

Phase defectivity and the grammar of Brazilian Portuguese

Jairo Nunes

Universidade de São Paulo

Nantes Université, 27/9/23

. Roadmap:

- To present a set of syntactic properties that distinguish Brazilian Portuguese (BP) within Romance
- To argue that these apparently independent phenomena follow from phase defectivity in the grammar
- To suggest a rationale for why BP came to make pervasive use of defective phases

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.1. Loss of third person accusative clitics

(e.g. Omena 1978, Tarallo 1983, Duarte 1986, 1989, Galves 1987, 1989, 2001, Corrêa 1991, Cyrino 1993, 1997, Kato 1993, 2017, Nunes 1993, Kato, Cyrino and Corrêa 2009)

- (1) A Maria {me/te/*o/*a/*os/*as} viu ontem.
the Maria me/you/him/her/them-MASC/FEM saw yesterday
'Maria saw {me/you/*him/*her/*them} yesterday.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.2. Expansion of null object contexts

(e.g. Moreira da Silva 1983, Tarallo 1983, Duarte 1986, 1989, Galves 1989, 2001 Farrell 1990, Corrêa 1991, Kato 1993, 1994, 2003, Bianchi and Figueiredo Silva 1994, Cyrino 1993, 1997, 2016, 2019, 2020, Ferreira 2000, Kato and Raposo 2001, 2005, 2007, Cyrino and Lopes 2016, Cyrino and Matos 2016)

- (2) A pessoa [**island** que comprou \emptyset] está muito satisfeita. (BP/*EP)
the person that bought is very satisfied
'The person who bought it is very happy with it.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.3. Animacy restrictions on null objects

(e.g. see e.g. Bianchi and Figueiredo Silva 1994, Ferreira 2000)

- (3) a. [**Esse prato**]_i desapontou as pessoas [que tentaram ler \emptyset_i].
this book disappointed the people that tried read it
'This book disappointed the people who tried to read it.'
- b. ***[Essa atriz]**_i desapontou as pessoas [que tentaram cumprimentar \emptyset_i].
this actress disappointed the people that tried greet
'This actress disappointed the people who tried to greet her.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.4. Different pattern of placement for third person accusative clitics in formal/written registers

(e.g. Nunes 2015, 2019)

- (4)
- a. O João tinha [**me/*a** visto].
the João had me/her seen
 - a'. O João **a/*me** tinha visto.
the João her/me had seen
'João had seen me/her.'
 - b. O João vai contratá-**lo/***contratar-**te**.
the João goes hire-him/you
 - b'. O João vai [**te/*o** contratar].
the João goes you/him hire
'João is going to hire you/him.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.5. Loss of third person possessives

(e.g. Oliveira e Silva 1984, Perini 1985, Cerqueira 1993, 1996, Menuzzi 1996, 1999, Müller 1996, Negrão and Müller 1996, Floripi 2003, Rodrigues 2004, 2010, Avelar 2004, 2006, 2009, Barros 2006).

- (5) [O João]_i lavou o meu/nosso/seu_[2.SG]/***seu_{i/k}** carro.
the João washed the my/our/your/his/her car
'João washed my/our/your/*his/*her car'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.6. Restrictions on null possessives

(e.g. Floripi 2003, Rodrigues 2004, 2010, Floripi and Nunes 2009, Nunes 2018)

- (6) a. [O Pedro]_i ligou para [o irmão \emptyset]_i.
the Pedro called to the brother
'Pedro called his brother.'
- b. *[A médica d[o Pedro]_i] ligou para [o irmão \emptyset]_i.
the doctor of-the Pedro called to the brother
'[Pedro's doctor]_i called her_i/*his brother.'
- c. *[O suspeito]_i disse que o detetive interrogou [os amigos \emptyset]_i.
the suspect said that the detective interrogated the friends
'[The suspect]_i said that [the detective]_k interrogated his_{k/*i} friends.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.7. Loss of external possession constructions

