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1. Introduction In many of the Romance languages perception verbs can take a special complement structure known as the "Pseudo-relative" for its prima facie resemblance to a relative clause. See (1)a-d, which correspond to the ACC-ing English form in (2).¹

(1) a. Ho visto Mario che correva a tutta velocità (Italian)
   b. J'ai vu Mario qui courait à toute vitesse (French)
(2) I saw Mario running at full speed

That the structures in (1) should not be identified with ordinary relative clauses is amply motivated in the literature. So I will not dwell on this point here.² Rather, I will consider the main syntactic analyses which have been proposed, suggesting that each has some merit, even though none can provide a complete analysis of the construction.

The reason is that (1)a-b (and (2), for that matter) turn out to be structurally three times ambiguous, in ways which bear on certain aspects of the logical form of the construction.

It will also be seen that, this notwithstanding, the construction can be given a unitary analysis at a more abstract level.

Beginning with Romance, we may, for convenience, distinguish the analyses proposed in the literature in three main families.

1.1 The first attributes to (1) the structure [VP[V-V NP ] CP ] (see (3)), where NP is the direct object of the perception V, and CP another complement, much as in the case of verbs like convincere 'conince' (see (4)).³

(3) Ho [VP[V-visto [NP Gianni]] [CP che correva a tutta velocità]]
   I saw Gianni running at full speed
(4) Ho [VP[V-convinto [NP Gianni]] [CP che doveva andarsene]]
   I have convinced Gianni that he had better leave

Under this analysis, the two complements do not form a constituent. This, as noted in Radford (1977), runs against the evidence that the NP and the following CP are treated as a constituent under fronting. Compare (5)a-b with (6)a-b, in which, as expected, the two complements cannot be fronted together:
(5)  a. MARIO CHE PIANGEVA, ho visto!
    Mario that was weeping (focus), I saw
   b. *GIANNI CHE DOVEVA ANDARSENE, ho convinto!
    Gianni that he had better leave (focus), I convinced

The same evidence also rules out a variant of this analysis which takes the CP in (3) always to be an adjunct: [vp[v· V NP ] (adv.)CP ]. Here too, the NP and the adverbal CP do not form a constituent. A second influential analysis of pseudo-relatives is a sophisticated version of the pseudo-relative as ordinary relative analysis. Cf. Kayne (1981), Burzio (1981,1986), Taraldsen (1981), Graff (1983) for slightly different variants of this analysis.

This analysis attributes to the pseudo-relative the structure of an ordinary relative ([NP NP CP ]), except that no wh-movement is involved to the SPEC of CP, but rather control of a PRO by qui/che, ultimately by the head NP coindexed with qui/che (for simplicity, we ignore here the DP hypothesis):

(6)  a. J’ai vu [NP Gianni [CP qui [IP e courait ]]
    b. Ho visto [NP Gianni [CP che [IP e correva ]]
     I saw Gianni that was running

This analysis has certain clear advantages over the previous one. First, it treats the sequence NP CP as a constituent, as required by such cases as (5)a above.

Secondly, it reduces the ungrammaticality of (7)

(7)  *Je l’ai rencontré que tu sortais du cinéma (Kayne 1981)
    I met her that you were going out of the cinema

to the fact that in any [NP NP CP] "structure, the [CP] must contain a position bound by the head NP" (p.98). Cf. *The man that Mary went to Paris was named Ashby.

Thirdly, it reduces the island sensitivity of the pseudo-relative (cf. (8)a, again from Kayne (1981)) to the complex NP Constraint (cf. (8)b):

(8)  a. *Quelle fille l’as-tu rencontré qui embrassait t? 
    Which girl have you met him that was kissing ?
   b. *Quelle fille as-tu frappé le garçon qui avait insulté t ?
    Which girl have you beaten up the boy who had insulted ?

Also, it avoids the problems encountered by a pseudo-relative as ordinary relative analysis. The fact that the construction is sensitive to the type of verb (voir/reconnaître "see/meet", but not connaître "know" - cf. the possible (1)b, and (9)a below vs. the impossible *Je le connais qui est intelligent 'I know him that is intelligent') follows if the control structure [NP NP CP] is lexically selected. Second,
the fact that the construction displays a clear subject/object asymmetry ((9)a-b), absent from genuine relatives, also follows from its control nature:

(9)  a. Je l’ai vu qui t sortait du cinéma
    I saw him that was leaving the cinema
b. *Je l’ai vu que Marie embrassait t
    I saw him that Marie was kissing

Furthermore, the fact that qui/che/etc. do not alternate freely with relative pronouns (compare e.g. (9)a with *Je l’ai rencontré laquelle sortait du cinéma), is no more surprising, at least if the CP does not involve wh-movement.

Despite such clear advantages, this analysis too faces certain problems.

One conceptual problem is the question why wh-movement to the Spec of CP should be forbidden in the structure [NP NP CP] of pseudo-relatives.

An empirical problem is the fact that the head of the pseudo-relative, but not the head of an ordinary relative, can be a trace of wh-movement in relatives - cf.(10). In this case, the contrast does not seem to follow from the control nature of [NP NP CP] in pseudo-relatives:

(10)  a. Quello che vedi [ t [ che sta partendo ]] è Gianni
      The one who you see that is leaving is Gianni
b. *Quello che conosci [ t [ che sta partendo ]] è Gianni
      The one who you know that is leaving is Gianni
      (cf. Vedi/conosci quello che sta partendo?
      ’Do you see/know the one who is leaving’)

A third problem is represented by the fact that the constituent formed by the NP and the CP refers to a proposition rather than to an individual, even when its head NP refers to an individual. The propositional nature of the constituent is apparent in contexts such as the a. cases in (11)-(13) vs. the b. cases (cf. Radford 1977, 155ff):

(11)  a. Ciò che ho visto è Mario che scriveva nel sonno
      That which I have seen is M. that was writing while asleep
b. *Ciò che ho invitato è Mario che scriveva nel sonno
      That which I invited is M. that was writing while asleep
(12)  a. Ho visto un fatto molto curioso: Mario che scriveva nel sonno
      I saw a very curious thing/*guy: M. that was writing while asleep
b. *Ho visto un tipo molto curioso:
      I saw a very curious thing/*guy: M. that was writing while asleep
(13)  a. Ho visto Mario che scriveva nel sonno, il che non mi pareva poi così strano
      I saw M. that was writing while asleep, which did not seem that strange after all
b. *Ho visto Mario, il che mi ha detto di salutarti
I saw M., which told me to say hello to you

In each case, *Mario che scriveva nel sonno* is resumed by a pro-form (*ciò, un fatto molto curioso, il che*) which can only resume propositions, not individuals.

An additional problem for the [NP NP CP] analysis of pseudo-relatives is discussed in the next section.

1.3. The final analysis to be discussed is that proposed in Guasti (1988, 1990) (also see Rizzi 1991), which takes the pseudo-relative to be a constituent of type CP, with the initial NP in the SPEC of such CP:

(14) a. [\(\nu\) V [CP NP [IP]]]
b. Ho [\(\nu\)P visto [CP Gianni [C'che [IP correva a tutta velocità]]]]

This analysis does not encounter the problems mentioned in connection with the previous analyses, but, as such, is still in- sufficient to account for all types of pseudo-relatives (e.g. those following such verbs as *incontrare* 'meet', *cogliere/* sorprendere* 'catch', etc.).

