allowed (ERTESCHIK-SHIR *et al.*, 2013, p. 147):

(22) Dani hevi xalav ve-tapuxim me-ha-super.
 Dani brought milk and-apples de-o-supermercado.
 ‘Dani brought milk and apples from the supermarket.’

a. *(**et ha-xalav**) hu sam ba-mekarer
 ACC o-milk he put in-the-fridge
 Lit. ‘The milk, he put in the fridge.’

b. *hu sam **oto** ba-mekarer
 he put it in-the-fridge

The first sentence in (22) introduces *xalav* ‘milk’ and *tapuxim* ‘apples’. One of the members could be the topic and must be moved to sentence-initial position as in (22a), in boldface. It cannot be referred back with a pronoun, as the continuation in (22b) shows. According to Erteschik-Shir *et al.* (2013), the *shifting topic* is realized through movement and not through LD – in other words, there can be no resumption of the topic by a pronoun.

Hebrew is different from Italian in this sense since the latter requires CLLD for *Shifting Topics*, as we saw above in (17).

As for *familiar/continued topics* in Hebrew, there is a different scenario since movement is not possible, according to the authors. Consider the dialog in (23) from Erteschik-Shir *et al.* (2013, p. 148):

(23) Dani hevi xalav me-ha-super.
 Dani brought milk de-o-supermercado.
 ‘Dani brought milk from the supermarket.’

a. *(**et ha-xalav**) hu sam ba-mekarer
 ACC o-milk he put in-the-fridge
 Lit. ‘The milk, he put in the fridge.’

b. hu sam **Ø/oto** ba-mekarer
 he put it in-the-fridge

The first sentence in (23) introduces the object *xalav* ‘milk’, making it a *familiar/continued topic*. The continuation of that sentence reveals that movement is ungrammatical – there can be no movement of the object to sentence-initial position. However, either a

pronoun *oto* or a “missing object” is possible as a continuation, as seen in (19b). In other words, in the analysis of Erteschik-Shir *et al.* (2013), the topic can only be realized through LD with an overt or covert pronoun, the latter being an instance of ‘topic drop.’

5 ARE BP NULL OBJECTS INSTANCES OF “TOPIC DROP”?

As discussed above, Erteschik-Shir *et al.* (2013) propose that movement is reserved for *Shifting-topics* in Hebrew, whereas in *Familiar-topics* there is no movement when there is an object gap as an alternative to an overt pronoun. The gap is, in fact, an instance of ‘topic drop’.

BP, however, displays a different behavior since, as I will show, it allows movement of *familiar/continued topics*, and it allows overt pronouns for *Shifting-topics*, the latter being the only possibility when the antecedent is [+animate].

Consider first the dialogs below, where we have *familiar/continued topics*. As opposed to Hebrew, BP allows the topic to move to the initial position of the sentence. Moreover, this is possible regardless of the animacy of the object. See the contrast between (24) and (25):

(24) A: O Ivo trouxe a Lia para a festa, e ela reclamou.
 the Ivo brought the Lia to the party and she complained.
 ‘Ivo brought Lia to the party and she complained.’

B: A Lia, (ela) sempre reclama quando ele leva Ø na festa.
 the Lia she always complains when he takes in-the party.
 Lit ‘Lia, she always complains when he takes to the party.’
 Lia, she always complains when he takes her to the party.’

(25) A: O Ivo trouxe o brinquedo para a festa e deixou (ele) no carro
 the Ivo brought the toy to the party and left it in-the car
 ‘Ivo brought the book to the party and left it in the car.’

B: O brinquedo, ele sempre deixa Ø no carro.
 the toy he always leaves in-the car
 Lit. ‘The toy, he always leaves in the car.’
 ‘The toy, he always leaves it in the car.’

In addition to that, an overt pronoun is also possible, as can be seen in (26) and (27):

(26) O Ivo trouxe a Lia para a festa, e ela reclamou.
 the Ivo brought the Lia to the party and she complained.
 ‘Ivo brought Lia to the party and she complained.’

