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Introduction

:: It is well known that Brazilian Portuguese (henceforth, BP) has anaphoric (3rd person) ‘null objects’ that may occur in islands (Galves 1989, Farrell 1990, Kato 1993):

(1) Eu deixei os bolinhos na geladeira porque Maria vai comer Ø mais tarde.
I left the cupcakes in-the fridge because the Maria go eat more late
‘I left the cupcakes in the fridge because Maria is going to eat (them) later.’

This seems not to be possible in some languages, as European Portuguese, for example (Raposo 1986).

:: Besides the island non-sensitivity seen in (1), null objects in BP have a set of properties that occur together, and this seems to be unique to this language.

Goals of this talk
1- “Null objects” in BP are unique to this language. They
   :: have a set of specific properties not found in other languages.
   :: are DP ellipsis
2- On animacy restrictions for null objects in BP
3- Not all cases of object gaps in BP are “null objects”
   :: Indefinite null objects
   :: Topics

What this talk is not about
   :: VP ellipsis cases in which only the direct object is missing, or when other conditions for VP ellipsis in the language apply (Matos 1992, Cyrino & Matos 2016)
   :: Gaps occurring in short answers to yes/no questions (Kato 2016, Ruda 2017)
   :: Pragmatically controlled null objects (Cyrino 2016)
1. Brazilian Portuguese null objects

1.1 Strict/sloppy readings

Cyrino (1994) noticed that anaphoric null objects in BP allow strict and sloppy readings

(2) Ontem o Ivo pôs o anel no cofre, mas Pedro guardou Ø na gaveta.
    Yesterday the Ivo put the ring in-the safe but Pedro kept in-the drawer
    ‘Yesterday Ivo put the ring in the safe, but Pedro kept it in the drawer.’

✓ Pedro kept Ivo’s ring (strict reading)
✓ Pedro kept his own ring (sloppy reading)

(3) O João devolveu o livro em bom estado
e a Maria devolveu Ø estragado. [VBP,#EP]
    the João returned the book in good condition
    and the Maria returned damaged
    ‘João returned his book in good condition and Maria returned it in bad shape.’

✓ one and the same book or different books involved
✓ this ambiguity is not easily obtained in EP

:: but notice that once an overt pronoun (4) and (5) is used the sloppy reading is out, which argues against the pro analysis

(4) Ontem o Ivo pôs o anel no cofre, mas Pedro guardou ele na gaveta.
    Yesterday the Ivo put the ring in-the safe but Pedro kept it in-the drawer
    ‘Yesterday Ivo put the ring in the safe, but Pedro kept it in the drawer.’
✓ Pedro kept Ivo’s ring (strict reading)

(5) O Ivo devolveu o livro em bom estado e a Lia devolveu ele estragado.
the Ivo returned the book in good condition and the Lia returned it damaged
‘João returned his book in good condition and Maria returned it in bad shape.’

✓ one and the same book

1.2 Structure Parallelism

:: Cyrino (1994), Cyrino & Lopes (2016): null objects are only possible in parallel
structures, that is, the antecedent has to be in complement position as well:

(6) *O governador disse que o deputado desrespeitou Øi na festa.
the governor said that the congressman disrespected in-the party
‘The governor said that the congressman disrespected him at the party’

:: However, if (6) is embedded in a context as (7) (where there is VP ellipsis, Matos 1992,
Cyrino & Matos 2005), a null object becomes possible:

(7) Lia disse ao governador que ninguém desrespeitou elei na festa,
Li said to-the governor that nobody disrespected him in-the party
mas o governador disse que o deputado desrespeitou Øi.
but the governor said that the congressman disrespected
‘Maria said to the governor that nobody disrespected him at the party, but the
governor said the congressman did.’

:: This is reminiscent of the Condition on Parallelism or Identity Condition (see Fiengo &
May 1994, Duguine 2014), a condition that ensures the ‘recoverability’ of the silent
material in ellipsis.