(e.g. Barros 2006, Torres Morais and Salles 2016, Gonçalves and Miguel 2019, Nunes and Kato 2023)

(7) *O Pedro consertou o carro **ao** **João**.
the Pedro fixed the car to-the João
'Pedro fixed João's car.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.8. Loss of third person dative clitics

(e.g. Berlinck 1996, Salles 1997, Torres Morais 2007, Torres Morais and Berlinck 2007, Torres Morais and Salles 2010, Calindro 2015, 2020)

- (8) A Maria me/te/***lhe** deu um presente.
the Maria me/you/him gave a presente
'Maria gave me/you/*him a present.

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.9. Use of the locative preposition *em* 'in' with directional verbs

(e.g. Wiedemer 2013)

- (9) a. O João foi **no** mercado.
the João went in-the market
'João went to the market.'
- b. A Maria já chegou **em** casa.
the Maria already arrived in house
'Maria has already arrived home.'
- c. O Pedro veio **na** festa.
the Pedro came in-the party
'Pedro came to the party.'
- d. A Maria levou o filho **no** cinema hoje.
the Maria took the son in-the movies today
'Maria took her son to the movies today.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.10. Pervasive use of chopping relatives:

(e.g. Tarallo 1983, Kato 1993, Kenedy 2003, Lessa de Oliveira 2008, Kato and Nunes 2009, Medeiros Júnior 2014, Nunes and Kato 2023)

- (10) a. Eu conversei/competi ***(com)** aquele estudante.
I talked/competed with that student
- a'. O estudante [que eu conversei/competi \emptyset ontem] viajou.
the student that I talked/competed yesterday travelled
- b. Eu dei um presente ***(para)** um amigo.
I gave a present to a friend
- b'. O amigo [que eu dei um presente \emptyset] tinha me ajudado no trabalho.
the friend that I gave a present had me helped in-the job
- c. Eu confio ***(n)**aquele candidato.
I trust in-that candidate
- c'. O candidato [que eu mais confiava \emptyset] me decepcionou.
the candidate that I more trusted me disappointed

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.11. Loss/optionality of (nonargumental) reflexive clitics

(e.g. d'Albuquerque 1984, Galves 1987, Nunes 1995, Carvalho 2021)

- (11) a. Eu **(me)** lembrei que amanhã é feriado.
I REFL.1.SG remembered that tomorrow is holiday
'I remembered that tomorrow is a holiday.'
- b. O João **(se)** machucou.
the João REFL.3.SG hurt
'João got hurt.'
- c. Você **%(se)** arrependeu do que você fez?
you REFL.3.SG repented of-what you did
'Did you repent from what you did?'
- d. Eu **%(me)** magoei com o que você disse.
I REFL.1.SG hurt with what you said
'I got hurt with what you said.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.12. Loss of passive *se*:

(e.g. Naro 1976, Galves 1987, Nunes 1990, 1991, Martins and Nunes 2016)

- (12) a. *Comeram-**se** os bolos.
ate-PL SE the cakes
- b. *Os bolos comeram-**se**.
the cakes ate-PL-SE
'The cakes were eaten.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.13. Optionality of middle *se*:

(e.g. Galves 1987, Rodrigues 1998, Pacheco 2008, Carvalho 2016, 2019)

- (13) Esse material (**se**) lava fácil.
this material SE wash easy
'This material washes easily.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.14. “Detransitivization” of transitive verbs

(e.g. Galves 1987, Ciríaco and Caçado 2009, Caçado and Amaral 2010, Negrão and Viotti 2010, Amaral 2015)

- (14) a. A revista tá **xerocando**.
the magazine is xeroxing
‘The magazine is being xeroxed.’
- b. A casa ainda não **vendeu**.
the house still not sold
‘The house has not been sold yet.’
- c. A ponte **construiu** rápido.
the bridge built quick
‘The bridge was built quickly.’
- d. O caminhão já **carregou**.
the truck already loaded
‘The truck has already been loaded.’

