0. Introduction

In this talk I hope to present some facts about the anaphoric null object in Brazilian Portuguese:

(1) a. João comprou ___
    'João bought ___(it) yesterday'

b. Tirei o dinheiro do bolso e mostrei ___ ao guarda.
    'I took themoney from the poket and showed ___ (it) to the policeman.'

c. João tirou o casaco depois que experimentou ___
    'João took off the coat after he tried ___(it) on.'

I will first review some analyses that have appeared in the literature on null objects in BP. After that, I present Fiengo & May (1994) proposals for ellipsis as reconstruction, for in the following section I propose that the null object in BP is a special case of ellipsis that has appeared in the language as a consequence of a diachronic reanalysis.

Finally I point out how my theory can handle some problems observed with other formulations for this empty category in BP and advance some speculations about other phenomena that may be related to the appearance of the null object in BP.

1. The null object in Brazilian Portuguese: the problem

Since the eighties, with the beginnings of GB, null arguments have caught the attention of researchers. First, the null subject parameter was proposed to account for the fact that some languages may not express the external argument.

Soon after that, the absence of the internal argument was also the focus of much research, beginning with Huang (1984) for Chinese and Raposo (1986) for European Portuguese. Although Wheeler (1981) was the first analysis for the null object for Brazilian Portuguese, she did so in the Extended Standard Theory framework. Working within the GB framework, Farrell (1990), Galves (1987, 1989), Kato (1993) have proposed the empty category pro for this language as opposed to the variable proposed for Chinese and European Portuguese. The reason is that all the sentences below, which are ruled out in European Portuguese because they occur in island structures, are perfect in Brazilian Portuguese:

(2) a. Eu informei à policia da possibilidade de o Manuel ter guardado ___ no cofre da sala de jantar.
    'I informed the police of the possibility of Manuel having had kept ___(it) in the safe'

b. O rapaz que trouxe ___ agora mesmo da pastelaria era o teu afilhado.
    'The boy that brought ___(it) just now from the pastry shop was your godson.

c. Que a IBM venda ___ a particulares surpreende-me.
    'That IBM sell ___(it) to individuals surprises me.'

d. O pirata partiu para as Caraíbas depois de ter guardado ___ no cuidadosamente no cofre.
    'The pirate left for the Caraibe after having kept ___(it) carefully in the safe.'

Huang (1884) proposed that the null object should be considered like a variable bound by a null topic. Farrell (1990) did not accept this proposal for BP because some sentences that would be ungrammatical if we followed Huang' s reasoning are perfect in BP. For example, an ungrammatical sentence like (3a) becomes perfect in certain contexts (3b). The problem is that, according to Farrell, if we follow Huang's analysis, we would have a strong crossover violation (3c), which is something that does not occur, since sentence (3a) is grammatical in context (3b):
On the other hand, because of the existence of sentences like (3a), he proposes that the antecedent of a null object in a complement clause cannot be the subject of the matrix sentence. However, he proposes that in adjunct sentences that is not the case, and he considers (4) grammatical in BP:

(4) A Júlia, sempre chora quando ponho ___ no berço.
'Julia always cries when I put ___(her) in the cradle.'

But this sentence is not grammatical. If we have (4), we notice the contrast, comparable to (3a) vs. (3b):

(5) Eu sempre ponho meus filhos no berço sem problemas. Mas a Júlia, sempre chora quando ponho ___ no berço.
'I always put my children in the cradle with no problems. But Julia, always cries when I put ___(her) in the cradle.'

Thus, Farrell (1990) proposes that the null object in BP would be intrinsically specified as 3rd person for its identification and it would be formally licensed by INFL or V. (and then, BP would have one kind of pro for subjects and another for objects? cf. Kato, 1993)

Galves (1989) proposes that the null object in PB, pro, would be an empty category base generated bound to an external subject - it would be an empty category simultaneously free and bound. In (1991), she proposes a special structure for the sentence in BP, in which the null object pro would be licensed by V and identified by a pro in Spec-Agr. (but a sentence like *Pedro disse que Maria viu ___ is still impossible)

Kato (1993) proposes that the null object in BP is an instance of pro which is identified as being 3rd person and licensed by a null clitic, whose antecedent is always in an anti-c-command position. (but in sentence Este livro decepcionou o público quando a editora pôs ___ à venda, the antecedent is not in an anti-c-command position).

