

SUBJECT DOUBLING IN BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RESUMPTIVE PRONOUNS*DUPLICAÇÃO DO SUJEITO NO PORTUGUÊS BRASILEIRO: UMA ANÁLISE DOS PRONOMES RESUMPTIVOS**Letícia Emília Krieck¹**Sandra Quarezemin²**Vitor Hochsprung³***ABSTRACT**

This paper investigates some specific syntactic, prosodic, and morphological properties of subjects and pronouns in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) subject doubling (SD) constructions. The study demonstrates that neither the subject nor the pronoun exhibits uniform behavior within this construction. Adopting the “one feature, one head” principle (Kayne, 2005), this research argues that the subject may occupy positions in both the CP domain, as a topic, and the TP domain, as a grammatical subject. Furthermore, based on the grammatical properties of pronouns, this study posits that pronouns in BP SD can function either as strong or weak forms, aligning with the analysis of Cardinaletti and Starke (1994). The hypothesis is that strong pronouns can occupy Spec,TopP (Rizzi, 1997) or Spec,SubjP (Cardinaletti, 2004), similar to the subject, whereas weak pronouns, by contrast, occupy Spec,TP.

KEYWORDS: Brazilian Portuguese. Subject. Pronoun. Doubling. Cartographic syntax.

RESUMO

Este artigo apresenta algumas propriedades sintáticas, prosódicas e morfológicas do sujeito e do pronome nas sentenças de duplicação do sujeito (DS) do português brasileiro (PB), a fim de sugerir as posições estruturais desses elementos. A investigação aponta que nem o sujeito, nem o pronome se comportam uniformemente nessa estrutura. Com base no princípio “um traço, um núcleo” (Kayne, 2005), esta investigação propõe que o sujeito pode aparecer tanto no domínio CP, como um tópico, quanto no domínio TP, como um sujeito gramatical. Este estudo defende, baseado nas propriedades gramaticais dos pronomes, que eles podem se comportar como formas fortes ou fracas na DS do PB, seguindo a análise de Cardinaletti e Starke (1994). Nossa hipótese é que pronomes fortes podem ocupar Spec,TopP (Rizzi, 1997) ou Spec,SubjP (Cardinaletti, 2004), assim como o sujeito, enquanto pronomes fracos, diferentemente, ocupam Spec,TP.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Português brasileiro. Sujeito. Pronome. Duplicação. Sintaxe cartográfica.

¹ PhD student in the Graduate Program in Linguistics at Federal University of Santa Catarina. CAPES Fellowship, leticiaakrieck@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4392-4193>.

² Professor in the Graduate Program in Linguistics at Federal University of Santa Catarina. CNPq Fellowship, Grant n. 316375/2021-7, sandra@cce.ufsc.br, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8570-5389>.

³ PhD student in the Graduate Program in Linguistics at Federal University of Santa Catarina. CNPq Fellowship, hochsvitor@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3772-266X>.

1. Introduction

There is no consensus regarding the syntax of Brazilian Portuguese (BP) subject doubling (SD) sentences. On the one hand, some research categorizes these sentences as instances of left-dislocated structures, involving subject topicalization. On the other hand, other studies propose an analysis that excludes left dislocation, positing that the subject occupies an argument position, i.e., it is not interpreted as a topic.

Recent studies suggest that an accurate analysis of the structural aspects of SD sentences must account for the properties of their resumptive pronouns. Building on the analyses of Quarezemin (2019, 2020) and Krieck (2022), this paper investigates the behavior of resumptive pronouns in sentences exhibiting doubling. Furthermore, a series of tests is presented to classify the pronoun within the tripartite framework proposed by Cardinaletti and Starke (1994, henceforth C&S). Determining the pronoun's status will clarify the position it occupies within SD structures. The initial hypothesis is that BP SD sentences do not feature the same pronoun type across all cases, unlike what is observed in English and Spanish varieties, for example.

As previously noted by Silva (2006) and Quarezemin (2019, 2020), at least two configurations can be identified in SD sentences: (i) both the subject and the pronoun occupy an A-position; (ii) the subject is left-dislocated, while the pronoun occupies an A-position, constituting a case of subject topicalization. Furthermore, SD may occur either in main or embedded clauses, as observed by Duarte (2000).

- (1) a. A Clarinha ela cozinha que é uma maravilha.
the Clarinha she cooks that is a wonder
'Clarinha cooks pretty well.'
- b. Eu acho que um trabalho sério ele teria que começar por aí.
I think that a job serious it have that start for there
'I think a serious job should start like this.'
- c. Você, no Canadá, você pode ser o que quiser.
you in.the Canada you can be what want
'In Canada, you can be whatever you want.'

(Duarte, 2000, p. 28)

The data also indicate that SD can occur either with (1c) or without (1a, b) intervening material between the subject and the resumptive pronoun. Therefore, it is essential to examine whether the resumptive pronoun behaves consistently in the presence or absence of an intervening XP. According to current analyses, when SD occurs with intervening material, the subject behaves as a topic in CP, and the pronoun occupies Spec,TP, as shown in (2b), derived from (2a). This analysis is supported by Duarte (1993, 1995, 2000), Britto (1998), Kato (1999), Duarte and Kato (2008), Vasco (2006), and

Orsini and Vasco (2007). In the absence of intervening material, the pronoun is considered deficient, occupying an A-position, as illustrated in (2c). This proposal has been developed by Costa, Duarte, and Silva (2004), Costa (2010, 2011), Silva (2006), Kato and Duarte (2014), and Kato (2015)⁴.

- (2) a. O menino ele joga futebol.
 the boy he plays soccer
 ‘The boy plays football’
 b. [_{CP} O menino [_{TP} ele
 c. [_{TP} O menino [_T ele

According to Quarezemin (2019, 2020), analyses that consider SD solely as a case of left dislocation (similar to what occurs in French) fail to distinguish between structures involving a strong pronoun and those with a deficient pronoun. Furthermore, such analyses do not differentiate structures with a dislocated object, as in all cases both the object and the subject are placed in the left periphery of the sentence (within the CP domain), while the pronoun occupies an A-position. The author argues that SD should not be exclusively regarded as a topicalization strategy, given that it occurs even in contexts where topics are not permitted, such as in typical out-of-the-blue focus contexts⁵.

In this study, we will demonstrate that an analysis grounded in the cartographic approach (cf. Rizzi (1997, 2005) and Cardinaletti (2004)) effectively accounts for cases where, for example, a topicalized subject appears alongside an SD structure, as illustrated in (3):

- (3) O João, esse cara ele não ajuda em nada.
 the João this guy he not help in nothing
 ‘John, that guy, he doesn’t help at all.’

In addition to such cases, Krieck (2022)⁶ observed instances in BP corpus data where SD is followed by intervening material and another pronoun⁷, as exemplified in (4).

⁴ It is worth noting that the researchers of the second group recognize that left dislocation can occur in SD sentences. What differentiates the two groups of sources is that, for the second group, the SD construction does not always involve a marked topic.

⁵ We will see this empirical fact in subsection 3.2 on weak pronouns.

⁶ Krieck (2022) analyzed a speech data corpus of 550 sentences collected through observation on the virtual platform YouTube (under copyright).

⁷ According to Quarezemin and Ordóñez (2024, manuscript in preparation), data like (4) reinforce their proposal that SD can form a unit and move together. However, unlike in Spanish and Italian, the stripping does not occur in Brazilian Portuguese.