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.15. Availability of “topic-subject” constructions

(e.g. Pontes 1987, Avelar and Galves 2011, Munhoz and Naves 2012, Andrade and Galves 2014, Kato and Ordóñez 2019, Kato and Duarte 2021, Nunes 2022, Nunes and Kato 2023)

- (15) a. Cabe muita coisa nessas gavetas.
fit.3SG many thing in-these drawers
- a'. [**Essas gavetas**]_i cabem muita coisa *t_i*.
these drawers fit-3**PL** many thing
'Many things can fit in these drawers.'
- b. Quebrou o ponteiro dos relógios.
broke.3SG the arm of-the watches
- b'. [**Os relógios**]_i quebraram o ponteiro *t_i*.
the watches broke-3**PL** the arm
'The arms of the watches broke.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.16. Use of bare singulars with countable nouns

(see e.g. Saraiva 1997, Schmitt and Munn 1999, Müller 2002, Müller and Oliveira 2004, Lopes 2005, Dobrovie-Sorin and Pires de Oliveira 2008, Ferreira 2010, Pires de Oliveira and Rothstein 2011, Cyrino and Espinal 2015, Menuzzi, Figueiredo Silva and Doetjes 2015).

- (16) O João nunca compra **livro usado**.
the João never buys book used
'João never buys used books.'

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.17. Agreement variation within DP

(e.g. Scherre 1988, 1994, Scherre e Naro 1998):

- (17) a. *Standard BP*: aqueles **s** carros **s** amarelos **s** amassados **s**
DEM-MASC-PL car-MASC-PL yellow-MASC-PL dented-MASC-PL
‘those dented yellow cars’
- b. *Nonstandard BP*: aqueles **s** carro amarelo amassado
DEM-MASC-PL car-MASC yellow-MASC dented-MASC

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.18. Different degrees of acceptability for null subjects

(e.g. Chao 1983, Moreira da Silva 1983, Negrão 1986, Galves 2001, Duarte 1995, Figueiredo Silva 1996, Kato 1999, Ferreira 2000, Modesto 2000, Barbosa, Duarte and Kato 2001, Rodrigues 2004, Holmberg, Nayudu, and Sheehan 2009, Petersen 2011, Saab 2016, Nunes 2020, Martins and Nunes 2021, Kato, Martins and Nunes 2023):

- (18)a. \checkmark [Quem que \emptyset devíamos contratar]? $\emptyset = nós \rightarrow \checkmark$
who that should-1.PL hire ‘we’
‘Who should we hire?’
- b. $??$ [O que que \emptyset tenho a ver com isso]? $\emptyset = eu \rightarrow ??$
what that have-1.SG to see with this ‘I’
‘What do I have to do with this?’
- c. $??$ [Quando que \emptyset vão viajar]? $\emptyset = vocês/eles/elas \rightarrow ??$
when that go.3.PL travel ‘you(PL)/they(MASC.FEM)’
‘When are {you(PL)/they} going to travel?’
- d. $*$ [Quando que \emptyset deve viajar]? $\emptyset = você/ele/ela/a gente \rightarrow *$
when that should-3.SG travel ‘you(SG)/he/she/we’
‘When are you(SG.)/we (*a gente*) supposed to travel?’
‘When is he/she supposed to travel?’

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.19. Restrictions on null subjects

(e.g. Chao 1983, Moreira da Silva 1983, Negrão 1986, Galves 2001, Duarte 1995, Figueiredo Silva 1996, Kato 1999, Ferreira 2000, Modesto 2000, Barbosa, Duarte and Kato 2001, Rodrigues 2004, Holmberg, Nayudu, and Sheehan 2009, Petersen 2011, Saab 2016, Nunes 2020, Martins and Nunes 2021, Kato, Martins and Nunes 2023):

(19)a. O João disse que [a Maria]_i acha [que \emptyset _i está grávida].

the João said that the Maria thinks that is pregnant

‘João said that Maria thinks that she is pregnant.’

b. *[A Maria]_i disse que o João acha [que \emptyset _i está grávida].

the Maria said that the João thinks that is pregnant

‘Maria_i said that João thinks she_i is pregnant.’

c. *O pai d[a Maria]_i acha [que \emptyset _i está grávida].

the father of-the Maria thinks that is pregnant

‘Maria’s father thinks that she is pregnant.’

d. *Eu_i encontrei o livro [que \emptyset _i perdi].