(15) a. Se incontri Mario che scappa, non meravigliarti
   If you meet M. that runs away, don't be surprised
b. Hanno colto Mario che rubava negli spogliatoi
   They caught M. that was stealing in the dressing-room

If the analysis makes the correct constituency predictions for the pseudo-relative following perception verbs, which are indeed propositional constituents, it does not make the right prediction for the pseudo-relative following the non perception verbs of the *incontrare* class, in which the NP and the following tensed clause do not even form a constituent. See (16):

(16) a. *Quello che vorrei incontrare è Mario che corre
   What I would like to meet is M. that is running
b. *MARIO CHE FUMA, vorrei cogliere!
   M. that is smoking, I would like to catch
c. *E' Mario che corre ciò che vorrei incontrare
   It's Mario that runs away what I would like to meet
d. *E' Mario che rubava negli spogliatoi che hanno colto
   It's M. that was stealing in the dressing-room that they caught

Clearly, the difference in constituency of the 'NP che IP' sequence following a verb of perception and a verb of the *incontrare* class correlates with a selectional difference between the two classes. Only verbs of perception may select a
propositional argument (CP), in addition to a referring expression (NP):

(17) a. Ho visto/sentito che Gianni suonava
    I saw/heard that G. was playing
    b. Ho visto/sentito Gianni
    I saw/heard G.

(18) a. *Ho incontrato/sorpreso che Gianni suonava
    I met/caught that G. was playing
    b. Ho incontrato/sorpreso Gianni
    I met/caught G.

This however means that the analysis in (14) is insufficient for the second class of cases. What is needed is an analysis that may capture the unitary nature of the pseudo-relative at a more abstract level while deriving the observed differences between the two classes.

2. The Small Clause Analysis of Pseudo Relatives One such analysis seems to be available if only we pay attention to a further difference between the two classes of verbs; one which correlates with the observed differences in their selectional properties.

Perception predicates can take a small clause complement. The incontrare class of predicates cannot. The latter can only take an adjunct small clause, if any. 8

(18) Ho visto [sc Gianni arrabbiato/in difficoltà]
    I saw G. angry/in trouble
(19) Ho [VP [v' incontrato Gianni] [sc PRO arrabbiato/in difficoltà]]
    I met G. angry/in trouble

The complement vs. adjunct status of the small clauses in (18) and (19), respectively, can be seen both from the constituency tests utilized above (cf. (20)), and from the wh-extraction of the small clause predicate, in general possible from a complement, but not from an adjunct, small clause - cf. Chomsky 1986,81ff. See (21):

(20) a. Ciò che vedrai è Gianni arrabbiato/in difficoltà
    What you will see is G. angry/in trouble
    b. *Ciò che incontrerai è Gianni arrabbiato/in difficoltà
    What you will meet is G. angry/in trouble

(21) a. Quanto stanco lo avete visto, Gianni?
    How tired have you seen Gianni?
    b. *Quanto ubriaco lo avete sorpreso, Gianni?
    How drunk have you caught Gianni?

Now, if we assume that a tensed CP is but another manifestation, with particular
aspectual properties (for which, see Declerck 1981, Guasti, 1991), of the predicate of a small clause, then we can provide a unitary analysis of the pseudo-relative which is also capable of explaining the observed differences between the perception predicates and the predicates of the *incontrare* type:

(22) a. Ho visto [sc Gianni [cp che correva verso casa]]
    I saw Gianni that was running home
b. Ho incontrato Gianni [sc PRO [cp che correva verso casa]]
    I met Gianni that was running home

Of course, nothing prevents perception verbs from entering the adjunct structure (22)b too. This is, then, the first source of structural ambiguity of (1).

Note that this analysis is consistent with the selection properties of the two classes of verbs and with the constituency tests seen above. Moreover, it reduces the observed constituency difference between the two classes to an independent difference between them in the domain of small clauses. The only crucial assumption that is needed is that a tensed CP can (under certain conditions, met in the case of pseudo-relatives) be the predicate of a small clause.9

This assumption, unusual as it may appear, is supported by at least two considerations.

The first is that pseudo-relatives are not only found after perception predicates and predicates of the *incontrare* type (which indeed admit adjunct small clauses), but they are possible in all and only those contexts in which a small clause is possible (modulo aspectual compatibilities). Also see Raposo (1989, 283). (23) to (30) list 8 different contexts in which small clauses can be found. As the b. case of each shows, a pseudo-relative variant is indeed possible in each such context.

(a) Complement small clauses

(23) a. Non sopporto [sc Gianni e Mario [vestiti da boy scout]]10
    I can’t stand G. and M. dressed as boy scouts
b. Non sopporto [sc Gianni e Mario [che fumano in casa mia]]
    I can’t stand G. and M. that smoke in my house

(b) Adjunct small clauses predicated of an object11

(24) a. Mangiò la pizza [sc PRO [calda]]
    He ate the pizza hot
b. Mangiò la pizza [scPRO [che stava ancora fumando]]
    He ate the pizza that it was still smoking

(c) Adjunct small clauses predicated of a subject12
(25) a. Gianni lasciò la stanza [scPRO [ubriaco]]
    G. left the room drunk
b. Gianni lasciò la stanza [scPRO [che era ancora sotto gli effetti
dell’alcohol]]
    G. left the room that he was still under the effects of alcohol

(d) Small clauses in the 'absolute' with construction13

(26) a. Con [scGianni [malato]], non possiamo partire
    With G. ill, we can’t leave
b. Con [sc Gianni [che continua a lamentarsi]], non possiamo partire
    With G. that keeps complaining, we can’t leave

(e) Small clauses in locative contexts14

(27) a. Maria è là [scPRO [arrabbiata più di prima]]
    M. is there angry more than ever
b. Maria è là [scPRO [che piange più di prima]]
    M. is there that cries more than ever

(f) Small clauses in existential contexts15

(28) a. C’è qualcuno [scPRO [disposto ad aiutarci]]
    There is someone willing to help us
b. C’è qualcuno [scPRO [che sta salendo le scale]]
    There is someone that is climbing the stairs

(g) 'Root' small clauses in incredulity contexts16

(29) a. [scMario [ubriaco]] ? E’ impossibile!
    M. drunk? It’s impossible!
b. [scCarlo [che si è offerto di aiutarci]]? Non mi sembra vero!
    C. that offered to help us? It doesn’t seem true to me!

(h) Small clauses subject of copulative verbs17

(30) a. [sc Gli studenti [così, alla mercè dei minatori]] è uno spettacolo che
    mi auguro di
    non rivedere più
    The students at the mercy of the miners is a sight that I hope not to
    see again
b. [scI minatori [che picchiano degli studenti inermi]] è uno spettacolo
    che fa star
male
The miners that beat up defenceless students is a sight that makes one feel bad

A second consideration in favor of a small clause analysis of pseudo-relatives is the fact that they can be coordinated with other types of small clauses (cf. (31) a-b), and, significantly, cannot be coordinated with full CP complements (cf. (32a)), just as ordinary small clauses cannot (cf. (32b)):

I saw G. depressed and P. that was trying to cheer him up
I saw G. on a bike and P. that was running after him
(32) a. *?Ho visto [Piero che correva] e [che Mario cercava di raggiungerlo]
I saw P. that was running and that M. that was trying to reach him
b. *?Ho visto [Gianni depresso] e [che Piero cercava di risolverarlo]
I saw G. depressed and that P. was trying to cheer him up

It thus seems that pseudo-relatives, both for their external distribution (which overlaps completely with the distribution of ordinary small clauses) and their coordinability with run-of-the-mill small clauses, can reasonably be analysed themselves as small clauses.