B: A Lia, (ela) sempre reclama quando ele leva ela na festa.
 the Lia she always complains when he takes her in-the party.
 ‘Lia, she always complains when he takes her to the party.’

(27) A: O Ivo trouxe o brinquedo para a festa e deixou (ele) no carro
 the Ivo brought the toy to the party and left it in-the car
 ‘Ivo brought the book to the party and left it in the car.’

B: **O brinquedo**, ele sempre deixa **ele** no carro.
 the toy he always leaves in-the car.
 ‘The toy, he always leaves it in the car.’

As in Hebrew, *shifting topics* in BP may apparently be moved to sentence-initial position. Consider the dialog in (28):

(28) A: Hoje eu trouxe o material completo na escola.
 today I brought the material complete in-the school.
 ‘Today, I brought all the school supplies to school.’

B: **O tablet**, a professora sempre reclama quando eu levo \emptyset na escola.
 the tablet the teacher always complains when I take in-the school.
 Lit. ‘The tablet, the teacher always complains when I take to school.’
 ‘The tablet, the teacher always complains when I take it to school.’

However, as opposed to Hebrew, *shifting topics* may also be resumed by overt pronouns:

(29) A: Hoje eu trouxe o material completo na escola.
 today I brought the material complete in-the school.
 ‘Today, I brought all the school supplies to school.’

B: **O tablet**, a professora sempre reclama quando eu levo **ele** na escola.
 the tablet the teacher always complains when I take it in-the school.
 ‘The tablet, the teacher always complains when I take it to school.’

Furthermore, if this is indeed a case of movement, animate objects are intriguingly impossible, and this fact begs the question of why this is so. Consider the dialog in (30):

(30) A: Hoje eu trouxe as garotas na festa.
 today I brought the girls to-the party.
 ‘Hoje eu levei as garotas na festa.’

B: ***A Lia**, o Ivo sempre reclama quando eu \emptyset levo na festa.
 the Lia the Ivo always complains when I take in-the party.

In this case, only overt pronouns are possible:

(31) A: Hoje eu trouxe as garotas na festa.
 today I brought the girls to-the party.
 ‘Hoje eu levei as garotas na festa.’

B: **A Lia**, o Ivo sempre reclama quando eu levo **ela** na festa.
 the Lia the Ivo always complains when I take her in-the party.
 Lit. ‘Lia, Ivo always complains when I take her to the party.’

A gap is always possible when the object is [-animate], as seen in example (28) above, repeated as (32) below:

(32) A: Hoje eu trouxe o material completo na escola.
 today I brought the material complete in-the school.

‘Today, I brought all the school supplies to school.’

B: **O tablet**, a professora sempre reclama quando eu levo **Ø** na escola.
the tablet the teacher always complains when I take in-the school.

Lit. ‘The tablet, the teacher always complains when I take to school.’

‘The tablet, the teacher always complains when I take it to school.’

In the next section, I will propose an explanation for this animacy sensitivity with respect to topics in BP by assuming Frascarelli and Hinterhölz’s (2007) proposal for their different syntactic properties.

6 ON THE STRUCTURE OF DIFFERENT TOPICS

Frascarelli and Hinterhölz (2007) propose that topics, in spite of their possible multiplicity in the left periphery (as suggested by Rizzi, 1997), obey a strict hierarchy of positions (33). According to the authors, each topic has a different syntax in the way it is realized/resumed in the sentence.

(33) *Topic Hierarchy*

[_{ShiftP} Shifting Topic [_{+aboutness}] [_{ContrP} Contrastive Topic [_{FamP} Familiar Topic

The authors investigated these different types of topics and their realization in Italian and German. In the present paper, I study the realization of object topics in BP. Accordingly, and following Frascarelli and Hinterhölz’s (2007) results for Italian, I propose that BP, another Romance language, realizes *Familiar-topics* in two ways: (i) movement of the DP to the specifier of Familiar Topic Phrase (FamP) and; (ii) merge of *Familiar-topics* in the specifier of FamP and pronoun resumption in object position. *Shifting-topics*, however, are merged directly in the specifier of Shifting Topic Phrase (ShiftP), and they may or not be resumed by pronouns (as it happens CLLD in Italian, or in LD, see below). Therefore, there is no movement for *shifting topics* in BP.