I found the book that lost.1SG

‘I found the book that I had lost’

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

1.20. Availability of hyper-raising

(e.g. Ferreira 2000, 2009, Duarte 2004, 2007, Martins e Nunes 2005, 2010, Nunes 2008, 2016, 2020)

- (20)a. [Os meninos]_i parecem **m** que **t_i estão** gostando bastante da nova escola.
the boys seem-PL that are liking a.lot of-the new school
‘The boys seem to be enjoying their new school.’
- b. [Esses professores]_i **são** difíceis de **t_i elogiarem** alguém.
these teachers are difficult of praise.PL someone
‘These teachers rarely praise someone.’
- c. [A vaca]_i parece que **t_i** foi pro brejo.
the cow seems that went to-the swamp
Idiomatic reading: ‘It seems that things went bad.’

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

- 1.1. Loss of third person accusative clitics
- 1.2. Expansion of null object contexts
- 1.3. Animacy restrictions on null objects
- 1.4. Different pattern of placement for third person accusative clitics in formal/written registers
- 1.5. Loss of third person possessives
- 1.6. Restrictions on null possessives
- 1.7. Loss of external possession constructions
- 1.8. Loss of third person dative clitics
- 1.9. Use of the locative preposition *em* 'in' with directional verbs
- 1.10. Pervasive use of chopping relatives
- 1.11. Loss/optionality of (nonargumental) reflexive clitics
- 1.12. Loss of passive *se*
- 1.13. Optionality of Middle *se*
- 1.14. “Detransitivization” of transitive verbs
- 1.15. Availability of “topic-subject” constructions
- 1.16. Use of bare singulars with countable nouns
- 1.17. Agreement variation within DP
- 1.18. Different degrees of acceptability for null subjects
- 1.19. Restrictions on null subjects
- 1.20. Availability of hyper-raising

1. Syntactic properties of (Colloquial) Brazilian Portuguese

- 1.1. Loss of third person accusative clitics
- 1.2. Expansion of null object contexts
- 1.3. Animacy restrictions on null objects
- 1.4. Different pattern of placement for third person accusative clitics in formal/written registers
- 1.5. Loss of third person possessives
- 1.6. Restrictions on null possessives
- 1.7. Loss of external possession constructions
- 1.8. Loss of third person dative clitics
- 1.9. Use of the locative preposition *em* 'in' with directional verbs
- 1.10. Pervasive use of chopping relatives
- 1.11. Loss/optionality of (nonargumental) reflexive clitics
- 1.12. Loss of passive *se*
- 1.13. Optionality of Middle *se*
- 1.14. “Detransitivization” of transitive verbs
- 1.15. Availability of “topic-subject” constructions
- 1.16. Use of bare singulars with countable nouns
- 1.17. Agreement variation within DP
- 1.18. Different degrees of acceptability for null subjects
- 1.19. Restrictions on null subjects
- 1.20. Availability of hyper-raising

Proposal:

All these properties follow from the general availability of defective phases in BP

2. Defectivity at the CP phase

. Consensus in the literature (e.g. Chao 1983, Moreira da Silva 1983, Negrão 1986, Galves 2001, Duarte 1995, Barbosa 1995, Figueiredo Silva 1996, Kato 1999, Ferreira 2000, Modesto 2000, Barbosa, Duarte, and Kato 2001, Rodrigues 2004, Martins and Nunes 2005, Nunes 2008, Holmberg, Nayudu, and Sheehan 2009, Petersen 2011, Saab 2016):

