

# What are ‘Pseudo-Relatives’?

Giorgio Graffi

## Abstract

There is no agreement among generative scholars about the extension of the class of the so-called pseudo-relative constructions. It is also standard practice/procedure to equate them with ‘predicative relatives’ of traditional and non-generative studies, but even such studies differ as far as the extension of such a class of relatives is concerned. Our proposal is to consider the ‘subject-object asymmetry’ as the distinguishing feature of pseudo-relatives: since this asymmetry is exceptionless only after verbs of perception, we conclude that this is the only context where pseudo-relatives constructions occur. We propose that such constructions form a ‘Larsonian shell’, where the antecedent is the subject and the pseudo-relative clause is the predicate.

KEYWORDS: generative grammar • ‘Larsonian shells’ • predication • pseudo-relatives • verbs of perception

## 1. Pseudo-relatives: ‘pseudo’ or ‘relatives’?

### 1.1 “Pseudo-relatives” and “predicative relatives”

To my knowledge, the term PSEUDO-RELATIVES dates back to Radford (1975), to denote constructions such as that introduced by *qui* in the French sentence (1), or by *che* in the (almost) structurally identical Italian sentence (2)<sup>1</sup>:

- |     |                      |              |              |            |               |
|-----|----------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| (1) | <i>J’ai</i>          | <i>vu</i>    | <i>Paul</i>  | <i>qui</i> | <i>fumait</i> |
|     | I have               | seen         | Paul         | who/that   | was smoking   |
|     | ‘I saw Paul smoking’ |              |              |            |               |
| (2) | <i>Ho</i>            | <i>visto</i> | <i>Paolo</i> | <i>che</i> | <i>fumava</i> |
|     | (I) have             | seen         | Paul         | who/that   | was smoking   |

One might immediately wonder why I have glossed the element *qui* (and, respectively, *che*) introducing the pseudo-relative in two alternative ways.<sup>2</sup> Actually, as will be seen below, there has been (and there still is) much debate concerning its nature: is it a relative pronoun (as traditional grammars of both French and Italian assume)? Alternatively, is it, in Italian, the same element (*che*) that introduces declarative clauses or, in French, an allomorph of it (*que*)? For the time being, I leave the question open; we will come back to it in §2.3 and in §3.1.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In many cases, the translations of the French and Italian examples are not grammatical English sentences: they only intend to make such examples intelligible.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, *that* is not even a possible option in this context, in English: I have introduced it only to stress the possibility of interpreting French *qui* and Italian *che* both as a pronoun and as a complementizer.

<sup>3</sup> In what follows, I will use the label PSEUDO-RELATIVE (henceforth: PR) to refer to the clause introduced by this element and the label PSEUDO-RELATIVE CONSTRUCTION (henceforth: PRC) to designate the sequence NP (or DP) + PR. I will also refer to the NP as the ANTECEDENT of the PR, so resorting to the same labelling as ‘authentic’ relative clauses: this does not imply, however, that I agree with the classifications of PRs as a kind of relative clause.

My aim is to discuss the extension of the class of PRs and their constituent structure. Namely, the questions that I will try to answer are: 1) which clauses show a set of shared features which allow us to treat them as a unitary class, whether these are called PRs or otherwise? 2) Are they only apparently relative clauses, as the prefix ‘pseudo’ suggests, or are they just a special kind of relative clause? Radford (1975) and others generative studies of the 1970s adopted the former position, but in the following decades it was stressed that PRCs also share some significant features with ‘authentic’ relatives (both appositive and restrictive). 3) A further question I intend to discuss concerns the *predicative* nature that is ascribed to PRCs by most scholars.<sup>4</sup> What does it mean and to which structure (or structures) does it correspond? As will be seen, these three questions are not unrelated to each other. My discussion will be limited to the two Romance languages I am most familiar with, namely Italian (my mother tongue) and French. I leave to further research the task of checking if my analysis can also be applied to other languages, within or outside the Romance group.

It is almost standard to state that PRs largely overlap with the clauses that several grammarians, working in traditional or in non-generative frameworks, call *propositions relatives attributs* (or *attributives*; remember that *attribut* means ‘predicate’ in French grammatical tradition).<sup>5</sup> This label (or an equivalent one) is still resorted to in most treatments of these constructions that lie outside the generative framework, and hence avoid the term ‘pseudo-relative’. I will investigate in the following sections to what extent the class of “predicative relatives” (or any other equivalent label) actually coincides with the generative one of PRs.

## 1.2 Main features of the pseudo-relative constructions

I will first quote some features which favor the treatment of PRs as a kind of clause that is essentially different from relative ones; then, one favoring instead their classification as a special kind of relatives. Two features that clearly oppose PRs to both restrictive and appositive relatives are 1) the possibility of cliticizing the antecedent and 2) the fact that the introductory element can only have a subject function (the so-called subject-object asymmetry). These are respectively exemplified by sentences (3)-(5) (feature 1) and (6a) vs (6b) (feature 2); examples are from Italian (French facts are identical, as can be easily checked by consulting works such as Radford 1975 or Kayne 1975: 126-129):

- (3) a. *Ho visto Gianni che usciva dal cinema* (pseudo-relative)  
 (I) have seen Gianni who/that was coming out from the cinema  
 ‘I saw Gianni coming out of the cinema’
- b. *L’ho visto che usciva dal cinema*  
 (I) him=have seen who/that was coming out from the cinema  
 ‘I saw him coming out of the cinema’
- (4) a. *Conosco le persone che abitano vicino a Gianni* (restrictive relative)  
 (I) know the people who live near to Gianni  
 ‘I know the people who live near Gianni’
- b. *\*Li conosco che abitano vicino a Gianni*  
 (I) them=know who live near to Gianni

<sup>4</sup> For example, a recent paper (Casalicchio in press) devoted to PRCs defines them as “a predicative construction found in all Romance languages except Romanian, as well as some other language groups like Slavic and Greek”.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Marouzeau (1961: s.v.), which lists German *Prädikat*, English *Predicate* and Italian *Predicato*, as equivalents of the French term *Attribut*.

- (5) a. *Conosco Gianni, che parla inglese* (appositive relative)  
 (I) know Gianni, who speaks English  
 b. \**Lo conosco, che parla inglese*  
 (I) him=know who speaks English
- (6) a. *Ho visto Gianni che picchiava suo padre*  
 (I) have seen Gianni who/that was beating his father  
 ‘I have seen Gianni beating his father’  
 b. \**Ho visto Gianni che suo padre picchiava*  
 (I) have seen Gianni whom his father was beating

Note that (6b) is wholly grammatical if it is pronounced with a pause between the antecedent *Gianni* and the following clause introduced by *che*: in this latter case, such a clause is interpreted as an appositive relative. This illustrates a further distinguishing feature of PRs: contrary to restrictive relatives, their antecedent can be a proper noun, but, contrary to appositive relatives, there is no pause between such antecedents and the following clause introduced by the *qui/che* element. Other distinguishing features commonly quoted are the impossibility for the introductory element to be of the form *lequel* (French) or *il quale* (Italian) and some restrictions on the verb of the clause, which cannot be stative and whose tense cannot be different from that of the governing verb.<sup>6</sup>

All such features are normally listed in the generative studies of PRCs from the earliest (Schwarze 1974; Radford 1975; Kayne 1975: 126-129) until the most recent ones (Casalicchio in press) and, with the exception of feature 2, also in non-generative or para-generative<sup>7</sup> treatments of the construction. Feature 1 is already recognized in some traditional treatments of PRCs: see, e.g., Tobler (1896: 56). Feature 2 is hinted at as a possibility in Polentz (1903: 6), but it is immediately rejected. Actually, only generative studies emphasize it. I think that its discovery is the real contribution of generative grammar to the study of PRs, since it was based on the “diagnosis of *wh*-movement” (see van Riemsdijk 1978) as the litmus test for distinguishing them from ‘authentic’ relatives. Since *wh*-movement can also move elements other than the subject, the latter kind of clause, but not the former, would be derived through it.

