

Object BNs in Brazilian Portuguese. More on the NP/DP analysis.

1. A central topic in the literature on the contrast between languages with and without articles has been the debate between the *Universal-DP hypothesis* (Cinque 2005, Pereltsvaig 2007) and the *Parametrized-DP hypothesis* (Bošković & Gajewski 2008). Brazilian Portuguese (BrP) has articles but still allows bare nominals (BNs) in subject, object and in predicate position (1), and, in this sense, it is a challenge for the *Nominal Mapping Parameter* (Chierchia 1998) which predicts that Romance languages have [-arg, +pred] nouns, and therefore should only allow BNs in predicate position:

- (1) a. Criança lê **revistinha**. (Munn & Schmitt 2005:(1b))
 child read.3 SG comic-book 'Children read comic books'.
 b. Eu vi **criança** na sala. (Munn & Schmitt 2005:(7))
 I saw child in.the room 'I saw a child/children in the room'.
 c. João é **professor** nesta escola.
 João is teacher in.this school 'João is a teacher in this school'.

The literature on BrP has proposed either that BNs in BrP are DPs with empty determiners and no Number Projection (NumP) (cf. Munn & Schmitt 2005) or that they are nominals whose interpretation is neutralized between atomic and plural denotations (cf. Müller 2002). In this paper, we will challenge the assumption that BrP has but one possible structure for BNs – we will argue that BNs in BrP are ambiguous between two different structures: a real bare NP (i.e., a noun with no further functional projection above it) and a FP (Functional Projection) / DP with a null determiner. The different structures show up in different configurations triggered by different argument structures of verbs (Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002), and this can be evidenced both by the semantics of weak and null pronouns in natural languages (Tomika 2003), and by the anaphoric possibilities shown in BrP.

2. We focus on BNs that occur in postverbal position of different types of verbs. Dobrovie-Sorin et al. (2006), Espinal & McNally (2007, 2011), Espinal & Mateu (2011) show that BNs in Spanish (Sp) can only occur in object position of an unergative-like HAVE-predicate, which excludes DO unergatives, unaccusatives and transitives:

- (2) a. María **tiene** coche. (Dobrovie-Sorin et al. 2006: (8a)) - HAVE-predicate
 María has car 'Maria has a car.'
 b. *Juan **bailló** polca. - DO-unergative
 Juan danced polca
 c. ***Murió** niño. - unaccusative
 died child
 d. *Juan **rompió** vaso. (Esp & Mat 2011: (1a)) - causative transitive
 Juan broke glass

Interestingly, there is a correlation between the possibility of having a BN in object position, allowing a property-type anaphora (eg. the Catalan (Ct) clitic *en* 'it', the 'partitive' pronoun) but not an entity-token anaphora (eg. the Ct accusative clitic *la* 'it'), and preventing secondary predication:

- (3) a. Avui porta **faldilla**. Li 'n vam regalar una l'any passat.
 today wear.3SG skirt. to.her PART PAST.1PL give.present one the.year last
 'Today she is wearing a skirt. We gave her one as a present last year.' (Esp & McN 2011: (17))
 b. Tinc cotxe (***a punt**). b'. Tinc el cotxe **a punt**.
 have car at point have the car at point 'I have the car ready.'
 (Esp & McN 2011: (22a,b))

BrP, by contrast, allows BNs to occur in object position of all kinds of verbs, (4):

- (4) a. Maria **tem** carro. 'Maria has a car' - HAVE-predicate
 b. João **dançou** samba. 'João danced samba' - DO-unergative
 c. **Morreu** criança no terremoto. 'Children died in the earthquake' - unaccusative
 d. João **quebrou** copo. 'João broke a glass' - causative transitive

However, BrP does not have a property-type clitic (cf. Cyrino 1997). Instead, a null object occurs in a context such as (3a) for Ct:

- (5) Hoje ela está usando **saia**. Deram ∅ para ela no ano passado.
 today she is wearing skirt gave.3PL ∅ to her in.the year last
 'Today she is wearing (a) skirt. (They) gave (it) to her last year'.

Besides, BrP allows both (6a) and (6a'), as opposed to Ct (3b):

- (6) a. Eu tenho carro **pronto**. a'. Eu tenho o carro **pronto**.
 I have car ready I have the car ready 'I have the car ready'

Finally, BrP does not have property-type and third person accusative clitics in informal speech anymore. In (7), the discourse sequence allows either a null object or a weak non-clitic pronoun (cf. Galves 2001, for the special behavior of the latter in BrP):

- (7) a. O João **tem** maçã. Comprou \emptyset /*ela ontem. - HAVE-predicate
 the João has apple bought \emptyset /it yesterday
 ‘João has an apple. He bought it yesterday.’
- b. O João **correu** maratona este ano, e depois criticou \emptyset /ela. - DO-unergative
 the João run maratón this year and then criticized \emptyset /it
 ‘João run the maratón this year, but then he criticized it.’
- c. **Chegou** parente em casa e o João cumprimentou \emptyset /ele. - unaccusative
 arrived relative at home and the João complimented \emptyset /it
 ‘Relatives arrived at home and João did the compliments to them.’
- d. O João **quebrou** copo porque colocou \emptyset /ele no chão. - transitive
 the João broke glass because put \emptyset /it in.the floor
 ‘João broke a glass because he had put it on the floor.’