Barra Ferreira (2000) proposes that the null object in BP is a pro without Case features, and, to account for the [-animate] feature, characteristic of the null object in BP, he stipulates that this pro does not admit animate antecedents in BP. In view of sentences like (6a), he proposes this null pronoun may be A-bar bound and assumes that BP can also have a structure with movement like (6b), since he proposes a strong feature in the head of Top:

(6) a. Esse livro, a Maria conhece o cara que escreveu ___.
This book, Maria said that João bought ___ in Paris.'

In BP, in sentences like (6), the object position is ambiguous between a trace and the Caseless pro. He considers that whatever the nature of the empty category in PB is, it is not the same for PE, because a sentence like (6a) would be ungrammatical in PE. For Barra Ferreira Ferreira, sentences with topicalized elements in PB could be obtained through movement of an element to TopP, but could also have a Caseless pro in object position:

(7) a. *O João precisa esse livro
Esse livro, o João precisa.

b. Esse livro, o João precisa pro.
Then, since traces of movement would be impossible in islands, a sentence like (8) could only contain a pro - we would not have ambiguity here:

(8) Esse aluno, eu ainda não consegui um professor que elogiasse ____i
   'This student, I still haven't got a professor that praised ____(him)'

Barra Ferreira says that, since in PE topicalization is always a result of movement, sentences like (8) would be impossible in PE because of the island structure and the lack of null object pro.

However, in Raposo & Kato (2000) ((9 a-c)) and Kato (2000b) ((9a-b)) we find the sentences in (9) being considered grammatical both in BP and EP:

(9) a. Este livro, Maria acha que ele decepcionou o público quando a editora pôs ____i à venda.
   'This book, Maria thinks tha it let down the public when the publisher put ____ (it) for sale.'

b. Este autor, Maria acha que ele decepcionou a todos que cumprimentaram ____i,
   'This author, Maria thinks he let down everybody that greeted ____(him)'

   (9c) O teu artigo, o aluno que tem ____i em casa devolve ____i ainda hoje.
   'Your article, the student that has ____ (it) at home will bring ____ (it) back still today.'

With these examples, we see that we cannot take sentences in (6) and compare them with sentences with null anaphoric objects in BP. If we do that and consider the null object a pro without Case in BP as opposed to EP, in which it would be a variable, the generalization and the subsequent contrast between these languages, which Barra Ferreira wants to stress in his analysis, is lost, since the sentences in (9) appear to be grammatical in both languages.

Noticing that BP null objects are [+animate] by contrasting sentences like (10a-b) with (10c-d), Bianchi & Figueiredo (1994) propose to split the analysis for the empty category into two, variables and pro, according to whether the antecedent is [+animate] or [-animate]:

(10) a. *O José impediu a esposa de matar ____i
   'José prevented the wife from killing ____ (him)'

b. *O José sabe que a Maria gostaria de conhecer ____i,
   'José knows that Maria would like to meet ____ (him)'

c. Esse tipo de garrafa, impede as crianças de abrirem ____i sozinhas.
   'This kind of bottle prevents the children from opening ____ (it) by themselves.'

d. Esse prato, exige que o cozinheiro acabe de preparar ____i na mesa.
   'This dish requires that te cook finishes to prepare ____ (it) at table.'

As a test for this hypothesis, the authors show that the fact that we cannot have a [+animate] null object in sentences like (11a) may be correlated with the fact that these are island structures (11b):

(11) a. *O José, conheceu a mulher que beijou ____k
    'José met the woman who kissed ____ (him)'

b. *Quem o José, conheceu a mulher que beijou ____k?
    'Who did José meet the woman who kissed ____ (him)'

They also say, correctly, that a sentence like (12), is, in contrast, grammatical:

(12) a. O José, conheceu a mulher que comprou ____k
    'José knew the woman who bought ____ (it)'

But they do not the same as they did in (13), that is, they do not contrast the sentence with an island structure. If we do that, we see that it is also ungrammatical:

(13) *O que o José conheceu a mulher que comprou ____k?
    'What did José meet the woman who bought ____ (him)?
Therefore, it looks like it is the feature [-animate] itself that allows null objects in BP. That is one of the things I intend to show in this talk.