1.3 Disjunctive/E-type disjunctive readings

:: Sakamoto (2013) refers to the observations by Simons (1996, 2001), according to
whom, English pronouns which are anaphoric on disjunctive arguments can only yield
what she calls the disjunctive E-type reading (or E-reading):

(8) A: John scolded [either Mary or Nancy].
    B: Bill scolded her, too.
    Bill scolded the one who John scolded, too. [V Disjunctive E-type reading]  
    Bill scolded either Mary or Nancy (one of them), too. [*Disjunctive reading]

The disjunctive reading (or Q-reading) can be obtained via VP ellipsis:

(9) John scolded either Mary or Nancy and Bill did [V Ø] too.
Null objects in BP allow an both the disjunctive - and the E-type disjunctive reading-
(provided the antecedent is [-animate]):

(10) *Maria preparou [ou o bife ou o peito de frango].
Maria prepared or the steak or the breast of chicken
‘Maria prepared either the steak or the chicken breast.’

*Pedro comeu Ø quando chegou. [Vdisjunctive reading, Vdisjunctive E-type reading]
Pedro ate when arrived
‘Pedro ate (it) when he arrived.’

Notice that when the pronoun is used (11), the disjunctive reading is lost, just like in
English:

(11) *Pedro comeu *ele quando chegou. [*disjunctive reading, disjunctive E-type reading]
Pedro ate it when arrived
‘Pedro ate it when he arrived.’

**Interim Summary**

:: Anaphoric null objects in BP have certain properties:
- possible in islands
- inanimate antecedent
- strict/sloppy readings
- parallelism
- disjunctive and E-type readings

:: No other language (to my knowledge) has null objects with all these properties
For example:
2. Analyses

2.1 Various analysis in the literature

:: Null objects have received differing analysis:
- Null objects are variables: cannot appear in islands
  European Portuguese (Raposo 1986)
  Kinande (Authier 1988)
  Spanish (Campos 1986)
- Null objects as pro: appear in islands
  Italian (Rizzi 1986)
  Brazilian Portuguese (Galves 1989a, b; Farrell 1990; Kato 1993; a.o.),
  Imbabura Quechua (Cole 1987)

:: Other proposals:
- Null objects as bundle of features not pronounced at PF
  Russian, Bulgarian, Hebrew (Erteschik-Shir et al 2013)
- Ellipsis of object, the result of V-stranding VP ellipsis
  Hebrew (Doron 1999, Goldberg 2005)
- Argument Ellipsis
  Japanese, Turkish (Şener & Takahashi 2010)

2.2 Anaphoric null objects are DP ellipsis in BP

:: Cyrino (1994, 1997): null objects in BP are inaudible DPs that have identical antecedents \( \rightarrow \) DP ellipsis

:: This analysis is based on the fact that BP lost third person clitics
  - these were replaced either by a full pronoun (antecedent: animate/inanimate)
  - or by a null object (antecedent: inanimate)

:: Null objects arose due to a diachronic process involving
- loss of V-movement (Cyrino & Matos 2005, Cyrino & Matos 2016, Cyrino 2013)
- increase of the occurrences of propositional ellipsis, which fed the loss of 3rd person (inanimate) clitics.

:: As seen above, null objects in BP have properties usually associated with ellipsis:
 a) availability of strict/sloppy readings (Ross, 1967);
 b) structural parallelism between the antecedent and the elided string (Fiengo and May 1994, Duguine 2014);
 c) disjunctive readings (Simons 1996, 2001; Sakamoto 2013); and

:: Considering

→ ellipsis must be licensed by a functional head (Lobeck 1995, Kester 1996)
→ BP has lost verb movement to a high functional projection (T) (Galves 2001, Cyrino 2013),
→ VP ellipsis is licensed by V in an Aspectual head (Cyrino & Matos 2005, 2016; Cyrino 2013),
→ I assume this position to be InnerAspect (Cyrino 2019a, 2020, MacDonald 2008).
:: As a consequence, both vP ellipsis and DP ellipsis can be licensed, since they are c-commanded by V in a functional projection (lower than T), contrary to what happens in European Portuguese (see Cyrino & Matos 2016):