Before turning to the question of what is the precise internal structure of the pseudo-relative, we should consider yet another context where small clauses and pseudo-relatives freely alternate. This context was kept separate as it introduces the third possible analysis of the pseudo-relative following a perception verb:

(1) Small clauses as adverbial modifiers of NPs

(33) a. [NPNero e Paolo \(\text{scPRO [vestiti da boy scout]}\)] sono un vero spettacolo
C. and P. dressed as boy scouts are a real sight
b. [NPGianni e Maria \(\text{scPRO [che ballano il tango]}\)] sono uno spettacolo da non perdere
G. and M. that dance the tango are a sight not to be missed
(34) a. [NPNero e Paolo \(\text{scPRO [vestiti da boy scout]}\)], non li sopporto
C. and P. dressed as boy scouts, them I can’t stand
b. [NPNero e Paolo \(\text{scPRO [che mi fumano in faccia]}\)], non li sopporto
C. and P. that smoke into my face, them I can’t stand
(35) a. Non voglio perdermi la vista di [NPNero \(\text{scPRO [vestito da boy scout]}\)]
I don’t want to miss the sight of C. dressed as a boy scout
b. La vista di [NP Carlo [sc PRO [che balla il tango]]] è da non perdere
The sight of C. that dances the tango is not to be missed

In the three different contexts under (i), the small clause cannot but be internal to
the NP. This is shown, in (33), by the fact that, contrary to (30) above, here the verb
agreement is plural, which implies that the head of the larger NP is the plural NP
Carlo e Paolo. In (34), it is shown by the fact that they are part of the dislocated NP
resumed by the plural clitic pronoun li ‘them’. Finally, in (35), it is shown by the fact
that (subcategorized) prepositions in Italian can only take a NP, but no clausal,

That such small clauses are (NP-internal) adverbal modifiers rather than reduced
relative clauses is indicated by their interpretation, which is not that of an apposition
to the NP, but rather that of a temporal modification of the NP. So, for example,
(33a) does not mean "C. and P., who are dressed as boy scouts, are a real sight", but
rather "C. and P., when they are dressed as boy scouts, are a real sight", and the same
holds for the other cases.

Now, as the following examples show, even perception verbs may be followed
by such ‘complex NPs’ containing a small clause adverbial:

(36) a. [[NP Gianni e Paolo] [sc PRO [vestiti da boy scout]]], non li ho mai
visti
G. and P. dressed as boy scouts, them I never saw
b. [[NP Gianni e Maria] [sc PRO [che ballano il tango]]], non li ho mai
visti
G. and P. that danse the tango, them I never saw

This means that even abstracting from (37), which is a pure adverbial parallel to (i) of
fn. 4 above, absent from French, a pseudo-relative complement to a perception verb is
three way ambiguous. Specifically, it can receive one or the other of the analyses
shown in (38) a-c:

(37) Ho [VP visto Mario] [CP che correva a tutta velocità]18
I saw M. that was running at full speed

(38) a. small clause complement:
Ho [VP visto [sc Mario [che correva a tutta velocità]]]
b. small clause adjunct within NP:
Ho [VP visto [NP [NP Mario] [sc PRO [che correva a tutta velocità]]]]
c. small clause adjunct within VP:
Ho [VP [VP visto Mario] [sc PRO [che correva a tutta velocità]]]

We have already seen evidence to attribute the analyses (38) a and b to (1). Structure
(38a) is justified by such cases as (39), discussed above, where the pseudo-relative
behaves as a constituent of a propositional kind:

(39) a. Ho visto *Mario che correva a tutta velocità, il che mi ha sorpreso*
   (Relativization via the propositional pro-form *il che*)
   I saw M. that was running at full speed, which surprised me
b. C'è una cosa che non sopporto: *[sc[Gianni e Paolo] [che mi fumano in faccia]]* ("Equative Deletion")
   There is one thing that I can't stand: G. and P. that smoke into my face
   c. *[sc[Gianni e Paolo] [che mi fumano in faccia]], proprio non *lo* sopporto*
      (Dislocation of the sequence resumed by the propositional pro-form *lo*)
      G. and P. that smoke into my face, really it I can't stand

Structure (38b) is justified by such examples as (36)b, just seen. What about (38c)? Is there any more direct evidence that this analysis must be open to (1) with perception predicates, besides the observation that it must be available for the pseudo-relative following the *incontrare* class of predicates, hence more generally? There is indeed some such evidence if we compare the properties of the perception predicates, the *incontrare* class of predicates, and a further class of predicates taking pseudo-relatives as complements: the *sopportare* class of (23) above.

For the *incontrare* class of predicates we have seen that the complement structure (38a) is unavailable. For this class, the VP adjunct structure (38c) is in fact the only structure available, since these predicates do not admit instantiations of the adjunct within NP structure (38b), as shown by such cases as the following:

(40) a. *Carlo che esce, spesso lo incontro*
   C. that goes out, I often meet him
   (cf. *Spesso incontro Carlo che esce* 'Often I meet C. that goes out')
b. *Carlo che rubava negli spogliatoi, non l'hanno colto*
   C. that was stealing in the dressing-room, him they haven't caught
   (cf. *Hanno colto Carlo che rubava negli spogliatoi*
      'They caught C. that was stealing in the dressing-room')
c. *Carlo che beve, lo sorprendono sempre*
   C. that drinks, they always catch him
   (cf. *Sorprendono sempre Carlo che beve*
      'They always catch C. that drinks')

Concerning the *sopportare* class of predicates, there is positive evidence that at least the analyses (38)a and b are available. See (41)a-b, respectively:

(41) a. C'è una cosa che non sopporto: *[Gianni e Mario [che mi fumano in faccia]]*
   There is one thing that I can't stand: G. and M. that smoke into my face
b. *[Gianni e Paolo [sc che mi fumano in faccia]], proprio non *li*
sopporto

G. and P. that smoke into my face, really them I can't stand

On the other hand, we have no evidence that they can enter structure (38)c.

Now, the sopportare class of predicates differ from the incontrare class for another interesting property. The incontrare class, though not the sopportare class, admits clitic movement and NP-movement (in Passive contexts) of the NP head of the pseudo-relative construction. See:

(42) a. Loi hanno colto ti che rubava negli spogliatoi
    Him they caught that was stealing in the dressing-room
b. Carloj è stato colto ti che rubava negli spogliatoi
    C. was caught that was stealing in the dressing-room
(43) a. *Non loi sopporto ti che mi fuma in faccia
    Him I can't stand that smokes in my face
b. *Lui non è sopportato ti (da nessuno) che fuma in quel modo
    He is not tolerated (by anybody) that smokes that way

It thus seems plausible to attribute the possibility of Clitic- movement and NP-movement to the structure (38)c only. If these processes were possible in (38)a-b as well, then, we should expect the predicates of the sopportare class to allow for them too. But they do not, as noted.

From this, it is tempting to conclude that Clitic- or NP-movement of the NP head of the pseudo-relative is only possible in the configuration (38)c, i.e. when the NP is the real object of the verb.

If this conclusion is correct, the fact that both Clitic- and NP-movement of the pseudo-relative following perception verbs is possible is direct evidence that they can also enter structure (38)c:15

(44) a. L'ho visto che correva a tutta velocità
    Him I saw that was running at full speed
b. Gianni è stato visto che correva a tutta velocità
    G. was seen that was running at full speed

Why should clitic- and NP-movement of the NP be impossible in structures (38)a and b? In the case of (38)b the answer is obvious: for the same reason that excludes clitic- and NP- movement of the head of a relative clause (cf. *L'ho invitato che avevamo conosciuto l'uomo che avevamo conosciuto 'I him invited who we had met'). Cf. Ho invitato l'uomo che avevamo conosciuto 'I invited the man who we had met'). In both cases, the NP is a subconstituent of the category that should undergo the rule. What about structure (38a)? The property in question would follow if the category of what we have called a 'small clause' were in fact a regular CP.
(45) Mario è stato visto [CP [AGRpt AGR [CPche correva a tutta velocità]]]

In (45), the trace left in subject position of the CP fails to be properly head-governed, C being itself inert for proper head-government (Koopman-Sportiche 1988, Rizzi 1990). This conclusion is still compatible with the well-formedness of (46), since in the case of wh-movement (but not clitic- or NP-movement) passage is possible through the Spec of CP (which turns C into a proper head-governor).

(46) Chi non sopporti [CP[C [AGRpt AGR [CPche fuma in quel modo]]]]?  
Who can’t you stand that smokes in that manner?