More recently, Kato (2000a) proposes that the pronouns ele/ela have undergone a syntactic change in BP and have become weak pronouns. As a consequence of this change, BP has lost the weak accusative form in the form of the clitic and the weak nominative form in the form of agreement inflection. Thus, instead of considering the null object in BP as a null clitic as her previous analysis, she proposes that the null object is the 'null' corresponding to ele/ela, that she argues are 'pronominal nominals' in the manner of epithets (cf. Lasnik & Stowell 1991, that propose the 'null noun')

But noticing problems with the proposal in view of sentences like (14), Kato proposes a principle that governs null pronominal categories as the ECP, that would govern null non-pronominal empty categories, since the null object can have an antecedent in the position of topic and in the position of object of V:

(14)a. A mãe do Pedro, viu o safado.
   'The mother of Pedro, saw the bastard.'
b. *A mãe do Pedro, viu ____.
   'The mother of Pedro, saw ____ (him).'

In this case, the null object is a DP, that is, a null name subject to some principles.

Therefore we have seen in this section that the proposal for the null object in BP as a pro does not bring about further understanding of the phenomenon. There is no consensus on the proposals for the fulfillment of the licencing and identification requirements of pro.

Furthermore, there is still sentence (3a), here repeated as (15), whose ungrammaticality is left unexplained if we propose the null object as a null pronoun in BP:

(15) Ele, disse que Maria não beijou ____.
    'He said that Maria didn't kiss ____ (him).'

In the next section, I briefly review Fiengo & May (1994)'s theory of reconstruction for ellipsis together with their Dependency theory for pronouns. This I hope will bring more light to the status of the empty category in object position in BP.

2. Fiengo & May

Fiengo & May (1994) propose that ellipses are subject to a more general principle, at LF: reconstruction. According to the authors, reconstruction is a necessary but not sufficient condition for ellipsis. Other factors are at play, as the question of elements that may count as appropriate governors for the ellided material, as discussed by Zagona (1982), Lobeck (1987) and Matos (1992). For English, the auxiliary counts as verbal; it is, therefore, the appropriate governor. For other languages, I becomes the licenser through V movement. The nature of reconstruction, however, would be the same throughout languages, since it is a condition on syntactic identity.

Reconstruction is a set of token structures, occurrences of a (sub)phrase marker in a discourse, over a given terminal vocabulary. The members of the reconstruction may or may not be (phonologically) explicit. Reconstruction is then an identity condition: it renders explicit which occurrences are the same in a phrase marker. For the reconstruction to be possible it is necessary that the members of the reconstruction preserve the grammatical category and linear relations and dominance within the grammatical category, that is, that all the occurrences are structurally composed in the same way.

Fiengo & May also propose a Dependency theory that may be integrated in their theory of reconstruction and thus account for the strict and sloppy reading phenomena present in ellipsis constructions. Their excellent exploration of the complex eliminative puzzles of ellipsis and explanation of how their theory may account for all of them is the interesting core of the book. They call these puzzles 'eliminative' because ellipsis does not affect anaphora, but limits deixis.

For example, in a sentence as (16) we have some possibilities, in (17), for the interpretation of the ellided pronouns:

(16) John saw his mother, and Peter did too.
(17) a. John saw John's mother, and Peter saw John's mother too.
    b. John saw John's mother, and Peter saw Peter's mother too.
    c. John saw Jack's mother, and Peter saw Jack's mother too.

But the interpretation in (18) is impossible:

(18) John saw Jack's mother and Peter saw Frank's mother too.

The interesting fact here is that all the possibilities exist when there is no ellipsis, as in (19) where the interpretation of the pronouns could be accompanied by gestures (deixis):

(19) John saw his mother and Peter saw his mother.

That is why Fiengo & May state that ellipsis is not conservative, but eliminative, because it eliminates a possible interpretation.

The authors also show that the ambiguity possessive pronouns exhibit concerning these readings need not be left for an interpretative component. Another puzzle explained away in Fiengo & May and that I'll be mentioning later in this talk is sentence (20), the ‘Dahl puzzle’ (Dahl, 1973 was the first to notice it):

(20) Max thinks he is strong, Oscar does too, but his father doesn't.

