Contents

Acknowledgments	X
<u>Chapter 1</u>	
Introduction	1
11 Overview	3
1.2 The Small Clause Theory	8
1.3 Framework	20
1.3.1 The Language Faculty	. 20
1.3.2 The Theoretical System	21
1.3.3 Modules of Grammar	23
1.3.4 The X-bar Theory	27
1.4 Outline	28

<u>Chapter 2</u>

The Complex Small Clause-Model

35

2.1	The Complex Small Clause-Model		
2.2	The Structural	Organization of a Complex Small Clause	38
2.3	The Internal Organization of a Complex Small Clause		
	2.3.1	The Legitimization of the CSCI-Subject	47
	2.3.2	The Licensing of the two Subjects	
		2.3.2.1 The Internal Predication	56
		2.3.2.2 The External Predication	57
2.4	The Semantic (Organization of a Complex Small Clause	62
	2.4.1	A Situation as a Predicate	62
	2.4.2	The Semantic Role of the FP-Head	66
2.5	Summary		67

Chapter 3

The Pseudo-Relative			
71			
3.1 The Pseudo-Relative 7	3		
3.1.1 Three Possible Approaches to Account for the Syntax of the			
Pseudo-Relative	. 82		
3.1.1.1 An Op Raising to Spec, CP	82		
3.1.1.2 An Op Base-Generated in Spec, CP	86		
3.1.1.3 The DP Raising to Spec, CP	91		
3.1.1.3.1 Syntactic Problems	. 92		
3.1.1.3.2 Conceptual Problems	94		
3.1.2 A Complex Small Clause-Analysis for the Pseudo-Relative	107		
3.1.2.1 The Subject-Predicate Relationship in the Pseudo-Relative	109		
3.1.2.2 Argumental or Adjunct Complex Small Clause	113		
3.1.2.2.1 The Pseudo-Relative as an Argumental			
Complex Small Clause	113		
3.1.2.2.2 The Pseudo-Relative as an Adjunct			
Complex Small Clause	117		
3.1.2.3 Internal Organization			
3.1.2.3.1 pro and Expletive	120		
3.1.2.3.2 pro in French	124		
3.1.2.3.3 The Lexical DP	135		
3.2 Three Types of C: Modifier, Propositional, and Predicational	142		
3.3 Summary	146		
Appendix: Campos' examples	148		
<u>Chapter 4</u>			
The Prepositional Infinitival Construction and its Relationship with the PR	155		
4.1 The Prepositional Infinitival Construction	157		
4.1.1 A Complex Small Clause-Analysis for the Prepositional			
Infinitival Construction	160		
4.1.2 The Subject-Predicate Relationship in the Prepositional			

		Infinitival Construction	164
	4.1.3	Argumental or Adjunct Complex Small Clause	166
		4.1.3.1 The Prepositional Infinitival Construction as an Argumental	
		Complex Small Clause	167
		4.1.3.2 The Prepositional Infinitival Construction as an Adjunct	
		Complex Small Clause	168
	4.1.4	Internal Organization	169
		4.1.4.1 pro / PRO and Expletive	170
		4.1.4.2 The Lexical DP	172
4.2	The C in the Ps	eudo-Relative: From C to P	178
	4.2.1	Some Relevant Facts that Show that the PR and the PIC Behave Alike	178
		4.2.1.1 Complementary Distribution	178
		4.2.1.2 The PR and the PIC Denote Events	180
		4.2.1.3 Aspectual Restrictions	183
	4.2.2	C as a P: Some Arguments in Favor	186
		4.2.2.1 The Adverbial Value of the C que in Some Romance Languages	186
		4.2.2.2 Balearic Catalan: que vs. qui	191
		4.2.2.3 Salentino: <i>ka</i> vs. <i>ku</i>	193
		4.2.2.4 Dutch and German	199
		4.2.2.5 The PIC in Italian	200
	4.2.3	How C Differs from a C and Resembles a P in the Pseudo-Relative	203
		4.2.3.1 The C Cannot Close the Temporal Chain in the Pseudo-Relative.	203
		4.2.3.2 C as an Aspectual Marker in the Pseudo-Relative	212
	4.2.4 C	and P: Aspectual Markers or Temporal Connectors	219
4.3	When C is not a	a P	221
4.4	Summary		226
App	endix: The Pseu	do-Relative Headed by a Modal or Factive C	227
<u>Cha</u>	apter 5		
The	e Gerund Const	ruction and its Relationship with the PR and the PIC	241
5.1	The Pseudo-Re	lative, the Prepositional Infinitival Construction, and the	
	Gerund Constru	action	243