How, then, does the NP in (38)a get its Case, if it is not governed by the verb? I would like to suggest that, much as in the parallel English Acc-ing complements to perception verbs, Case is assigned by the verb to the CP, from where it percolates down to AGR, which then assigns it to its Spec (cf. Reuland 1983).

This implies a principled difference with genuine small clause complements and complements of ECM verbs like believe in English, whose subjects are governed by, and receive Case from, the matrix verb directly.

Under this analysis, direct government of the subject NP from the matrix verb correlates with the possibility for the same NP to undergo Clitic- and NP-movement. Compare (43)a-b with (47a-b) and (48):

(47) a. Lo ti ritengo [AGRti intelligente]  
    Him I consider intelligent
b. Lui era ritenuto [AGR ti intelligente]  
    He was considered intelligent

(48) He was believed [ti to be intelligent]

There is indeed independent evidence that Case is not assigned by the matrix verb under direct government to the NP subject of the pseudo-relative.

We know that, when Case is assigned this way, a strict adjacency requirement is imposed on Case assignment. So, for example, no material can intervene between the Case assigner and the Case assignee (cf. (49)a-b), nor can the Case assignee be moved, within a larger phrase, away from the Case assigner (cf. (50)a-b):

(49) a. *Ritenevo in Francia [Gianni onesto]  
    I believed in France G. honest
    (Cf. Ritenevo in Francia [che Gianni fosse onesto]  
    I believed in France that G was honest)
b. *?I believe with some reason [him to be intelligent]

(50) a. *[GIANNI ONESTO], credo che ritengano  
    G. honest, I think they believe
b. *?[Him to be intelligent], I can’t believe
(Cf. That he is intelligent, I can’t believe)

The fact that pseudo-relatives behave systematically in the opposite way (and analogously to Acc-ing complements) supports the conclusion reached earlier that their subject is not directly governed and Case marked by the matrix verb. See (51)a-b:

(51) a. Non sopportavo in Francia [Gianni e Mario che fumavano in quel modo], il che poi dava fastidio anche ad altri
I couldn’t stand in France G. and M. that smoked that way, which bothered others too

b. [GIANNI E MARIO CHE MI FUMANO IN FACCIA], non sopporto!
G. and M. that smoke in my face, I can’t stand

To reconcile this conclusion with the generalization concerning their distribution (non distinct from that of small clauses), I will assume that small clauses (i.e. clauses with null inflection) can be either AGRPs or CPs (whenever the CP projection is required for independent reasons). In the case at hand, one may assume that while AP, NP and PP small clause predicates do not require the presence of Tense (hence TP), a CP predicate does (perhaps due to its ‘progressive’ interpretation). If T in turn must match the tense features of a higher C (cf. finite T matching that in English), then the complete small clause must be of category CP, whence the observed impossibility of Clitic- and NP-movement of its subject).^{22}

(52) a. Non sopporto [CP[AGRP[NPG. e M.] AGR [TP [CPche [fumano in quel modo]]]]]
'I can’t stand G. and M. that are smoking in that manner'

b. Ho incontrato [NPG. e M.] [CPche [AGRP uscivano]]
I met G. and M. that were going out

Since in other analyses (Guasti 1988, 1991, Rizzi 1991) the pseudo-relative is taken to be a ‘bare’ CP, some motivation must be given to assume the more complex (52)a-b in place of the simpler (53)a-b:

(53) a. Non sopporto [CPG. e M. [C’che [AGRPfumano in quel modo]]]

b. Ho incontrato G. e M. [CPRO [C’che [AGRP uscivano]]]

First, under the ‘bare’ CP analysis, the simple account of the impossibility of Clitic- and NP-movement of the complement subject is lost, as the Spec of CP presumably counts as a position governed by the matrix V.

Secondly, if only categorially identical constituents can be coordinated, as seems plausible, sentences like (54)a-b below constitute a problem:{^23}
(54) a. Ho visto [Gianni [[AGR/IA' agitato] e [C' che fumava come un turco]]
    I saw G. nervous and that was smoking like a Turk
b. Con [Gianni [[AGR/IA' agitato] e [C' che fuma come un turco]]
    With G. nervous and that is smoking like a Turk,....

Thirdly, it turns out that the head of the pseudo-relative can be separated from its (che+IP) predicate by (a limited class of) adverbials, as in ordinary small clauses. See (55):

(55) Con la casa ancora che fuma, non possiamo certo sistemarci qui
    With the house that still smokes, we certainly can't be accommodated here
    (Cf. Con Gianni ancora incerto riguardo alla partenza,
    'With G. still uncertain about the departure,...')

Having argued for the more articulate structure (52), here repeated as (56), over the simpler (53), I will now consider a number of questions that this structure raises, in particular those listed in (57):

(56) Non sopporto [CP[AGR NP AGR [TP T [CP e che [AGR e V]]]]]

(57) a. What kind of empty categories are in the Spec's of the embedded AGR and CP, and are they in a chain?
b. How does the NP in the Spec of the higher AGRP receive its theta-role?
c. How can a lexical NP alternate with a controlled PRO in the Spec of the higher CP?
d. What is its domain of binding?
e. What does the island sensitivity of the construction follow from?
f. Is the "direct perception" interpretation grounded on structure, and if yes how?

Beginning with (57)a, the predicate CP is an open sentence predicated of the subject of the 'small clause', its index percolating from C, which acquires it via Spec/head agreement with an XP in Spec. It is neither a null operator/primary variable open sentence, nor a null operator/derivative variable (bound clitic) open sentence. Otherwise, such sentences as *Je l'ai rencontré que Marie embrassait or *Je l'ai rencontré que Marie l'embrassait should be well-formed.24

To capture the fundamental subject/object asymmetry of the construction, I will assume, following Taraldsen (1986), that the Spec of the predicate CP is an A-position, hence that movement to it creates an A-chain. From this, it follows, as Taraldsen notes, that the only movement allowed is from the subject (of AGRP). If the object (or another complement) moved to the Spec of CP, its trace, an anaphor, would be free in its binding domain, the AGRP:
(58) a. ... [CP NPi [C' che [AGRP ti] V ...  
    b. ... [CP NPi [C' che [AGRP NP] V ti ...  

The A(rgument) 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). Cf. Rizzi (1991). Also see Rizzi (1990, sect.2.5). This is, in fact, visible in French, where C indeed takes the (agreeing) qui form, as seen.

Besides rendering the Spec of CP an A-position, this has the effect of making the trace in Spec of AGRP a properly bound anaphor, and a properly head-governed ec (by che + AGR), and of making CP, which inherits the index of the NP in its Spec via C, an appropriate open sentence predicated of the 'subject of predication' in the Spec of the higher AGRP.  

(59) a. Vedo [CP [AGRP Maria; AGR [TP T [CPi NPi [C' che-AGR; [AGRP ti AGR corre]]]]]]

The nature remains to be determined of NP1 in the Spec of the lower CP in (59).

We have already excluded that it is a null operator. We can likewise exclude that it is a variable, there being no plausible higher operator to which it is bound. The possibilities left are NP-trace, PRO and pro.

Could it be NP-trace? A simple consideration makes this option dubious. The Spec of CP is governed by (finite) AGR in C (which is generally incompatible with anaphors) and is presumably assigned nominative Case by it, which is again in contrast with the Case-less nature of NP-traces.

The same considerations (government and Case assignment) also rule out the option in which NP1 is PRO.

So, the only plausible candidate remains pro. Indeed, I assume that it is licensed and identified in its phi-features by finite AGR in C, in Italian, under ordinary Spec/head agreement. In French, it is licensed and identified by the agreeing form of the complementizer (qui).

Some evidence may come from an observation of Guasti's (1988, 45ff), according to which, when the head of the construction is other than 3rd person, the result is judged either downright ill-formed or marginal (*Pierre me/te/nous/vous voit qui parle/parles-parlons-parlez à Jean), in striking contrast with what happens with the participial variant (Pierre me/te/nous/vous/voit parlant à Jean).