Let us now turn to the feature (call it feature 3) which both pseudo-relatives and ‘authentic’ relative clauses share. It consists in their islandhood and, in particular, in their sensitivity to the CNPC (Complex Noun Phrase Constraint) of Ross (1967). This feature was signaled by Graffi (1980) and by Kayne (1983 [1981])<sup>8</sup>, and by several other scholars as well. It can be exemplified by (7) for Italian and by (8) (from Kayne 1983: 97) for French:

- (7) \**Il libro che ho visto Gianni che leggeva*  
 The book which (I) have seen Gianni who/that was reading
- (8) \**Quelle fille l’as-tu rencontré qui embrassait?*  
 Which girl him=have you met who/that was kissing

<sup>6</sup> As shown in Rothenberg (1979: 73) and in Scarano (2002: ch. 3), this last feature has to be somewhat qualified; in the present paper, I will not deal with this problem.

<sup>7</sup> I will use this label to refer to works that, although taking into account some aspects of generative grammar, such as the notion of transformation, do not lie in the framework of what, pending a better term, I have called (Graffi 2001) the “Chomskian program”, and therefore are not involved in many of its typical issues, such as that of islandhood (see immediately below).

<sup>8</sup> When the date of the first appearance of a work and that of the version quoted here do not coincide, I put the former after the latter, within square brackets.

As can be seen from (9) and (10), the CNPC-sensitivity of PRCs wholly parallels that of relatives. (9) and (10) respectively derive from a structure underlying to *Conosco Gianni, che leggeva quel libro* and to *Je connais Jean, qui embrassait cette fille*:

- (9) \**Il libro che conosco Gianni, che leggeva*  
 The book which (I) know Gianni who was reading
- (10) \**Quelle fille connais-tu, Jean qui embrassait ?*  
 Which girl know-you Jean who was kissing

An adequate analysis of PRCs must therefore account for their simultaneous showing features 1, 2 and 3.<sup>9</sup> I will first review some previous proposals concerning the status of PRCs (§2), without any claim of completeness.<sup>10</sup> Then I will propose a new possible analysis of them (§3).

## 2. Previous analyses

### 2.1 The predicative nature of PRCs

The standard reference (see, a.o., Schwarze 1974; Graffi 1980: 117) for a class of predicative relatives (*relatives attributives*), distinct both from restrictive (*relatives determinatives*) and appositive (*relatives explicatives*) ones is Grevisse (1975: § 1011). Actually, this distinction is much older: predicative relatives as a specific category are already recognized by some 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century grammatical studies on French, e.g., Mätzner (1877: 54), Tobler (1884: 492; 1896: 62-66), Lücking (1889: 187), Polentz (1903) and Sandfeld (1936: 139-159); Sandfeld's analysis is explicitly extended to Italian by Herczeg (1959). For example, Lücking (loc. cit.) says that the relative clause is connected to its antecedent (*Beziehungswort*) attributively (without any comma), appositively (with a comma) or predicatively, "namely to the closer object of verbs of perception". Tobler and Polentz do not consider predicative relatives as a third class besides restrictive and appositive: they instead speak of a predicative *employment* of relative clauses (which is only appositive according to Tobler, both appositive and restrictive according to Polentz).<sup>11</sup> Tobler (1896: 55) offers one criterion for distinguishing this predicative use of relative clauses: the verb governing the antecedent of the relative clause "has one object" when the relative clause has an "adnominal" employment (i.e., it is a restrictive or an appositive one), while it "has two objects" (or a "double relationship") when the relative clause has a predicative employment. The first object is "the entity designated by the noun", the second "what is stated by the relative clause"; or, rather, the first object is such "insofar as it is involved in the second". Sandfeld considers the *propositions relatives dépendantes attributs* ('predicative dependent relative clauses') as an autonomous class, distinguished from free relatives (*relatives indépendantes*, 'independent relatives') on the one hand and from both restrictive and appositive relatives (*relatives adjointes*, 'adjunct relatives') on the other. The first two classes are "primaries", while the third is defined as "secondary" in Jespersen's (1924) sense (Sandfeld 1936: xv). Predicative relatives differ from independent relatives "since they have an antecedent", and from the other class of relatives "since they do not qualify their antecedent, but they are its predicate" (id.: 139).

We turn now to some para-generative studies. Rothenberg (1979) divides Sandfeld's *propositions relatives attributs* in two classes: *propositions relatives prédictives* and *propositions relatives attributives*. The two kinds of

<sup>9</sup> Of course, also other features of PRCs, such as those exemplified above, should be appropriately explained: the three features I am focusing on, however, seem to me to be the essential ones of such constructions, which no adequate analysis cannot avoid accounting for.

<sup>10</sup> In particular, I will not deal with such studies as those by Strudsholm (1998) or van der Auwera (1993), which lie in functional or in other non-generative frameworks, but I will limit myself to some traditional, generative and para-generative studies. For other reviews of past studies on PRCs, see a.o. Prebensen (1982), Casalicchio (2013: Chapter 1) and Scarano (2002: Chapters 1 and 2).

<sup>11</sup> Actually, Tobler (1896) is somewhat ambiguous about this subject: for this he is reproached by Polentz (1903: 3).

clause are opposed by resorting to valency theory: *propositions relatives prédictives* are equated with “obligatory complements”, *propositions relatives attributives* with “optional complements”. Prebensen’s (1982) starting point is the distinction between *relatives anaphoriques* and *relatives transformées*. The former class contains restrictive (*déterminatives*), appositive (*explicatives*) and predicative (*attributives*) relatives. The latter class contains cleft sentences, “presentative” relatives (e.g., *il y a un homme qui vous attend*, ‘there is a man waiting for you’) and “possessive” relatives (*Paul a les cheveux qui frisent*, lit. ‘Paul has hair that curl’). Clauses of the former class can be split into two independent sentences; those of the latter cannot (cf. Prebensen 1982: 99-100). As far as the status of PRCs is concerned, Prebensen’s classification does not therefore differ from that of Sandfeld. Koenig & Lambrecht (1999) analyze predicative relatives as having two subjects, one “internal” and the other “external”: the latter is the antecedent, the former the pronoun *qui* (cf. Koenig & Lambrecht 1999: 201-3). The same analysis is restated in Lambrecht (2000): PRCs (here called “presentative relative constructions”) are ‘flat’ structures (i.e., the antecedent and the relative do not form a constituent), endowed with both an internal and an external subject. Scarano (2002) proposes a dual typology of relatives, keeping the semantic-informational point of view distinct from the syntactic one. From the former point of view, relative clauses are subdivided into “relatives of integration” (= appositives), “relatives of identificative modification” (= restrictives), “relatives of denotative modification” (= PRs). From the syntactic point of view, relative clauses can be appositive, attributive, or predicative. “Relatives of denotative modification” (i.e., PRs) which occur in presentative contexts or after a verb of perception are predicative, since their function is that of subject or object complement; those occurring in other contexts are attributive (cf. Scarano 2002: 161-163).

In the first generative analyses of PRCs, dating back to the 1970s (Schwarze 1974; Radford 1975), their predicative nature was not explicitly stated, but it was, in a sense, implied by the derivation proposed to account for them. In fact, all these studies assume a derivation of PRCs from declarative complement clauses. Hence, a sentence like (1) would be derived from the same deep structure underlying (11) by raising the subject to the embedded clause to the position of object of the main verb *voir*:

- (11) *J’ai vu que Paul fumait*  
 I have seen that Paul was smoking

This analysis has encountered several objections. Already Schwarze noticed several semantic differences between PRs (called by him *relatives complétives*) and declarative complement clauses: in his view, both kinds of clause share the same syntactic analysis, while their semantic analysis would be different. Later works (e.g., Ruwet 1978; Graffi 1980) argued that such a derivation of PRs is untenable, since they show many differences, both syntactic and interpretive, with respect to the declarative clauses from which they allegedly derive. Graffi (1980: 130) considers them as a case of predication in Williams’ (1980) sense, with the antecedent being the subject and the PR being the predicate. This remark is framed in the analysis of PRCs as NPs, which will be discussed below (§2.2).