(12) Brazilian Portuguese vP ellipsis

a. *Ela tem lido o livro para as crianças e ele tem também lido Ø too read
   ‘She has read the book to the children and he has too.’
b. ... [t tem] [v{PAux tem} [Adv também] [outASP lido [vP [Asp+V <lido> [vP <V> [Asp para as mães]]]]]

:: Cyrino (2019a) proposes: DP ellipsis of the object is licensed by the V in a lower aspectual head located between vP and VP, InnerAspect (MacDonald 2008):

(13) Brazilian Portuguese null objects

a. *Ela tem lido o livro para as crianças e ele tem também lido Ø para as mães too read to the mothers
   ‘She has read the book to the children and he has also read it to the mothers.’
b. ... [t tem] [v{PAux tem} [Adv também] [outASP lido [vP [Asp+V <lido> [vP <V> [Asp para as mães]]]]]

:: Assuming that inanimate null objects in BP are ellipsis, however, cannot be the full story since we have to explain why their antecedents are [-animate], as seen in (1)-(2).

3. Animacy in syntax

:: Differential Object Marking (DOM): animacy is relevant

(14) Spanish

a. He visto *(a) tu padre have seen DOM your father
   ‘I saw your father.’
b. He visto *(a) tu coche have seen DOM your car
   ‘I saw your car.’
Several recent studies have proposed that DOM is the result of DP movement to a position outside VP driven by Case requirements (Torrego 1998, Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, López 2012, Ormazabal & Romero 2013, Zdrojewski 2013, Ordoñez & Roca 2018, a.o.).

Different authors assume different positions with respect to the specific Case a is encoding, Dative or Accusative. All of them, however, assume that the DOM object is in a higher position than the unmarked object. In other words, it seems that there is a consensus that inanimate DPs remain in situ.

3.1 Residual DOM in BP

BP seems not to have DOM.

Cyrino & Ordonez (2018) conjecture that there must be a parametric choice in the for the insertion of a.
- In both BP and Spanish, animates move out of the vP.
- However, Case is realized differently in BP and Spanish.
- In Spanish an overt preposition must inserted for Case purposes (Ordóñez and Roca, 2018; Zdrojewski 2013).
- In BP, there was a general loss of the preposition a, and a-marking in direct objects is very restricted

But we have evidence of residual DOM marking in BP:

- coordinated structures: the presence of a signals [+ animacy] (Cyrino 2017):
  (15a) has a (gapping) ellipsis reading (no relevant coordinated object reading)
  (15b) has the relevant reading for coordinated object:

(15) a. Eu vi o menino e o professor também.
    I saw the boy and the teacher too
    ‘I saw the boy and the teacher did too.’

b. Eu vi o menino e ao professor também.
    I saw the boy and DOM-the teacher too
    ‘I saw the boy and the teacher as well.’

Now, a is impossible when the object is [-animate]:

(16) a. Eu vi o menino e ao professor também.
    I saw the boy and DOM-the teacher too
    ‘I saw the boy and (I saw) the teacher too.’

b. Eu vi o livro e (*a) o caderno também.
    I saw the book and DOM-the notebook too
‘I saw the book and (I saw) the notebook too.’

:: Additionally, and interestingly, there is yet another context where DOM a is necessary. This is represented by animate quantifiers, as seen in (17) (see also Fábregas 2013: 12 for Spanish)

(17) a. Ele visitou todos. (todos = [+ animate])
   he visited all
   ‘He visited everyone/everything.

b. Ele visitou a todos. (todos = [+ animate])
   he visited DOM all
   ‘He visited everyone.’

c. Ele viu (a) alguns homens/*a algumas escolas
   he saw DOM some men DOM some schools
   ‘He saw some men/ some schools.’