As she notes the contrast can be attributed to the fact that pro needs to be identified in its phi-features and that qui has only (or has characteristically) 3rd person features.

The next question to consider is how the NP in the subject position of the higher AGR receives a theta-role. Observationally, it appears that such NP bears the theta-role which the predicate of the lower CP assigns externally, an agent theta-role in (60)a, a theme theta-role in (60)b, a goal theta-role in (60)c:
(60) a. Ciò che ho visto è Gianni che picchiava suo figlio
   What I saw was G. that was beating his son
b. Ciò che ho visto è Gianni che veniva picchiato da sua moglie
   'What I saw was G. that was beaten by his wife'
c. Ciò che vorremmo vedere è Gianni che riceve il primo premio
   'What we would like to see is G. that gets the first prize'

The fact is problematic since we have noted that the subject NP of the higher AGRP cannot have originated in the subject position of the lower AGRP, which contains an argument (pro) raising to the Spec of the lower CP.

The main reason for that was that no idiom chunk belonging to the lower CP can appear there.

This state of affairs recalls the easy-to-please case. There, as Chomsky (1981, sect. 5.4) notes, the NP in subject position bears the theta-role assigned by the complement predicate to its object, and yet it cannot be an idiom chunk:

(61) a. *Good care is hard to take t of the orphans
b. *Too much is hard to make t of that suggestion

It thus seems plausible to try and extend Chomsky’s solution for this problem to the present puzzle too.

The subject NP position of the higher AGRP is not a theta- position, so it cannot contain a lexical NP at D-structure. The external theta-role of the lower predicate is assigned to the Spec of the lower AGRP containing pro. At S-structure, a lexical NP is "base-generated" in the Spec of the higher AGRP, which is reanalysed into a chain with the Spec of the lower CP, itself in a chain with the lower AGRP subject. The single chain which is formed thus contains one argument (the lexical NP), one Case (the one assigned to the Spec of the higher AGRP), and one theta-role (the one assigned to the Spec of the lower AGRP). Nevertheless, as the lexical NP is "base-generated" directly in the Spec of the higher AGRP at S-structure, it cannot be an idiom chunk related to the lower CP.

How can a lexical NP, as in (62)a, alternate with a controlled PRO, as in (62)b?

   I can’t stand G. that .
 b. Ho incontrato Gianni [CP [AGR P PRO AGR [CP che .
   I met G. that .

This is related to the mechanism of Case assignment to the Spec of the higher AGRP. As already noted above, there is reason not to take such a position to be directly governed and Case marked by the matrix V. Rather, it was suggested, essentially after Reuland’s (1983) analysis of the corresponding Acc-ing
construction, that Case is assigned to the higher CP, from which it percolates to AGR, which ultimately assigns it to the subject NP (under Spec/head agreement). We further assume that such AGR in Italian, differently from the -ing AGR of the English construction, necessarily becomes a governor and must assign its Case when it receives one. This abstract difference with English -ing should capture the following difference between Italian and English concerning the alternation between lexical NP and PRO:

(63) a. Odio [[Gianni [che canta per strada]]]
    I hate G. that sings in the street
b. *Odio [[PRO [che faccio tardi]]]
    I hate that I am late

(64) a. I hate [[him singing in the street]]
b I hate [[PRO singing in the street]]

This implies that whenever the matrix CP is found in a Case position the PRO option is excluded in Italian. When the CP is instead found in a non Case position, such as the adjunct position of (62)b, a lexical NP is disallowed and only PRO is possible.

Interestingly, there is evidence that whatever Case is assigned to the CP (and percolates to AGR) is realized as Nominative in the Spec of AGRP. Of course, (65) is well-formed with Accusative Case, but given the structural ambiguity seen above we cannot really tell from (65) whether the pronominal is the object of the matrix V or the subject of a complement small clause:

(65) Ha visto me che fumavo per strada
    He/she saw me that was smoking in the street

However, if the former option is structurally excluded, the only Case that can be realized is indeed the Nominative. See (66)- (68):

(66) [Io/*me che fumo per strada] è uno spettacolo che non raccomando a nessuno
    I/*me that smoke in the street is a sight that I can’t recommend
(67) Ciò che lei non sopporta è io/*me che fumo per strada
    What she can’t stand is I/*me that smoke in the street
(68) Se vedi Maria che scappa e io/*me che la inseguo, non farci caso
    'If you see M. that is running away and I that am chasing her, don’t bother

Consider, now, the question of the binding domain of the NP in the Spec of the higher AGRP. From such cases as (69), it would seem that the relevant domain is the matrix clause:

(69) Nel filmato rivide se stesso che giocava con Mario
In the film, he saw himself that was playing with M.

But, once again, this particular context is not informative. *Se stesso* could well be the direct object of the matrix *V.*

If we force the postverbal NP to be in a subject position of a small clause complement of the matrix *V,* it turns out that no anaphor (bound from the matrix clause) can fill that position:

(70) a. Nel filmato, Maria vide Gianni che scappava e lei/*se stessa che io rincorreva
   'In the film, M. saw G. that was running away and that she/herself was chasing him
   b. Ciò che Gianni rivedrebbe volentieri è *lui/*se stesso che suona la batteria
      What G. would like to see again is him/himself that is playing the drums

This pattern is in fact expected on the assumption, motivated above in relation to Case assignment and the distribution of PRO, that the null AGR of the small clause governs its Spec if it receives Case. For, under such an assumption the complete functional complex of the NP in the Spec of AGRP is the AGRP itself.28

Finally, a few words on the island character of the construction, for which we will suggest a tentative answer. Above, we noted how the bare CP analysis could not provide a non-stipulative account for it. A similar situation perhaps holds in the present analysis. If anything, one should expect the construction to show quasi-*wh*-island effects, thus blocking the extraction of adjuncts but not that of arguments. Both, however, appear to be blocked:

(71)a *La persona con cui ho visto tua sorella che stava parlando è questa
   'The person with whom I saw your sister that she was talking is this'
   b. *Il modo in cui ho visto tua sorella che lo stava trattando mi ha dato fastidio
      'The way in which I saw your sister that she was treating him bothered me'

This means that (71)a has at least one barrier (more), when compared with a standard *wh*-island such as (72):

(72) (?)La persona con cui mi chiedevo di che cosa stessi parlando è questa
   'The person with whom I was wondering about what you were talking is this'

A difference between (71)a and (72) is in the P selected by *T,* a CP in the former
case (cf. (56)) and a VP in the latter. This has as a consequence that only in the ordinary case of (72) does T become leical after raising of the V. If (slightly modifying the system of Cinque 1990) we take coindexing (either through raising or lowering) between the selecting head and the head of the selected XP to be a condition to void the barrierhood of the XP, then the CP headed by che is a barrier, since it is selected by T, to which C does not raise nor is coindexed. Presence of a single such barrier must then be sufficient to block extraction of both arguments and adjuncts (cf. Cinque 1990).

3. The Acc-ing construction As already noted, essentially the same threelfold structural ambiguity has been proposed by Declerck (1982) for the corresponding English Acc-ing construction. As he points out, the apparently contradictory nature of the evidence discussed in the literature can find a solution if the tacit assumption that "there is only one correct analysis of [participial perception verb complements]" (p.2) is abandoned.