- (4) a. Observe que um espectador ele, ao que parece, ele está sendo moldado.
 observe that a viewer he to what seems he is being molded
 ‘Observe that some viewer apparently is being influenced.’
- b. O fast-food ele, em algum momento, ele termina com a ideia da comensalidade
 the fast-food it in some moment it ends with the idea of the commensality
 ‘At some moment, fast-food loses the commensality idea.’

(Krieck, 2022, p. 72-76)

Krieck (2022) also identified occurrences of SD with quantified DPs, as shown in (5), although no examples of bare quantifiers in SD have been recorded – a fact likely related to a discourse constraint (cf. Rizzi (1997)).

- (5) Todos os atos da administração pública eles possuem princípios que o regem.
 all the acts of the administration public they have principles that it rule
 ‘All the acts of public management have principles that rule them.’

(Krieck, 2022, p. 69)

According to the author, the second-person pronoun does not behave in the same way as the third-person one, with the latter being more prevalent in BP SD. Pilati, Naves, and Salles (2017) note a tendency to fill the subject position with lexicalized referential elements. Furthermore, the occurrence of locative subjects with third-person agreement appears to provide evidence that the BP pronominal system treats third-person features differently from those of the first and second persons.

This paper focuses on the behavior of resumptive pronouns. Our aim is to explore certain grammatical aspects that may provide insights into their hierarchy and positions in Brazilian Portuguese, following the Cartographic methodology. We analyze syntactic, morphological, and interpretative aspects of SD based on the corpus presented in Krieck (2022).

The paper is organized into four sections. The first section presents the theoretical background of SD and is divided into two parts: (i) an overview of grammatical properties assumed by analyses that associate SD with topicalization, and (ii) a discussion of studies that relate SD to the TP domain without involving subject left dislocation. The second section examines the cartographic analysis, focusing on the different positions occupied by the subject in SD. Evidence for two types of pronouns in SD is presented in the third section, which begins with a discussion of strong pronouns and introduces empirical data supporting our analysis of them. Subsequently, we highlight evidence indicating that when the subject is not left-dislocated, weak pronouns are involved, requiring a distinct analysis.

2. Theoretical background of subject doubling in Brazilian Portuguese

In this section, we provide an overview and discussion of how studies on the subject syntax have conceptualized SD constructions. Accordingly, the section is divided into two parts. First, we discuss the interpretation of SD structures as instances of topicalization in the CP domain. Next, we present analyses that highlight SD as an occurrence in the TP domain, distinct from the first scenario.

2.1. SD as a case of topicalization, in the CP domain

The SD phenomenon occurs frequently in both main and embedded clauses in spoken BP. Pontes (1987) analyzed SD constructions as instances of topicalization, specifically left dislocation, where the subject is positioned in the CP domain and resumed in the comment clause by a personal pronoun. The author notes that these constructions are characterized by a pause (which may sometimes be absent) between the subject and the pronoun, as well as the [+definite] value of the topicalized element, as illustrated in (6) below:

- (6) a. Eu acho que esses dois casos do português, eles...
 I think that these two cases of the Portuguese they
 ‘I think that these two cases in Portuguese, they...’

(Pontes, 1987, p. 78)

- b. [_{CP} esses dois casos do português [_{TP} eles]]

According to Duarte (2000), who builds on Pontes’ analysis, these instances involve only the left dislocation of the subject DP. Later, Duarte and Soares da Silva (2016) argue that BP has been undergoing a process of syntactic change affecting [-human] referents, characterized by a significant increase in left-dislocated subjects. The authors observe that SD can occur in both main and embedded clauses, that the dislocated element may or may not be adjacent to the resumptive pronoun, and that these constructions are not restricted by the semantic features of the referent, as shown in sentences like (7).

- (7) a. Eu acho que [o povo brasileiro]_i ele_i tem uma grave doença.
 I think that the people Brazilian it has a serious illness
 ‘I think the Brazilian people have a serious illness.’
 b. [O comércio]_i eu acho que ele_i é sábio.
 the commerce I think that it is wise
 ‘I think that the commerce is wise.’
 c. [Um apartamento com um banheiro só]_i ele_i já vale menos.
 a flat with one restroom only it already worth less
 ‘A flat with just one bathroom is already worth less.’

(Duarte; Soares da Silva, 2016, p. 19-20)

Duarte (1995) claims that the doubling of a pronoun by another, as illustrated in (8a) and (8b), necessarily involves a strong pronoun resumed by a weak one, often homophonous. Furthermore, according to the author's proposal for these items in SD constructions, the strong pronoun is a topic, while the weak one occupies a position in the middlefield. Some languages may also opt for an empty category instead of the weak pronoun, as illustrated in (8a') and (8b').

- (8) a. Eu, eu sinto demais isso, né?
 I I feel too.much this right
 'I feel it too much, right?'
 a'. Eu, *pro* sinto demais isso, né?
 I feel too.much this right
 'I feel it too much, right?'
 b. Você, quando viaja, *cê*⁸ passa a ser turista.
 you when travel you become to be tourist
 'When you travel, you become a tourist.'
 b'. Você, quando viaja, você passa a ser turista.
 you when travel you become to be tourist
 'When you travel, you become a tourist.'

(Duarte, 1995, p. 138)

According to Britto (1998), BP employs a weak pronoun in place of an empty category. This contrasts with European Portuguese (EP), which features rich morphology expressing person features in Agr; as a result, [+referential] *pro* is projected in Spec,IP in EP. Consequently, the author argues that the structure with a preverbal subject in EP and SD in BP is the same: in both languages, subject DPs occupy a left-dislocated position. In this respect, BP resembles French, which also uses a weak pronoun in Spec,IP in SD contexts.

The author proposes the structures below, where subject DPs necessarily occupy a position higher than the IP domain in French (9a), BP (9b), and EP (9c). The difference lies in the fact that, while the first two systems feature a full pronoun realized in the IP domain, the latter exhibits an empty form that resumes the left-dislocated XP:

- (9) a. [_{XP} Pierre [_{IP} *il*_i [_{I'} aime_j la musique [_{VP} *t*_i *t*_j]]]] (French dislocation)
 Pierre he loves the music
 'Pierre loves music.'
 b. [_{XP} O Pedro [_{IP} *ele*_i [_{I'} adora_j música [_{VP} *t*_i *t*_j]]]] (BP dislocation)
 the Pedro he loves music
 'Pedro loves music.'

⁸ The pronoun *cê* corresponds to the reduced form of the pronoun *você* (you).

- c. [_{XP} Pedro [_{IP} *pro_i [_{I'} adora_j música [_{VP} t_i t_j]]]] (EP SV)
 Pedro loves music
 ‘Pedro loves music.’*

(Britto, 1998, p. 88)

Galves (2001) analyzed SD sentences with third-person pronouns, drawing on Moreira da Silva’s (1983) proposal referred to as the “reminder strategy”. According to this perspective, SD instances always involve subject topicalization, with a reminder pronoun occupying the subject position. The author considered this construction as a displacement of the subject DP to a topic position, with the resumptive pronouns functioning independently.