The predicative nature of PRCs derives automatically from the analyses of both Guasti (1988; 1992) and Rizzi (1992). They analyze PRCs as CPs, on the basis of several tests which show that the construction behaves as a sentential rather than a nominal category (pseudo-clefting, clefting, equative deletion, passivization; cf. Guasti 1988: 41). Semantically, such CPs “have a predicate nature” (Guasti 1992: 62).

As will be seen in more detail in the next section, Cinque (1995) proposes a threefold structure for PRCs. All three structures, despite their internal difference, share a common feature: they are all SMALL CLAUSES (SC), namely predicative structures. Cinque remarks that, for any of the structures he takes into account (see below, (22)), there exists a parallel small clause structure whose predicate is not a CP (as in PRCs), but an AP. In recent years, Cinque’s threefold analysis has been resumed by Casalicchio (2013; in press). Casalicchio’s analyses of PRCs will be presented in the next section. For the time being, it is enough to remark that the structure(s) he proposes are all of a sentential kind; hence the predicative nature of PRCs is automatically accounted for.

## 2.2 Structure and derivation of PRCs

Let us now examine the three different kinds of structure which have been proposed for PRCs in recent decades. Some scholars have analysed them as a two-constituent structure (antecedent NP + PR), others as complex NPs structurally analogous to ‘authentic’ relatives, and yet others as CPs.

Traditional studies did not contain any constituent structure analysis, hence it is impossible to establish which structure they would assign to PRCs: it is interesting, however, to recall Tobler’s remark quoted in §2.1, according to which the verb governing predicative relatives “has two objects”, namely the antecedent and the PR. This could be equivalent to an implicit assumption of a two-constituent structure. Similarly, many non-generative or para-generative studies do not face the problem of constituent structure of PRCs explicitly. One important exception is Koenig & Lambrecht (1999): the authors state that the antecedent and the PR do not form a constituent, as is shown, among other things, by the possibility of cliticizing the antecedent and detaching it from the relative clause. This test of cliticization was actually the basic argument provided by Kayne (1975) in favor of a two-constituent analysis of PRCs. In general, this analysis was standard in the 1970s (see also Ruwet 1978).

A two-constituent analysis of PRCs, however, does not explain why they show islandhood effects. This was the reason why some scholars assigned them a structure analogous to that of ‘authentic’ relatives. This analogy is implicit in all studies which treat PRs as a special kind of relative, namely almost all the traditional and some more recent ones, such as Scarano (2002), Donati & Cecchetto (2011) and Cecchetto & Donati (2015). Scarano’s analysis has been sketched in §2.1, above. Cecchetto & Donati (2015) assume for PRCs a derivation analogous to that of free relatives and ordinary relatives. They assume as their starting point the analysis of relative clauses in terms of “head raising” first proposed by Vergnaud (1974) and subsequently endorsed by Kayne (1994). In the case of free relatives, the head is a *wh*-D; in the case of ‘authentic’ relatives, an N; in that of PRs, a D. In Donati & Cecchetto (2011), the trigger of the head-raising operation (Internal Merge) is said to be the main verb, which is endowed with an “edge feature” D. The structure of the pseudo-relative would be the following (cf. Donati & Cecchetto 2011: 549)<sup>12</sup>:

- (17) *Ho incontrato* [<sub>D</sub> *lui* [<sub>C</sub> *che* [<sub>T</sub> [<sub>D</sub> ~~*lui*~~] *baciava Maria*]]]  
 (I) have met him who/that was kissing Maria  
 ‘I met him kissing Maria’

The first explicit proposals for an analysis of PRCs as complex NPs analogous to relative constructions are those by Graffi (1980) and by Kayne (1983 [1981]), formulated independently of each other. The former paper proposes the following structure (see Graffi 1980: 132)<sup>13</sup>:

- (18) *Ho visto* [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> *Gianni*] [<sub>S</sub> *che* [<sub>S</sub> PRO<sub>i</sub> *usciva dal cinema*]]]  
 (I) have seen Gianni who/that was coming out of the cinema  
 ‘I saw Gianni coming out of the cinema’

Kayne’s (1983 [1981]: 97) relevant example is the following:

<sup>12</sup> In the most recent generative works, an element ‘struck through’ (as ~~*lui*~~ in (17)) corresponds to the ‘trace’ of earlier treatments.

<sup>13</sup> The symbol S’ (read ‘S-bar’), employed in generative grammar from Chomsky (1973) until the mid-1980s, indicates the category formed by the sentence and the ‘complementizer’ (COMP) that introduces it, i.e. *che* and *qui* in (18) and in (19), respectively. S’ and S have been replaced by CP and by IP, respectively, since Chomsky (1986). The symbol *e* (meaning ‘empty’) indicates any syntactic category without phonetic realization.

- (19) *Je l'<sub>i</sub>ai rencontré* [<sub>NP</sub>[<sub>NP</sub> e<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>S'</sub> *qui*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>S</sub> *PRO* *sortait du cinéma*]]]  
 I him=have met            who/that            was coming out of the cinema  
 'I met him coming out of the cinema'

Graffi (1980) and Kayne (1983 [1981]) therefore argue that relatives and PRs have the same structural representation, although their derivation is different: *wh*-movement for the former, a case of control for the latter ones. Since PRCs are not a two-constituent structure dominated by VP, but complex NPs, they behave like islands. Of course, this analysis has to account for the possibility of cliticizing the antecedent of PRCs vs. its impossibility in the case of 'authentic' relatives. The solution resorted to by both Graffi and Kayne was the impossibility for relatives, but not for PRs, to have an anaphoric head, as [<sub>NP</sub> e<sub>i</sub>] would be if the antecedent were cliticized. An analogous analysis is proposed by Burzio (1986: 296). Burzio is not interested in PRs as such (he does not even use this term), but in the constructions, finite and infinitival, governed by verbs of perception, to both of which he assigns the structure [<sub>NP</sub>NP [<sub>S'</sub>]]. Burzio (1986: 300-304) remarks that PRs (to employ our terms) and infinitival clauses governed by perception verbs sometimes behave differently (e.g., the latter do not show island effects, in Italian at least), but he does not consider these facts as strong enough to lead him to abandon his unitary analysis.

Côté (1999) analyzes PRs in a way essentially analogous to Graffi (1980) or to Kayne (1983 [1981]), the only difference being the replacement of the 'old' category NP by the 'new' DP:

- (20) *Ho visto* [DP [DP *Gianni*<sub>i</sub>] [CP *PRO*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>C'</sub> *che* [IP *correva a tutta velocità*]]]]  
 (I) have seen    Gianni    who/that was running at full speed  
 'I saw Gianni running at full speed'

PRCs would therefore be control structures (which accounts for the subject-object asymmetry) and complex DPs (which accounts for their islandhood).

Di Lorenzo (2010: Chapter 4) ascribes to PRs the following structural properties: (a) They are DPs containing a CP which in turn dominates a S(mall) C(lause); (b) their antecedent is a single noun, not a NP; (c) their subject is a "silent copy" of the antecedent; (d) they have no INFL and therefore their tense is only apparently finite. The specific category to which the "silent" subject of the PR should belong is not specified: it is rather obvious, however, that the structure proposed by Di Lorenzo is a control structure, and this accounts for the subject-object asymmetry, as has just been seen above. The complex DP in which the pseudo-relative is embedded should also account for the islandhood of the construction, although Di Lorenzo is not explicit on this point.