5.1.1	The Pseudo-Relative in Romance	243		
5.1.2	The Prepositional Infinitival Construction in European Portuguese	246		
5.1.3 The Gerund Construction in English and Brazilian Portuguese				
5.2 The Gerund Construction				
5.2.1 The Standard Analysis				
	5.2.1.1 Crosslinguistic Comparison	254		
	5.2.1.2 Temporal Constraints			
	5.2.1.3 No Subject PRO			
	5.2.1.4 DP-Movement			
	5.2.1.5 Wide Scope Interpretation	260		
	5.2.1.6 Transparent Context	261		
	5.2.1.7 No Expletive <i>there</i>	262		
5.2.2	A Complex Small Clause-Analysis for the Gerund Construction	264		
	5.2.2.1 The Subject-Predicate Relationship in the Gerund Construction	266		
	5.2.2.2 Argumental or Adjunct Complex Small Clause	267		
	5.2.2.1 The Gerund Construction as an Argumental			
	Complex Small Clause	268		
	5.2.2.2 The Gerund Construction as an Adjunct			
	Complex Small Clause	270		
	5.2.2.3 Internal Organization	271		
	5.2.2.3.1 PRO and Expletive	272		
	5.2.2.3.2 The Lexical DP	274		
	5.2.2.3.2.1 Idiom Chunks	279		
	5.2.2.3.2.2 HAVE and BE	285		
	5.2.2.3.3 Extractions	290		
	5.2.2.4 Other Properties	297		
5.3 Three Valu	tes for the [- <i>ing</i> - \mathcal{O}_C] Interaction: Modifier, Propositional, and			
Predication	nal	298		
5.4 Analytic of	r Synthetic	302		
5.4	.1 The Mechanism	310		
	5.4.1.1 Something about Ns	311		
	5.4.1.2 Applying the Mechanism to the PR, the PIC, and the GC	313		
	5.4.1.3 Some Immediate Consequences	316		
	5.4.1.3.1 The Phonological Realization of the Type Shifter	316		

		5.4.1.3.2	The Aspectual Markers Cannot Operate on Atoms	318
		5.4.1.3.3	The Aspectual Markers Operate on Sets	321
		5.4.1.3.4	Predicates vs. Arguments	322
		5.4.1.3.5	Aspectual Particles vs. Aspectual Verbs	323
	5.4.2	Selecting T	emporal Sets: Parametric Variation	324
5.5	Summary			330

333

Chapter 6

Nonverbal Complex Small Clauses

6.1 Nonverbal Complex Small Clauses	335
6.1.1 The Standard Analysis	340
6.1.1.1 The Relationship between the SCI-Subject and	
the Prepositional C	343
6.1.1.2 The Movement of the Subject Creates a Mixed	
[A, A', A] Chain	344
6.1.1.3 The Subject Cannot Check Case at LF	345
6.1.1.4 Verbs Like to take Do not Subcategorize for a Full CP	346
6.1.2 A Complex Small Clause-Analysis	346
6.1.2.1 The Subject-Predicate Relationship in a Nonverbal Complex	
Small Clause	348
6.1.2.2 Internal Organization	353
6.1.2.2.1 PRO	353
6.1.2.2.2 The Lexical DP	360
6.2 The Semi-Lexical Status of the Head	366
6.2.1 The Functional Status of the Particle in a	
Nonverbal Complex Small Clause	367
6.2.2 The Lexical Status of the Particle in a	
Nonverbal Complex Small Clause	374
6.3 Summary	379

