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
    Maria has car ‘Maria has a car.’

b. *Juan bailó 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 un van regalar una l’any passat.
    today wear.3 SG skirt. to.herb 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’

b. João dançou samba. ‘João danced samba’

c. Morreu criança no terremoto. ‘Children died in the earthquake’

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 Ø para ela no ano passado.
    today she is wearing skirt gave.3PL Ø 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):
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 \(\emptyset*/\text{ela}/\text{elas}\) ontem. \(-\text{NP object}\)

b. O João tem maçã na cesta. Comprou \(\emptyset*/\text{ela}/\text{elas}\) ontem. \(-\text{DP object}\)

c. O João tem muita maçã. Comprou \(\emptyset*/\text{ela}/\text{elas}\) ontem. \(-\text{FP object}\)

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 prenominal 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.

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 \(\emptyset*/\text{ele}\). \(-<e,t>\)

b. João viu \([o,\text{un}]\) ursinho e Pedro beijou \(\emptyset*/\text{ele}\). \(-<e>\)