Guasti's (1988; 1992) and Rizzi's (1992) analyses of PRCs as CPs have already been hinted at in §2.1. According to both scholars, (1) would have the representation (21) (cf. Guasti 1988: 41; the same analysis is adopted by Rizzi 1992: 42):

- (21) *J'ai vu* [<sub>CP</sub> *Paul*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>CO</sub> *qui* [<sub>IP</sub> *e fumait*]]]

The antecedent of the PR, although contained in a CP, receives a theta-role from the governing verb, and this seems to violate the theta-criterion. Guasti and Rizzi solve this problem in two different ways. Whatever solution is chosen, the antecedent of the PR would be governed by the main verb, and this would presumably account for the possibility of cliticizing it, although neither Guasti nor Rizzi explicitly face the problem. To account for the island character of PRCs, Guasti notes that, in a structure like (21), an element moving from inside the PR clause would cross two bounding nodes, IP and CP. According to Guasti (1992: 64), there is another possible structure for pseudo-relatives besides (21), namely a two-constituent one, where the CP "functions as a secondary predicate of the NP object". This second structure occurs after verbs like *sorprendere*

(‘catch’) and after perception verbs, in cases where “the perceptual experience and what is described in the embedded clause do not need to share the same temporal coordinates” (Guasti 1992: 65). Verbs like ‘see’, therefore, would have a double thematic grid: they would assign three roles, as in (21) above (experiencer, event, and theme), or just two (experiencer and theme, the PR being in that case an adjunct).

In the preceding section we have quoted Cinque’s (1995) threefold analysis of PRCs. Cinque (1995: 245) states that they are “three-ways ambiguous” and then proposes a threefold structure for them:

- (22i)  $[_V V [_{SC} NP [che VP]]]$  (cf. Cinque 1995: 256, (38a))  
 or, more specifically,  $[_V V [_{CP}[_{LAGRP} NP AGR [_{TP}[_{CP} e che [_{LAGRP} e V]]]]]]$  (cf. id.: 262)
- (22ii)  $[_V [_{NP} NP [_{SC} PRO [che TP]]]]$  (cf. id.: 256, (38b))
- (22iii)  $[_{VP} [_V V NP] [_{SC} PRO [che VP]]]$  (cf. id.: 256, (38c))

Verbs of the *sopportare* (‘tolerate’) class can have both structures (22i) and (22ii). Verbs of the *incontrare* (‘meet’) class only have structure (22iii). Perception verbs can have all three structures (cf. Cinque 1995: 258). Structure (22i) accounts for the propositional character of PRCs, which is shown by the possibility of pronominalizing them with a sentential pro-form. Structure (22ii) accounts for the islandhood of PRCs, as well for the fact that the antecedent can also be pronominalized with a nominal pro-form. Structure (22iii) accounts for the possibility of cliticizing the antecedent.

Cinque’s paper appeared in 1995, but it dates back to a workshop held in 1990, hence in a pre-minimalistic period. This could explain the assumption of a threefold structure for PRCs, which seems largely opposite to the tenets of the Minimalist Program. However things might stand, Cinque’s analysis is taken as a starting point for a recent and very detailed study of PRCs, namely Casalicchio (2013). Casalicchio reformulates Cinque’s analysis in the framework of the ‘cartographic’ approach of Rizzi (1997) and subsequent work, but he still adopts a threefold analysis for PRs. This analysis undergoes some important changes in Casalicchio (in press). In particular, PRs are assigned not a threefold structure, but a single one, namely:

- (23)  $_{SC=ForceP}[+EPP][Maria_i$        $che_{TopP}[\dots TP[pro_i$        $canta_{VP}[pro_i, canta]]]]]$   
 Maria                                      who/that                                      sings

According to Casalicchio, this “basic structure [...] occurs in any type of P(seudo)R(ative). It is the way and the place in which this structure is embedded that changes. [...] The differences between PRs are therefore not dependent on their internal structure, but rather on the context in which they occur”. We will list these contexts below (§2.5).

### 2.3 *Qui/che* and the subject of PRs

The analyses of PRCs not only differ in the structures assigned to them, but also in the representation of certain specific elements: in particular, the introductory element (*qui* in French, *che* in Italian) and the category occupying the subject position of the PR clause.

Is the introducing element of PRs a pronoun or a complementizer? All traditional approaches, including para-generative approaches (cf. e.g., Koenig & Lambrecht 1999), choose the first option: the classification of PRs as a particular kind of relative clauses is simply based on the assumption that they are introduced by a relative pronoun. This seems especially adequate for French, where there is a contrast between subject *qui* and object *que* as introducers of relative clauses. On the contrary, most generative analyses (e.g., Graffi 1980; Guasti 1988, 1992; Rizzi 1992; Cinque 1995; and so on) treat *qui* and *che* as complementizers: these are based on the epoch-making paper by Kayne (1976), which maintained that French relative *qui* is not actually a pronoun, but an allomorph of the finite complementizer *que*. This solution seemed even more

suitable for Italian, where there is no *que/qui* alternation, and the ‘relative pronoun’ *che* of traditional grammars, which has both the subject and the object function, is homophonous with the complementizer introducing finite declarative clauses. Recently, however, the traditional analysis has been resumed in the generative framework: e.g., Koopman & Sportiche (2008) and Sportiche (2011) classify *qui* as a pronoun, as in traditional grammar, and no more as a complementizer. If the ‘traditional’ solution is adopted, the two structural elements mentioned in the title of the present section plainly coincide: the introductory element *qui*, being a subject pronoun, is also the subject of the PR.

The analysis is necessarily more complex if the option is chosen which treats *qui* or *che* as complementizers. Graffi (1980: 129) labels French *qui* as a “pronominal complementizer”, which is inserted in the subject position of the PR, replacing the pronominal anaphor PRO. It is not necessary to assume this special property for Italian *che*: in Italian, PRO would be deleted and its content would be recovered by the finite inflection. Graffi (1980) was based on Chomsky’s (1981) classification of empty categories, which did not yet represent the empty subject of finite clauses as *pro*, this last category being introduced only in Chomsky (1982).<sup>14</sup> A subject *pro* for PRs is instead assumed by Guasti (1988). According to Guasti, the complementizer *qui* is endowed with [Agr] features, which it shares with the antecedent and the inflection of the PR. The empty category in (21), above, is *pro*: in French, it “is legitimated by C<sup>0</sup> which governs it and, having the [Agr] feature, assigns it nominative case” (Guasti 1988: 44). In Italian, *pro* is directly legitimated by the [Agr] of the PR, which is always a “strong governor” (cf. Guasti 1988: 49). In both languages, the coindexing between the antecedent of the PR and its *pro* subject is mediated through the [Agr] of the PR. Still another analysis can be found in Cinque (1995), who assumes that “the Spec of the predicate CP [i.e., the first *e* in (22i), G.G.] is an A-position, hence that movement to it creates an A-chain” (Cinque 1995: 263).<sup>15</sup> The empty category in the subject position of the PR would therefore be an anaphor in the sense of Chomsky (1981). All three analyses were worked out during the GB period of generative grammar, but they seem to violate one or another of its principles. If, as assumed by Graffi, the empty category in subject position of PRs is PRO, this would represent a case of governed PRO (the governor being the finite inflection of the PR); if it is assumed to be *pro*, as in Guasti, we would have a pronominal which is obligatorily coindexed with an antecedent. Cinque’s analysis, finally, seems rather ad hoc, since it assumes that a position which is normally A’, namely that of the specifier of CP, should be an A-position in this particular case.

The rigid typology of empty categories established in GB framework has undergone some important changes during the Minimalist period, although a definite new classification has not yet been formulated (to my knowledge, at least). This state of affairs could possibly account for the fact that some of the most recent works on PRs do not assign their subject position to any specific category. This is the case, for example, of Di Lorenzo (2010), as has been seen in the previous section. Possibly, it is the copy left by Internal Merge of the antecedent of the PR, as in Donati & Cecchetto (2011; see above, (17)). Other analyses, however, adopt a more definite position, resorting to some of the empty categories typical of the GB framework: Côté (1999) represents the subject of PRs as PRO (cf. (20), above); according to Casalicchio (in press), however, it is a case of *pro* (cf. above, (23)).

## 2.4 PRs and the subject-object asymmetry

The ways of accounting for our feature 2 of §1.2, above, are obviously linked to the different structural analyses proposed for them. Works such as Graffi (1980), Côté (1999), or Di Lorenzo (2010), according to

<sup>14</sup> According to the typology of empty categories worked out in Chomsky (1982), PRO indicates the phonetically null subject of infinitival clauses, and *pro* the phonetically null subject of finite sentences, in languages (such as Italian) which allow it. In earlier works, PRO was employed to indicate both types of null subjects.