3. In order to explain these contrasts in these Romance languages, we focus on the fact that BNs, which are restricted to syntactic complement position of a {HAVE, BE} relation in Sp and Ct, can only be recovered by a property anaphora of type <e,t>. For BrP, we propose a bare NP alternating with a full DP with a null D or a FP, the former recovered by a property-type null anaphora and the latter by an entity type anaphora. A NP vs. DP/FP structural analysis for *ter maçã* ‘have an apple’ sequences is borne out by the possibility of secondary predication and pronominalization with *ela*, cf. (8):

- (8) a. O João tem maçã. Comprou \emptyset /*ela/*elas ontem. - NP object
 b. O João tem maçã **na cesta**. Comprou \emptyset /ela/elas ontem. - DP object
 c. O João tem **muita** maçã. Comprou \emptyset /ela/elas ontem. - FP object

Furthermore, DO unergatives, unaccusatives and transitive verbs allow BNs in BrP (7b-d) because they are analysed either as **DPs with a null D** or as FPs.

4. This proposal has several **welcome consequences**. First, we are able to understand the contrasts in (7a-d) in BrP, where weak pronouns are not allowed in the subsequent discourse when a property type anaphora is the option in Ct/Sp. In this case, only null objects are possible. Second, we have a structural explanation for the possibility of overt degree quantifiers (*demais*) and non-agreeing in Number adnominal quantifiers (*um pouco de*) in pronominal position (9a), and the possibility for freely secondary predication (9b) in BrP. These nominals are to be analysed either as FPs or DPs.

- (9) a. Veio **um pouco de** trem. a'. Veio trem **demais**.
 b. Eu vi criança **na sala**. E ela estava / elas estavam ouvindo. (Munn & Schmitt 2005:(7))
 I saw child in.the room and she was / they were listening
 ‘I saw a child / children in the room. And she was / they were listening.’

Third, we predict that the weak non-clitic pronoun *ele* in BrP is only an entity anaphora of type <e>, whereas null pronouns (in general, cf. Tomioka 2003) may show ambiguity between an entity type interpretation and a property denotation of type <e,t>, cf. (10):

- (10) a. João comprou ursinho e Pedro beijou \emptyset /*ele. - <e,t>
 b. João viu {o, un} ursinho e Pedro beijou \emptyset /ele. - <e>

References: Bošković, Z. & Gajewski, J. (2008) Semantic correlates of the NP/DP Parameter, paper presented at NELS 39, Cornell University. Chierchia, G. (1998) Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6. 339-405. Cinque, G. (2005). *Comparative syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Cyrino, S. (1997) O objeto nulo no português brasileiro. Londrina: Editora da UEL. Dobrovie-Sorin, C. et al. (2006) Bare nouns, number and types of incorporation. In S. Vogelee & L. Tasmowski (eds.) *Non-definiteness and plurality*, 51-79. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Espinal, M.T. & Mateu, J. (2011) Bare nominals and argument structure in Catalan and Spanish. *The Linguistic Review* 28, 1-39. Espinal, M.T. & McNally, L. (2007) Bare singular nominals and incorporating verbs. In G. Kaiser & M. Leonetti (eds.), *Definiteness, specificity and animacy in Ibero-Romance Languages*. Arbeitspapier 122, 45-62. University of Konstanz. Espinal, M.T. & McNally, L. (2011) Bare nominals and incorporating verbs in Catalan and Spanish”. *Journal of Linguistics* 47, 87-128. Galves, C. (2001) *Ensaio sobre as gramáticas do português*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp. Hale, K. & Keyser, S-J. (1993) On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In K.L. Hale & S-J. Keyser (eds.). *The View from Building 20. Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 59-109. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Hale, K. & S-J Keyser (2002) *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Müller, A. (2002) The semantics of generic quantification in Brazilian Portuguese. *Probus* 14. 279-298. Munn, A. & Schmitt, C. (2005) Number and indefinites. *Lingua* 115. 821-855. Pereltsvaig, A. (2007) The universality of DP: A view from Russian. *Studia Linguistica* 61(1): 59-94. Tomioka, S. (2003) The semantics of Japanese null pronouns and its cross-linguistic implications. In K. Schwabe & S. Winkler (eds.) *The interfaces: deriving and interpreting omitted structures*. 321-334. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.