. Brazilian Portuguese is **not** a prototypical null subject language

2. Defectivity at the CP phase

. Ferreira (2000): A finite T head in BP may be ϕ -complete or ϕ -incomplete:

(21) a. O João disse que [ele $T_{\phi\text{-complete}}$ comprou um carro].
the João said that he bought a car
'João said that he bought a new car.'

b. O João disse que [t $T_{\phi\text{-incomplete}}$ comprou um carro].
↑ _____ |

(22) a. *O pai d[a **Maria**]_i acha [que t_i está grávida].
the father of-the Maria thinks that is pregnant

b. *[A **Maria**]_i disse que o **João** acha [que t_i está grávida].
the Maria said that the João thinks that is pregnant-FEM

c. ***Eu**_i encontrei o livro [_{island} que t_i perdi].
I found the book that lost.1SG
'I found the book that I had lost'

2. Defectivity at the CP phase

. Ferreira (2000): A finite T head in BP may be ϕ -complete or ϕ -incomplete:

. **Hyper-raising** (Ferreira 2000, 2009, Martins and Nunes 2005, 2010, Nunes 2008, 2020)

(23)a. [Os meninos]_i parecem [que $t_i T_{\phi\text{-incomplete}}$ estão gostando bastante da nova escola]
the boys seem-PL that are liking a.lot of-the new school

‘The boys seem to be enjoying their new school.’

b. [Esses professores]_i são difíceis de [$t_i T_{\phi\text{-incomplete}}$ elogiarem alguém]
these teachers are difficult of praise.PL someone

‘These teachers rarely praise someone.’

c. [A vaca]_i parece que [$t_i T_{\phi\text{-incomplete}}$ foi pro brejo]
the cow seems that went to-the swamp

Idiomatic reading: ‘It seems that things went bad.’

2. Defectivity at the CP phase

- . Ferreira (2000): A finite T head in BP may be ϕ -complete or ϕ -incomplete:
- . Question: How come the same finite form can be associated with a complete or incomplete ϕ -set?

- (24) a. O João disse que [ele $T_{\phi\text{-complete}}$ **comprou** um carro].
the João said that he bought a car
'João said that he bought a new car.'
- b. O João disse que [*t* $T_{\phi\text{-incomplete}}$ **comprou** um carro].
↑ _____|

2. Defectivity at the CP phase

- . Question: How come the same finite form can be associated with a complete or incomplete ϕ -set?
- . Nunes (2008, 2019): . C in BP may be associated with **person and number** or **just number**

2. Defectivity at the CP phase

. Nunes (2008, 2019):

(25) a. [P/N:1] ↔ {-mos};

b. [P/N:SG] → {-o} / INDIC.PRES ____
 → {-i} / INDIC.PERF.PAST ____

c. [N:PL] ↔ {-m};

d. ∅ elsewhere.

Ambiguity of T in Brazilian Portuguese

Nominative Pronouns	Agreement with a ϕ -complete T	Agreement with a ϕ -incomplete T	Output: <i>dançar</i> 'dance' indicative present
<i>eu</i>	[P: N:SG]	[N:SG]	<i>danço</i>
<i>você</i>	[P:u; N:u]	[N:u]	<i>dança</i>
<i>ele/ela</i>			
<i>a gente</i>			
<i>vocês</i>	[P:u; N:PL]	[N:PL]	<i>dançam</i>
<i>eles/elas</i>			
<i>nós</i>	[P: N:1]	*	<i>dançamos</i>

2. Defectivity at the CP phase

Ambiguity of T in Brazilian Portuguese

Nominative Pronouns	Agreement with a ϕ -complete T	Agreement with a ϕ -incomplete T	Output: <i>dançar</i> 'dance' indicative present
<i>nós</i>	[P.N:1]	*	<i>dançamos</i>

(26)a. \checkmark [Quem que \emptyset devíamos contratar]? $\emptyset = nós \rightarrow \checkmark$
who that should-1.PL hire 'we'
 'Who should we hire?'

b. ***Nós**_i parecemos [que t_i T elogiamos bastante os alunos]. $T_{[P;N]}: -mos; *movement$
we seem-1 that praise-1 a.lot the students $T_{[N]}: *-mos$
 'It seems that we praise the students a lot.'