However, this proposal is not sufficient to explain the animacy sensitivity with respect to different topics in BP as we have discussed above. Similar to what happens with *familiar/continued topics*, there is movement; the antecedent can be animate (34a) or not (35a). The structure with the moved topics are represented in (34b) and (35b):

(34) a. A: Hoje eu levei a Maria no médico.
today I took the Maria in-the doctor.
‘Today I took Maria to the doctor.’

B: **A Maria**, ela sempre reclama quando eu levo **Ø** no médico.
the Maria she always complains when I take in-the doctor.

Lit. ‘Maria, she always complains when I take to the doctor.’

‘Maria, she always complains when I take her to the doctor.’

b. [_{FamP} A Maria], ela sempre reclama quando eu levo <a Maria> no médico.

(35) a. A: O Pedro trouxe o livro para a escola.
the Pedro brought the book to the school.
‘Pedro brought the book to school.’

B: **O livro**, ele sempre deixa **Ø** no armário.
the book he always leaves in-the locker.

Lit. ‘The book, he always leaves in the locker.’

‘The book, he always leaves it in the locker.’

b. [_{FamP} O livro], ele sempre deixa <o livro> no armário.

As I proposed above, *familiar/continued topics* can also be merged directly in the specifier of FamP and be resumed by pronouns (as a case of LD) (see FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ, 2007). In this case, the structures for (36B) and (37B) would be (36b) and (37b):

(36) a. A: Hoje eu levei a Maria no médico.
today I took the Maria in-the doctor.
‘Today I took Maria to the doctor.’

B: A **Maria**, ela sempre reclama quando eu levo **ela** no médico.
the Maria she always complains when I take in-the doctor.
‘Maria, she always complains when I take her to the doctor.’

b. [_{FamP} A Maria], ela sempre reclama quando eu levo ela no médico.

(37) A: O Pedro trouxe o livro para a escola.
the Pedro brought the book to the school.
‘Pedro brought the book to school.’

B: **O livro**, ele sempre deixa **ele** no armário.
the book he always leaves in-the locker.
‘The book, he always leaves it in the locker.’

b. [_{FamP} O livro], ele sempre deixa ele no armário.

However, in BP, when a *Shifting-topic* is present, the possibility for having either a gap or a pronoun is only possible if the antecedent (the topic) is [-animate]. See the contrast between (38) and (39). Considering the proposal that *Shifting Topics* are merged directly in the specifier of ShiftP, see the representations in (38b) and (39b):

(38) [-animate] *Shifting topic*

a. A: Hoje eu trouxe o material completo na escola.
today I brought the material complete in-the school.
‘Today, I brought all the school supplies to school.’

B: **O tablet**, a professora sempre reclama quando eu levo **Ø/ele** na escola.
the tablet the teacher always complains when I take it in-the school.
‘The tablet, the teacher always complains when I take (it) to school.’

b. [_{ShiftP} O tablet] a professora sempre reclama quando eu levo Ø/ ele na escola.

(39) [+animate] *Shifting topic*

a. A: Hoje eu trouxe as garotas na festa.
today I brought the girls in-the party.
‘Hoje eu levei as garotas na festa.’

B: A **Lia**, o Ivo sempre reclama quando eu levo ***Ø/√ela** na festa.
the Lia the Ivo always complains when I take her in-the party.

‘Lia, Ivo always complains when I take her to the party.’

b. [_{ShiftP} A Lia], o Ivo sempre reclama quando eu levo *Ø/√ela na festa.

It is necessary to explain this animacy sensitivity. In the next section, I show that the animacy sensitivity is accounted for in Cyrino’s (2016, to appear) proposal, in which [-animate] object DPs stay *in situ* in BP (as well as in other languages, as shown by DOM effects, see the references above).