This sentence has ‘across-the-board’ interpretations where we understand that Oscar thinks he, Oscar, is strong, but his father does not think he, his father is strong, and it also has the interpretation where Max thinks he is strong, Oscar thinks he, Max is strong, and his father thinks Max is strong.

But the other, unexpected interpretation is that Oscar thinks that he, Oscar, is strong, but his father does not think he, Oscar, is strong. That is, the ellided pronoun in the last clause has a strict reading in relation to the ellided pronoun in the second clause, that has a sloppy reading.

Fiengo & May propose that the strict or sloppy reading is a consequence of the type of occurrence of a pronoun, that is, pronouns may have independent or dependent occurrences. A pronoun is an alfa occurrence if it is independent of an antecedent in the same phrase marker, whereas it is a beta occurrence if it is dependent of an antecedent. If the occurrence is independent, reconstruction copies the occurrence of the index. If it is dependent, reconstruction copies the dependency.

Therefore (21) is explained:

(21) a. John saw his\textsuperscript{a} mother and Peter saw his\textsuperscript{a} mother too.
    b. John saw his\textsuperscript{b} mother and Peter saw his\textsuperscript{b} mother too.
    c. John saw his\textsuperscript{c} mother and Peter saw his\textsuperscript{c} mother too.

The fourth reading is impossible because the antecedent of an occurrence his\textsuperscript{d} does not have an antecedent so that it may be reconstructed.

As for the Dahl puzzle, Fiengo & May solve the problem by correlating the strict readings to alfa occurrences, sloppy readings to beta occurrences, together with the observation that nothing prevents a pronoun from being a beta occurrence, that is, dependent, and having a strict reading with respect to its antecedent. That may happen when the values for the pronouns are the same, and they are \( \beta \)-occurrences.

(22) a. Max\textsubscript{1} thinks he\textsuperscript{a} is strong, Oscar\textsubscript{2} thinks he\textsuperscript{a} is strong too, but his\textsuperscript{b} father does not think he\textsuperscript{b} is strong.
    b. Max\textsubscript{1} thinks he\textsuperscript{b} is strong, Oscar\textsubscript{2} thinks he\textsuperscript{b} is strong too, but his\textsuperscript{c} father does not think he\textsuperscript{c} is strong.
    c. Max\textsubscript{1} thinks he\textsuperscript{c} is strong, Oscar\textsubscript{2} thinks he\textsuperscript{c} is strong too, but his\textsuperscript{d} father does not think he\textsuperscript{d} is strong.

Fiengo & May point out this possibility for dependent pronouns to have a strict reading with respect to its antecedent which is itself dependent after observing sentence like (23) vs. (24):

(23) Max thinks he is strong, Oscar\textsubscript{2} thinks he\textsuperscript{a} is strong too, but his\textsuperscript{b} father does not think he\textsuperscript{b} is strong.

(24) Max thinks he\textsuperscript{a} is strong, Oscar\textsubscript{2} thinks he\textsuperscript{b} is strong too, but his\textsuperscript{c} father does not think he\textsuperscript{c} is strong.
Every bachelor said he was crazy, and Bill did too.

Every bachelor said he was crazy before Bill did.

In (23) the only reading possible for the elided pronoun is the sloppy reading, because we have a bound pronoun - it is a β-occurrence, that is, dependent, in Fiengo & May's theory (see their chapter 2). However, Sag (1876) and Williams (1977) have observed that in sentence (24) we can also have a strict reading for the elided pronoun. Compare (25):

For every bachelor x, x said that x was crazy before Bill said that x was crazy

with the quantifier binding the pronoun in a subordinated clause, in (26):

Every bachelor said he was crazy before he left.

On the other hand, a sentence like (27) below does not have a sloppy reading, even though it is similar to (24):

Every bachelor's mother said he was crazy before Bill did.

Thus, since (24) has a sloppy reading, we could have the following representation:

Every bachelor, said heß, was crazy before Bill said heß was crazy

But we can also have the following representation, with another possible value for the β-occurrence of the pronoun in the ellided clause, and this will account for the strict reading:

Every bachelor, said heß, was crazy before Bill said heß was crazy

If we try the same representation for (23), the sentence in a coordinate structure, we see that this type of anaphora is not available because the scope of the quantifier does not extend to the second coordinate clause (cf. (30b) with the version with pronouns):

*a. *Every bachelor, said heß, was crazy, and Bill said heß was crazy

b. Every bachelor said he was crazy, and he left.