3. Defectivity at the DP phase

. Agreement variation within DP

- (27) a. *Standard BP*: aqueles carros amarelos amassados
DEM-MASC-PL car-MASC-PL yellow-MASC-PL dented-MASC-PL
- b. *Nonstandard BP*: aqueles carro amarelo amassado

. Bare singulars with countable nouns: (28) O João nunca compra **livro usado**.
the João never buys book used
'João never buys used books.'

. Loss of third person possessives

- (29) [O João]_i lavou o meu/nosso/seu_[2.SG]/***seu_{i/k}** carro.
the João washed the my/our/your/his/her car

3. Defectivity at the DP phase

. Hypothesis: (The extended projection of) DP in BP may be ϕ -complete or ϕ -incomplete

(30) $[_{DP_2} D_2 \dots [_{NP} N DP_1]]$

. If DP_2 is ϕ -complete $\rightarrow DP_1$ may be assigned structural genitive Case by (a head of the extended projection of) D_2

. If DP_2 is ϕ -incomplete $\rightarrow DP_1$ cannot be assigned structural genitive Case by (a head of the extended projection of) D_2

. **Solution I \rightarrow A-movement**: $[\dots [_{DP_2} D_{\phi\text{-defective}} \dots [_{NP} N DP_1]]]$
 \uparrow _____ \downarrow A-movement

3. Defectivity at the DP phase

. **Solution I → A-movement:** [... [DP₂ D_{φ-defective} ... [NP N DP₁]]]
↑ _____ | A-movement

. Prediction: all things being equal, null possessors and embedded null subjects in BP should pattern alike

(31) (e.g. Floripi 2003, Rodrigues 2004, Floripi and Nunes 2009, Nunes 2018)

a. [O Pedro]_i ligou para [o irmão t_i].

↑ _____ |

b. *[A médica d[o Pedro]_i] ligou para [o irmão t_i].

↑ _____ * _____ |

c. *[O suspeito]_i disse que o detetive interrogou [os amigos t_i].

↑ _____ * _____ |

3. Defectivity at the DP phase

(30) $[_{DP_2} D_2 \dots [_{NP} N DP_1]]$

. If DP_2 is ϕ -incomplete $\rightarrow DP_1$ cannot be assigned structural genitive Case by (a head of the extended projection of) D_2

. **Solution II \rightarrow inherent Case:** $[\dots [_{DP_2} D_{\phi\text{-defective}} \dots [_{NP} N DP_1]]]$
| \uparrow inherent Case

(32) a. A Maria **{me/te}**_i segurou [a [mão **t_i**]] ‘Maria held {my/your} hand.’

| \uparrow inherent Case

b. *A Maria **lhe**_i segurou [a [mão **t_i**]]

b’. A Maria segurou a mão **{dele/dela}**. ‘Maria held {his/her} hand.’

| \uparrow inherent Case

4. Defectivity at the ν P phase

- . Loss of third person accusative clitics
- . Animacy restrictions on null objects
- . Loss of external possession constructions
- . Loss of third person dative clitics
- . Loss/optionality of (nonargumental) reflexive clitics
- . Loss of passive *se*
- . Optionality of Middle *se*

4. Defectivity at the ν P phase

- . Contrast between ϕ -deficient CP and DP phases, on the one hand, and ϕ -deficient ν P phases, on the other:

(33) [... [CP C_{defective} [TP **DP**₂ [T' T [ν P **t** [ν [ν P V **DP**₁]]]]]]]
↑ _____ |A-movement