As in Romance, (73) can enter anyone of the three structures shown in (74)a-c, which correspond, with certain differences to which we return directly, to (38)a-c above:

(73) I saw the moon and Venus rising over the mountain
(74) a. I saw [CP[AGRP[NP the moon and Venus] AGR rising over the mountain]]
    b. I saw [NP[NP the moon and Venus] [CP[AGRP PRO rising over the mountain]]]
    c. I [v saw [NP the moon and Venus]] [CP[AGRP PRO rising over the mountain]]

Evidence for structure (74)b is provided by Akmajian (1977). Akmajian observes that the Accusative NP of the Acc-ing construction can determine number agreement on the matrix verb, as we indeed expect if it is the head of a larger nominal constituent comprising the participial modifier:

(75) [(The moon and Venus] rising in conjunction] have often been observed by the astronomers at Kitt Peak

Equally telling is the fact, also noted in Akmajian (1977), that the participial modifier can extrapolate to the end of the matrix clause, thus behaving like other complements and modifiers of a head N (PP and that complements, relative clauses, etc.):

(76) a. The moon rising over the mountain looks spectacular
    b. The moon looks spectacular rising over the mountain

Furthermore, the Acc-ing complement of perception verbs is found to occur in
other typical NP positions (subject and object of P positions).  

(77) a. [The moon rising over the mountain] was a breathtaking sight  
    b. The sight of [the moon rising over the mountain] was breathtaking  

What about Gee’s (1977,462f) observation, in his comments to Akmajian’s paper, that verb agreement can also be singular? 

(78) Them trying to play Brahms together was quite a sight  

This follows, as Declerck (1982,13) notes, if the Acc-ing constituent of (78) receives a different analysis. Namely, that of a CP functioning as subject of the matrix predicate (whence the 3rd person singular agreement of the latter). As the predicate of a subject CP cannot extrapose, it is correctly predicted that no extraposition of the participial constituent will be available with singular agreement on the matrix verb: 

(79) *Them was quite a sight trying to play Brahms together  

Indeed, only plural agreement is compatible with extraposition, as Gee (1977,463) notes:

(80) They were quite a sight trying to play Brahms together 

Further evidence that the analysis (74)a must be available to (73) is provided by such cases as (81), which were pointed out by Akmajian himself (1977,456) and whose relevance in this connection was stressed in Declerck (1982) and Higginbotham (1983):

(81) I saw it raining  

Here, weather *it can plausibly only fill the subject position of a complement clause, not the (head position of an) object NP. 

The same point is strengthened by the following sentences, from Declerck (1982,12), where the NP is an idiom chunk related to the embedded predicate or 'expletive' there:

(82) a. We noticed allowances being made for the very young  
    b. I saw there being a riot  

The fact that Acc-ing constituents can be resumed (or anticipated) by propositional pro-forms such as it or what is additional evidence for the availability of (74)a. See (83)a-b, from Gee (1977,465) and Declerck (1982,6), respectively:
(83) a. It/*she is quite a sight, Mary trying to play the tuba
    b. What/*who I saw was John kissing a girl

(83)b expectedly contrasts with the following (from Gee 1977, 465), since *catch selects individuals (NPs) and not propositions (CPs):

(84) *What we caught was John stealing the car

This means that (85)a, just like its Romance analogue, can only be analysed as having the third structure (74c), with the NP filling the object position, followed by a control adjunct CP as shown in (85)b:

(85) a. We caught John stealing the car
    b. We [V-caught [NPJohn] [CP[AGRPRO AGR [VPstealing the car]]]]

By full generality, the structure with a control adjunct CP predicated of the object (namely, (74)c) should be available to perception verbs as well. Indeed, as was the case in Romance, we have positive evidence that it must.

As the ungrammaticality of (86) and (87) shows, NP-movement of the subject of the Acc-ing complement to a perception verb is excluded, for familiar reasons if the complement is a full CP:

(86) *It was seen raining
     (It was seen [CP C [AGRPRO AGR raining]])

(87) a. *There was seen being a riot
     b. *Allowances were noticed (by us) being made for the very young

(88)a is of course possible because it can have the structure (88)b, precluded to (86) and (87). NP-movement of objects is unproblematic.

(88) a. John was caught stealing the car
     b. Johni was caught ti [CP C [AGRPRO AGR stealing the car]]

(89), then, must be possible as a case of the same type - namely of structure (74)c, given that NP-movement is excluded in both (74)a and b (cf. (86) and (87)):

(89) John was seen stealing the car

Further evidence for this analysis comes from the observation that, while extraction of an adjunct from an Acc-ing complement of an active perception verb is possible (cf. (90)), extraction becomes impossible if the perception verb is passivized (cf. (91)).
(90) a. How did you see John behaving on such an occasion?
    b. Where did you see John going?
(91) a. *How was John seen behaving on such an occasion?
    b. *Where was John seen going?

This follows if NP-movement is only possible in the structure (74)c, in which the participial clause is an adjunct island.

4. Some Remarks on Direct vs. Indirect Perception. The conclusion that the Romance pseudo-relative and the English Acc-ing constructions following verbs of perception are structurally ambiguous allows us to take a new look at the structural conditions under which a direct perception interpretation is possible (or necessary). In the literature, the relevant facts are not interpreted univocally. It is sometimes claimed, for example, that the Acc-ing and pseudo-relative constructions differ from ordinary tensed complements of perception verbs in that the subjects of the former (though not that of the latter) are necessarily directly perceived.34

(92) a. Ho visto Gianni che dormiva
    b. I saw Gianni sleeping
(93) a. Ho visto che Gianni dormiva
    b. I saw that Gianni was sleeping

Others have pointed out that, although possibly typical, this is not necessary. Gee (1975,1977), for example, notes that there is no requirement that the accusative of the Acc-ing construction be directly perceived, as long as some aspect of the event denoted by the NP and VP is. Similar remarks are made in Declerck (1982, 12ff) and Barss (1985,156f). So, for example, it is possible for me to say (94)a and b even if I don’t actually see John, who is behind a curtain, or in the other room. Similarly, (94)c and d are appropriate even if what I heard was just the pig, and what I smelled was just the wax, not Mary:

(94) a. I can see John moving the little figures
    b. I saw John sawing through the wall
    c. I heard the farmer killing the pig
    d. I smelled Mary beeswaxing the floor

Similar remarks hold for the pseudo-relative construction, whose head can be a NP referring to something which cannot be directly perceived in any obvious sense:

(95) a. Vedere le proprie idee che si impongono con facilità non è sempre una bella sensazione
    To see one’s ideas that have success easily is not always a nice feeling
b. Vide il vento che muoveva le foglie\textsuperscript{35}
He/she saw the wind that was moving the leaves

Also, as with the English Acc-ing cases (94), the following sentences are appropriate even if no direct perception of the NP head of the pseudo-relative obtains; i.e., if the little brother’s cries are the only thing heard in the context of (96)a, and if Gianni’s changing of mind is merely reported in the context of (96)b:

(96) a. Se senti Gianni che fa piangere il fratellino, chiamami
If you hear G. that has his little brother cry, call me
b. Vedere Gianni che cambia opinione così spesso non ci fà meraviglia\textsuperscript{36}
To see G. that changes his mind so often does not surprise us

This state of affairs is expected under the threefold analysis proposed above. Both for the Romance pseudo-relative and for the English Acc-ing constructions, there is at least one configuration in which the subject is not even governed, or directly Case-assigned, by the verb of perception, from which it is separated by AGRP and CP (cf. (59) and (74)a, respectively):

(59) Vedo [CP [AGRP]Maria AGR [TP T [CP che [AGRP corre ]]]]
(74) a. I saw [CP [AGRP] the moon and Venus AGR rising over the mountain ]

This is compatible with restricting the direct perception interpretation just to the cases where the head NP is the real object, or the head of the real object, of the verb of perception (cf. (38)b-c, (74)b-c). In that case, nothing special would have to be said. For, real objects of verbs of perception are necessarily interpreted as directly perceived.\textsuperscript{37}

Notice that the hypothesis defended above that NP-movement (under Passive) and Clitic-movement (in the Romance construction) are only possible when the target is the real object of the verb of perception (and impossible in (59), (74)a) affords a straightforward prediction: namely that, when the NP is passivized or cliticized, the direct perception interpretation becomes obligatory even in those cases as (94)-(96), where it was not. The prediction appears to be correct, thus strengthening that hypothesis. See (97) through (101), which are the Clitic-movement and NP-movement counterpart of (94)-(96) ('%' marks the semantic oddity of those cases where direct perception is not available owing to the inherent nature of the passivized or cliticized object):\textsuperscript{38}

