

Review by Samara Almeida

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation? [max 250 words]*

Yes. The author proposes an analysis to account for the distribution of 3rd person object full pronouns concerning two questions: (1) why object full pronouns do not allow strict and sloppy readings regardless of animacy; and (2) why only [+animate] full pronouns can be focalized. The author assumes that the full pronouns in the Romance underwent a reanalysis based on the demonstratives and that the full pronouns in BP have a structure that prevents them from licensing strict/sloppy readings. As for the animacy distinction in focalization, she assumes that [+animate] full pronouns in BP are specified for [Person] and move out of vP to check that feature. They escape the relevant vP phase and become available for checking [focus] by a low Focus head.

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]*

Yes, it is (but see the comments in the next field). Animacy features seem to play a different role in the distribution of 3rd person objects (i.e. null vs full pronouns) in BP:

- (9) a. A Lia comprou o vestido depois de experimentar Ø. [-animate]
b. *A Lia chutou o rapaz depois de beijar Ø. [+animate]
- (10) a. A Lia comprou o vestido depois de experimentar ele. [-animate]
b. A Lia chutou o rapaz depois de beijar ele. [+animate]

In contrast to null objects, object full pronouns do not allow strict/sloppy readings:

- (11) Ontem o Ivo pôs o anel no cofre, mas Pedro guardou Ø/ele na gaveta.
Ø = Ivo/Pedro's ring (strict/sloppy readings)
Ele = Ivo's ring (only strict reading)

Only [+animate] full pronouns can be focalized and convey new information:

- (12) A: Quem você deixou em casa?
B: Ele/Ela. (=o Pedro/a Maria)
- (13) A: O que você deixou em casa?
B: *Ele/Ela. (=o livro/a revista)

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]*

Yes, it is. The author focuses on the syntax of 3rd person object full pronouns to account for the asymmetrical animacy features' role in obtaining ambiguous readings (strict /sloppy) and focalization. She argues against Galves' proposal of strong/weak object full pronouns in BP (based on the well-known tripartite division by Cardinaletti & Starke 1999). Following Manzini (2014), she defends that the syntactic properties of [+animate] pronouns are sufficient to explain the observed focus-related differences. Furthermore, following Giusti's (2015) proposal, she assumes that 3rd person object full pronouns in BP have a referential index (parallel to overt demonstratives), which are merged in a DP structure. According to her, object full pronouns in the language may include or not a [Person] feature, depending on their animacy specification. So, with regard to question (1), she attributes the unavailability of strict/sloppy readings to the fact that they are inherently indexical, hence they refer strictly to an antecedent as demonstratives do. As for question (2), she proposes that [+animate] full pronouns move up to a functional category below vP -InnAsp- to check their [Person] features, and then to FocP to check focus feature, whereas [-animate] ones are "trapped" inside InnAsp-phase.

The author's proposal is theoretically very well grounded and constitutes an original and important contribution to the understanding of the distribution of 3rd person objects -null and full pronouns. In particular, regarding the syntax of full pronouns. However, the reviewer's intuition does not coincide with the author's in some cases, which may favor null objects (production point of view), but not sound ungrammatical (comprehension point of view). Consider (9b') and (9b''):

(9) b'. A Lia chutou o rapaz depois que beijou / de ter beijado \emptyset .

b''. A Lia pegou o garoto e depois humilhou / enxotou / escorraçou \emptyset .

As for strict/sloppy readings, it seems that some examples lead to strict reading perhaps for pragmatic reasons, but it is possible. Consider (11'):

(11') O Ivo gastou o dinheiro / prêmio com viagem e o Pedro gastou ele com roupa.

On the claim that only [+animate] full pronouns can be focalized and convey new information, consider (13'):

[Context: A vendedora está com um vestido e uma saia na mão e pergunta para a cliente indecisa, quem só poderá levar um item.]

A: O que você vai levar?

B: Ele / Ela.

In sum, the author's proposal is well grounded if we assume the paradigm is constructed according to her intuition. Otherwise, there would be an empirical problem. Some questions arise: (i) would there be more than one grammar? If so, (ii) what could be the locus of microvariation? Or (iii) would the "counterexamples" provided presuppose other underlying structures?

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.*

The only observation to be made is that Ordóñez and Ruas are mentioned in the text, but not in the references.

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]*

No, I have not seen it anywhere else.

If you accept the paper with minor revisions, please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

-