Departing from the analyses mentioned above, Pires (2007) posits that the subject may sometimes remain within the sentential domain, in Spec,TP, and at other times be left-dislocated, in Spec,TopP. The author highlights that the subject occupies the topic position, while the resumptive pronoun resides in the sentential domain. Such sentences become ungrammatical when the referential relation between the topic and the pronoun is disrupted in some way, as illustrated in (11):

- (10) a. [_{TopP} Ele e ela, [_{TP} eles querem visitar o Rio]]
 he and she they want visit the Rio
 ‘He and she want to visit Rio.’
 b. [_{TopP} [O Paulo e a Silvia]_i, [_{TP} [ele e ela/ os benditos]_i querem visitar o Rio]
 the Paulo and the Silvia he and she the blessed want visit the Rio
 ‘Paul and Silvia, he and she/the blessed ones want to visit Rio.’
 (11) * [_{TopP} [Ele e ela]_i, [_{TP} [o Paulo e a Silvia]_i querem visitar o Rio]
 he and she the Paulo and the Silvia want visit the Rio
 ‘He and she, Paul and Silvia want to visit Rio.’

(Pires, 2007, p. 123)

According to the author, it is possible to disrupt the adjacency between the DP and the pronoun with adverbs or adverbial expressions, as in (12).

- (12) A Julia, hoje cedo ela saiu.
 the Julia today early she left
 ‘Julia left early today.’

(Pires, 2007, p. 129)

Pires (2007) further argues that, like other topicalized structures, SD is marginal in out-of-the-blue contexts, as shown in (13).

(13) Q: O que aconteceu?

what happened

‘What happened?’

A: O Paulo me deu um anel de noivado no parque

the Paulo me gave a ring of engagement in.the park

Paul gave me an engagement ring in the park.’

A’:??O Paulo, ele me deu um anel de noivado no parque

the Paulo he me gave a ring of engagement in.the park

‘Paul gave me an engagement ring in the park.’

(Pires, 2007, p. 130)

For Rizzi (1997), questions like “what happened?” are appropriate in a wide focus context. However, the answer in (13A’) includes an intonational pause between the subject DP and the third-person pronoun, suggesting that the subject is left-dislocated. Indeed, if the break signals a topic constituent, the sentence becomes an unsuitable response to the question⁹.

Below, we will discuss studies that do not treat SD as obligatorily involving a dislocated subject or as a topicalization strategy in BP. As we will see, analyses that assume preverbal SD to be a case of left dislocation (as in French) fail to differentiate between structures containing a strong pronoun and those with a weak pronoun, which frequently appear in BP preverbal SD constructions. Similarly, these analyses do not distinguish between structures with a topicalized object and those with SD, as both cases place the object and the subject in a left-peripheral position, while the pronoun occupies an argument position.

2.2. SD in TP domain

Costa, Duarte, and Silva (2004) present a contrastive analysis of BP SD sentences. According to the study, the parallelism between French and BP SD constructions – previously suggested by Duarte (1995) as having the same structure – does not hold. Drawing on De Cat’s (2002, 2005) contributions, the authors provide several arguments demonstrating that SD in French necessarily involves left dislocation, as evidenced by the following: (i) it is not possible with quantified subjects; (ii) it cannot occur without an intonational break; (iii) in both acquisition and adult grammar, it is grammatical

⁹ It is worth noting that doubling sentences were classified by Pires (2007) as marginal rather than ill-formed. According to Quarezemin (2020), subject doubling is possible in “what happened?” contexts. To investigate how BP speakers evaluate SD data in different contexts, such as those collected by Krieck (2022), Quarezemin (2022) conducted a linguistic experimental study. A questionnaire was designed using Google Forms, which was completed by 120 adult speakers aged between 18 and over 40 years, representing all regions of Brazil. The form included 22 target contexts and 15 distractor contexts, all interspersed, and was also answered by 5 graduate students in Linguistics as a control group. The findings revealed the possibility of subject doubling in broad focus contexts. These results will be discussed in the next section (data (22)).

only when the initial constituent is interpreted as a topic; (iv) it can be interrupted by intervening XPs; (v) it allows bare nouns as topics; and (vi) it occurs frequently across all discourse persons. In contrast, the situation in BP is markedly different regarding these criteria; for instance, SD with quantified subjects is possible, as shown in (14).

- (14) a. Cada criança, ela leva seu livro para a escola.
 each child she takes her book to the school
 ‘Each child takes their own book to school.’

(Costa; Duarte; Silva, 2004, p. 143)

- b. Note que cada projeto ele necessita de pessoas que atuam em diferentes áreas
 observe that each project it needs of people who operate in different areas
 ‘Note that each project needs people who work in different areas.’

(Krieck, 2022, appendix)

According to the topic properties outlined by Rizzi (1997), quantifiers cannot be topicalized because topics are not quantificational, unlike focus. Another property distinguishing BP from French is that the prosodic pause between the initial position and the resumptive pronoun is neither obligatory nor uncommon, as previously noted by Pontes (1987):

- (15) Pedro ele telefonou faz horas.
 Pedro he called makes hours
 ‘Pedro called hours ago.’

(Costa; Duarte; Silva, 2004, p. 140)

Silva (2006) further observes that BP SDs are governed by the A-principle, as shown in (16), providing evidence that the subject and the resumptive pronoun occupy A-positions.

- (16) a. As mulheres_i elas_i usaram todas_i os brincos umas das outras_i.
 the women they wore all the earrings one of the others
 ‘The women all wore each other’s earrings.’
 b. Os meninos_i eles_i brigaram uns com os outros_i.
 the boys they fought ones with the others
 ‘The boys fought with each other.’

(Silva, 2006, p. 195-196)

Building on this analysis, Quarezemin (2019) identifies the possibility of extraction as another syntactic property that challenges the classification of SD as merely a case of left dislocation:

- (17) a. Onde o Pedro acha que a Ana ela encontrou o João?
 where the Pedro thinks that the Ana she met the João
 ‘Where does Peter think Ana met John?’
- b. *Onde o Pedro acha que o João a Ana ela encontrou?
 where the Pedro thinks that the João the Ana she met
 ‘Where does Peter think that John Ana met?’

(Quarezemin, 2020, p. 126)

In sentence (17b), relativized minimality effects (RM) (Rizzi, 1990) are violated because the object *o Pedro* is dislocated, blocking the movement of the Wh-phrase over it. In contrast, in (17a), the extraction of *onde* does not lead to ungrammaticality, as the subject *a Ana* occupies an A-position. Moreover, Costa, Duarte, and Silva (2004) argue that SD with a quantified subject is possible in BP (cf. data in (14)) because the pronoun does not share the referential properties of the subject, unlike in French, as illustrated in (18) below.

- (18) *Chaque enfant, il apporte son livre à l’ école.
 each child he takes his book to the school
 ‘Each child takes his own book to school.’

(Costa, 2010, p. 131)

The Northern Italian Dialects (NIDs), unlike French, permit clitic pronouns with quantified subjects:

- (19) a. Nessuno gl’ ha detto nulla. (Fiorentino)
 nobody he has said anything
- a’. Nisun l’ ha dit niente. (Trentino)
 nobody he has said nothing
 ‘Nobody said nothing.’
- (20) a. Tutto gl’è successo di notte. (Fiorentino)
 everything it has happened at night
- a’. Tut l’è capita de not. (Trentino)
 everything it has happened at night
 ‘Everything happened at night.’

(Silva, 2006, p. 193-194)

In BP, by contrast, the resumption of a bare universal quantifier, without a lexical constraint, is not possible. The nature of the pronominal element may underlie this distinction. NIDs exhibit

a subject clitic system, whereas BP does not. Kato and Duarte (2014) sought to compare the weak subject pronouns in BP to clitic pronouns. According to their analysis, the distinction between BP and consistent pro-drop languages lies in the type of adjunction to T: in BP, the pronoun co-occurs with the inflected verb, whereas in pro-drop languages, it would function as a suffix. However, Kriek's (2022) data, such as (21), suggest that adjunction of the pronoun to T is not always possible due to the potential presence of adverbs.

