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Aims of this talk

I. To discuss existing evidence concerning the role of animacy for null object realization in (Brazilian and European) Portuguese;

II. To contribute empirical evidence from (monolingual) language acquisition and spontaneous speech corpora showing that animacy is indeed relevant for null object realization in EP;

III. To show that bilingual speakers of EP acquire the animacy restriction in EP with some delay and show a diachronically innovative use in terms of an advancement/extension of null objects along a referential scale (Cyrino et al. 2000).
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1 - Animacy effects in BP and their relevance for the analysis of null objects

- Corpus investigations since the 70ies/80ies have revealed a strong tendency for null objects to have inanimate objects (e.g. Omena 1978, Tarallo 1989, Duarte 1989, Schwenter & Silva 2003)
  - Tarallo (1983): 84.2% of null objects with [- human] antecedents
  - Duarte (1989, see table below): clitics [78.4% animate vs. 21.6% inanimate], null objects [23.7% animate vs. 76.2% inanimate], strong pronouns [92.4% animate vs. 7.6% inanimate]

![Table 3. Distribuição das variantes usadas segundo o traço semântico do objeto.](image)
Restrictions on animate null objects in BP:
- They must not have an antecedent in subject position or occur in strong islands; Bianchi & Figueiredo Silva (1994):

(1) a. Este livro/*autor decepcionou o publico quando a editora apresentou _ na cerimônia de lançamento. (ex. from Raposo & Kato 2005)
   b. E a Maria? *O Zé ficou nervoso porque o Pedro beijou ec. (ex. from Costa and Duarte 2003: 256)

- Animate null objects are *non-specific* (Cyrino 1994, Cyrino et al. 2000)
Implicational referential hierarchy (Cyrino et al. 2000)

**Referential Hierarchy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>non-argument</th>
<th>proposition</th>
<th>[-human]</th>
<th>[+human]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-spec.</td>
<td>+spec.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[-ref] < ----------------------------------------------- > [+ref.]

**Synchrony:**
- the more referential, the less it is likely to have a null object
- a language with a null object at some point of the scale implies that null objects are allowed to its left on the scale

**Diachrony:**
- extension of null objects in BP from left to right on the referential scale.
Experimental evidence confirms the animacy effect for BP (Castro et al. 2017):

• Significant difference in acceptance between overt (strong) and null objects on a scale from 1 (péssimo) – 6 (excelente)

Null / overt animate objects in simple sentences:
“- O namorado da Tatiane estava entediado. O que foi que ela decidiu fazer?”
“- Tatiane’s boyfriend was bored. What did she decide to do?”
“- Ø levou Ø pra praia.” “- Ø took Ø to the beach.” 3.94
“- Ø levou ele pra praia.” “- Ø took him to the beach.” 5.26

Null / overt animate objects in islands:
“- O André convidou a Priscila para um jantar. O que foi que aconteceu?”
“- André invited Priscila to dinner. What happened?”
“- O André pagou a conta quando Ø levou Ø ao restaurante.” 3.34
“- O André pagou a conta quando Ø levou ela ao restaurante.” 5.06
“- André paid the bill when Ø took Ø/her to the restaurant.”
The relevance of animacy restrictions for the structural analysis of null objects

• There seems to be a „division of labour“ between null and overt pronominal objects in BP.
• This reflects some kind of *Differential Object Marking* in BP (DOM, cf. Schwenter & Silva 2003) and may indicate that animate objects occupy *a higher structural position* (e.g. above vP (Cyrino 2016)), like DOM-marked animate objects in languages like Spanish (Ormazabal & Romero 2007).
• Animacy effects speak against an analysis of the null object as a syntactic variable (Costa & Duarte 2003a: „espera –se que a restrição de animacidade não se aplique a variáveis dado que estas podem ser ligadas por PPs, VP não máximos ou advérbios que são categorias às quais dificilmente se podem associar traços de animacidade.“ Duarte & Costa 2003a)
• If animacy restrictions are also found in EP, this may speak in favour of a *unified analysis of null objects in EP and BP* (e.g. in terms of a D-head embedding pro (Raposo 2004, Kato & Raposo (2005), Kato (2011); of course taking into account the differences between the two grammars (clitics vs. strong pronouns, (non)existence of singular bare nouns, etc.)).
2 Previous studies on animacy effects in EP