7 INTERACTIONS BETWEEN OBJECT ANIMACY AND TOPICALITY

As discussed above, Cyrino (2016, to appear) proposes that anaphoric animate DPs move out of VP and, as a consequence, they cannot be subject to DP ellipsis in BP because, in that position, they are not licensed by the verb that has moved up to a proper licenser, Inner Aspect. Therefore, these animate anaphoric objects need to be realized by overt pronouns. On the other hand, anaphoric inanimate DPs stay *in situ* and can either be elided or realized as full pronouns.

Let us now observe how this proposal interacts with the analysis of different topics in BP as explored in the previous section.

First, let us take the case of *Familiar/continued* topic DPs that are [+animate], such as the one shown in (40B):

(40) [+animate] *familiar/continued* topic

A: Hoje eu levei a Maria no médico.
today I took the Maria in-the doctor.
‘Today I took Maria to the doctor.’

B: A **Maria**, ela sempre reclama quando eu levo Ø/ela no médico.
the Maria she always complains when I take in-the doctor.
Lit. ‘Maria, she always complains when I take (her) to the doctor.’

In order to allow for the possibility of either the gap or the pronoun in object position, there are two different structures:

(i) Movement (or topicalization, see Kato, 2003) of *Familiar/continued* topics to FamP

Kato (2003) advances an analysis of topicalization as the result of remnant movement of VP fronting, that is, the VP moving to a topic position. This allows for explaining the insensitivity to islands for topicalization in BP. Hence, I build on her analysis and propose that the structure presenting the gap in (40B) corresponds to (41):

(41) [_{FamP} [_{VP} <levar_j> a **Maria**]_i] ... eu [_{OutAsp} levo_j [_{VP} <eu> <[_{VP} <levar_j> a **Maria**]_i>] ...

Since BP allows verb movement (at least up to Outer Aspect, see above), fronting (remnant) movement of the VP leaves copies (KAYNE, 1998). In (41), the subject has moved to the specifier of IP, and the verb has moved to Outer Aspect. The object, *Maria*, remains in the fronted VP as the only audible element in FamP topic position. In other words, the gap in one of the options in (40B) corresponds to the inaudible copy of the VP that has moved to the left periphery, leaving the gap as an apparent null object in BP.

(ii) Direct merge of *Familiar/continued* topics in FamP plus occurrence of LD

In order to allow for the second possibility in (40B), that is, the one in which there is a pronoun, I carry out an LD analysis, whereby the topic is merged directly in the specifier of FamP, in the traditional way (see FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ, 2007), as shown in (42):

(42) [_{FamP} a **Maria**]_i ... eu [_{OutAsp} levo_j [_{VP} <eu> [_F **ela**]_i] [_{InnAsp} <levo_j> [_{VP} <levo_j> <ela_i>] ...

In (42) the [+animate] object is a resumptive pronoun co-referent with the familiar/continued topic that is merged in the left periphery. Since it is [+animate] pronoun, it has to move out of VP, as proposed by Cyrino (2016, to appear).

As for [-animate] object DPs that are *familiar/continued topics*, the same analysis applies, but now the direct object stays *in situ*. Consider (43).

(43) [-animate] *familiar/continued topic*

A: O Ivo trouxe o livro para a escola.
 the Ivo brought the book to the school.
 ‘Ivo brought the book to school.’

B: O **livro**, o Ivo sempre deixa **Ø/ele** no armário.
 the book the Ivo always leaves in-the locker.
 ‘The book, Ivo always leaves (it) in the locker.’

Again, there are two possibilities provided by the ‘dual’ nature of the derivation of *familiar/continued topics* (following FRASCARELLI; HINTERHÖLZ, 2007):

(i) Movement of *Familiar/continued topics* (KATO, 2003) to FamP

As provided in (37) above, the topic will be moved by VP remnant movement to FamP, and there is again a case of apparent null object:

(44) [_{FamP} [_{VP} <deixar> o livro]_i] ... o Ivo [_{OutAsp} deixax_j [_{VP} <[_{VP} <o Ivo> <deixar> o livro]>] ...