:: The same pattern arises with comparatives: the non-a marked (18a) means Pedro loves Rita as a woman does; the a-marked (18b) allows the comparative direct object reading in which Pedro loves Rita in the same way as he loves a woman:

(19) a. Pedro ama Rita como uma mulher.
   Pedro loves Rita as a woman
   ‘Pedro loves Rita as a woman does.’

b. Pedro ama Rita como a uma mulher.
   Pedro loves Rita as DOM a woman
   ‘Pedro loves Rita as he does a woman.’

:: The exact description and analysis of DOM facts in BP is under investigation (see Cyrino 2017, Cyrino & Irimia 2018, in preparation).

3.2 Why do null objects in BP show animacy effects?

:: A natural question is then: can we say animacy restrictions on null objects in BP are effects of DOM in the language?

:: Indeed, there have been previous accounts relating BP to Spanish DOM: within a functionalist framework, Schwenter & Silva (2002) and Schwenter (2006) have claimed that the null object/full pronoun pattern found in BP is reminiscent of DOM in Spanish.

:: If null objects in BP are DP ellipsis licensed by the lexical V in AspInn, and unrestricted null objects are only possible when the antecedent is [-animate], the impossibility of restricted null objects has to be linked to the fact that DP ellipsis is not licensed.

:: The question is thus: why are animate objects not licensed under ellipsis?
:: The answer must reside in the syntactic composition strategies available for categories like ‘animacy’:
   - if animate objects move to a higher position (as in DOM) they cannot be elided since they will not be licensed by V in InnAsp.

:: Cyrino (2019a, 2020) proposes, following Richards (2008), that [±Person] features are inherent to different nominals.

:: Animacy in syntax can be implemented as the result of the movement of a [+Person] or [-Person] DP to the specifier of functional category (call it F_{[Person]} that has an uninterpretable ([uPerson]), probably to value Case (see also Ordoñez & Roca 2018).

:: DPs that are [-animate] (ie, those that are Person-less) and non-specific do not move out of VP, since they are φ-incomplete, and they value Case in-situ (by the φ-incomplete probe v, as in Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person-animacy</th>
<th>Person-definiteness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animate</td>
<td>Inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

:: Transitive vs in BP, as in Spanish (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, Ordoñez & Roca 2018), do not have [Person] features, and they are φ-incomplete. Case is only valued for matching DPs, Vs are not able to value Case in animate DPs, because the latter are φ-complete. Therefore, they have to move to value Case.

:: A functional head (F_{[Person]}) located below VP and above InnAsp is able to value Case to those DPs that match that feature.
   - Therefore, the effects of animacy in syntax comes from the movement of a [+Person] or a [-Person] DP to the specifier of functional category that has [Person].

---

1 I assume Carnie (2005), whereby phases must contain
   (i) a sole argument;
   (ii) a predicative element (either V or VP) that introduces the argument;
   (iii) a temporal operator (a functional category) that locates the predicate and the argument in time and space (that is, Asp or T).
Phase are related to thematic roles in argumental structure;
   (i) Theme Phase [AspP [Asp’ Asp [VP theme V]]]
   (ii) Goal Phase [EndP [End’ End [v goal [v’ v...]]]]
   (iii) Agent Phase [TP [T’ T [vp agent [v’ v...]]]]
Each phase has its own domain for Existential Closure (vP or VP) and its own Nuclear Scope. Each DP is interpreted independently.
In my proposal, DP ellipsis licensing in BP happens inside the Phase that contains the internal argument, the verb, and the temporal operator Asp.
In other words, the lexical verb, when moving to InnAsp, is able to license the ellipsis of a c-commanded DP – this constitutes a phase, its complement its sent to Spell Out, and the derivation proceeds.
Summary:
[-animate] (ie, Person-less) DPs do not move out of VP, they are φ-incomplete, and have Case valued by the φ-incomplete probe v (as in Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007).

[+animate] (ie [+Person] or [-Person]) DPs are φ-complete, so they move to the specifier of F[Person] to value Case.