Chapter 7

Conclusion

References

381

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank all the people that have helped me in one way or the other during the process of elaboration of the dissertation that you have in your hands. Some of them are Giovanni Albertocchi, Héctor Campos, Walcir Cardoso, Joan Miquel Contreras, Peter Culicover, Antón Chusé Gil, Ángela DiTullio, Manuel Español, Donatella Gagliardi, Maria Lluïsa Hernanz, Jim Huang, Jaume Mateu, Jim McCullough, Caroline Morgan-Carter, Salvador Oliva, Miguel Oliveira, Maria Pertile, Carme Picallo, Isabel Pujol, Francesc Roca, Joana Rosselló, Jaume Solà, and Sze-Wing Tang.

I would also like to thank all my colleagues from the Universitat de Girona, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, City University of New York, and University of California at Irvine. And I would also like to specially thank all my native informants that I've been coming across around the world for their help and patience, especially during party time, strolls, and breakfast / lunch / dinner where we were not supposed to talk about linguistics.

The work on this thesis was supported in part by a fellowship of Formació de Personal Investigador (1995FI 05104) from the Generalitat de Catalunya. I also benefited from two other additional grants also from the Generalitat de Catalunya that have allowed me to visit the *Graduate Center and the City University of New York* (CUNY) for three months in the 1996 fall term, and the *University of California at Irvine* (UCI) also for three months in the 1998 fall term.

Part of this material has been previously presented at the 7th Colloquium on Generative Grammar, Universidad de Oviedo, Spain, April 03, 1997; Going Romance 11, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, The Netherlands, December 12, 1997; The 33rd Mid-America Linguistics Conference, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Illinois, U.S.A., October 23, 1998; The 29th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A., April 10, 1999; and the Workshop on Semi-Lexical Heads, Tilburg University, The Netherlands, May 20, 1999. I thank the audience of all these conferences for their very insightful comments and helpful discussion.

I would also like to thank Gemma Rigau and Montse Batllori for guiding me when I was just a "baby" in Linguistics (well, I still am). I still remember the long conversation by phone that Gemma had to bear just hours after she came back from a business trip from the States. This is praiseworthy for Gemma bearing in mind that the topic of that conversation was how *I* could apply for a doctoral fellowship. Moltes gràcies pel teu ajut. And Montse for telling me once and again that I had to travel, that is, visit foreign universities, submit papers in conferences, and go wherever I could learn something else about linguistics. Moltes gràcies per les teves encertades recomanacions.

A special thanks goes to my advisor Avel·lina Suñer for her attitude towards me during all this time, and for her great great humor. Needless to say that I thank her for sharing all her knowledge in linguistics with me and having trusted me the way she has done. Moltíssimes gràcies.

I també un especial agraïment per a la meva família que ha hagut d'aguantar cada una de les obsessions que m'han envaït abans i durant el temps que ha durat la confecció d'aquest treball. Moltes gràcies pel vostre suport i ajut.

Probably it will be the end of a dissertation, but the most exciting thing is to think that it will be the beginning of a career.

Chapter 1

Introduction

"Universal grammar may be thought of as some system of principles, common to the species and available to each individual prior to experience." (Noam Chomsky)

1.1 Overview

There is the belief that a predicative relationship between a subject and a predicate is a linguistic phenomenon that does not need to be exclusively satisfied within the structural domain of a full sentence.