<sup>15</sup> “The A(argument) status of the Spec of CP can be seen to result from the generation of an abstract agreement morpheme in C alongside the complementizer (or of an agreeing form of the complementizer, which in Italian happens to be the same as the non-agreeing form: *che* [...]). This is, in fact, visible in French, where C indeed takes the (agreeing) *qui* form [...].” (ibid.).

which the subject of PRs is a controlled PRO, provide an immediate explanation for the subject-object asymmetry: PRO can appear only in subject position. In Guasti (1988), which represents such position as an instance of *pro*, the asymmetry is accounted for by the fact that the coindexing between the antecedent of the PR and the *pro* subject is mediated by [Agr]: since [Agr] can be coindexed only with the subject, direct and indirect objects cannot be the antecedent of the PR.

We have seen that Cinque (1995) provides an explanation in terms of A-movement from inside the PR to its Spec position, which he defines as an A-position. Hence, only the subject of the PR (the lower AGR-P in (22i)) can move to it: if the direct or the indirect object would move, “its trace, an anaphora, would be free in its binding domain, the AGRP” (Cinque 1995: 263), violating principle A of the Binding Theory in Chomsky (1981).

The most recent treatments of PRCs explain the subject-object asymmetry in terms of Minimality effects, which are defined in somewhat different ways. For example, Donati & Cecchetto (2011: 549) assume that D movement from the object position (cf. above, (17)) is excluded since it crosses over a DP in the subject position, while Cecchetto & Donati (2015: 167, fn. 14) consider the PR as a case of “unprobed movement” (i.e., without any *wh*-feature), which has to obey the “Gross Minimality” effect. This accounts for the impossibility of raising any element other than the subject. Casalicchio (2013) is possibly the only generative work that does not consider the subject-object asymmetry as a distinguishing feature of PRCs and quotes some examples that seem to invalidate it; we will turn to those in a moment. Casalicchio has plainly changed his mind in his more recent paper (Casalicchio in press), where he lists the subject-object asymmetry as a typical feature of PRCs. To account for it, he resorts to Rizzi’s (1990) notion of Relativized Minimality: “the antecedent cannot be coindexed with an object because there is an intervening element” (*pro* in the structure (23)).<sup>16</sup>

We have said in §1.2 that subject-object asymmetry is considered a feature of PRCs only in generative treatments, while the studies deriving from other frameworks do not even mention it. Actually, there are some exceptions: for example, a not strictly generative study such as Scarano (2002) does consider this phenomenon. According to Scarano (2002: 109), the subject-object asymmetry is not absolute, since there would be some examples of PRs introduced by elements other than subject *che*.<sup>17</sup> I do not agree with such an analysis. In my view, (124) is not a pseudo-relative, but an appositive relative; (125) is a construction not derived through *wh*-movement of the object or by control of a position other than the subject, but by means of the ‘resumptive pronoun strategy’; finally, (126) would not be a pseudo-relative in the proper sense. Also Casalicchio (2013) quotes several cases of Italian PRs introduced by elements other than the subject: within absolute constructions introduced by the preposition *con*<sup>18</sup>; in some cases of ‘presentative’ constructions<sup>19</sup>; after *ecco*<sup>20</sup>; and an example of PR as adjunct to subject.<sup>21</sup> In my view, all these are cases of constructions derived

<sup>16</sup> An analogous explanation had already been offered by Belletti (2008: 10), not in terms of coindexing, however, but of movement: the antecedent of the PR (which could be externally merged or moved from inside the PR) would be endowed with an EPP feature.

<sup>17</sup> I refer to the following examples by Scarano (with original numbering and grammaticality judgments):

(124) *Ieri in tv ho visto Laura a cui consegnavano il premio*  
 ‘Yesterday on TV I saw Laura who they handed the prize to’

(125) *La vidi che l’accompagnavano all’uscita*  
 ‘I her=saw whom they her=led to the exit’

(126) ? *Questa è ormai la situazione: Maria a cui niente va bene e Giorgio che cerca di accontentarla in tutto*  
 ‘This is now the situation: Maria to whom nothing is right and Giorgio who tries to please her in everything’

<sup>18</sup> E.g. *Con Mario che tutti considerano ormai un fallito, perderemo sicuramente le elezioni* (‘With Mario who everybody now considers a failure, we will surely lose the election’, Casalicchio 2013: 101).

<sup>19</sup> E.g. *C’è Maria che la stanno chiamando continuamente al telefono* (‘There is Mary whom they are constantly calling on the phone’, Casalicchio 2013: 130).

<sup>20</sup> E.g. *Ecco Maria che la abbracciano* (‘Here is Maria whom they her=embrace’, Casalicchio 2013:142).

<sup>21</sup> *Maria lasciò la stanza che la insultavano* (‘Maria left the room that they her=insulted’, Casalicchio 2013: 151).

by the resumptive pronoun strategy: hence, as is the case of Scarano's example (125) they are not real counterexamples to the subject-object asymmetry.

## 2.5 Where do PRCs occur?

The analyses of PRCs we have presented not only differ regarding the structures they propose, but also, and in a significant way, regarding the contexts they discuss as those where PRCs occur. Such differences not only characterize generative studies, but also traditional, non-generative and para-generative ones. We can subdivide them into three groups: a) those that only consider PRCs after verbs of perception; b) those that add to those a limited number of other contexts; c) those that consider a wide range of contexts.

In chronological order, the first study belonging to group a) is possibly Hatcher (1944), which is just devoted to predicative relatives as one of the three constructions following perception verbs in French, along with the infinitive and the present participle. Other studies which restrict, implicitly or explicitly, the analyses of PRCs to contexts after verbs of perception are Radford (1975), Burzio (1986: 287-302), Guasti (1988; 1992), Rizzi (1992), Di Lorenzo (2010), Donati & Cecchetto (2011) and Cecchetto & Donati (2015). Studies of group b) state that PRCs occur, besides after verbs of perception, after verbs like *trouver* ('find'), *rencontrer* ('meet'), in the so-called presentative contexts (e.g., *Elle est là qui pleure comme une Madeleine*, 'She is there weeping copiously') and in 'absolute' constructions, namely those introduced by the prepositions *avec* in French, or *con* in Italian ('with'). This group contains Lücking (1889), Tobler (1896), Polentz (1903), who also includes cleft sentences under predicative relatives, Kayne (1975: 126-129), Ruwet (1978), who is the first one to explicitly quote PRCs after 'absolute' *avec*, Rothenberg (1979), Graffi (1980), and Prebensen (1982).

As studies belonging to group c), we can quote Sandfeld (1936), Cinque (1995) and Casalicchio (2013; in press). In particular, Sandfeld (1936: 140-156) lists not less than eleven contexts where predicative relatives can occur<sup>22</sup>: (i) "as direct predicate", e.g. in "absolute" constructions (*la cour d'école que les gamins désertaient à quatre heures* 'the playground that the kids were leaving at four'; id.: 141). (ii) As definitions of items in a dictionary (*Insensible : qu'on ne sent pas*, 'Insensitive: that we don't feel'; *ibid.*). (iii) "As indirect predicate", in several constructions, as the following one: *Un officier parut, à cheval, blessé et que deux hommes soutenaient* ('An officer appeared on horseback, wounded, and whom two men sustained', id.: 142). (iv) "When the predicative relative clause is related to the main clause object" (*[elle] le laisse au dehors qui sanglote au jardin*, lit. 'she him=leaves outside who/that is sobbing in the garden'; *ibid.*). (v) "As a shortened sentence" (*Le « tripot » qu'il fit construire dans son jardin, n'implique pas qu'il en ouvrit l'accès au public*, lit. 'The "gambling" that he made build in his garden does not imply that he of it=opened the access to the public'; id.: 144). (vi) "After verbs that indicate perception and observation" (*je le vois qui vient*, lit. 'I him=see who/that comes', id.: 146). (vii) If "the wording formed by the noun and the predicative relative clause is employed as predicate" (*C'était Pierrotte qu'on appelait au magasin*, 'It was Pierrotte whom we were calling to the store', id.: 150). (viii) Further employments are: 1. as an apposition (*Quelque encombrement, peut-être un reposoir qu'on achève* 'Some obstruction, perhaps an altar which we are completing'; id.: 152); 2. as a standard of comparison; 3. as a prepositional object (*Je ne peux pas, pour une petite amie que je voudrais avoir, me charger aussi de sa famille*, lit. 'I cannot, for a girlfriend whom I would like to have, charge me also with her family'; *ibid.*). (ix) "In many cases where the wording noun + relative clause is employed, one could also employ a complement clause" (*ces moines que vous chassez, c'est très malheureux*, lit. 'these monks whom you chase away, it is very unfortunate' is equivalent to *que vous chassez ces moines, c'est très malheureux*, lit. 'that you chase away these monks, it is very unfortunate', id. : 153)". (x) In many cases, the combination noun + relative clause forms an utterance in itself (*Qu'est-ce que c'est donc que ce bruit? – Des peupliers qu'on nous abat*, lit. 'What it is that noise? - Poplars which people cut down to us'; id. : 154). (xi) Similar phrases occur in exclamations, but without *c'est* (*Monsieur Michel que je ne verrai plus! Mon*