:: Cyrino (2019a, 2020): the behavior of BP null vs. overt objects seen in (20) can be understood as the possibility for InnAsp to license ellipsis, something only possible for inanimate objects since they stay in situ, as seen in the structure in (21):

(20) a. O estudante levou o livro para a biblioteca depois que leu Ø.
    the student took the book to the library after that read
    ‘Pedro took the book to the library after he read (it).’
    b. *O estudante levou o menino para casa depois que o professor expulsou Ø.
       the student took the boy to house after that the teacher expelled

(21) \[ \text{v} \left[ \text{InnAspP} \left[ \text{V+ InnAspP leu [vp <V> o livro ]]}} \middle| \begin{array}{c}
\text{ellipsis licensing}
\end{array} \right. \]

:: Animate DPs are [-Person]; therefore, they move out of VP to Spec, F[Person] (= DOM movement) and value Case.

:: In BP, the anaphoric animate object has to be spelled out as a full pronoun, exemplified by ele in (22).

(22) O estudante levou o menino para casa depois que o professor expulsou ele.
    the student took the boy to house after that the teacher expelled him
    ‘The student took the boy home after the teacher expelled him.’

(23) \[ \text{v} \left[ \text{f[PersonP] ele[-Person]} \text{F[Person]} \left[ \text{InnAspP [V+ InnAspP expulsou [V <ele[-Person]> }} \right. \right] \]

:: However, there are some instances of animate 3rd person gaps in BP

:: I argue they are not the “BP null object”
   - some may be related to VP ellipsis (Matos 1992, Cyrino & Matos 2016) or to the argument structure of certain verbs (Cyrino, 2016)
   - some have been considered as missing objects in Yes-No answers (Kato 2016, Ruda 2017)
   - some are pragmatically controlled null objects (Cyrino 2016)
   - and there are still other cases: indefinite “null objects”, and Topic gaps.
4. On animate null objects in BP

4.1 Indefinite null objects

:: In BP, as well as in Spanish, indefinite null objects are also possible, but (differently from the definite ones) no animacy restriction is at work:

(24) Ando procurando candidatos/poltronas, mas não encontro Ø.
    walk looking-for candidates/armchairs but not find
    ‘I’ve been looking for applicants/armchairs, but I don’t find (them).’

:: How can we account for this?

The answer I propose (Cyrino 2019c) is related to the analysis of the indefinite DPs that are the antecedents to these null objects plus the fact that nominal ellipsis is possible in BP (25):

(25) Ontem vi a casa vermelha e a Ø azul [BP]
    yesterday saw the house red and the blue
    ‘Yesterday, I saw the red house and the blue one.’

:: Let’s assume that nominal ellipsis is licensed by D (see Saab 2019):

(26) Ontem vi [DP [D a [NP casa]]] vermelha e [DP [D a [NP casa]]] azul
    ellipsis licensing

:: Espinal & Cyrino (2013) and Espinal & Cyrino (2019, 2020) propose that, syntactically, Romance indefinites are DPs containing an operator DE adjoined to a pluralized D. This operator cancels the definiteness of the DP.

:: In BP (and Spanish, Catalan), this operator is not overtly realized, but in some Romance languages it is realized as de(i), des. (see Espinal & Cyrino 2020, forthcoming)

:: The structure for indefinites as candidatos in (24) is shown in (27):

(27) [DP [D DE [D PLURALIZER [Ddef Ø ]]] [NP candidato]]

:: In order to explain the puzzle seen above concerning the possibility for indefinite animate null objects in BP, I propose (Cyrino 2019c, but see also Laca 2013) that in this type of null objects, we have nominal ellipsis and the licenser is the null D in indefinites.
(28) a. Ando buscando candidatos, mas não encontro Ø

b. ... *buscando [DP [D DE [D PLURALIZER [Ddef Ø ]]] [NP candidato]]

mas não encontro [DP D DE [D PLURALIZER [Ddef Ø ]]] [NP candidato]]

|__________|

ellipsis licensing

:: Therefore, there isn’t a “null object” in these constructions, but nominal ellipsis.