In general terms, the structural domain of a full sentence is constituted of a *lexical* VP-shell and two *functional* projections, which are Inflection Phrase (IP) and Complementizer Phrase (CP). The VP-shell provides an eventuality; the IP is related to the temporal properties of that eventuality;¹ and, finally, the CP supplies the "reference" of the event, namely it links the eventuality to the

¹ At this point I ignore the agreement properties of IP, which are just a morphological manifestation of the structural Spec-Head relationship between the IP-head and the grammatical subject in Spec, IP.

actual world.² In the embedded clauses in (1), for example, the head of each one of these three projections appears overtly manifested.

a. I consider that John is intelligent.b. I saw that John was in the garden.

The V of the clause is the copula *be* in both cases. That V bears the temporal specification of I, which is [-past] in (1a) and [+past] in (1b), yielding the form *is* and *was*, respectively. Finally, *that* is the phonological realization of the CP-head in the two subordinate clauses.

The complement of the well-formed sentences in (2), on the other hand, also contains a predication, but here there is no phonological trace indicating the presence of a VP-, IP-, or CP-projection in the structure.

- (2) a. I consider *John intelligent*.
 - b. I saw John in the garden.

As can be observed, the embedded predication is apparently formed in these cases by the AP *intelligent* in (2a) and the PP *in the garden* in (2b), and the DP *John*.

That the structural configuration DP plus XP that we find in the complement position of the sentences in (2) must also constitute a predication is demonstrated by examples of the following type:

(3) a. I walked *my shoes flat*.b. *I walked *my shoes*.

The ungrammaticality of the sentence in (3b) tells us that the DP my shoes cannot establish a semantic relationship with the matrix V *walked*. By the same token, we must say that the DP my shoes cannot be the semantic object of the V in (3a) either. Now the contrast between the two

² The term `reference' of an event can be taken here either as Frege's technical use of `bedeutung,' that is, as referring to the *truth value* of the sentence, usually applied to the CP of main sentences (direct reference), or to the *thought* that it may express, if it is the CP of an embedded clause (indirect reference); or as in Barwise and Perry 1983 and subsequent work, that is, as referring to the *interpretation* that the sentence has.

sentences in (3) is to be found in that only in (3a) the DP *my shoes* can be semantically licensed by being interpreted as the subject of the adjectival predicate *flat*.

At this stage, we could suppose that the embedded clausal structure in the examples in (2) also contains the two *functional projections* that a regular clause possesses, namely IP and CP, and that these two functional projections are equally *active* in these cases, hence the licensing of the predication. If this were so, then the two main differences between the embedded clauses in (1) and (2) would lie in that the IP- and CP-heads are phonologically expressed only in (1), and that this functional domain introduces a nonverbal XP-shell only in (2). But there is syntactic and semantic evidence that indicates that the embedded clauses in (2) do not possess a complete active functional domain. From a formal viewpoint, for instance, this is indicated by the fact that the embedded subject can only be extracted in (2), as shown by the contrast between (4) and (5).

- (4) a. *John_i is considered [that t_i is intelligent.]
 b. *John_i was seen [that t_i was in the garden.]
- a. John_i is considered [t_i intelligent.]
 b. John_i was seen [t_i in the garden.]

This contrast can be accounted for by assuming that the movement of a phrase to an argumental (A-) position outside its clause is forbidden when that clause contains a complete active functional domain.³ Something similar can also account for a second contrast that again separates the embedded structures in (1) from the embedded structures in (2). Consider the sentences in (6) and (7).

- (6) a. John is intelligent.
 - b. John was in the garden.
- (7) a. *John intelligent.

³ In the literature it has been assumed that A-positions are those bearing grammatical relations. That is, potential theta-role positions like Spec, VP and Spec, XP in a Small Clause (see shortly below), and the specifier of agreement projections, for instance, Spec, AgrsP -or Spec, IP- and Spec, AgroP. On the other hand, A'-positions are operator positions, typically Spec, CP.

b. *John in the garden.⁴

Here we can see that the embedded clauses in (2) cannot appear as main sentences, as opposed to what occurs with the subordinate clauses in (1). Again this difference can be attributed to the assumption that a clause can appear independently only if it possesses a complete active functional domain.