But this, the strict reading, is the only possibility for the sentence in (27), where we have a bound variable pronoun (cf. Every bachelor's mother said he was crazy before he left):

Every bachelor's mother said heß was crazy before Bill said heß was crazy

That is why we can have a strict reading for a pronoun in a subordinated clause, just like a bound variable pronoun: it is a beta occurrence and it may be dependent on another beta occurrence (cf. 29).

Fiengo & May show that subordination is the key to understand some sentences with the Dahl puzzle, such as (ww) below, and they claim that their theory is the only solution for the problem. This means that whenever we have subordination, the reading obtained may be strict for whatever we have in the subordinated clause in relation to the antecedent in the main clause, as (32c) shows:

Max thinks he is strong, but Oscar only did before I did.

Max1 thinks heß was strong, but Oscar2 only thought heß was strong before I thought heß was strong.

Max1 thinks heß is strong, but Oscar2 only thought heß was strong before I thought I was strong.

Max1 thinks heß was strong, but Oscar2 only thought heß was strong before I thought heß was strong.
Fiengo & May argue extensively that the key for the Dahl puzzle, that is, the strict reading relative to a sloppy reading is subordination, and state:

'These cases show that when one clause is subordinated within another, it is possible to have structures that realize various dependencies on the same antecedent. Nothing prescribes dependencies that share the same antecedent [...] They are [...] dependencies that link the pronouns to the same antecedent, possible just because of the subordinate position of the clause' (p. 174)

3. Null object as reconstruction

3.1. Historical facts

In Cyrino (1994/1997), I propose that the null object in BP would be better understood if we considered it as an instance of reconstruction of the antecedent NP in FL and ellipsis in PF. A possible test for this proposal is the existence of strict and sloppy readings of null objects in BP, which I considered a possibility. Thus, in a sentence like (33), we may have these readings:

(33) João espera ganhar seu presente, no Natal, mas Pedro vai comprar ___ antes.
   'João hopes to get his present on Christmas, but Pedro will buy ___ (it) before.'

The sentence is ambiguous because we may understand that Pedro will buy João's presents (strict reading), or that Pedro will buy his own presents (sloppy reading).

This proposal tries to capture the idea advanced in Kato (1993) that the null object in BP is like the English neuter pronoun it. As we will see in a moment, the null object seems to have appeared through the fall of the neuter pronoun o, a pronoun like it, in constructions where ellipses were allowed by the grammar.

So my claim that the null object is reconstruction and ellipsis is due to the findings of the diachronic study in Cyrino (1994/1997) (1994, 1997), whose results show various facts about BP:

a) a decrease in filled positions for direct object - see table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>null positions</th>
<th>filled positions</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b) the first null object to appear is the one whose antecedent is propositional, that is, the object that could be realized by the neuter clitic o:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>[+specific] NP</th>
<th>[-specific] NP</th>
<th>Propositional</th>
<th>generic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>3% (4/139)</td>
<td>9% (3/34)</td>
<td>23% (23/99)</td>
<td>50% (1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>4% (4/100)</td>
<td>18% (16/90)</td>
<td>21% (14/68)</td>
<td>33% (3/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>8% (9/120)</td>
<td>6% (2/33)</td>
<td>45% (41/90)</td>
<td>25% (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>31% (38/121)</td>
<td>4% (1/24)</td>
<td>83% (81/98)</td>
<td>33% (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>67% (64/95)</td>
<td>86% (31/36)</td>
<td>91% (97/107)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Null objects according to type of antecedent, adapted from (Cyrino (1994/1997), 1994, 1997) - excluded: VP ellipsis and exopro

c) there is an increase in the occurrences of the null objects with antecedents which are NPs [+specific, -animate] in the XIXth century, while the increase in the null objects with [-specific] antecedents happens only in the XXth century:
Table 3. Null objects according to specificity and animacy features in the antecedent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>[+ spec, + ani]</th>
<th>[+ spec, - ani]</th>
<th>[- spec, + ani]</th>
<th>[- spec, + ani]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>1% (1/78)</td>
<td>5% (3/61)</td>
<td>3% (1/8)</td>
<td>8% (2/26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>7% (2/31)</td>
<td>3% (2/69)</td>
<td>4% (1/24)</td>
<td>23% (15/61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>5% (1/21)</td>
<td>8% (8/99)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6% (2/32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>2% (1/46)</td>
<td>49% (37/75)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8% (1/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87% (64/74)</td>
<td>57% (4/7)</td>
<td>93% (27/29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Using propositional ellipsis or the neuter clitic o in its place seem to have always been a possibility, cf table 2. If this is just an option, we would expect no changes through time - that is, for example, what Cyrino (1992) finds for EP. But a close up in the data of BP for this construction shows that there is an increase in the ellipsis construction, cf. propositional column in table 2.