- (21) a. A astronomia oriental ela também já identificava astros e órbitas.
 the astronomy oriental it also already identify stars and orbits
 'The oriental astronomy also already identified stars and orbits.'
- b. O núcleo ele ainda vai ser dividido em núcleo interno e externo.
 the nucleus it still will be divided in nucleus internal and external
 'The nucleus will still be divided into an internal and an external nucleus.'

(Kriek, 2022, appendix)

Further evidence supporting SD without topicalization is presented by Quarezemin (2019, 2020, 2022). The author demonstrates that SD is possible in out-of-the-blue contexts, whereas topics do not occur in such contexts (cf. (22c)), contrasting with the analysis of Pires (2007).

- (22) a. O que aconteceu?
 what happened
 'What happened?'
- b. A Ana ela comprou um carro.
 the Ana she bought a car
 'Ana bought a car.'
- c. # Um carro, a Ana comprou ele.
 a car the Ana bought it

(Quarezemin, 2020, p. 126)

According to the author, if the subject were left-dislocated, (22b) would be ill-formed. In this case, the preverbal subject appears to occupy the same domain as the pronoun, in an A-position. Therefore, the literature provides consistent evidence to support the claim that SD does not always involve the topicalization of the subject DP, even though displacement may be possible in BP.

In the following section, we will present different positions for the subject, focusing on the cartographic approach that underpins our proposal in this study. We argue that the subject can also occupy a specific position within the TP domain.

3. Cartographic proposals and subject doubling sentences

Cartographic studies on subject positions suggest a division within the inflectional domain, where subject positions are determined by distinct features. These features include the nominative Case feature/EPP on one hand and a predication feature on the other. Cardinaletti (1997, 2004) proposes that preverbal subjects are defined by the property of being the “Subject of Predication”. Consequently, XPs that do not check phi-features and Case can occupy the preverbal subject position, as illustrated by the Italian data below.

- (23) a. A Gianni è piaciuto il regalo.
to Gianni is pleased the gift
‘Gianni pleased the gift.’
- b. Su Gianni è caduta una grande disgrazia.
on Gianni is fallen a big misfortune
‘A big misfortune is fallen on Gianni.’
- c. La causa della rivolta sono Gianni e Maria.
the cause of the revolt are Gianni and Maria
‘The cause of the revolt is Gianni and Maria.’

(Cardinaletti, 2004, p. 125)

Following this approach, the middlefield is composed of independent projections [SubjP... AgrSP... TP] (see Cardinaletti (1997, 2004), Rizzi (2005), and Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007)). This analysis differentiates the grammatical subject, defined by morphosyntactic criteria, from the subject of predication, with this information being encoded in distinct functional projections. The first projection is responsible for checking phi-features, while the second one is dedicated to checking the subject-of-predication feature, the latter not being restricted to DPs¹⁰.

Regarding subject movement, Rizzi (2015) explores two hypotheses: (i) the standard hypothesis, which argues that movement is motivated by Case requirements, emphasizing the interface with morphology; and (ii) the alternative hypothesis, which suggests that the subject position possesses discourse properties (quasi-topicality) and that external systems require events to be expressed in the subject-predicate form (Rothstein, 1983), thus highlighting the relevance of the interface with semantics as a motivator of movement.

According to Rizzi (2015, 2018), the subject clitics in NIDs can visibly instantiate the Subj head:

¹⁰ According to the cartographic approach, the preverbal subject may also occupy a position within the CP domain when functioning as a topic or as a contrastive/corrective focus (cf. Quarezemin, 2009).

- (24) El fio el mangia l' pom. (Milanese)
 the boy SCL eats the apple
 'The boy eats the apple.'

(Poletto, 2000, p. 142)

Quarezemin (2019, 2020) postulates that both pronouns and subjects can appear in the TP domain in BP SD. The author demonstrates that a precise analysis of resumptive pronouns reveals two distinct structures: topicalized DPs are doubled by strong pronouns, whereas subject DPs necessarily involve a deficient pronoun, which may assume the status of a subject clitic, as proposed by Rizzi for Northern Italian Dialects (NIDs). These deficient pronouns lexicalize the Subj head, as shown in (25a). In cases where the subject is left-dislocated, the pronoun occupies Spec,SubjP, as illustrated in the structure in (25b).

- (25) a. $[_{SubjP} DP_i [_{Subj} pron [_{TP} t_i [_{T'} V (...)]]]]$
 b. $[_{TopP} DP [_{SubjP} pron_i [_{Subj} [_{TP} t_i [_{T'} V (...)]]]]]]$

(adapted from Quarezemin (2020, p. 127))

The evidence presented by Quarezemin (2020) for classifying the pronoun as a subject clitic lies in its dependence on the subject DP rather than on the verb. While the insertion of adverbs between the doubling DP and the verb is possible, separating the subject DP and the pronoun in SD without topicalization results in an ungrammatical sentence. This contrasts with the behavior of clitic accusative pronouns, which are directly attached to the finite verb.

Krieck (2022), also adopting the cartographic approach, highlights an aspect that supports analyses favoring the presence of SD within the argument domain. According to the hierarchy proposed by Rizzi and Bocci (2017), building on Rizzi (2004) for the CP domain of embedded clauses, topics cannot appear lower than embedded Wh-expressions:

- (26) $[_{ForceP} [_{TopP*} [_{IntP} [_{TopP*} [_{FocP} [_{TopP*} [_{ModP} [_{TopP*} [_{QembP} [_{FinP} \dots]]]]]]]]]]]]]$

(Rizzi; Bocci, 2017, p. 9)

Q-embedded interrogative phrases are generated in a low position within the left periphery hierarchy, specifically in QembP, which is higher than FinP but necessarily lower than foci and sentential topics. Consequently, topics are expected to precede embedded interrogative expressions. The influence of SD in this context is evident: when SD follows the Q-embedded expression without any intervening elements, the sentence is well-formed, as shown in (27). This also applies when the subject DP occupies a position above QembP (i.e., a topic position), as illustrated in (28).

- (27) Eu fico me perguntando que coisa (que) o Bruno ele cozinhou pra Carla.
 I stay me asking what thing that the Bruno he cooked to.the Carla
 'I keep wondering what Bruno cooked for Carla.'

- (28) Eu fico me perguntando, o Bruno, que coisa (que) ele cozinhou pra Carla.
 I stay me asking the Bruno what thing that he cooked to.the Carla
 ‘I keep wondering what Bruno cooked for Carla.’

However, the intervention of an XP between the subject DP and the resumptive pronoun below QembP is not permissible, as there is no available position to host this constituent.

- (29) *Eu fico me perguntando que coisa (que) o Bruno, pra Carla, ele cozinhou.
 I stay me asking what thing that the Bruno to.the Carla he cooked
 ‘I am wondering what thing Bruno to Carla cooked.’

(Kriek, 2022, p. 79)

In (29), the PP *pra Carla* is dislocated above the interrogative expression; however, according to the hierarchical structure in (26), this configuration is not permitted. Additionally, there is a violation of the RM (see the discussion in example (17b)). The grammaticality of (27) demonstrates that the DP *o Bruno* does not occupy a left-dislocated position, but instead resides within the argument domain of the sentence, as does the adjacent resumptive pronoun.