There also exist semantic distinctions that set the clausal complements in (1) and (2) apart. The most obvious one is that in (1b) the *that*-clause has a propositional value, and this propositional value triggers the epistemic interpretation of the perception verb *to see*. That is, this verb is interpreted here like the verb *to realize*. As a result, this sentence can be used in a situation in which I did not see John, but, for example, I heard him talking or I saw his car parked near the garden. This is not the case in (2b), where the perception verb *to* see combines with a reduced clause. Here the reduced predication does not trigger the epistemic interpretation of the perception verb *to* see. So this verb can only be interpreted in its nonepistemic or sensible reading. This means that (2b) can be only appropriate in a situation in which I have seen John with my very own eyes. The semantic difference between these two sentences can be clearly seen by comparing the following two sentences:

- (8) I saw [that John was in the garden,] because I saw his car there.
- (9) *I saw [John in the garden,] because I saw his car there.

Here the adjunct *because I saw his car there* has been introduced in the sentences in (1b) and (2b) above. As it can be observed, this adjunct expresses the cause that has let us see what the matrix object (*that John was in the garden* in (8) and *John in the garden* in (9)) says. Now the cause that this adjunct expresses forces the epistemic interpretation of the perception verb *to see*. This interpretation is in accordance with the reading of *saw* in (8), which combines with a *that*-clause. So the sentence is ruled in. But it is not in (9), since *saw* combines with a reduced clause. Hence the

⁴ Clauses of this kind are not unusual in the Romance and Germanic languages. The crucial point, however, is that this type of clause is only possible in very specific contexts, such as in headlines, exclamations, on the bottom of a picture, etc. (see Benveniste 1966, Gutiérrez Ordóñez 1986, Suñer 1996, Hernanz and Suñer 1999). In other words, the "reduced" clauses in (7) and their counterparts in (6) are not freely interchangeable.

sentence is ruled out.⁵ Once again, this semantic distinction can be interpreted as a consequence of the different structural domain that a full clause, (1), and a reduced clause, (2), may have.⁶

The reduced structural domain in which a DP-subject and an XP-predicate can be licensed, as in (2), has been called *Small Clause* (SCI).⁷ Since the early eighties, the syntactic nature of SCIs has been on the agenda of Generative Grammar. The sorts of questions that have often been formulated with respect to these constructions range from the basic architecture that defines a SCI to its position in the Grammar. So we can find extensive discussions concerning its lexical and functional organization along with debates challenging its very existence.

This essay sets out to be a contribution to the ongoing research devoted to discerning the nature of SCls and the variety of forms in which these constructions can come. I attempt to achieve this goal by examining the syntax and semantics of a specific set of constructions in Romance and Germanic (mainly English). The analysis that I assign to these constructions reduces to the general structure that I call the *Complex Small Clause*. As its name already suggests, the term 'Complex Small Clause' makes reference to those constructions that behave like SCls but the composition of which is more complex than that of ordinary SCls. We will see that nontrivial empirical facts that characterize the constructions investigated in this dissertation derive straightforwardly from the syntactic organization that is proposed here.

1.2 The Small Clause Theory

Several theories have been put forward to provide a description of the structural configuration of SCIs along with an explanation of the system that rules this structure.

The *Predication Theory*, for example, argues against the existence of an autonomous structure for SCls. From the point of view of this approach, it is claimed that the notion of "reduced

(i) a. I see John tired today.

⁶ Here I use the expression `different structural domain' in a general sense, that is, as referring to the number and type of projections that may appear in each construction, and to the information that these projections may supply in each case.

⁵ This contrast does not mean that in other contexts the perception can have an epistemic interpretation when it combines with a reduced predication. Some examples are provided in (i).

b. I saw Mary in a very good mood yesterday.