4.2 Topics

:: Animate null objects are possible in certain topic fronting structures. Notice that the sentence in (29B) is also possible with a full pronoun in object position:

(29) 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

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

:: However, an apparently similar sentence as (30B), in which the null object has an animate antecedent, is not possible in BP:

(30) A: Hoje eu trouxe as garotas na festa.

today I brought the girls in-the party.

‘Today I brought the girls to the party.’

B: A Lia, o Ivo sempre reclama quando eu levo *Ø/ vela 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.’

:: I propose (Cyrino 2019b) that the gap in (29B) is not a “null object” in BP.

:: Assuming that there are different types of topics (Frascarelli & Hinterhölz 2007, Erteschik-Shir et al., 2013; among others):

- (29B) is the result of (Familiar Topic) Fronting: when there is no DP ellipsis, the gap is the result of movement of the topic to a left-periphery position.
- (30) is the result of the merge of a Shifting Topic

:: Frascarelli & Hinterhölz (2007): Topics obey a strict hierarchy of positions (31), and each topic has a different syntax in the way it is realized/resumed in the sentence

(31) Topic Hierarchy

[ShifP Shifting Topic [+aboutness]] [ContrP Contrastive Topic [FamP Familiar Topic]
Focusing on Familiar Topics and Shifting Topics, Cyrino (2019b) shows that null objects in BP are not cases of Topic Drop (as proposed, for example, for Hebrew and Russian by Erteschik-Shir et al. 2013).

BP does not have 3rd person clitics, and no CLLD, but the language behaves like Italian with respect to Familiar and Shifting Topics, which have different structures.

Notice the contrast: Familiar Topics and Shifting Topics

Familiar topics: both null objects and full pronouns are possible regardless of [animacy]

(32) 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
    ‘Maria always complains when I take her to the doctor.’

(33) A: *O Ivo trouxe o casaco para a festa e deixou Ø/ ele no carro.*
    the Ivo brought the coat to the party and left it in-the car
    ‘Ivo brought the coat to the party and left it in the car.’

    B: *O casaco, ele sempre deixa Ø/ ele no carro.*
    the coat he always leaves it in-the car
    Lit. ‘The coat, he always leaves in the car.’
    ‘The coat, he always leaves it in the car.’

Frascarelli &Hinterhölz (2007): there is no optionality of clitic-resumption in Italian Familiar Topics; there are two ways of realizing Familiar Topics: movement or base-generation

(i) non-clitic-resumed Familiar Topics are moved to FamP from an IP-internal position

(ii) clitic-resumed Familiar Topics are merged directly in FamP

non-clitic resumed Familiar Topics don’t trigger Principle C violations, which show they have moved, and can be reconstructed back into the IP. When clitics are present, there is no such effect.

This behavior can be seen with right-dislocated Fam Topics (actually, they are merged in the Left periphery, IP inversion applies later, F&H 2007: 11-12).

Consider the sentences in BP:

(i) right-dislocated Familiar Topics do not c-command the rest of the clause:

(34) A: *Hoje vou levar a Maria no médico.*
    today go take the Maria in-the doctor
    ‘Today, I’m going to take Maria to the doctor.’
with sure the Maria go escape she
‘For sure, Maria is going to escape (from going).’
b. [*GP*[^{ip}Maria, vai escapar], [*Topp ela*] t_p]

(ii) There is a contrast between non-pronoun resumed and pronoun resumed right-dislocated Familiar Topics, which can be seen in the distributive/individual reading interpretation of the sentences:

(35) non-pronoun resumed: ambiguous binding
a. Maria[^k] apresentou [a todo hóspede], [o seu[^k/*j] vizinho de mesa].
   Maria introduced to every guest the her/his neighbor of table
   ‘Maria introduced to every guest her/his table-mate.’
b. [*GP*[^{ip}Maria, apresentou [a todo hóspede], [<o seu[^k/*j] vizinho de mesa>]]],
   [*Topp o seu[^k/*j] vizinho de mesa] t_p]