The cartographic analysis is also adopted by Cyrino (2021), who suggests that the subject can appear in Spec,SubjP or Spec,TP, depending on its grammatical status. Spec,SubjP is dedicated to referential subjects, while Spec,TP is the position for weak ones. In the context of SD constructions, a “big DP” analysis is assumed. First, the big DP moves to Spec,TP, where the phi-features and Case of the weak pronoun are checked. Subsequently, the DP moves independently to Spec,SubjP. As a result, the structure of sentence (30) is represented by (31):

- (30) O diretor ele investiu na bolsa
 the director he invested in.the stock exchange
 ‘The director invested in the stock exchange.’

- (31) [_{SubjP} [O diretor_i] [_{TP} ele_i investiu na bolsa [... [VP t_i tVfin]]]]

(Cyrino, 2021, p. 402)

The analyses presented in this section address the properties of the subject DP in SD constructions. These proposals do not account for the specific features of the pronoun when SD occurs. Therefore, the next section discusses the properties of the resumptive pronoun found in SD constructions in BP.

4. The behavior of pronouns in BP subject doubling

It is crucial to examine the distinct properties associated with the pronoun in BP SD sentences. This raises several questions: does its behavior remain consistent across the range of SD sentences? What are its associated grammatical properties? Based on these properties, could there be one or multiple positions for the pronoun? If so, what might this(these) position(s) be?

At this point, it is essential to emphasize that the assumptions of cartography lead to a significant implication, grounded in the ‘one feature, one head’ principle: elements bearing a specific *x* feature will occupy a hierarchical position aligned with that feature, distinct from projections that attract items with a given *y* feature. When applied to pronouns, it is crucial to consider that if they exhibit uniform behavior in SD sentences, a single position should suffice for them. Conversely, if their properties lack regularity, it becomes necessary to posit more than one head to accommodate their distribution.

At this stage, we extend the analysis developed in the preceding section, where we demonstrated that subjects in BP sometimes behave as topics – occupying Spec,TopP – and at other times as subjects – allocated to Spec,SubjP. Additionally, we consider the postulates proposed by C&S regarding the pronominal class across natural languages. Broadly speaking, this analysis posits the existence of two classes of pronouns, strong and deficient, which differ based on a set of grammatical features. Summarizing the generalizations proposed by the authors, we adopt the following postulates, which are central to this study: only strong pronouns can (i) be coordinated, (ii) carry categorical modifiers, and (iii) occupy positions within the peripheral domain, as will be explored in the next section.

4.1. Strong pronouns: left-dislocated subject

First, we examine coordinated pronouns, which, according to C&S’s bipartition, can only be strong. In BP SD sentences, these forms can occur acceptably as resumptive pronouns. This is evident in (32), where coordinated pronouns are possible under certain conditions: when adjacency between these elements and the subject is disrupted by an intonational pause (32a) – represented in this analysis by a comma – or by intervening XPs (32b). Additionally, such forms appear to be permissible in anacoluthon topic constructions (32c).

- (32) a. O Carlos e a Ana, ele e ela vão casar no sábado.
 the Carlos and the Ana he and she will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘Carlos and Ana, they are getting married on Saturday.’
- b. O Carlos e a Ana, pelo que eu sei, ele e ela vão casar no sábado
 the Carlos and the Ana by.what I know he and she will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘Carlos and Ana, as far as I know, are getting married on Saturday.’
- c. O casal, ele e ela vão casar no sábado.
 the couple he and she will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘The couple, both of them, are getting married on Saturday.’

However, if the break in adjacency between these two elements is not observed, and topic intonation is absent, the sentence becomes ill-formed, as illustrated in (33).

- (33) a. *O Carlos e a Ana ele e ela vão casar no sábado.
 the Carlos and the Ana he and she will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘Carlos and Ana they are getting married on Saturday.’
- b. *O casal ele e ela vão casar no sábado.
 the couple he and she will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘The couple both of them are getting married on Saturday.’

The contrast observed between (32) and (33) allows us to propose, at least in part, that strong pronouns are admissible as resumptive in SD sentences only when the subject is topicalized. On the other hand, strong pronouns appear to be disallowed in the absence of left dislocation.

However, a comprehensive assessment of the validity of this assertion is still required. We now examine the categorical modification of the resumptive item, which, like coordination, is only compatible with strong pronouns. From these observations, we identify a consistent pattern regarding coordinated pronouns: adverb-modified forms are permissible when the subject occupies an A-bar position, as shown in (34). In contrast, when the subject occupies an A-position, the sentence becomes sensitive to the occurrence of such forms, resulting in ungrammaticality, as illustrated in (35).

- (34) a. O Carlos, só ele vai casar no sábado.
 the Carlos only he will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘Carlos, he’s the only one getting married on Saturday.’
- b. O Carlos, pelo que eu sei, só ele vai casar no sábado.
 the Carlos by.what I know only he will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘Carlos, as far as I know, he’s the only one getting married on Saturday.’
- c. O casal, só eles vão casar no sábado.
 the couple only they will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘The couple, they’re the only ones getting married on Saturday’
- (35) *O Carlos e a Ana só eles vão casar no sábado
 the Carlos and the Ana only they will marry on.the Saturday
 ‘Carlos and Ana, only they’re getting married on Saturday.’

These tests provide evidence for SD in BP, leading us to consider the following points: (i) strong pronouns are licit as resumptive forms, as confirmed by the possibility of coordination and categorical modification (c-modification) of these items; (ii) however, this possibility appears to be acceptable only in the context of subject DP topicalization, given the impossibility of removing the adjacency break between this constituent and the strong pronoun. According to C&S’s proposal, we might posit that the resumptive pronouns in (32) and (34) – contexts in which the subject DPs are in

an X-bar position – must occupy a Spec position in the left periphery. We will revisit this assumption later, in line with the refinement of C&S’s theory.

SD with coordinated pronouns can appear in embedded clauses, as shown in (36a), but in a fixed order; the embedded Wh-phrase cannot cross over the DP, as demonstrated in (36b).

- (36) a. Eu quero saber [_{TopP} o Carlos e a Ana [_{QembP} pra quem [_{SubjP} ele e ela deram
I want know the Carlos and the Ana to who he and she gave
o livro.
the book
- b. *Eu quero saber [_{QembP} pra quem [_{TopP} o Carlos e a Ana [_{SubjP} ele e ela
I want know to who the Carlos and the Ana he and she
deram o livro.
gave the book
‘I want to know who Carlos and Ana gave the book to.’

Unlike cases where the pronoun is weak, as in the data (27-29) above, we now have the strong pronoun in the highest position of the TP domain. Therefore, the topicalized DP *o Carlos e a Ana* cannot appear below the embedded Wh-phrase, as in (36b), because this would violate RM (Rizzi, 1990).

The evidence presented in this section allows us to propose that strong forms do not occur when the subject is in the A-domain, i.e., in Spec,SubjP. We suggest that this impossibility arises precisely because these two elements are in complementary distribution. In other words, non-topicalized subject DPs occupy the same position relative to strong pronouns. Consequently, sentences such as (33) and (35) are not licit: in these cases, while there is no evidence that the subject DPs are left-dislocated, their respective resumptive pronouns, despite being in coordination and c-modification, cannot be categorized as deficient.

Following Cyrino (2021), we assume that, in these sentences, a big DP is selected by the verb. The first movement occurs to Spec,TP, where the splitting takes place, and the DP moves to a topic position in the left periphery. Subsequently, the pronoun moves to Spec,SubjP, satisfying the subject criterion (Rizzi; Shlonsky, 2007). This proposal is illustrated in (37), derived from (32a):

- (37) [_{TopP} O Carlos e a Ana]_i [_{SubjP} ele e ela]_i [_{TP} t_i [_{VP} t_i ...