• A corpus study by Schwenter (2014) shows that animacy, definiteness, plural and specificity favour an overt clitic pronoun and disfavour a null object in EP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLITIC Pronoun</th>
<th>Null Object</th>
<th>Lexical NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animate</td>
<td>Favors</td>
<td>Disfavors</td>
<td>Disfavors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>Favors</td>
<td>Disfavors</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural Number</td>
<td>Favors</td>
<td>Disfavors</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>Favors</td>
<td>Disfavors</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Costa & Duarte (2003b: 256) claim that EP who accept null objects in strong islands only accept them with inanimate antecedents (like BP-speakers):

(2)a. E este carro? ?O Zé ficou nervoso porque o Pedro comprou ec.
and this car the Zé became nervous because the Pedro bought _

b. E a Maria? *O Zé ficou nervoso porque o Pedro beijou ec.
and the Mary the Zé became nervous because the Pedro kissed_
Experimental evidence confirms the animacy effect for EP (Castro et al. 2017):

- Significant difference in acceptance between overt (clitic) and null objects on a scale from 1 (péssimo) – 6 (excelente)

**Null / overt animate objects in simple sentences:**

“- O namorado da Carolina estava entediado. O que é que ela decidiu fazer?”

“- Carolina’s boyfriend was bored. What did she decide to do?”

“- Ø levou Ø para a praia.” “- Ø took Ø to the beach.” 2.71

“- Ø levou-o para a praia.” “- Ø took him to the beach.” 5.25

**Null / overt animate objects in islands:**

“- O João convidou a Fernanda para um jantar. O que é que aconteceu?”

“- João invited Fernanda to dinner. What happened?”

“- Ele pagou a conta quando Ø levou Ø ao restaurante.” 2.55

“- Ele pagou a conta quando Ø a levou ao restaurante.” 5.07

“- He paid the bill when Ø took Ø/her to the restaurant.”
3  Monolingual Evidence
3.1 Corpus Evidence

- **Corpus study** on object realization by monolingual and bilingual speakers of two generations (Flores, Rinke & Azevedo 2017; Rinke, Flores & Barbosa 2018)

**SPONTANEOUS SPEECH CORPUS**

Participants: 32 speakers; 4 groups
- 1\textsuperscript{st} generation migrants (age 48 – 70) = Gen1bil
- 2\textsuperscript{nd} generation migrants (HS, age 21-31) = G2bil
- older group of monolinguals (age 54-74) = Gen1mon
- younger group of monolinguals (age 18-32) = G2mon

Data base: oral interviews
- Total tokens: 10,880
- Equable distribution of tokens: G1bil: 2672, G2bil: 2627, G1mon: 2802, G2mon: 2779
- Statistical analysis: *Generalized linear mixed model* (RBrul)
Methodology

I. Proportion of null object constructions in the corpora (differentiating object realizations from object omissions, as well as genuine null object constructions from other types of object omissions);

II. Structural aspects of null objects with the following coding variables: occurrence of null objects in islands; null objects in verb-initial sentences with post-verbal subjects (apparent German topic drop);