(ii) Direct merge of *Familiar/continued topics* in FamP plus the occurrence of LD

In the same way as above, when *familiar/continued topics* are merged directly in FamP position, a LD pronoun is possible. However, in this situation, the resumptive pronoun stays *in situ* since it is a [-animate] direct object, and the verb moves up to InnAsp and OutAsp:

(45) [_{FamP} o livro] ... deixax_j [_{VP} [_{InnAsp} <deixax_j> [_{VP} <deixax_j> **ele**] ...

Now, a different derivation occurs with *shifting topics*. As pointed out above, they do not allow [+animate] object DPs in BP. Following Frascarelli and Hinterhölz (2007) this type of topic is *always* merged directly in the left periphery position of ShiftP, and they are resumed by pronouns (CLLD in languages like Italian, or LD).

In this case, the null object (DP ellipsis) is possible in BP. This is possible because the resumed topic is [-animate], stays *in situ*, and the DP ellipsis may be licensed by the verb as it moves up to Inner Aspect. See once more the contrast between (46) and (47), repeated from (38) and (39) above for convenience:

(46) [-animate] *Shifting topic*

a. A: Hoje eu trouxe o material completo na escola.
 today I brought the material complete in-the school.
 ‘Today, I brought all the school supplies to school.’

B: O **tablet**, a professora sempre reclama quando eu levo **Ø/ele** na escola.
 the tablet the teacher always complains when I take it in-the school.
 ‘The tablet, the teacher always complains when I take (it) to school.’

(47) [+animate] *Shifting topic*

a. A: Hoje eu trouxe as garotas na festa.
 today I brought the girls to-the party.
 'Hoje eu levei as garotas na festa.'

B: A Lia, o Ivo sempre reclama quando eu levo *Ø/√ela na festa.
 The Lia the Ivo always complains when I take her in-the party.
 'Lia, Ivo always complains when I take her to the party.'

The fact that *shifting topics* are merged directly in ShiftP explains the contrast. Exactly like in other cases,³ in (47B), the [-animate] DP does not move out of VP, and can either be elided by the verb in Inner Aspect as a case of DP ellipsis (represented in (48) as the overstricken DP) or realized as a full pronoun:

(48) [_{ShiftP} ~~o tablet~~]... [_{InnAsp} levo [_{VP} <levo> ~~o tablet~~ / **ele**]]...

However, when we have a [+animate] DP, since it moves out of VP, it cannot be elided/licensed by the *v* in Inner Aspect. The only option is then for it to be resumed by a full pronoun:

(49) [_{ShiftP} **a Maria**]... [**ela** [_{InnAsp} levo [_{VP} <levo> <ela>]]]...

Following the analysis I herein propose, it is possible to explain the animacy effects with different types of direct object topics in BP and sort out the cases of apparent null objects.

8 CONCLUSION

BP has null objects that have a different behavior from the missing objects in Hebrew (or Russian), which have been analyzed as 'topic drop' in the literature. As argued in this paper, the null object in BP has animacy restrictions and, contrary to what happens in Hebrew, for example, it is allowed to occur with *shifting topics*.

On the other hand, *familiar/continued topics* in BP can be realized through movement ('topicalization'), and, therefore, there are no animacy restrictions. Consequently, the sentence in (50) constitutes an apparent case of BP null object. Indeed, they have as the object gap the result of the topicalization of *familiar/continued topics*, and so they are not cases comparable to those of the Hebrew 'topic drop'.

(50) **A Maria**, (ela) sempre reclama quando levo Ø/ela no médico.

The next step in this research is to look for independent evidence for different types of topics in BP, such as evidence stemming from different phenomena based on a thorough investigation of oral corpora. If what I propose in this paper is in the right track, such future investigation should support the analysis here advanced.

REFERENCES

CARNIE, A. A phase-geometric approach to multiple marking systems. In: MCGINNIS, M.; RICHARDS, N. *Perspectives on phases*. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, v. 49, p. 87-102. ^[L]_[SEP]2005.

³ This analysis could also probably apply to the case in (45), with the DP ellipsis of the resumptive pronoun. I leave the issue for further study.