At this point, this analysis is partially aligned with the positions assumed in Costa, Duarte, and Silva (2004) and Quarezemin (2019, 2020), as outlined in section 2. As with these proposals, we argue that SD in BP does not necessarily entail left dislocation of the subject DP, although this remains possible. In the next section, we will show that the weak pronoun is restricted to a low argument position. Additionally, only the deficient class is allowed to (i) have [-animate] referents and (ii) undergo morphophonological reduction.

4.2. Weak pronoun: subject in A-domain

The focus now shifts to the deficient pronouns. For this inquiry, we will first consider their exclusive reference to [-animate] entities. The central question at this stage is whether the behavior of these items is compatible with that observed for the strong pronouns. Data from Kriek's (2022) corpus indicate that these forms are more productive with subjects in A-position, as in (38). In the corpus, there were few occurrences in which the adjacency between a [-animate] subject and the pronoun was broken, as in (39).

(38) A tristeza ela faz parte da vida.

the sadness she makes part of.the life

'Sadness is part of life.'

(39) O talco, por exemplo, ele é facilmente riscado com a unha.

the talcum for example it is easily scratched with the nail

'Talcum, for example, is easily scratched with the fingernail.'

(Kriek, 2022, p. 118)

When we apply the coordination test to [-animate] DPs, we find that they cannot be coordinated or modified by adverbs, as shown in (40) and (41), respectively. According to C&S, only strong pronouns can appear in these contexts, which are incompatible with [-animate] DPs.

(40) *O talco e a poeira, por exemplo, ele e ela são facilmente riscados com a unha

the talcum and the dust for example it and it are easily scratched with the nail

'Talcum and dust, for example, are easily scratched with the fingernail.'

(41) ??A tristeza, só ela faz parte da vida.

the sadness only she makes part of.the life

'Only sadness is part of life.'

If the pronouns in sentences (38) and (39) were strong, sentences (40) and (41) would be well-formed. The distinctions observed in pronouns referencing [-animate] entities serve to reinforce the conclusions drawn for subjects in section 2. No deviation should be observed in BP SD sentences if such a construction invariably occurred with the subject appearing as a topic. Thus, this differentiation provides additional evidence supporting the conclusion that the left dislocation of this DP, although possible, is not obligatory, as it can satisfactorily occupy a position in the A-domain.

We thus reaffirm the disassociation between the position adopted in this analysis and those in analyses such as Pontes (1987), Duarte (2000), Duarte and Soares da Silva (2016), Britto (1998), Galves (2001), and Pires (2007), which argue that SD in BP is essentially a case of subject DP left dislocation. The tests involving the resumptive pronoun, in addition to enabling inferences about its

status, suggest that the subject can occupy a position in the middlefield structure in SD – assumed here to be Spec,SubjP, according to the cartographic approach.

Returning to the case of deficient pronouns, we can also consider the use of reduced pronoun forms, which, according to C&S's typology, are exclusively deficient. Kato and Duarte (2014) demonstrate that BP has a highly productive paradigm of reduced pronouns, as shown in (42):

(42) 1SG EU	[ô]	'I'	2PL VOCÊS	[ceis]	'you'
2SG VOCÊ	[cê]	'you'	3PL ELES	[eis]	'they'
3SG ELE	[ei]	'he'			

(Kato; Duarte, 2014, p. 16)

These pronouns can function as resumptive elements in SD. This is the case for the second-person singular pronoun *cê*, which occurs in such sentences, whether adjacent to the subject or not, as shown in (43) and (44) below:

- (43) Você *cê* não fala pra ele o que *lhe* contei.
 you you not tell to he what to.you told
 'You don't tell him what I told you.'

(Costa; Duarte; Silva, 2004, p. 141)

- (44) Você, quando viaja, *cê* passa a ser turista.
 you when travel you become to be tourist
 'When you travel you become a tourist.'

(Duarte, 1995, p. 138)

Considering the test applied above with [-animate] pronouns (cf. (40) and (41)), it is consistent to claim that deficient pronouns occur successfully in such a structure, regardless of whether the subject is dislocated. This behavior aligns with that of weak pronouns, which do not require a topicalization context. However, data presented by Quarezemin (2020) warrant a careful analysis of this issue. As shown in (45), the absence of adjacency between the subject and the third-person pronoun renders the sentence unacceptable.

- (45) a. Ele *ei* sempre trabalha até tarde.
 he he always works until late
 'He always works until late.'
- b. *Ele sempre *ei* trabalha até tarde.
 he always he works until late
 'He always works until late.'

(Quarezemin, 2020, p. 119)

Indeed, this inconsistency highlights a distinction between second- and third-person pronouns. This raises two questions: what factors account for the difference in grammaticality judgments in (45)? Why does the broken adjacency in (45b) render the sentence ill-formed, while in (44) it does not?

At this point, a refinement of C&S's approach to pronominal class becomes essential. In addressing the particularities that characterize pronouns across languages, the authors note that the bipartition between strong and deficient pronouns does not fully capture their complexity. It is proposed, therefore, that since they exhibit divergent behaviors, deficient pronouns should be further subdivided into weak and clitic categories. Some distinguishing aspects of these categories are: (i) clitic pronouns are heads, thus occupying X^0 , while weak pronouns, like strong ones, are constituents that occupy Spec,X; and (ii) only weak pronouns can carry lexical accent.

Therefore, the central issue now is to determine how the reduced pronouns in (42) behave within the deficient class. First, we address the grammatical features of the second-person pronominal form *cê*. The literature on this form (see Coelho (1999), Barbosa (2005), Perez (2006), and Petersen (2008)) demonstrates its significant productivity in contexts where clitics are not viable, a fact that aligns its behavior with that of a weak pronoun, according to C&S's proposal. Barbosa (2005) supports this point with evidence such as the following: (i) the clitic is dependent on the accent of another word, which occurs with the enclitic pronoun *se*, but not with *cê* (cf. (46)); and (ii) a clitic cannot be replaced, whereas this restriction does not apply to *cê* (cf. (47)).

- (46) a. Foi -se o culpado de tudo.
 went-imp.pron the guilty of everything
 'The one responsible for everything is gone.'
- b. Foi *cê* o culpado de tudo.
 was you the guilty of everything
 'It was you the guilty of everything.'

(Barbosa, 2005, p. 97)

- (47) a. Duas horas e *cê* só falou isso agora!
 two hours and you only said this now
 'Two hours, and you only said that now!'
- a'. Duas horas e tu só falou isso agora!
 two hours and you only said this now
 'Two hours, and you only said that now!'

(Barbosa, 2005, p. 108)

However, the author emphasizes the restricted occurrence of this form in contexts where only pronouns of the strong class, such as c-modification and coordination, are permitted. Perez (2006) observes that this form in these contexts is limited and significantly marked, possibly indicating

a gradual shift of this form toward the behavior of BP second-person pronouns like *você* and *tu*, i.e., strong forms. Based on this observation, it is reasonable to consider that *cê* is a weak pronoun, particularly when taking C&S's tripartition into account.