(97) a. John was seen (by us) moving the little figures (cf. (94)a)
b. John was seen (by everybody) sawing through the wall (cf. (94)b)
c. The farmer was heard (by everybody) killing the pig (cf. (94)c)
d. Mary was smelled (by us) beeswaxing the floor (cf. (94)d)
(98) a. %Vedere che si impongono, le proprie idee, non è sempre piacevole
(cf. (95)a)
'To see them that have success, one's ideas is not always a nice feeling'
b. %Le sue idee sono state viste che si imponevano
   His ideas were seen that had success

(99) a. %Il vento, lo abbiamo visto che muoveva le foglie
   The wind, we saw it that was moving the leaves (cf. (95)b)
b. %Il vento fu visto che muoveva le foglie
   The wind was seem that was moving the leaves

(100)a Gianni, l’ho sentito che faceva piangere il fratellino
   G., I heard him that was having his little brother cry (cf. (96)a)
b. Gianni è stato sentito (da tutti) che faceva piangere il fratellino
   'G., was heard (by everybody) that was having his little brother cry’

(101)a. Vederlo che cambia opinione così spesso non ci fa meraviglia (cf. (96)b
   'To see him that changes his mind so often does not surprise us’)
b. Esser visti che cambiamo opinione così spesso è brutto
   To be seen that we change our mind so often is bad
Footnotes

* This article is a revised version of the paper presented at the Conference on "Perceptual Reports" held in Gargnano in September 1990, under the title "Pseudo-relatives as Small Clauses", and at the Seminario di Linguistica of the University of Venice. I am indebted to those audiences, and especially to A. Bonomi, P. Casalegno, G. Giusti, M. T. Guasti, G. Longobardi, A. Moro and L. Rizzi, for helpful comments. The analysis of the Romance construction argued for there an developed here reaches conclusions similar to those of Declerck (1982) for the corresponding English Acc-ing construction, at least as far as the three way ambiguity of the construction is concerned. See sect. 3 here for some comparative remarks. Gee (1977), Reuland (1983), and Raposo (1989), also argue for a two way ambiguity of the English Acc-ing construction and the Portuguese 'prepositional infinitive' construction, respectively, thus partially converging with the analysis proposed here.

1. For other Romance varieties in which they are attested, see Guasti (1991). Rumanian lacks the pseudo-relative construction, and resorts instead to a gerund construction (like English): Am vazut Ion fugind 'I saw Ion running away'. Other Romance varieties have the gerund construction alongside the pseudo-relative (French, Spanish, Brasillian Portuguese, etc.).


4. That the CP can optionally be adverbial (in Italian) is shown by the well-formedness of the following sentences, in which the che clause cannot qualify as a pseudo-relative, either because it lacks an open position which can be predicated of the head ((i)a), or because this is in a non subject position ((i)b):

   (i) a. Paolo la vide che stava piovendo a dirotto (Radford 1977)
       Paolo her saw that (it) was raining heavily
   b. Paolo la vide che la stavano rincorrendo
       Paolo her saw that they were chasing her

   This implies that a sentence like (ii) will be ambiguous between a pseudo-relative reading and a purely adverbial reading, although that may not be immediately obvious:

   (ii) Ho visto Gianni [che se ne stava gia andando]

   I saw Gianni that (he) was already leaving

   The adverbial reading is the only one available if the subject of the che clause is lexical ((iii)a), while the pseudo-relative reading is the only one available if the NP and the CP are fronted together ((iii)b):

   (iii) a. Ho visto Gianni [che lui se ne stava gia andando] (adv.)
       I saw Gianni that he was already leaving
   b. GIANNI CHE SE NE STAVA GIA’ ANDANDO, ho visto (pseudo-rel)

   This predicts that it will no longer be possible to front the NP and the che clause together when a lexical subject is present. A correct prediction:

   (iv) *GIANNI CHE LUI SE NE STAVA GIA’ ANDANDO, ho visto!

   Note that this additional ambiguity is absent from French, where this construction is for some reason unavailable:

   (v) a. *Je l’ai rencontré qu’il pluvait
       I met her that it was raining
   b. *Je l’ai rencontré qu’elle sortait du cinéma (Kayne 1984, (102))
       I met her that was going out of the cinema

   The possibility of fronting the NP and the CP together also argues against a raising analysis which generates the NP in the subject position of the CP and then moves it to the object position of the perception verb (Schwarze 1974, Radford 1975, 1977). Additional difficulties for this analysis are the French en-avant facts mentioned in Burzio (1986, 318), and the impossibility of subject idiom chunks in the object position of the perception verb:
(vi) a. *Se vedi i conti che tornano, puoi considerarti fortunato,
    'If you see the calculations square, you can call yourself lucky'
b. *Se vedi giustizia che viene fatta solo per pochi, non meravigliarti
    'If you see justice being done only for few people, don’t be surprised'

5. Note that the analogue of (7) in Italian is well-formed (*l’ho incontrata che tu stavi uscendo dal cinema). However, not as a pseudo-relative, but as an adverbal structure of the type discussed in the previous footnote.

6. Kayne (1981, fn.26) suggests reducing the difference between *Je le voit qui rit 'I see him that is laughing' and *Je le connais qui est intelligent 'I know him that is intelligent' (as well as that between Le garçon a été vu qui courait 'The boy was seen that was running' and *Le garçon a été critiqué qui courait 'The boy was criticized that was running') to the independent property of relative clauses whereby they cannot modify an anaphor: *John believed himself, who I find intolerable, to be quite pleasant. Sentences comparable to this are not so bad in Italian, however:
   (i) ?Se Gianni finirà per proporre se stesso, che pure non ha una grande esperienza...'
       If G. ends up proposing himself, who has no great experience,
An alternative for the ill-formed cases above may be provided by the observation that the target of Clitic- and NP-movement there is only a proper subpart (NP) of the maximal projection (DP) which should undergo the rule.

7. See Guasti (1991) for an extension of her analysis which may account for the pseudo-relative following the incontrare class of verbs. Nonetheless, problems remain for the 'bare' CP analysis. See below for discussion.

8. For the time being, I assume, after Kayne (1985, 1989), Hornstein and Lightfoot (1987), that "small clauses" are (at least) projections of an abstract AGR taking a lexical XP as its complement. For evidence that they can even be CPs, see the quoted works by Kayne, Mouchaweh (1984), and Cinque (1990a, fn.25). I come back later on what "ac" in (18)/(19) stands for.

9. Taraldsen (1986), while assuming a complex NP structure for pseudo-relatives, as noted, suggests (p.169) that they receive a small clause interpretation. In his analysis of the European Portuguese prepositional infinitive construction (PIC), Raposo (1989) also assumes a small clause analysis: Eu vi [pos meninos [y a [vlerem esse livro]]] 'I saw the boys reading this book'. In the analysis developed here, we would be led to assign the PIC the triple structure shown in (38) below, with a in the head position of the lower CP, to underline the similar role that che and a have in the aspectual value of the construction. Determining the actual viability of this analysis for the European Portuguese PIC is, however, beyond the scope of this article. For comparable suggestions, see Guasti (1991).