---

<sup>22</sup> I emphasize in bold all examples of PRs introduced by an element other than *qui*, hence that have a function different from that of subject.

*ami qui est mort!*, lit. ‘Mr. Michel whom I will see no more! My friend who is dead!’; id. : 155). One could rightly object that several of Sandfeld’s examples reproduced above are not really PRs, but restrictive or appositive relatives in a predicative function: this is wholly consistent with our analysis, as will be seen in §3.2.

According to Cinque (1995: 252-255), PRCs appear as 1. “complement small clauses” (*Non sopporto* [<sub>sc</sub> *Gianni e Mario [che fumano in casa mia]*], ‘I cannot stand Gianni and Mario that smoke at my home’); 2. “adjunct small clauses predicated of an object” (*Mangiò la pizza* [<sub>sc</sub> PRO [*che stava ancora fumando*]], ‘He ate the pizza that was still steaming’); 3. “adjunct small clauses predicated of a subject” (*Gianni lasciò la stanza* [<sub>sc</sub> PRO [*che era ancora sotto gli effetti dell’alcool*]], lit. ‘Gianni left the room that he was still under the effects of alcohol’); 4. “in the absolute *with* constructions” (*Con* [<sub>sc</sub> *Gianni [che continua a lamentarsi]*], *non possiamo partire*, ‘With Gianni that keeps complaining, we cannot go’); 5. “in locative contexts” (*Maria è là* [<sub>sc</sub> PRO [*che piange più di prima*]], ‘Mary is there that cries more than before’); 6. “in existential contexts” (*C’è qualcuno* [<sub>sc</sub> PRO [*che sta salendo le scale*]], ‘There is someone that is going up the stairs’); 7. “‘root’ small clauses” ([<sub>sc</sub> *Carlo [che si è offerto di aiutarci]*]? *Non mi sembra vero!* ‘Charles that has offered to help us? It does not seem real!’); 8. “small clauses subject of copulative verbs” ([<sub>sc</sub> *I minatori [che picchiano degli studenti inermi]*] *è uno spettacolo che fa star male*, ‘The miners that beat helpless students is a show that makes you sick’); 9. “as adverbial modifiers of NPs” ([<sub>sc</sub> *Gianni e Maria [che ballano il tango]*] *sono uno spettacolo da non perdere*, ‘Gianni and Maria that are dancing tango are a sight not to be missed’). Casalicchio (2013) distinguishes the contexts of occurrence of PRCs according to the syntactic function of the antecedent, which can be: A) the complement of a transitive verb; B) the subject of the matrix verb; C) the nominal predicate; D) the complement of a preposition; E) a free expression. Each of these major classes subdivides into several subclasses, which I will not list in detail. For example, type A includes PRCs after perception verbs and verbs of ‘finding and knowing’; type B, those in presentative contexts; type C, those within expressions such as *Io ero tornata la stupida che rideva* (‘I was back the stupid laughing’); type D, those in absolute constructions headed by *con* (‘with’); type E, headlines. Casalicchio (in press) lists the following contexts: (a) CPs, after verbs of the *immaginare* (‘imagine’) class; (b) complex DPs, after verbs of perception; two-constituent structures, (c1) with PRs in the adjunct position, when they are not an argument of the matrix verb or (c2) with PRs as the second member of a ‘Larsonian shell’, when they are.

The contexts of PRCs that such studies list only partially overlap: the only one mentioned by all of them is that of PRCs following verbs of perception. Possibly, this does not happen by chance: this is the only context that is exceptionless with respect to subject-object asymmetry. If we examine the whole set of Sandfeld’s (1936) examples, we find cases of PRs introduced by elements other than the subject *qui* in all the eleven groups listed above, with two exceptions: groups (iv) and (vi). We also find examples of PRCs introduced by elements not having the subject function in presentative contexts (cf. (24), from Polentz 1903: 6), in absolute *avec* constructions (cf. (25), from Ruwet 1978: 177; cf. also Casalicchio 2013: 101, (86), for an Italian example), namely in constructions treated as PRCs in works such as Graffi (1980):

- (24) *Mais le travail est là **qu’on** ne peut abandonner*  
 ‘But the work is there which (ACC.) we cannot give up’
- (25) *Avec Marie **que** Pierre embrasse sans arrêt, Paul n’arrive pas à se concentrer*  
 ‘With Marie whom Pierre kisses constantly, Paul cannot concentrate’

In contrast, Hatcher’s (1944) study on predicative relatives after perception verbs contains no example introduced by any element other than the subject *qui*. We therefore assume that those after verbs of perception are the *only real* case of PRCs. Now we are faced with at least two problems: 1) how to analyze the other cases of alleged PRCs? 2) What structure to assign to ‘real’ PRCs, which would be able to account for the three features which I have highlighted in §1.2, above? I will deal with these problems in the next section.

### 3. A new proposal

#### 3.1 PRCs as ‘Larsonian shells’

We began by noting the “goat-stag” nature of PRCs: on the one hand (possibility of cliticizing the antecedent and subject-object asymmetry), they show a behavior opposite to that of relatives; on the other (islandhood), they behave just like them. I think that this peculiar nature can be traced back to the fact that PRCs and relative constructions differ in their constituent structure, while the PR and the relative clause share the same introductory element, namely *qui*, that I consider a relative pronoun, following Koopman & Sportiche (2008) and Sportiche (2011). In an analogous vein, I will also consider the Italian element *che* introducing PRs as a relative pronoun.

I start by capitalizing on two suggestions found in the past literature on the argument. The first dates back to Tobler (1896): when a relative clause has a “predicative employment”, the verb governing the PRCs has “two objects” (see before, §2.1). Hence PRCs would belong to the class of double-object constructions, such as the verbs of ‘giving’ and they could be assigned the same structure, namely a ‘Larsonian shell’ (cf. Larson 1988). This leads us to the second suggestion I capitalize on: Casalicchio (2013; in press) suggests a structure of this kind for PRCs selected by verbs such as *sorprendere* (‘catch’; see above, 2.5.). My analysis, however, differs from Casalicchio’s in some important respects. On the one hand, I widen it, since I apply it to all cases of PRCs, not only to verbs like *sorprendere* (which, furthermore, I consider as rather marginal and possibly requiring a different analysis; see §3.2). On the other hand, I consider as PRCs only those occurring after verbs of perception, while according to Casalicchio they also occur in many other contexts. Finally, Casalicchio, while not stating it explicitly, does not treat Italian *che* as a relative pronoun.