CYRINO, S. *O objeto nulo no português brasileiro: um estudo sintático-diacrônico*. 1994. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas. 1994.

_____. *O objeto nulo no português brasileiro: um estudo sintático-diacrônico*. Londrina: Editora da UEL, 1997.

_____. Animacy and null objects in Brazilian Portuguese. Paper presented at the *Stony Brook University Department of Linguistics Colloquium Series*. February 26, 2016.

_____. On animacy restrictions for the null object in Brazilian Portuguese. In: HELLAN, L.; MALCHUKOV, A.; CENNAMO, M. *Contrastive studies in verbal valency*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017. p. 279-298.

_____. O objeto nulo no português brasileiro: sincronia e diacronia. In: ROBERTS, I.; KATO, M.; GALVES, C. *Português brasileiro: uma segunda viagem diacrônica*, to appear.

_____.; LOPES, R. Null objects are ellipsis in Brazilian Portuguese. *The Linguistic Review*, v. 33, n. 4, p. 483-502, 2016.

DUARTE, E. *Varição e sintaxe: clítico acusativo, pronome lexical e categoria vazia no português do Brasil*. 1986. Dissertação. (Mestrado em Linguística) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica, São Paulo, 1986.

ERTSCHIK-SHIR, N.; IBNBARI, L.; TAUBE, S. Missing objects as topic drop. *Lingua*, v. 136, p. 145-169, 2013.

FIENGO, R.; MAY, R. *Indices and identity*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1994.

FRASCARELLI, M.; HINTERHÖLZ, R. Types of topics in German and Italian. In: SCHWABE, K.; WINKLER, S. *On information structure, meaning and form: generalization across languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. p. 87-116.

HUANG, C-T. J. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic inquiry*, v. 15, n.4, p. 531-574, 1984.

IRIMIA, M.; CYRINO, S. Unifying differential marking: from Brazilian Portuguese to adpositional DOM. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, LXII v. 4, p. 411-426, 2017.

LOBECK, A. *Ellipsis: functional heads, licensing and identification*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

LÓPEZ, L. *Indefinite objects: scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2012.

KATO, M. Null objects, null resumptives and VP-ellipsis in European and Brazilian Portuguese. In: QUER, J. *et al. Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. p. 131-154.

KAYNE, R. Overt vs. Covert Movement. *Syntax*, v. 1, p. 128-191, 1998.

MACDONALD, J. *The syntactic nature of inner aspect: a minimalist perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008.

MACHADO, D. M. S. *O tópico no discurso oral: Anotação de diferentes tipos de tópico num corpus de discurso oral*. 2010. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) –

Universidade do Porto, Porto, 2010.

MENUZZI, S.; ROIZEMBERG, G. Tópicos contrastivos e contraste temático: um estudo do papel discursivo da “articulação informacional”. *Caderno de Estudos Linguísticos*, Campinas, v. 52, n. 2, p. 233-253, jul./dez. 2010.

ORDOÑEZ, F.; ROCA, F. Differential Object Marking (DOM) and clitic subspecification in Catalanian Spanish. In: GÁLLEGO, A. *The Syntactic Variation of Spanish Dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, to appear.

ORMAZABAL, J.; ROMERO, J. The object agreement constraint. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, v. 25, n. 2, p. 315-347, 2007.

ÖSTÜRK, B. Non-configurationality: free word order and argument drop in Turkish. In: BIBERAUER, T. *The limits of syntactic variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008. p. 411-440.

RAPOSO, E. On the null object in european Portuguese. In: JAEGGLI, O.; SILVA-CORVALÁN, C. *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1986. p. 373-390.

RICHARDS, M. . Defective agree, case alternations and the prominence of person. In: RICHARDS, M.; MALCHUKOV, A. *Scales*. Linguistische Arbeits Berichte, Universität Leipzig, v. 86, p. 137-161. 2008.

RIZZI, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In: HAEGEMAN, L. *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Springer, 1997. p. 281-337.



Received in August 23, 2018. Approved in February 2, 2019.