Extending the label of weak to this form implies the unavoidable necessity for it to occupy a specific Spec position in the structure. Applied to SD sentences, this accounts for why the second reduced form can be in adjacency with that constituent or not. Consequently, XP(s) can intervene between two elements without compromising the acceptability of the sentence. Nevertheless, we adopt Cardinaletti's (2004) approach, assuming that weak forms, lacking the same autonomy of the strong ones, are unable to occupy the hierarchically higher projection SubjP. Instead, they must be situated in the lower position, in Spec,TP.

$$(48) \text{ } [_{\text{SubjP}} \text{ você } [_{\text{TP}} \text{ cê } [_{\text{VP}} \text{ t}_i \dots]]]$$

The same treatment cannot be applied to the reduced third-person pronoun *ei*, as shown in (45), since the break in adjacency between the subject and this type of reduced pronoun renders the sentence ungrammatical. This observation highlights the inconsistent behavior among these reduced forms, preventing their homogeneous categorization. Unlike *cê*, it appears that the reduced pronoun *ei* forms a constituent with the subject DP, as proposed by Quarezemin and Ordóñez (2024, manuscript in preparation).

In this study, we follow the authors, who adapted the Poletto's (2008, p. 48) analysis and assume that the weak third-person pronoun occupies the K head, while the subject DP moves to the KP specifier, after KP phrase checks nominative case, as shown in (49a). The final step is the movement of the KP constituent to the SubjP position, as in (49b).

$$(49) \text{ a. } [_{\text{SubjP}} \dots [_{\text{Nomp}} [_{\text{KP}} \text{ DP}_i [_{\text{K}^\circ} \text{ ele }] [_{\text{VP}} \text{ t}_i \dots]]]]]$$

$$\text{ b. } [_{\text{SubjP}} [_{\text{KP}} \text{ DP}_i [_{\text{K}^\circ} \text{ ele }]]] [_{\text{Nomp}} \text{ t}_j [_{\text{VP}} \text{ t}_i \dots]]]$$

Our analysis differs from that of Quarezemin (2019, 2020), who proposed that the reduced pronoun *ei* behaves like the Italian subject clitic *el*. The author followed Rizzi's (2015, 2018) analyses and assumed that the *ei* form would be the realization of the Subj head. However, we do not have sufficient evidence to maintain this analysis, as BP does not have a productive subject clitic system. The tests applied by Quarezemin and Ordóñez (2024) provide evidence that SD with third-person pronouns forms a unit, and these pronouns cannot be separated. Thus, it is possible to classify the third-person pronoun in SD as a type of clitic, but it is not a subject clitic, as in Italian.

In summary, this section has argued in favor of treating the SD pronouns in BP as weak when the subject is not left-dislocated, in accordance with the grammatical features they exhibit. We outlined a cartographic proposal based on the 'one feature, one head' principle, explaining how this framework contributes to and efficiently accounts for the structural aspects of these sentences in their wide variety. Given that BP can have both strong and weak pronouns in SD sentences, this approach

maintains that there must be two positions capable of hosting them, each of which is necessarily compatible with the grammatical features of these items.

5. Conclusions

This paper presented a formal analysis of SD structures in BP, focusing on the behavior of the pronoun in such construction. We examined several properties of these constituents to propose a structural arrangement of these sentences based on Cartography guidelines. Our proposal suggests that both subject DP and resumptive pronoun exhibit distinct behaviors across different types of SD, with certain grammatical patterns highlighting the hierarchical relationship between them.

This study identifies two possible positions for the subject DP in SD constructions: either within the IP domain, in Spec,SubjP, or within the CP domain, in Spec,TopP. Evidence supporting the first possibility includes: (i) the viability of SD sentences in out-of-the-blue contexts; (ii) the grammaticality of SD sentences in the absence of intervening material between the subject and the resumptive pronoun; (iii) the fact that a subset of SD sentences does not feature a pause between the subject and the pronoun, aligning with the topic contour property (Rizzi, 1997); and (iv) the occurrence of SD in embedded interrogative sentences. Conversely, the subject can be left-dislocated in Spec,TopP when intervening material appears between the subject and the pronoun, or when a marked pause separates them.

Regarding the behavior of pronouns in SD sentences, this proposal suggests that they can be either strong or weak, depending on the grammatical features of the subject and the tests presented by C&S. Specifically, if the subject DP is in the A-domain, the pronoun is weak; conversely, if the subject is left-dislocated, the pronoun is necessarily strong. The weak pronoun can appear in Spec,TP (as observed by Cardinaletti, 2004) when it is the reduced second-person form *cê*, or in K head (as proposed by Quarezemin and Ordóñez (2024)), if it is the third-person form and forms an unit with the subject DP. The strong pronoun, on the other hand, occupies Spec,SubjP and is in complementary distribution with the subject. Therefore, in this case, the subject must be left-dislocated.

References

- BARBOSA, Liliane Pereira. *Estatuto da forma *cê*: clítico ou palavra?*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) – Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte, 2005.
- BARBOSA, Pilar; DUARTE, Maria Eugênia; KATO, Mary Aizawa. Null subjects in European and Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*, v. 4, n. 2, pp. 11-52, 2005. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/jpl.158>.
- BRITTO, Helena. *Deslocados à esquerda, resumptivo sujeito, ordem SV e a codificação sintática de juízos categórico e tético no Português do Brasil*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) – Universidade Estadual de Campinas. Campinas, 1998.
- CARDINALETTI, Anna. Toward a cartography of subject positions. In: RIZZI, Luigi. (ed.). *The structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. pp. 115-165.

CARDINALETTI, Anna. Subjects and clause structure. In: HAEGEMAN, Liliane. (ed.). *The New Comparative Syntax*. London: Longman, 1997. pp. 33-66.

CARDINALETTI, Anna.; STARKE, Michal. The typology of structural deficiency on the three grammatical classes. *Working paper in Linguistics*, v. 4, n. 2, pp. 41-109, 1994.

CHOMSKY, Noam. *Lectures on Government & Binding Theory*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1981.

CINQUE, Guglielmo. *Adverbs and functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

COELHO, Maria do Socorro Vieira. *Uma abordagem variacionista do uso de formas de tratamento no norte de Minas*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) – Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais. Belo Horizonte, 1999.

COSTA, João; DUARTE, Inês; SILVA, Claudia Roberta Tavares. Construções de redobro em português brasileiro. Sujeitos tópicos vs. soletração do traço de pessoa. *Revista Leitura*, v. 1, n. 33, pp. 135-145, 2004. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.28998/2317-9945.200433.135-145>.

COSTA, João. PB e PE: Orientação para o discurso importa?. *Estudos da Língua(gem) – Estados diacrônicos e sincrônicos da Língua Portuguesa*, v. 8, n. 1, pp. 123-143, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22481/el.v8i1.1117>.

COSTA, João. Topic prominence is not a factor of variation between Brazilian and European Portuguese. In: BERNIS, Janine; JACOBS, Haïke; SCHEER, Tobias. (eds.). *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory: Selected papers from ‘Going Romance’ Nice 2009*. John Benjamins, 2011. pp. 71-88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.3.05cos>.

CYRINO, Sônia. A “restrição do nome nu” e o Português Brasileiro. In: MARINS, Juliana Esposito; ORSINI, Mônica Tavares; CAVALCANTE, Silvia Regina de Oliveira. (eds.). *Contribuições à descrição e ao ensino do Português Brasileiro: da fonética ao discurso, com parada obrigatória na sintaxe – uma homenagem a Maria Eugênia Lammoglia Duarte*. Rio de Janeiro: Pimenta Cultural, 2021. pp. 384-406.

DE CAT, Cécile. *French dislocation*. 2002. Tese (Doutorado), University of York.

DE CAT, Cécile. French subject clitics are not agreement markers. *Língua*, v. 115, n. 9, pp. 1195-1219, 2005. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2004.02.002>.