That means that in the XVIth century, one had the option of using or not using the neuter clitic, but the preference was for the clitic (77% of clitics in the data). But in the XXth century, the situation was reversed, with the preference for the ellipsis (9% of clitics in the data).

We can see that the positive evidence for the child changes through time, she will hear more and more cases of ellipsis in a structure in which a neuter clitic is also allowed by the adult grammar. Cyrino & Reich (in preparation) argue for a phonological change that lead to this step of the change (cf. Roberts, 1993). My hypothesis for the Diachronic Reanalysis is that the child extended the ellipsis possibility to the structure of the other pronouns whose antecedent had also the [+specific, -animate] features. In other words, she reanalyzed the structures with the other 3rd person clitic as also allowing ellipsis. In Cyrino (1994/1997), I argue that some pronouns with low semantic value, like it, can also be analyzed as reconstruction, though not being elliptical in PF. A pronoun like it depends on its antecedent for its contents - they would also be cases of reconstruction, because we can have strict and sloppy antecedents without ellipsis in cases where it is used (34a), but not in cases where other pronouns like his or her are used (34b):

(34) a. The man who gave his paycheck to his wife was wiser than the man who gave it to his mistress.
    b. The man who gave his daughter to relatives was wiser than the man who gave her to strangers. (said, say, in an adoption situation)

Therefore, the analysis I propose for the null object in BP is of a reconstruction of NP in FL and ellipsis in PF for the [+specific, -animate] antecedents, and we can see it may explain the problems we saw earlier.

3.2. Additional hypothesis

In addition to positing reconstruction to account for the null object in BP, I also assume a hierarchy of referentiality as proposed by Cyrino, Duarte & Kato (2000), who show that referentiality is highly relevant in pronominalization in several languages. This hierarchy is as follows:

REFERRENTIALITY HIERARCHY

non-arguments propositions [-human] [+human]
3rd person 2nd person 1st person
[-specific] [+specific]

[-referential] ← ------------------------------- → [+referential]

Thus, [+N, +human] arguments are in the highest position in the hierarchy, and non-arguments, in the lowest. Regarding pronouns, the speaker (= I) and the hearer (= you), being inherently humans are in the highest and the third person that refers to a proposition is in lowest, with the [-human] entity in the middle. The [+specific] features interact with all these features. Thus, for a language that has the internal option for full or empty categories, one of the factors that influences the choice is the referential status of the antecedent.
With this hierarchy, several facts about BP can be explained (see Cyrino, Duarte & Kato, 2000). Languages will then vary in the spellout of the pronouns: in some languages, if the pronoun is 3rd person and [-animate] it may be null (for example, tupi). In fact, in Cyrino (1994/1997), I propose that certain pronouns could be the result of reconstruction of the antecedent and could be ellided in PF because its referentiality would very low.

In BP, that is the case with the null object, and then we could explain the various studies that show that objects can be null in BP a) if the antecedent is [-animate]; and b) if the antecedent is [-specific](Omena, 1978, Pereira, 1981, Duarte, 1986, among others).

Additionally, we should say that the referential hypothesis works reversely for the pronoun ele, which is used for [+animate] antecedentes, sometimes also for [-animate] antecedents, but it never is used for propositional antecedents (I thank Uli Reich for pointing that out to me).

3.3 The null object in BP

With this, we can explain the apparent puzzles in some sentences in Kato (2000b):

a) [-animate]

(35) a. Este livro decepcionou o público quando a editora pôs ___, à venda.
   'This book frustrated people when the publisher put ___ (it) on sale'
   b. *Este autor decepcionou o público quando a editora apresentou ___, na cerimônia de lançamento.
   'This author, frustrated people when the publisher introduced ___ (him) in the launching ceremony.'