⁷ The term `Small Clause' comes from Williams (1975), but the concept that this term refers to already appears in Jespersen 1924.

predication" (see (2)) must be defined as a linguistic phenomenon that results from a structural positioning of phrases, rather than as a linguistic phenomenon that derives from a previously established syntactic pattern. The basis of the Predication Theory lies in the idea that two complements can create a predicative relationship at Syntax if certain structural conditions are met. These conditions are the ones listed in (10).

- (10) (a) The subject must be an NP / DP.
 - (b) The predicate must be a maximal projection XP.
 - (c) The subject must c-command the predicate.⁸

Thus, according to this theory, X does not need to project a subject position - typically a specifier in order for that X - or X' - to be predicated of a DP. Instead, it is claimed that an XP can be predicated of a DP situated in a position external to the XP-projection as long as that DP ccommands this XP-projection. If we apply this assumption to the sequence *John intelligent* that we have in the example in (2a), then we would say that the AP *intelligent* is a second object of the V *consider*, and that this AP can be predicated of the first object, namely *John*, because the three structural conditions in (10) are satisfied. The Predication Theory has been advocated in Bresnan 1978, 1982, Williams 1980, 1983, Rothstein 1983, Emonds 1985, McNulty 1988, and Schein 1995, among others.

A second approach is the one defended by the so-called *Complex Predicate Theory*. This theory sustains that the DP-subject of a SCl is in fact the semantic object of a complex predicate. This complex predicate would be formed by the SCl-predicate and the lexical head that dominates the DP-subject, that is, by the AP *intelligent* and the V *consider* in the example in (2a). In order to account for the fact that at Syntax the SCl-predicate generally appears following the DP-subject, it is assumed that this predicate moves to a position to the right of the DP by means of a transformational rule that applies at some point of the derivation. As in the Predication Theory, this approach does not take the DP-subject and the XP-predicate to be primitive members of a SCl-

dominates β .

Dominance

⁸ C-command

 $[\]alpha$ c-commands β if, and only if, α does not dominate β and every phrase γ dominating α also

 $[\]alpha$ dominates β if every segment of α dominates β .

structure, since XP becomes the predicate of the DP only after the application of a transformational operation.⁹ The Complex Predicate Theory has been defended in Chomsky 1955/75, Dowty 1978, Bach 1979, and Larson 1988a, among others.

The Complex Predicate Theory has been taken up more recently in order to account for the restructuring process that a SCl may already undergo at Syntax. This phenomenon is found, for instance, in some Romance languages in contexts where the SCl is argumental (see Rizzi 1986, Stowell 1991). But, interestingly enough, now it is proposed that the movement of the (head of the) SCl-predicate goes just the other way around. That is, it is argued that the head of a SCl-predicate that occupies a complement position at Syntax must end up incorporating into the lexical head that selects the SCl. The completion of this precept is supposed to be necessarily fulfilled at Logical Form. This means that this operation can be triggered either at Syntax or later at Logical Form.

Finally, the *Small Clause Theory* states that a SCl is a syntactic unit and, as a such, possesses an intrinsic identity. The basic idea that this approach holds is that any lexical category (X) can project a specifier in order to host a subject. According to this theory, then, the subject of a SCl is the phrase that is base-generated in Spec, XP, that is, a position within the maximal projection of the lexical head X. The Small Clause Theory was first proposed in Stowell 1981 (see also Chomsky 1981), and developed later in Stowell 1983 and subsequent work.

In Stowell 1981 and 1983, it is argued that there are two basic differences that separate a SCl from a full sentence. The first difference concerns the position in which the subject of the construction is base-generated. As already mentioned, the subject of a SCl is claimed to be base-generated in Spec, XP (cf. Manzini 1983), where the categorial value of X can correspond to any of the four major lexical categories that exist, namely N, P, A, or V. The subject of a full sentence, on the other hand, is supposed to be base-generated in Spec, IP. The second major difference makes reference to the functional domain that would introduce each type of construction. It is claimed that a SCl does not contain any functional category at all. Conversely, full sentences would harbor an IP and a CP-projection (see section 1.1 above). All in all, the structure of an *argumental SCl* as defined in Stowell 1981, 1983 is as represented in (11). An example of SCl for each one of the four lexical categories cited in (11) is provided in (12).