10. Besides being complements to perception verbs, and 'mental attitude' verbs like (non) sopportare 'not tolerate', detestare 'detest', ricordare 'remember', etc., small clauses can also be found as complements to various other classes of verbs: causative (rendere,fare 'make',etc.), epistemic (considerare,tenere, 'consider', etc.), dicendi (definire 'define, dichiarare 'declare', etc.), volitional (volere 'want, desiderare 'desire', etc.). Differently from the case of mental attitude verbs, however, pseudo-relatives are not permitted as complements of these other classes of verbs. This should not be taken as problematic. Pseudo-relatives have a special aspectual value (often termed 'progressive' - cf. Declerck (1981), Guasti, 1990), which appears to be incompatible with the stative value characterizing the complement of the latter classes of verbs. See (i) vs. (ii):
   (i) a. Ho visto Gianni soprapensiero/in partenza/che partiva
I saw G. lost in thought/on the move/that was leaving
b. Non sopporto Gianni soprapensiero/in partenza/che parte
   I can’t stand G. lost in thought/on the move/that is leaving
c. Ricordo Gianni soprapensiero/in partenza/che partiva
   I remember G. lost in thought/on the move/that was leaving
(ii) a. *Ho reso Gianni soprapensiero/in partenza/che parte
     I rendered G. lost in thought/on the move/that is leaving
b. *Ritengo Gianni soprapensiero/in partenza/che parte
     I believed G. lost in thought/on the move/that is leaving
c. *Definire Gianni soprapensiero/in partenza/che parte
     I would define G. lost in thought/on the move/that is leaving
d. *Voglio Gianni soprapensiero/in partenza/che parte
     I want G. lost in thought/on the move/that is leaving

12. Cf., again, the references of the previous footnote.
18. Whether this adverbial CP is dominated by VP (or a segment of VP, i.e. it is adjoined to it) depends on the results of VP constituency tests as VP-preposing. Although the judgements are not always very sharp, they seem to suggest that the adverbial CP is in fact outside the VP. See:
(i) Vista, non l’ho, che stava piovendo a dirotto
    Seen, I haven’t her that it was raining cats and dogs
(ii) *Vista che stava piovendo a dirotto, non l’ho
    This is confirmed by an observation of Giusti (1991, 735); namely that such adverbial CPs cannot in general be focalized, which possibly suggests that they are not properly governed (cf. *?CHE STA VA PIOVENDO A DI ROTTO, sono uscito/l’ho vista “That it was raining cats and dogs (focus), I went out/I saw her’). Since the VP-joined position is a properly governed position, this suggests that the CP is higher.
19. Given the existence, in Italian, of the additional option (37), the argument should, in fact, be constructed on the the basis of the corresponding French facts.
20. (43)b and (46) should be compared to the following Acc-ing cases in English (also see sect. 3 below):
(i) *Johni was hated [CP C [AGR t; behaving like that]]
(ii) *I hate [CP C [t behaving like that] [all the people I helped]]
(iii) Who do they hate [CP[t:C i [AGR t; behaving like that]]
    Some speakers find (46) marginal or impossible.
21. Of course, the Case assignee can move away from the Case assigner when it moves alone, as Case can still be assigned by the Case assigner to its trace, under adjacency:
(i) GIANNI, ritenevo [ t onesto]
    G. (focus), I believed honest
(ii)  Him, I can’t believe to be intelligent

22.  In the adjunct within VP and in the adjunct within NP cases, the small clause subject is PRO. For the alternation lexical NP/PRO see below.

23.  From this point of view, it is interesting that the only well-formed cases where the categorial identity requirement seems to be violated are coordinations of predicate Ps, which can be interpreted as coordinations of identical higher level constituents (AGR’ or AGRP):

    (i)  a.  Gianni sembrava [AGR’[AGR’ AGR [AP ti irritato] e [AGR’ AGR [ [ppril sul punto di piangere]]

    b.  Gianni sembrava [AGRP[AGR’ ti [AGR’ AGR [AP ti irritato]]] e [AGRP ti [AGR’ AGR 

          [ [ppril sul punto di piangere]]] 

    G.  seemed irritated and on the verge of crying

24.  Perhaps, the unavailability of an operator/variable configuration is due to the fact that this is neither a relative clause configuration nor a reanalysis configuration of the easy-to-please type, which in Romance requires an infinitival construction.

25.  If generation of AGR in C is lexically selected in general (cf. Rizzi 1990, sect.2.5), here it must be selected by the particular aspectual T head which takes the small clause as its complement.

26.  We have to assume that the AGR head of the lower AGRP does not govern or assign Case to its Spec in the context of AGR in C, at least optionally. The ungrammaticality of idiom chunks in the Spec of the higher AGRP, noted above, excludes the subcase in which the NP-trace is created by movement to the Spec of the higher AGRP.

27.  The derivation *Je crois [proi qui [ ti est malade]] (instead of Je crois qu’il est malade) must be excluded. It is if the derivation creates a predicate (which here fails for lack of an appropriate subject of predication).


   Another area of inquiry, which we will not pursue here, concerns the LF properties of a quantified head of a pseudo-relative. What one would expect is that a narrow scope interpretation should be possible in the subject position of a complement pseudo-relative. This appears to be true (Vedere nessuno che cede il proprio posto quando entra una vecchia dà fastidio ‘To see nobody giving his seat when an old lady comes in is bothering’) although the judgements tend to be not very sharp and variable across speakers. For general discussion, see Higginbotham (1983) and Reuland (1983).

29.  As in the corresponding Romance case, the participial modifier of (75)-(76) is not a reduced relative clause (pace Barss 1985), but an adjunct-like modifier (cf. Declereck 1982, 7ff).

30.  Note that the head of the larger nominal ‘stranded’ by extraposition is in the Nominative, as one would expect given the context in which the NP occurs, while the pronominal subject of the subject CP in (78) is in the Accusative. Cf. Reuland’s (1983) above mentioned analysis of Case assignment in such clauses.

   Interestingly, Gee (1977,463) observes that singular agreement on the verb is much better for him than plural agreement when the head of the construction is an [Accusative] plural pronoun.
31. (81) also shows that the English Acc-ing construction differs from the Romance pseudo-relative construction in internal structure. While the latter must be a ‘small clause’ CP structure with the subject NP base-generated in situ, as noted, the English Acc-ing construction is (can be) a plain CP structure with the subject NP filling the Spec of the AGRP headed by ing. Several differences stem from this more abstract difference.

Among them, the fact that the subject of the English Acc-ing construction can be an idiom chunk (cf. (i)a, from Gee (1977), vs. (i)b = (vi)a of fn.4), and the fact that extraction, possible from Acc-ing complement clauses, is impossible from complement pseudo-relatives (cf. (ii)a, from Gee (1977), vs. (ii)b):

(i) a I saw the shit hitting the fan  
   b *Se vedi i conti che tornano, puoi considerarli fortunato  
      If you see the calculations square, you can call yourself lucky

(ii) a What did the policeman see John crossing?  
    b *Che strada hai visto Gianni che stava attraversando?  
      Which street Have you seen G. that was crossing?

32. (86)-(87)a are noted by Reuland (1983,fn7), who credits them to David Pesetsky. (87)a is also noted by Declerck (1982,13), who reports (87)b too.

33. Reuland (1983,fn7) cites (i) as wellformed. Indeed, if there is a detectable difference between it and (91)b, then it must be due to the familiar NP/non-NP asymmetry under extraction (cf. Cinque 1990):

(i) What was everyone; seen tji doing tji


35. This sentence was suggested at Gargnano by Paolo Casalegno

36. This sentence is an adaptation of a sentence suggested by Andrea Bonomi.

37. This was, in fact, Akmajian’s (1977) idea, though cast in a different analysis.

38. The actual viability of restricting the direct perception interpretation to real objects rather than to governed NPs (hence of dispensing with the notion of thematic sharing proposed in Rizzi (1991)) depends on the precise analysis of such clicitization cases as (i) below, which appear to be relatively acceptable in opposition to the corresponding cases of passive (cf. (ii)):

(i) Le sue idee, le ho viste imporsi con facilità  
   His ideas, I saw them have success easily

(ii) Le sue idee sono state viste (da tutti) imporsi con facilità  
   'His ideas have been seen (by everybody) have success easily.'

But I will not pursue this question here which touches on the analysis of infinitival complements to perception verbs.
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