(36) pronoun-resumed:
a. Maria[^k] apresentou *ele* [a todo hóspede], [o seu[^k/*j] vizinho de mesa].
   Maria introduced him to every guest the her/his neighbor of table
   ‘Maria introduced him to every guest her/his table-mate.’
b. [*GP*[^{ip}Maria, apresentou ele [a todo hóspede]], [*Topp o seu[^k/*j] vizinho de mesa] t_p]

:: The same is true for inanimate DPs:

(37) a. Maria[^k] mostrou [a todo menino], [o seu[^k/*j] brinquedo]
   Maria showed to every boy the her/his toy
   ‘Maria showed to every boy her/his toy.’
b. Maria[^k] mostrou *ele* [a todo menino], [o seu[^k/*j] brinquedo]
   Maria showed it to every boy the her/*his toy
   ‘Maria showed it to every boy her toy.’

++ Shifting topics: as seen, although full pronouns are always possible, animate null objects are not:

(38) 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.
   Lit. ‘Lia, Ivo always complains when I take her to the party.’

(39) 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.’
:: Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007): Shifting Topics can only be merged in the C-domain 
(and are always resumed by a clitic in Italian, a full pronoun or null object in BP)

:: If there is no movement, no reconstruction is possible, otherwise there would be a 
Principle C violation, as in (40b):

(40) a. A minha foto com o Pedro, ele não viu Ø/ela ainda.
   the my photo with the Pedro he not saw her yet
   ‘My picture with Pedro, he hasn’t seen (it) yet.’
   b. *Ele não viu ainda a minha foto com o Pedro
   he not saw yet the my photo with the Pedro

→ The Shifting Topic ([a minha foto com o Pedro]) is base-generated in situ, no Principle 
C effects, because Pedro is not c-commanded by ele.

++ In order to explain the contrast in animacy, Cyrino (2019b) proposes that BP, like
Italian, realizes Familiar Topics in two ways:

(i) movement of the Topic DP to the specifier of Familiar Topic Phrase (FamP) and 
reconstruction in the original IP position for interpretation

(ii) merge of Familiar Topics in the specifier of FamP. There is no 
clitic resumption in BP, but, as seen a full pronoun or null object may occur in object position.

:: Non-pronoun resumed DPs: Movement through “vP remnant movement” in BP

Kato (2003) argues extensively that BP always moves the largest constituent in 
topicalization, namely, the whole vP, and whatever remains inside it (as opposed to EP, 
where there is VP remnant movement)
Hence, both animate and inanimate objects move to [spec, FamP].

(41) a. A Maria, (ela) sempre reclama quando eu levo Ø no médic0.
   the Maria she always complains when I take in-the doctor
   ‘Maria always complains when I take her to the doctor.’
   b. [FamP [vP a Maria tv tij]] ... <[vP a Maria tv tij]...>

(42) a. O casaco, ele sempre deixa Ø no carro.
   the coat he always leaves it in-the car
   Lit. ‘The coat, he always leaves in the car.’
   ‘The coat, he always leaves it in the car.’
   b. [FamP [vP tv o casaco]] ... <[vP [vP tv o casaco]]...>

:: Pronoun resumed [+animate] DP: base generation of Familiar Topic in the LP, pronoun 
resumption
(43) a. Maria, ela sempre reclama quando eu levo ela no médico.
   ‘Maria always complains when I take her to the doctor.’

b. [Famp a Maria]...[VP ela [InnAsp <leva> [VP <leva> <ela>]]...]

:: pronoun resumed [-animate] DP: base generation of Familiar Topic in the LP, pronoun resumption

(44) a. O casaco, ele sempre deixa ele no carro.
   Lit. ‘The coat, he always leaves it in the car.’

b. [Famp o casaco]... [InnAsp deixa [VP <deixa> ele]]...