III. Semantic aspects of object realization:
   • Propositional vs. non-propositional null objects/clitics
   • Animacy: 1st/2nd person vs. 3rd person; animate / inanimate referents.
### Results for monolingual speakers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>pronouns</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1mon</strong></td>
<td>1334 (64%)</td>
<td>743 (36%)</td>
<td>2077 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2mon</strong></td>
<td>1375 (73%)</td>
<td>504 (27%)</td>
<td>1879 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>clitics</th>
<th>nullobjects</th>
<th>dem</th>
<th>other pronouns</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>G1mon</strong></td>
<td>414 (56%)</td>
<td>156 (21%)</td>
<td>73 (10%)</td>
<td>100 (13%)</td>
<td>743 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2mon</strong></td>
<td>234 (46%)</td>
<td>124 (25%)</td>
<td>61 (12%)</td>
<td>85 (17%)</td>
<td>504 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The younger generation (G2mon) uses more null objects with nonpropositional antecedents than the older generation (G1mon).
• **The results clearly show an effect of animacy**: animate referents are predominantly associated with clitics and inanimate referents with null objects.
3.2 Evidence from Monolingual First Language Acquisition

Results from previous studies on the acquisition of null objects in EP:

• **Production:** High rates of illicit object omissions (Costa & Lobo 2007), but at the same time more object omissions with 3rd person than with 1st and 2nd person antecedents and more null objects in simple sentences than in islands (Costa et al. 2009).

• **Comprehension:** overextension of null objects to island contexts in which a clitic would be required, but at the same time early pragmatic knowledge: null objects and clitics with given antecedents, but avoidance of NPs and strong pronouns in the same context (Costa et al. 2009).

Building on previous research on VP-ellipsis (Santos 2009), Costa et al. (2012) argue that children know the syntax of null object constructions, and that “the only problem they have is in the assignment of the correct interpretation” (Costa et al. 2012: 127)
• Production study with monolingual children (Flores et al. 2020), Rinke et al. 2019) investigating early pragmatic/semantic knowledge underlying object choice:

1. Do our data confirm early pragmatic knowledge concerning the differentiation between pronominal and non-pronominal contexts, i.e. higher and lower degrees of accessibility?
2. When do children start to be sensitive to the referential properties associated with null and overt pronouns, i.e. animacy?

Participants
• 41 children in the age span of 3 to 9 years (45 to 116 months (mean: 67.9; SD: 19.5)).
• children grew up in a monolingual setting in northern Portugal and were tested in their kindergarten or in a learning center
• Parents gave their written consent and answered to a language background questionnaire
• adult control group of 14 Portuguese monolingual speakers (age range: 23–66 years, mean: 34.9, SD: 12.7)
Test design following Sopata (2016)

Context given: In the garden of the grandmother there was an apple tree with a red and very appetizing apple. John wanted very much to taste this apple.

NIA (not immediately accessible referent)
Puppet: O que fez o João?
Expected Answer: Apanhou a maçã. - DP

IA inanimate (the referent is immediately accessible): The inanimate referent of the target object is mentioned in the prior discourse and it also appears in the immediately preceding question.
Puppet: O que fez o João com a maçã?
Expected Answer: Apanhou-a/_. - clitic/null object (expected preference for null)
Context given: The lickerish John wanted to eat a candy but his sister also wanted this candy and grabbed it first. Therefore, John was angry and – because he wanted the candy back – did something that he shouldn’t have done. And his sister started to cry.)

**IA animate** (the referent is immediately accessible): The animate referent of the target object is mentioned in the prior discourse and it also appears in the immediately preceding question.

**Puppet:** **Oh não! O que é que O João fez à irmã?**

**Expected Answer:** **Mordeu-a/**. clitic/null object (expected preference for clitic)

---

**Table 2. Test conditions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Immediately Present in the Question</th>
<th>Animate</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition 1: NIA</td>
<td>the inanimate referent is not immediately accessible</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 2: IA inanimate</td>
<td>the inanimate referent is immediately accessible</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition 3: IA animate</td>
<td>the animate referent is immediately accessible</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results monolingual children: Accessibility

- Early sensitivity to accessibility at the age of 4
Results monolingual children: Animacy

- Relatively late sensitivity to animacy at the age of 7
4. Bilingual Evidence
4.1 Evidence from Bilingual First Language Acquisition

**What about bilingual children?**

- Production study using the same test with bilingual (EP-German and Polish-German) bilingual children (Rinke et al. 2019), focusing again on accessibility and animacy.