In addition, if we take a sentence as (36) below, which shows the null object and change the antecedent to a [+animate] NP, the sentence becomes ungrammatical:

(36) a. João descascou a banana, mas Pedro não comeu ___,
   'João peeled the banana, but Pedro didn't eat ___ (it)'
   b. *João trouxe a Maria, mas Pedro não beijou ___,
   'João brought Maria, but Pedro didn't kiss ___ (her)'

It is important to note here that I am not claiming that the null object in BP is VP ellipsis, as has been proposed for Chinese by Huang (1991). In VP ellipsis, after the movement of the V to I, the rest is ellided. Likewise, Raposo (1986) claims that the null object in EP is not VP ellipsis.

I agree with Kato (1993), who proposes that sometimes the apparent result of a null object is a consequence of VP ellipsis in Portuguese:

(37) a. O homem colocou o armário?,
   'Did the man put up the cabinet?'
   b. João disse que ele colocou ___, ontem.
   'João said that he put ___ (it) up yesterday'

As we have seen, my analysis for the null object in BP as reconstruction includes the Referentiality Hierarchy, because the less referential the pronoun, the more possibilities exist in languages for it to be null.

b) [+animate]

Therefore, the null object with a [+animate] antecedent could only be possible in my analysis in:

a) a VP ellipsis structure:

Farrell (1990)'s example illustrate this point:

(38) a. *O Pedro disse que a Maria beijou ___,
   'Pedro said that Mary kissed ___ (him)'
   b. João disse que a Maria não beijou o Pedro, na festa, mas [o Pedro, disse que ela beijou ___],
   'João said that Maria didn't kiss Pedro, at the party, but Pedro said she kissed ___ (him).’
In (38) we have the ungrammatical sentence, due to the [+specific, +animate] antecedent in my analysis. In (38b), however, we have a VP ellipsis structure (see Matos, 1992, on the requirements for VP ellipsis that makes it different from the null object).

b) with a [-specific] antecedent (see Referentiality Hierarchy)
Indeed, this is the case with one example in Duarte (1986):

(39) A FEBEM é um dos elos dessa corrente que cria [o menor infrator], não é ela o único responsável, o único elo que cria ___, e como tal ela não consegue recuperar ___.

'FEBEM is not one of the links or that chain that creates the delinquent juvenile; it is not the only responsible, the only link that creates ___ (him), and as such it cannot recover ___(him)'

This can also account for the sentences Kato (2000b) found inexplicably ungrammatical in which we have [+animate] antecedents:

(40) a. ?O policial insultou o preso, antes de torturar ___.

'O policeman insulted the prisoner, before torturing ___ (him)'

b. ?Eu avisei estes homens, (de) que a polícia ia prender ___.

'I warned these men, that the police would arrest ___ (them)'

Compare with (41), where we made the antecedents [-specific]. The sentences are now acceptable:

(41) a. A polícia insulta presos, antes de torturar ___.

'The policemen insult prisoners, before torturing ___ (them)'

b. Eu avisei homens, (na rua) (de) que a polícia ia prender ___.

'I informed men, (in the street) that the police would arrest ___ (them)'

Here we have [+animate] antecedentes, but they are better, because of the [-specific] feature.

3.4 reconstruction = identity condition between tokens

Barra Ferreira (2000), as we have seen, proposes the null object in BP as a pro, and criticizes this analysis of the null object of BP as reconstruction, saying (p.84) that reconstruction is a phenomenon associated with structural parallelism. Thus, he argues that we could not have reconstruction if subordination is involved, and he gives the following sentences: (his (63)):

(42) a. O João não deu [nenhum presente], pra Maria, mas o Pedro deu ___ , pra Patrícia.

'João did not give [any present] to Maria, but Pedro gave ___ (it) to Patrícia.'

b. O João não relatou [nenhum acontecimento], à Maria antes do Pedro relatar ___. à Patrícia.

'João did not report [any event] to Maria before Pedro reported ___ (it) to Patrícia.

He explains that, if we claim reconstruction for (42a) we have to recurr to the vehicle change proposed by Fiengo & May, since the gap is going to be interpreted as algum presente (some present), instead of nenhum presente (any present). He observes that the opposite would only be true if the quantifier were binding two variables. But we saw earlier that in coordination structures the scope of the quantifies does not extend to the second clause (cf (30) above).