 $(11) \quad \begin{bmatrix} XP & DP_{subj} & \begin{bmatrix} X' & X \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

where
$$X = N, P, A, V$$

⁹ Notice that it would be at Syntax where an autonomous SCI-structure would be found.

- (12) a. John considers [NP himself [N' the best candidate.]]
 - b. I saw [PP John [P' in the garden.]]
 - c. I consider [$_{AP}$ John [$_{A'}$ intelligent.]]
 - d. Mary made [$_{VP}$ John [$_{V'}$ run.]]

On the other hand, the structure of a full sentence as it was understood in the eighties is as depicted in (13). The functional domain appears in italics.

(13) $\begin{bmatrix} CP & [C' & C & [IP & DP_{subj} & [I' & I & [VP & [V' & V &]] \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

The Small Clause Theory also proposes the existence of *adjunct SCls*. An adjunct SCl is simply a SCl that is not selected by a lexical head. The syntax of an adjunct SCl is claimed to be identical to the syntax of an argumental SCl. That is, its structure would be the one in (11). What distinguishes an adjunct SCl from an argumental SCl, however, is that the subject of an adjunct SCl is not a lexical DP, but a null pronoun PRO. This null pronoun is claimed to be a PRO, instead of a pro, because presumably this element is not assigned structural Case by either a Case assigner within the SCl-domain or a head outside this domain. In addition to this, it is held that this PRO is (generally) controlled by a DP-argument situated outside the SCl.¹⁰ Some examples of adjunct SCls are provided in (14).

(14) a. Kevin_i came home [PP PRO_i [P' in a red shirt.]]
b. I ate the meat_i [AP PRO_i [A' raw.]]

In (14a), PRO is controlled by the subject of the matrix sentence, *Kevin*, and in (14b) by the object of the V, *the meat*.

There are several arguments that suggest that a PRO is indeed present in the subject position of an adjunct SCl. For instance, in a language like English an anaphor can appear in the object position in this type of construction, as shown in (15).

(15) $[_{SC1(AP)} PRO_i \text{ proud of } himself_i]$ John_i proceeded to present his new song.

¹⁰ If PRO is not controlled by a structural antecedent, then it is interpreted as arbitrary.

This is a nontrivial observation since in English an anaphor occupying an object position must be bound within its *local domain* by a subject. That is, the so-called Condition A must be satisfied.¹¹ The grammaticality of the example in (15), then, indicates that the anaphor *himself* is bound by an antecedent situated within the AP-projection, which in this sentence is the local domain of the anaphor. According to the Small Clause Theory, this antecedent is the null pronoun PRO that occupies the subject position of the SCl, that is, Spec, AP. In this example, this PRO is, in turn, controlled by the subject of the matrix clause, namely *John*. Hence the ultimate coreference between *John* and *himself*.

The presence of a PRO in the subject position of an adjunct SCl is further demonstrated by those languages in which an agreement relationship between a subject and the head of a predicate is manifested morphologically. Consider the Spanish sentence in (16).

 (16) [SCI (AP) PRO_i enfadadas], tus primas_i pueden ser muy peligrosas. angry-FEM-PL your cousins can.they be very dangerous-FEM-PL `Angry, your cousins can be very dangerous.'

If we assume the widely accepted idea that agreement is a linguistic phenomenon that requires a local Spec-Head relationship between a DP and an X, then we have to say that in (16) the A *enfadadas* `angry' agrees in gender and number with a phrase situated in its specifier. To put it another way, a phrase in Spec, AP must be the element that triggers the feminine and plural specification on the A *enfadadas* `angry' in (16). Once again, this is solved by postulating the existence of a PRO in the subject position of the adjunct SCl, that is, in Spec, AP. In this example, that PRO would be controlled by the matrix subject, namely the DP *tus primas* `your cousins' (see Brucart 1987).

where:

The *local domain* or the *governing category* of α is the minimal clause containing α and a governor of α .