I therefore propose to assign to (1), above, as well as to the analogous Italian constructions, a structure like (26), generated by a Raising operation of the verb *voir* from its position inside the PRC to the head position of vP:

$$(26) \text{[_{VP}]'ai vu} \quad \text{[_{VP}Paul}_i \text{ [_{V'}\#} \text{[_{CP}qui}_i \text{fumait}]]]]$$

Such a structure can account for the several features of PRCs we have discussed throughout this paper. Their predicative nature is immediately derived. As already noted by Larson (1988: 351), such structures as the VP of (26) are “clause-like”: the antecedent of the PR (*Paul*) is the subject, and the V’ formed by the governing verb and the PR is the predicate.<sup>23</sup> Note, furthermore, that such a structure allows us to do away with the category of small clause, which has been widely employed in past treatments (e.g., Cinque 1995), but is unavoidably generic. The fact that PRCs show a propositional character, since they can be represented by a sentential pro-form (see Guasti 1988; 1992; Rizzi 1992; Cinque 1995)<sup>24</sup>, does not force us to treat them as CPs: as remarked by Koenig & Lambrecht (1999) and by Donati & Cecchetto (2011: 549, fn. 14), this kind of pronominalization concerns their semantics, not their syntax.

A representation such as (26) can also easily account for features 1. and 2., discussed in §1.2, above, which sharply oppose PRCs to ‘authentic’ relatives. Feature 1., namely the possibility of cliticizing the antecedent of PRs, but not that of relatives, was explained by Kayne (1975: 117; 128) as a violation of the A over A principle occurring in the latter case, but not in the former. This remark was at the basis of the two-constituent analysis of the PRCs, which was later abandoned (at least in part), as we have seen in §2.2. However, assuming for PRCs a structure identical to that of relatives, as in Graffi (1980), or in Kayne (1983

<sup>23</sup> For simplicity of exposition, I resort to an ‘old’ label such as V’. I think, however, that there should be no special problem in translating this representation in another one more consistent with the tenets of the Minimalist approach.

<sup>24</sup> Given e.g. a sentence like *Ciò che ho visto è Mario che scriveva nel sonno* (‘That which I have seen is Mario that was writing while asleep’), *Mario che scriveva nel sonno* ‘is resumed by a pro-form (*ciò* [...]) which can only resume propositions, not individuals’ (Cinque 1995: 249).

[1981]), implies a resort to rather ad hoc proposals, such as the assumption that the antecedent of an ‘authentic’ relative cannot be an anaphor. No problems of this kind arise given (26). The PRC is not a two-constituent structure, but at the same time its label is VP, not NP: then no A over A violation occurs. Feature 2. is the subject-object asymmetry: I think that this can be accounted for in a way analogous to Casalicchio (in press), namely as the impossibility for coindexing the antecedent with an object across a subject element. My proposal differs from Casalicchio’s as far as the nature of this subject is concerned: it is not a *pro*, but a relative pronoun, *qui*, or, in Italian, *che*, which is endowed with subject features. This representation seems more adequate since we are no longer obliged to assume an obligatorily coindexed *pro*. The anaphoric nature of the subject of the PR is what induced several scholars (Graffi 1980; Kayne 1983 [1981], a. o.) to represent it as PRO, with the ensuing difficulty of postulating a category PRO in a governed position. The present analysis avoids both difficulties: it seems reasonable to ascribe an anaphoric nature to a relative pronoun, which makes it necessarily coindexed with the antecedent.<sup>25</sup>

Feature 3. is the islandhood property, which, contrary to the two previous ones, seems to put PRs on the same plane of ‘authentic’ relatives. In this case too, I capitalize on Casalicchio’s proposal (in press), which considers PRCs as “full phases”: “other elements cannot be extracted from the PR because they cannot pass through the phase edge”.

### 3.2 Some residual problems

Having restricted the class of PRCs to those occurring after perception verbs, we have now to face the problem of what structure to assign to the other constructions which have been so labeled in several works devoted to the matter. Of course, terminology is always a matter of convention: no one forbids us from calling these constructions pseudo-relatives; the only relevant fact is to distinguish them from those that have the ‘Larsonian shell’ structure argued for in the preceding section. I recall that all these different constructions were classified as PRCs in generative studies such as Cinque (1995) or Casalicchio (2013; in press), or as predicative relatives in traditional studies such as Sandfeld (1936), because they show a subject-predicate structure. We have to show what structures actually implement this predicative feature.

In my view, some of these allegedly PRCs are actually relative clauses, while others are adjunct clauses. In particular, the other two classes that Graffi (1980) treats as PRCs, besides that following verbs of perception, could be dubbed with the traditional term of predicative relatives, or better, developing Tobler’s and Polentz’s original insights, ‘relative clauses employed predicatively’. I refer in particular to the so-called presentative contexts (cf. (24), above) and to absolute constructions introduced by French *avec* or Italian *con* (cf. (25)). As has been seen, both these kinds of construction do not strictly show subject-object asymmetry: they are therefore ‘authentic’ relatives, derived through *wh*-movement. Their predicative nature might be accounted for by assuming that their antecedent is endowed with a [+aboutness] feature in the sense of Rizzi (2005): the antecedent (*le travail* in (24), or *Marie* in (25)) would therefore be the subject and the relative clause (*qu’on ne peut abandonner* and *que Pierre embrasse sans arrêt*, respectively) the predicate. A similar analysis can also be suggested for groups 7. and 8. of Cinque’s (1995) list (see above: §2.4), i.e. “root small clauses” and “small clauses subject of copulative verbs”.

Other kinds of construction that are often called PRCs seem rather to be adjunct clauses. This is the case of Cinque’s groups 2 and 3, which the author himself labels “adjunct clauses”. I would add to this class also the constructions after verbs like *incontrare* (‘meet’). They sound to me to be rather marginal in Italian, or rather as substandard; surely, they are less commonly in use than those that follow the verbs of perception. However the matter stands, we can hypothesize that their structure is analogous to that of the adjunct clauses (here labeled ‘CP’ for convenience) in the following examples:

<sup>25</sup> I have still to account for why the subject-object asymmetry does not occur with ‘authentic’ relatives. A possible hint for an explanation lies in the different derivational history of the two constructions: while the antecedent of relatives is moved from its base position (namely, it is ‘internally merged’), that of PRCs is base generated (‘externally merged’).

- (27) *Ho incontrato Gianni* [<sub>CP</sub> *che ero appena uscito di casa*]  
 (I) have met Gianni that I had just left the house  
 ‘I met Gianni when I had just left home’

(27) belongs to a substandard register; it can be analyzed as containing an adjunct clause with a subject PRO controlled by the NP *Gianni*, as in structure (22ii) or (22iii) of Cinque (1995); see above, §2.2. We have to add that the element *che* introducing the adjunct clause would not be a relative pronoun in this case, but the homophonous complementizer. Of course, the occurrence of *qui* instead of *que* in French must be accounted for: I have for the moment no explanation.

A further problem is represented by the PRs after verbs like *sorprendere*. Following Guasti (1992: 64), one could consider them as adjuncts and then they could be analyzed in the same way as those of the *incontrare* class. However, as Casalicchio (2013: 44) convincingly shows, *sorprendere* in the sense of ‘catch’ (unlike the same verb in the sense of ‘astonish’) is a three-argument, not a two-argument, verb: hence, the PR following its (superficial) direct object cannot be an adjunct and this motivates Casalicchio’s analysis in terms of ‘Larsonian shells’, which we have extended to perception verbs. I have no definite answer to this problem either, but we can remark that the behavior of *sorprendere* in this special usage is rather different from that of typical perception verbs like *vedere*. First of all, a sentence like (28) seems to me rather marginal:

- (28) ?*Ho sorpreso Gianni* [<sub>CP</sub> *che usciva dal cinema*]  
 ‘I caught Gianni coming out of the cinema’

Alternatively, if the construction following the NP object of *vedere* or *incontrare* is not a PR, but an infinitival, it is introduced by *a* with *incontrare*, while it is a bare infinitive after *vedere* (the opposite cases are not fully ungrammatical, but marginal nonetheless):

- (29) a. *Ho visto Luca rubare caramelle*  
 b. ?*Ho visto Luca a rubare caramelle*<sup>26</sup>  
 ‘I saw Luca steal toffees’
- (30) a. ?*Ho sorpreso Luca rubare caramelle*  
 b. *Ho sorpreso Luca a rubare caramelle*  
 ‘I caught Luca Steal toffees’

One possible conjecture is that *sorprendere* (‘catch’) is to be classified among perception verbs<sup>27</sup>, with a somewhat ‘peripheral’ status: the PR would belong to a category other than VP.<sup>28</sup>

### 3.3 Conclusion

We asked at the beginning if PRs are a kind of relative clause or rather a peculiar structure. The analysis presented here leads us to the latter option: PRCs are VPs in the form of a ‘Larsonian shell’ and hence essentially different from ‘authentic’ relatives. This accounts for the features that oppose the two kinds of constructions (possibility of cliticizing the head and subject-object asymmetry); the islandhood property that

<sup>26</sup> From Guasti (1992: 58).