:: Shifting-topics in BP, like in Italian, are always merged directly in the specifier of Shifting Topic Phrase (ShiftP): there are no reconstruction effects; a full pronoun/null object occurs in object position

:: [+animate] DP moves out of VP and cannot be elided/licensed. The Shifting Topic can only be resumed by a full pronoun:

(45) a. Lia, o Ivo sempre reclama quando eu levo *Ø/√ela na festa.
   ‘Lia, Ivo always complains when I take her to the party.’

b. [Shift a Lia]...[ela [InnAsp <leva> [VP <leva> <ela>]]...]

:: [-animate] DPs stays in situ, and the DP ellipsis may be licensed by the verb as it moves up to Inner Aspect (53b) or a resumptive pronoun is possible (53c):

(46) a. O ipad, a professora sempre reclama quando eu levo Ø/ele na escola.
   ‘The ipad, the teacher always complains when I take it to school.’

b. [Shift o ipad]... [InnAsp levo [VP <levo> – o ipad]]...

   |__________|
   ellipsis licensing

c. [Shift o ipad]... [InnAsp levo [VP <levo> ele]]...

:: There are different effects for resumptive pronouns or ellipsis:
(i) as predicted, strict and sloppy readings are only possible with ellipsis (54a); (54b) only allows the strict reading, as expected.

\[(47)\] a. O ipad, a Maria deixa \(\emptyset\) em cima da mesa
\[\text{the ipad the Maria leaves on top of the table}\]
\[mas o Pedro guarda \emptyset na gaveta.\]
\[\text{but the Pedro keeps in-the drawer}\]
b. O ipad, a Maria deixa \(\text{ele}\) em cima da mesa
\[\text{the ipad the Maria leaves it on top of the table}\]
\[mas o Pedro guarda \text{ele na gaveta.}\]
\[\text{but the Pedro keeps it in-the drawer}\]

‘The ipad, Maria leaves (it) on top of the table but Pedro puts (it) in the drawer.’

(ii) Disjunctive readings only possible with ellipsis (48a) – E-type disjunctive readings, with full pronouns:

\[(48)\] a. Ou o ipad ou o iphone, a Maria deixa \(\emptyset\) em cima da mesa
\[\text{or the ipad or the iphone the Maria leaves on top of the table}\]
\[mas o Pedro guarda \emptyset na gaveta.\]
\[\text{but the Pedro keeps in-the drawer}\]
b. Ou o ipad ou o iphone, a Maria deixa \(\text{ele}\) em cima da mesa
\[\text{or the ipad or the iphone the Maria leaves it on top of the table}\]
\[mas o Pedro guarda \text{ele na gaveta.}\]
\[\text{but the Pedro keeps it in-the drawer}\]

‘Either the ipad or the iphone, Maria leaves (it) on top of the table but Pedro puts (it) in the drawer.’

:: Assuming differences between Familiar and Shifting Topics, we may explain the differences with respect to the possibility of \([\pm\text{animate}]\) gaps in BP.
\[\rightarrow\] the apparent possibility of \([+\text{animate}]\) object gaps in Familiar Topics is the result of movement, and not DP ellipsis.

**Conclusion**

:: There are several different phenomena have been called “null objects”, but they are not the same
- context sensitive null objects (Cummings & Roberge 2005, Masullo 2003, a.o.)
- topic drop (Erteschik-Shir et al., Taube 2013, a.o.)
- “recipe null objects” (Massam & Roberge 1989, Kato 1993, Ruda 2014)
- argument ellipsis (Takahashi 2013, 2014, Sakamoto 2016, a.o.)

::There is not one analysis for null objects in languages: a range of phenomena is possible, according to other properties the language has.
BP has a specific type of null object with unique properties that can be related to other phenomena of the language:
- low verb movement (Galves 2001, Cyrino 2013, Tescari Neto 2013, a.o.)
- nominal ellipsis (Saab 2019)
- different structures for different Topics constructions (Cyrino 2019b, Frascarelli & Hinterhölz 2007)

The observation of these correlating facts of the language leads to the proposal that, DP ellipsis (which, along with VP ellipsis, nominal ellipsis and other kinds of ellipsis in the language, require a licensing functional projection in an appropriate configuration) is a sound analysis for the null object.
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