1. Is there a difference between Portuguese–German and Polish–German bilingual children living in Germany or do they perform in a similar way, since their HLs display a similar system of direct object expression?

2. Do bilingual Portuguese–German and Polish–German children react to accessibility in terms of familiarity in EP/Polish?

3. Do bilingual Portuguese–German and Polish–German children distinguish between animate and inanimate referents in Polish/EP?

4. Do bilingual children during the ages of 6–10 years differ from monolingual children w.r.t. object production? More precisely: Do bilinguals overuse null objects, clitics, or full NPs?
Participants
Two groups of bilingual children living in Germany (Frankfurt area), age 6-10 years:
• 27 Child heritage speakers of Portuguese, mean age = 8.3 (DP = 1.33)
• 22 Child heritage speakers of Polish, mean age = 7.8 (DP = 1.27)

Detailed language background questionnaire shows similar background of both groups, regarding:
• type of bilingualism (simultaneous or successive learners of German)
• languages spoken at home (either only the HL or HL & German)
• enrollment in HL classes (some attend, some do not attend)
Results bilingual children:
- Sensitivity to accessibility and animacy
- Bilingual Groups behave in a similar way

### Table 4. Distribution of object forms per condition and per group (in %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NIA</th>
<th>IA Inanimate</th>
<th>IA Animate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **NIA vs. IA inanimate**
  - more NPs in NIA
  - less **clitics and null objects** in NIA

- **IA inanimate vs. IA animate**
  - less **clitics** and more **null objects** in IA inanimate than in IA animate
• **Accessibility:**

The results indicate that bilingual children of both language groups distinguish between not immediately accessible and immediately accessible objects.

• **Animacy:**

The bilingual children are also sensitive to the animacy of the referent. Both groups produce a higher amount of clitics and fewer null objects in the IA animate than in the IA-inanimate condition.

Table 5. Generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) results for immediately accessible (IA) conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null vs. Clitics</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td>0.2073</td>
<td>-2.020</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition InAn:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null vs. NPs</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.2513</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Bil_PTG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a predictive effect of ‘condition’ (p = 0.044) and a marginal group effect (p = 0.053).

Comparison to monolingual children:
- Bilingual children show a delay (more animate null objects than age-matched monolinguals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NIA</th>
<th>IA inanimate</th>
<th>IA animate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Mon (age- matched)</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port. Bil (mean 8.3)</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Mon (5-6)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Mon (age- matched)</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Bil (mean 7.8)</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Mon (5-6)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What about bilingual adults?

Coming back to the corpus study (Rinke, Flores & Barbosa 2018):

Participants: 32 speakers; 4 groups
- 1\(^{st}\) generation migrants (age 48 – 70) = Gen1bil
- 2\(^{nd}\) generation migrants (HS, age 21-31) = G2bil
- older group of monolinguals (age 54-74) = Gen1mon
- younger group of monolinguals (age 18-32) = G2mon
Results for bilingual speakers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>pronouns</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1mon</td>
<td>1334 (64%)</td>
<td>743 (36%)</td>
<td>2077 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2mon</td>
<td>1375 (73%)</td>
<td>504 (27%)</td>
<td>1879 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1bil</td>
<td>1319 (67%)</td>
<td>640 (33%)</td>
<td>1959 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2bil</td>
<td>1233 (73%)</td>
<td>449 (27%)</td>
<td>1682 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bilinguals (G2bil) produce:
- less clitics
- more null objects (comparable to G2mon)
propositional and non-propositional objects

G1mon
nonprop propositional
G2mon nonprop propositional clitic
null
G1bil nonprop propositional
G2bil nonprop propositional
Animate and inanimate (nonpropositional 3rd person objects)
Results for bilingual speakers:

• **There is no animacy effect in the bilingual group:** animate and inanimate referents are predominantly associated with null objects
• Bilingual speakers omit the object significantly more often with animate objects than all the other speaker groups.
• They do not only use more null objects in comparison to the older generation (as in G1mon vs. G2mon), but extend the the null objects to animate referents

**Table 6: Rate of animate null objects.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1_Bil (%)</th>
<th>G2_Bil (%)</th>
<th>G1_Mon (%)</th>
<th>G2_Mon (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animate null objects</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW TO INTERPRET THESE FINDINGS IN Gen2bil?

• No cross-linguistic influence from German (no parallel structures with German Topic drop (‘_VS‘), German does not allow for definite null objects in other constructions)
• No attrited input (no differences between G1_Bil and G1_Mon)
• Difference not only quantitative (as for G2mon), but also qualitative.

(3) [(o meu pai) tomou a decisão ir pa Alemanha, teve depois uns anos cá e depois a minha mãe, foi também ela.] Levou_ também pra cá. [ _= a minha mãe]

• LANGUAGE CHANGE: extension from left to right along the referential hierarchy as predicted by Cyrino et al.’s 2000 Referential Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>non-argument proposition</th>
<th>[+human]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-spec.</td>
<td>+spec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[-ref] < --------------------------------------------------------------- > [+ref.]
5. Summary and Conclusions

i. The results of our research confirm earlier studies on European Portuguese showing an animacy effect concerning the distribution of null and overt (clitic) objects.

ii. The results of a corpus study with older and younger monolingual speakers reveals that null objects favour inanimate and propositional antecedents, clitics favour animate antecedents. Younger speakers produce quantitatively more null objects.

iii. The animacy effect contributes to the complexity of the acquisition task: monolingual EP children acquire the distribution of null objects and overt clitics in (accessible) contexts relatively late: at the age of 7.

iv. In our production study, bilingual children showed a delay with respect to the animacy effect, still producing high rates of animate null objects at the age of 7-10.

v. In a spontaneous speech corpus, bilinguals do not show the animacy effect. They extend the use of null objects to more referential antecedents.
Thank you!

Obrigada!

Danke!
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Appendix

- Null object occur in islands in monolingual and bilingual speech

(X)  *Porque isto era uma freguesia muito rural.*
*Desde que eu comecei a conhecer Ø, apenas havia uma tasca na freguesia.*
*Bis since that I started to know (Ø = a freguesia / ‘the village’) (G1_mon_1)*
‘Because this was a very rural village. Since the time I started to know it, there was only one tavern in the village.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G1_Bil</th>
<th>G2_Bil</th>
<th>G1_Mon</th>
<th>G2_Mon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>null objects in islands</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Propositional null objects:

(Y) a. ... antes eu não sabia. [G2_bil_4]
   before I not knew
   ‘I didn’t know this before.’

b. eu desconheço por acaso. Não sei... [G2_mon_3]
   I not know by accident
   ‘I happen not to know this.’
### Results for bilingual speakers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd person</th>
<th>G1mon</th>
<th>G2 mon</th>
<th>G1bil</th>
<th>G2bil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonprop</td>
<td>124 (50%)</td>
<td>126 (50%)</td>
<td>52 (37%)</td>
<td>90 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propositional</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>34 (97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nonprop</th>
<th>G1mon</th>
<th>G2mon</th>
<th>G1bil</th>
<th>G2bil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clitics</td>
<td>null</td>
<td>clitics</td>
<td>null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate</td>
<td>96 (89%)</td>
<td>12 (11%)</td>
<td>38 (85%)</td>
<td>7 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate</td>
<td>28 (20%)</td>
<td><strong>114 (80%)</strong></td>
<td>14 (14%)</td>
<td><strong>83 (86%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>