<sup>27</sup> In fact, DISC (s.v.) defines it as “*vedere* qualcuno nel momento in cui sta compiendo qualcosa di nascosto, disdicevole proibito” (‘to see someone when he is doing something secretive or misbecoming or forbidden’; my italics); cf. Casalicchio (2013: 80).

<sup>28</sup> Casalicchio (2013: 255) analyzes prepositional infinitives as those contained in (30b) as CP structures. This analysis could be extended to PRs after verbs of the *sorprendere* (‘catch’) class.

they share can be explained by assuming an identical mechanism (i.e., in terms of phases), but not an identical structure. This analysis only holds for PRCs in contexts governed by verbs of perception. They form, along with those occurring in the other contexts, a spurious class from the structural point of view: the only feature they all share is their predicative nature, which justifies their standard identification as predicative relatives in traditional approaches.

### *Acknowledgments*

I thank Jan Casalicchio for his comments on a former version of the present paper, the responsibility for which is, of course, entirely my own. Probably, Jan would not agree with my analysis, but his remarks made me restate several points. Thanks are also due to an anonymous referee, who showed me many points needing further clarification. I am pleased to offer these reflections on a typical Romance phenomenon to Maria Grossmann, as a small sign of reverence for her impressive knowledge of Romance languages and for her work on them.

### *References*

- Auwers, Johan van der. 1993. Les relatives prédictives du français. *Travaux linguistiques du Cerlico* 6. 265-277.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2008. The CP of clefts. *CISCL Working Papers* 2. 7-17.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax. A Government-Binding approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Casalicchio, Jan. 2013. *Pseudorelative, gerundi e infiniti nelle varietà romanze. Affinità (solo) superficiali e corrispondenze strutturali*. Università di Padova. (Ph. D. dissertation).
- Casalicchio, Jan. (in press). Pseudo-Relatives and their left-periphery: A unified account. In Ernestina Carrilho et al. (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory*, Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 28, Lisbon 2014.
- Cecchetto, Carlo & Donati, Caterina. 2015. *(Re)labeling*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In Stephen R. Anderson & Paul Kiparsky (eds.), *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, 232-286. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1995. The Pseudo-Relative and ACC-ing constructions after verbs of perception. In Guglielmo Cinque, *Italian syntax and Universal Grammar*, 244-275. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corblin, Francis & Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin & Jean-Marie Marandin (eds.). 1999. *Empirical issues in formal syntax and semantics 2*. The Hague: Thesus.
- Côté, Marie-Hélène. 1999. Quantification existentielle sur des événements et structure des pseudorelatives. In Corblin et al. (eds.), 169-190.
- Di Lorenzo, Giorgia. 2010. *La subordinata come oggetto complesso. La causativa nelle lingue scandinave (attraverso la pseudorelativa)*. Università di Roma Tre. (Ph. D. dissertation).
- DISC. Francesco Sabatini & Vittorio Coletti (eds.). 1997. *Dizionario Italiano Sabatini Coletti*. Firenze: Giunti.
- Donati, Caterina & Cecchetto, Carlo. 2011. Relabeling heads: A unified account for relativization structures. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42. 519-560.
- Graffi, Giorgio. 1980. Su alcune costruzioni "pseudorelative". *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 5. 117-139.
- Graffi, Giorgio. 2001. *200 years of syntax*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Grevisse, Maurice. 1975<sup>10</sup>. *Le bon usage. Grammaire française avec des remarques sur la langue française d'aujourd'hui*. Gembloux: Duculot.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1988. La pseudorelative et les phénomènes d'accord. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 13. 35-80.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1992. Pseudorelatives and prepositional infinitives. A unified account. *Geneva Generative Papers* 1. 53-65.
- Hatcher, Anna G. 1944. Je le vois sourire; Je le vois qui sourit; Je le vois souriant. *Modern Language Quarterly* 5. 275-301; 387-405.
- Herczeg, Gy. 1959. Sintassi delle proposizioni subordinate nella lingua italiana. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 9. 261-333.

- Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The philosophy of grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1975. *French syntax. The transformational cycle*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1976. French relative *que*. In Marta Luján & Frederick G. Hensey (eds.), *Current studies in Romance linguistics*, 255-299. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1983 [1981]. Binding, quantifiers, clitics and control. In Richard S. Kayne, *Connectedness and binary branching*, 87-102. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Koenig, Jean-Pierre & Lambrecht, Knud. 1999. French relative clauses as secondary predicates: A case study in Construction Theory. In Corblin et al. (eds.): 191-214.
- Koopman, Hilda & Sportiche, Dominique. 2008. The *que/qui* alternation: New analytical directions. Ms. Los Angeles: UCLA.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 2000. Prédication seconde et structure informationnelle: la relative de perception comme construction présentative. *Langue Française* 127. 49-66.
- Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19. 335-391.
- Lücking, Gustav. 1889. *Französische Grammatik für den Schulgebrauch*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Marouzeau, Jean. 1961. *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique. Français, allemand, anglais, italien*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Mätzner, Eduard. 1877. *Französische Grammatik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Lateinischen*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Polentz, Emil. 1903. *Französische Relativsätze als prädikative Bestimmungen und verwandte Konstruktionen*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Prebensen, Henrik. 1982. La proposition relative dite attributive. *Revue Romane* 17. 98-117.
- Radford, Andrew. 1975. Pseudo-Relatives and the unity of Subject Raising. *Archivum Linguisticum* 6. 32-64.
- Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. 1978. On the diagnosis of *Wh* movement. In Samuel J. Keyser (ed.), *Recent transformational studies in European languages*, 189-206. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1992. Direct perception, government and thematic sharing. *Geneva Generative Papers* 1. 39-52.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2005. On some properties of subjects and topics. In Laura Brugè et al. (eds.), *Contributions to the thirtieth Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, 203-224. Venezia: Libreria Editrice Cafoscarina.
- Ross, John R. (1967), *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Cambridge (MA): MIT. (Ph. D. dissertation).
- Rothenberg, Mira. 1979. Les propositions relatives prädicatives et attributives: Problème de linguistique française. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 74. 351-395.
- Ruwet, Nicolas. 1978. Une construction absolue en français. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 2. 165-210.
- Sandfeld, Kristian. 1936. *Syntaxe du français contemporain*, vol. II : *Les propositions subordonnées*. Genève : Droz.
- Scarano, Antonietta. 2002. *Fraasi relative e pseudo-relative in italiano. Sintassi, semantica e articolazione dell'informazione*. Roma: Bulzoni.
- Schwarze, Christoph. 1974. Les constructions du type "Je le vois qui arrive". In Christian Rohrer & Nicolas Ruwet (eds.), *Actes du colloque franco-allemand de grammaire transformationnelle*, 18-30. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 2011. French relative *qui*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42. 83-124.
- Strudsholm, Erling. 1998. *Relative situazionali in italiano moderno. Una reinterpretazione della cosiddetta pseudorelativa sulla base di un approccio combinato, formale e funzionale*. Münster-Hamburg-London: LIT.
- Tobler, Adolf. 1884. Vermischte Beiträge zur Grammatik des Französischen. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 8. 481-498.
- Tobler, Adolf. 1896. Relativsatz als prädikative Bestimmung. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 20. 55-58.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 1974. *French relative clauses*. Cambridge (MA): MIT. (Ph. D. dissertation).
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11. 203-238.