(34) [... [DP₂ **D**_{defective} ... [NP N **DP**₁]]]
↑ _____ |A-movement

(35) [... [ν P **DP**₂ [ν P ν _{defective} [ν P V **DP**₁]]]]]
↑ _____ * _____ |A-movement

5. Inherent Case and Minimality

. Circumventing minimality through inherent Case

- (38) a. *[Mary_i seems to him_k [_{t_i} to like John_k]]
b. [Mary_i seems to him [_{t_i} to be nice]]
c. *[To him]_k seems _{t_k} [Mary to be nice]

- . Chomsky (1995): the experiencer receives inherent Case and *to* is a Case-marker
- . Nunes 2008, 2017, Nunes and Kato 2023: inherent Case renders a given element inert for purposes of A-movement, removing it from computations of Relativized Minimality.
- inherently Case-marked elements do not induce intervention effects for purposes of A-movement

5. Inherent Case and Minimality

. “Topic-subject” constructions (e.g. Nunes 2016, 2017, Nunes and Kato forthcoming)

(39) a. Cabe muita coisa **n**essas gavetas.
fits many thing in-these drawers

a'. [_{TP} expl T [_{vP} v [_{VP} [muita coisa] [cabe [_{DP} essas gavetas]]]]]

Caso inerente ↑ _____ || _____ ↑ **Caso inerente**

b. [essas gavetas] cabem **m** muita coisa
these drawers fit-3PL many thing

b'. [_{TP} [_{DP} **essas gavetas**]_i T [_{vP} v [_{VP} [muita coisa] cabem **t_i**]]]]]

Caso inerente ↑ _____ |

5. Inherent Case and Minimality

“Extralong” A-Movement (Nunes 2017):

(41) a. Diminuiu o tamanho da hélice do motor desses barcos.
diminished-3SG the size of-the fan of-the engine of-these boats
‘These boats had the size of the fans of their engine reduced.’

a’. [**Esses barcos**]_i diminuíram o tamanho da hélice do motor ***t_i***
these boats diminished-3PL the size of-the fan of-the engine

b. Cabe muita coisa na parte interna da lateral desses porta-malas.
fit-3SG many thing in-the part internal of-the lateral of-these car-trunks
‘Many things can fit on the side of the trunk of these cars.’

b’. [**Esses porta-malas**]_i cabem muita coisa na parte interna da lateral ***t_i***
these car-trunks fit-3PL many thing in-the part internal of-the lateral

5. Inherent Case and Minimality

“Extralong” mixed A-Movement (Nunes 2017):

(49) [**Esses porta-malas**]_i cabem muita coisa **na** parte interna **da** lateral **t_i**

[_{TP} [_{DP} **esses porta-malas**]_i T [_{vP} v [_{VP} [_{DP} muita coisa] cabem [_{DP} a parte interna [_{DP} a lateral **t_i**]]]]

inherent Case ↑ _____ | _____ ↑ inherent Case _____ ↑ inherent Case

Case

6. Interaction among Defective Phases

. $vP_{\text{defective}} + CP_{\text{defective}}$:

Nunes (2022)

(50) a. Os apartamentos acabaram **m** que não alugaram **m**.

the apartments finished-PL that not rented-PL

‘The apartments ended up not being rented.’

a'. [[os apartamentos] acabaram [_{CP} C_{defective} [_{TP} *t* [_T, T [_{vP} v_{defective} [_{VP} alugaram *t*]]]]]]]

b. Os caminhões parecem **m** que já carregaram **m**.

the trucks seem-PL that already loaded-PL

‘It seems that the trucks have already been loaded.’

b'. [[os caminhões] parecem [_{CP} C_{defective} [_{TP} *t* [_T, T [_{vP} v_{defective} [_{VP} carregaram *t*]]]]]]]

6. Interaction among Defective Phases

. $DP_{\text{defective}} + CP_{\text{defective}}$.