DUARTE, Maria Eugenia Lammoglia. Do pronome nulo ao pronome pleno: a trajetória do sujeito no português do Brasil. In: ROBERTS, Ian; KATO, Mary (eds.). *Português Brasileiro: uma viagem diacrônica*. Campinas: UNICAMP, 1993. pp. 107-128.

DUARTE, Maria Eugenia Lammoglia. *A perda do princípio “evite pronome” no português brasileiro*. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem, Universidade Estadual de Campinas. Campinas, 1995.

DUARTE, Maria Eugenia Lammoglia. The loss of the “avoid pronoun” principle in Brazilian Portuguese. In: KATO, Mary; NEGRÃO, Esmeralda (eds.). *The Null Subject Parameter in Brazilian Portuguese*. Frankfurt/Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana, 2000. pp. 17-36.

DUARTE, Maria Eugenia Lammoglia; KATO, Mary. Mudança paramétrica e orientação para o discurso. *XXIV Encontro Nacional da APL (Comunicação)*, Braga: Universidade do Minho, 2018.

DUARTE, Maria Eugenia Lammoglia; SOARES DA SILVA, Humberto. Microparametric variation in Spanish and Portuguese: The null subject parameter and the role of the verb inflectional paradigm. In: KATO, Mary; ORDOÑEZ, Francisco (eds.). *The Morphosyntax of Portuguese and Spanish in Latin America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016. pp. 1-26.

GALVES, Charlotte. *Ensaio sobre as gramáticas do português*. Campinas: UNICAMP, 2001.

KATO, Mary. Strong and weak pronouns in the null subject parameter. *PROBUS*, v. 11, n. 1, pp. 1-38, 1999. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.1999.11.1.1>.

KATO, Mary; DUARTE, Maria Eugenia Lammoglia. Restrições na distribuição de sujeitos nulos no português brasileiro. *Veredas*, v. 18, n. 1, pp. 1-22, 2014.

KATO, Mary. Expletivos nulos e construções de tópico/sujeito no português brasileiro. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos*, v. 57, n. 1, pp. 7-21, 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20396/cel.v57i1.8641469>.

KAYNE, Richard. Pronouns and their antecedents. In: KAYNE, Richard (ed.). *Movement and silence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. pp. 105-135.

KRIECK, Letícia Emília. *As sentenças com duplicação do sujeito no português brasileiro: uma análise cartográfica*. 2022. Dissertação (Mestrado em Linguística) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Linguística, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2022.

MOREIRA DA SILVA, Samuel. *Etudes sur la symétrie et l'asymétrie sujet/objet dans le Portugais du Brésil*. 1983. Tese (Doutorado) – Université Paris 8, Paris, 1983.

ORSINI, Mônica Tavares; VASCO, Sérgio Leitão. Português do Brasil: língua de tópico e de sujeito. *Revista Diadorim*, n. 2, pp. 83-98, 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35520/diadorim.2007.v2n0a3852>.

PEREZ, Edenize Ponzo. *O uso de você, ocê e cê em Belo Horizonte: um estudo em tempo aparente e em tempo real*. 2006. Tese (Doutorado) – Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2006.

PETERSEN, Carol. A tripartição pronominal e o estatuto das proformas cê, ocê e você. *D.E.L.T.A.*, v. 24, n. 2, pp. 283-308, 2008. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-44502008000200005>.

PILATI, Eloisa; NAVES, Rozana; SALLES, Heloisa. On the syntax of subjects in Brazilian Portuguese. Using the “split” pronominal system as the basis for an alternative analysis. *Diadorim*, v. 19, pp. 99-137, 2017. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35520/diadorim.2017.v19n0a13579>.

PIRES, Acrísio. *The subject, it is here!:* the varying structural positions of preverbal subjects. *D.E.L.T.A.*, v. 23, pp. 113-146, 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-44502007000300008>.

POLETTI, Cecilia. *The higher functional field: evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

PONTES, Eunice. *O tópico no português brasileiro*. Campinas: Pontes Editores, 1987.

QUAREZEMIN, Sandra. *Estratégias de focalização do sujeito no Português Brasileiro*. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) – Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Florianópolis, 2009.

QUAREZEMIN, Sandra. Um novo olhar sobre as sentenças de redobro em Português Brasileiro. *Revista Anpoll*, v. 1, n. 48, pp. 52-63, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18309/anp.v1i48.1253>.

QUAREZEMIN, Sandra. Brazilian double subjects and the sentence structure. In: OLIVEIRA, Roberta Pires; EMNEL, Ina; QUAREZEMIN, Sandra. (eds.). *Brazilian Portuguese, Syntax and Semantics: 20 years of Núcleo de Estudos Gramaticais*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2020. pp. 107-134.

QUAREZEMIN, Sandra. *Doubling in Brazilian Portuguese: where is the subject?*. Paper presented at the Linguistics Seminar of Stony Brook University, New York, 2022.

QUAREZEMIN, Sandra; ORDÓÑEZ, Francisco. *Different types of subject doubling in Brazilian Portuguese*. Paper presented at the XIII Romania Nova workshop, Florianopolis, 2024.

RIZZI, Luigi. The fine structure of left periphery. In: HAEGEMAN, Liliane. (ed.). *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1997. pp. 281-337.

RIZZI, Luigi. On the position of int(errogative) in the Left Periphery of the clause. In: CINQUE, Guglielmo; SALVI, Giampaolo (eds.). *Current Studies in Italian Syntax*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001. pp. 287-296.

RIZZI, Luigi. On some properties of subjects and topics. In: BRUGÉ, Laura; GIUSTI, Giuliana; MUNARO, Nicola; SCHWIKERT, Walter; TURANO, Giuseppina. (eds.). *Proceedings of the XXX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*. Venezia: Cafoscarina, 2005. pp. 203-224.

RIZZI, Luigi. On the form of chains: Criterial positions and ECP effects. In: CHENG, Lisa Lai-Shen; CORVER, Norbert. (eds.). *On Wh-Movement*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 2006. pp. 97-133.

RIZZI, Luigi. Cartography, criterial and labeling. In: SHLONSKY, Ur. (ed.). *Beyond Functional Sequence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. pp. 314-338.

RIZZI, Luigi. Subjects, topics and the interpretation of pro. In: PETROSINO, Roberto; CERRONE, Pietro; VAN DER HULST, Harry. (eds.). *From sounds to structures: beyond the veil of Maya* [Studies in Generative Grammar, n. 135]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2018. pp. 510-529.

RIZZI, Luigi; BOCCI, Giuliano. Left periphery of the clause: primarily illustrated for Italian. In: EVERAERT, Martin; RIIEMSDIJK, Han Van (eds.). *The Wiley Blackwell*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2017.

RIZZI, Luigi; SHLONSKY, Ur. Strategies of subject extraction. In: GÄRTNER, Hans-Martin; SAUERLAND, Uli. (eds.). *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-semantics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007. pp. 115-160.

ROTHSTEIN, Susan Deborah. *The Syntactic Forms of Predication*. 1983. Ph.D thesis, MIT.

SILVA, Claudia Roberta Tavares. Duplicação de sujeitos pré-verbais no francês, no inglês e no português brasileiro: uma análise não-unificada. *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos*, v. 14, n. 2, pp. 185-210, 2006. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17851/2237-2083.14.2.185-210>.

VASCO, Sergio Leitão. *Construções de tópico na fala popular*. 2006. Ph.D thesis. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro - UFRJ / FL, 2006