So far so good. Next, he claims that, since in (42b) the empty category in the subordinated clause has to be interpreted as bound to the quantifier nenhum acontecimento, we cannot have reconstruction. But this is precisely what was argued by Fiengo & May for the Dahl readings for ellipsis in subordination structures (cf. (29) above).

Because of this, he says a pro is a better explanation for (42b), while in (42a) we would have reconstruction. Well, I think we do not need to say that.

Furthermore, he gives, as a further evidence, the following sentence which lacks the sloppy reading:

(43) João publicou seu livro, pela editora A antes da Maria enviar ____ , para a editora B.

'João published the book through publisher A before Maria sent ___ (it) to publisher B.'
As we have seen, according to the author, the reconstruction proposal could only be applied to parallel structures, as coordination. But, as we have seen, when there is subordination, the availability of strict reading arises promptly. Remember the explanation of Fiengo & May about the Dahl puzzle strict reading that arises with subordination structures. Therefore, since (43) is a subordination structure, we are not surprised with the strict reading it shows.

According to Fiengo & May (1994) with coordinating conjunctions, we have distinct dependency domains and thus, both the strict and sloppy readings are possible:

(44) a. João publicou seu livro pela editora A, mas Maria enviou ___ para a editora B.
   'João published his book through publisher A, but Maria sent ___(it) to publisher B.'
   b. [João, publicou seu libro pela editora A], mas [Maria, enviou seu livro para a editora B.
   'João published his book through publisher A, but Maria sent his book to publisher B.'
   c. [João, publicou seu livro pela editora A], mas [Maria, enviou seu livro para a editora B.]
   'João published his book through publisher A, but Maria sent her book to publisher B'

But Fiengo & May add that, with subordinating conjunctions, on the other hand, clauses are bracketed as a single sentence, and there is just one domain of dependency’ (Fiengo & May, 1994:182):

(45) a. João publicou seu livro pela editora A antes da Maria enviar ___ para a editora B.
   'João published his book through publisher A before Maria sent ___ (it) to publisher B. '
   b. [João, publicou seu libro pela editora A antes da Maria enviar seu libro para a editora B.]
   'João published his book through publisher A before Maria sent his book to publisher B.'

The reason why null objects may appear in islands is thus explained: nothing prevents reconstruction structures from appearing in islands, as these sentences in Fiengo & May show:

(46) a. John shaved himself, but Bill didn't because the barber did.
   b. What John knows is minimal, and what he doesn't is vast.

4. Further work

In Cyrino (1995), I propose that for reconstruction to be possible, it is necessary that some functional category c-command the reconstruction sequence, which will always consist of lexical categories. Hence, V in I licenses null objects and VP ellipsis in BP. English allows VP ellipsis only when I is filled by a modal, auxiliary or copula verb (and it always directly c-commands the inaudible sequence). English does not have null objects because it does not have V to I movement, and thus I cannot license the V complement because it is not lexically filled.

In French, we can admit that V raises to I, but we cannot say there is a direct c-command because of the possible intervening adverbs.

To account for the change in BP for the null objects, I can draw from the work of Torres Morais (1997) and Ribeiro (1997) that claim that Portuguese of XVIth century was V2. - there were few null objects at that time, as we can see on the tables. The difference between EP and BP nowadays would be due to the difference in structure of TP in the two languages. In work in progress with Gabriela Matos, we have found that there are some VP ellipsis that are possible in BP and impossible in EP, such as:

(47) Eles estão a comer bolos na padaria, e nós também estamos a comer ___
   BP= bolos na padaria
   EP= *bolos na padaria
   √ intransitive comer

'They are eating cakes at the baker's, and we are also ___'

Moreover, there is a different position for the adverb também:
(48) \[ EP= \ \sqrt{A \ Joana \ tinha \ enviado \ livros \ para \ a \ editora \ e \ a \ Maria \ também \ tinha \ enviado \ __} \]
  'Joana had sent books to the publisher and Maria also had sent ___'
  *A Joana tinha enviado livros para a editora e a Maria tinha também enviado __.
  'Joana had sent books to the publisher and Maria had also sent ___'

BP= both are \sqrt

This work is now in progress.
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