Nunes (2016):

- (51) a. Os relógios **parecem** que **quebraram** o ponteiro
the watches seem-PL that broke-PL the arm
'It seems that the arms of the watches got broken.'

- b. [**os relógios**] **parecem** [$_{CP\text{-defectivo}}$ que [$_{TP}$ t [$_T$ T [$_{vP}$ v [$_{VP}$ quebraram [$_{DP\text{-defectivo}}$ o ponteiro t]]]]]]
|_____↑inherent Case

7. Why do BP phases exhibit generalized defectivity?

- Nunes (2019, 2020, Martins and Nunes 2021, Kato, Martins and Nunes 2023):
Phase defectivity at the DP level in BP affected the morphological specifications of its pronominal system

Morphological specifications for person and number and verbal agreement in Portuguese
(Kato, Martins, and Nunes forthcoming)

	EP	BP	Surface form of <i>dançar</i> ‘dance’ (INDIC.PRES)
Nominative Pronouns	pronoun specification	pronoun specification	
<i>tu</i> ‘you(SG)’	[P.N:2.SG]		<i>danças</i>
<i>eu</i> ‘I’	[P.N:1.SG]	[P.N:SG]	<i>danço</i>
<i>nós</i> ‘we’	[P.N:1.PL]	[P.N:1]	<i>dançamos</i>
<i>você</i> ‘you(SG)’	[P:2; N:SG]	[P; N]	<i>dança</i>
<i>ele/ela</i> ‘he/she’	[P:3; N:SG]		
<i>a gente</i> ‘we’	[P.N]	[P.N]	
<i>vocês</i> ‘you(PL)’	[P:2; N:PL]	[P; N:PL]	<i>dançam</i>
<i>eles/elas</i> ‘they’	[P:3; N:PL]		

7. Why do BP phases exhibit generalized defectivity?

Morphological specifications for person and number and verbal agreement in Portuguese
(Kato, Martins, and Nunes forthcoming)

	EP	BP	Surface form of <i>dançar</i> ‘dance’ (INDIC.PRES)
Nominative Pronouns	pronoun specification	pronoun specification	
<i>tu</i> ‘you(SG)’	[P.N:2.SG]		<i>danças</i>
<i>eu</i> ‘I’	[P.N:1.SG]	[P.N:SG]	<i>danço</i>
<i>nós</i> ‘we’	[P.N:1.PL]	[P.N:1]	<i>dançamos</i>
<i>você</i> ‘you(SG)’	[P:2; N:SG]	[P; N]	<i>dança</i>
<i>ele/ela</i> ‘he/she’	[P:3; N:SG]		
<i>a gente</i> ‘we’	[P.N]	[P.N]	
<i>vocês</i> ‘you(PL)’	[P:2; N:PL]	[P; N:PL]	<i>dançam</i>
<i>eles/elas</i> ‘they’	[P:3; N:PL]		

Speculation: ϕ -feature agreement for purposes of Case-valuation need not require a fully specified phase head if the agreeing DP/pronoun has a underspecified set of ϕ -features

7. Why do BP phases exhibit generalized defectivity?

Generalized **pronominal ϕ -feature underspecification** → Generalized **phasal defectivity**

defective CP phases

- . restrictions on null subjects
- . hyper-raising
- . finite control

defective vP phases

- . *3rd CL_{ACC/DAT}
- . *null object_[hum]
- . ≠ placement for 3rd CL_{ACC}
- . *external *poss*-constructions
- . (CL_{REFL})
- . (middle *se*)
- . *passive *se*
- . detransitivization
- . general resort to inherent Case

- . chopping relatives
- . *em* with directional verbs

defective DP phases

- . agreement variation
- . bare singulars
- . *3rd person possessives
- . restrictions on null possessives
- . general resort to inherent Case

- . “topic-subject” constructions
- . “extralong” A-movement

MERCI BEAUCOUP!

BRIGADÃO!