¹¹ According to the Principles and Parameters approach (see Chomsky 1981):

A. An anaphor must be bound in a local domain.

B. A pronoun must be free in a local domain.

C. An r-expression must be free.

And thirdly, the hypothesis that there is a PRO in the subject position of an adjunct SCI also helps to solve a theory-internal question that otherwise would remain obscure. The *Theta-Criterion* states that a DP-argument can only be assigned one, and only one, theta-role (see section 1.3 below). Now, if PRO were absent in the subject position of an adjunct SCI, then we would be led to say that the subject of the matrix clause in (14a), *Kevin*, and the object in (14b), *the meat*, are doubly theta-marked. On the one hand, the subject *Kevin* and the object *the meat* would receive a theta-role from the verbal predicate and the verbal head, respectively. And, on the other hand, they would receive a second theta-role from the SCI-predicate in both cases. Of course, this would pose a nontrivial problem for the Theta-Criterion as currently formulated. But, if we assume that there is a PRO in the subject position of these adjunct SCIs, then we can say that this PRO picks up the theta-role assigned by the SCI-predicate.

Furthermore, as we will see throughout this work, the idea that there are adjunct SCls, as proposed by the Small Clause Theory, also accounts in a natural way for those cases in which the lexical DP that is interpreted as the subject of the SCl and the predicate of this SCl do not form a constituent.

Recent research has provided compelling evidence that demonstrates that the subject of an ordinary full sentence is base-generated in Spec, VP. That is, in the specifier of the phrase projected by the lexical category X that heads the lexical domain of a sentence, namely V. This proposal is the well-known *VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis* (Kuroda 1988 and, for slightly different versions of this hypothesis, see Fukui and Speas 1986, Kitagawa 1986, Koopman and Sportiche 1988, 1991). And, in addition to that, the idea that SCIs possess a functional domain as well has also been strongly defended (see Mouchaweh 1984, Kitagawa 1985, Hornstein and Lightfoot 1987, Suñer 1990, Guasti 1992, Cardinaletti and Guasti 1995).¹² Let me just mention very briefly some arguments that have been used to sustain this latter hypothesis.

It is generally assumed that floating quantifiers are generated in a position preceding the N that they modify. Now, if this assumption is correct, then the presence of the SCI-subject *the men* in a position preceding the floating quantifier *all* in (17) stands as a clear indication of the movement of this subject towards a functional projection introducing the AP-shell.¹³

¹² This idea has been clearly reinforced after the appearance of the split IP-hypothesis. This hypothesis, which is developed in Pollock 1989, states that IP is formed by Tense Phrase (TP) and Agreement Phrase (AgrP).

¹³ Notice that the SCI-subject cannot be occupying a position within the matrix clause if we accept, on the one hand, that V stays within the VP-shell in English, contrary to finite Vs in Romance, and, on the other hand, that the functional projection in which objects are licensed, presumably AgroP, is situated above VP.

(17) John considers *the men*_i [AP all t_i fools.]

The movement of the SCI-subject to a functional position would also account for the grammaticality of examples like the one in (18).

(18) John considers Mary crazy and a fool.

Here the predicates of two SCIs appear coordinated. If we suppose that a SCI is simply composed of a lexical XP-shell, and nothing else is said, then we would expect the sentence in (18) to be ungrammatical. This would be so since, in principle, we would be coordinating two constituents of a different category status, to wit, an AP and a DP. Of course, this prediction would contradict the facts. The idea that a SCI is introduced by a functional domain then serves to solve another paradox. In (18) we do not conjoin an AP and a DP, but two functional projections FP. This is schematically represented in (19).

(19) John considers Mary_i [$_{FP} t_i$ crazy] and [$_{FP} t_i$ a fool.]

Finally, the example in (20) shows us that the predicate of a SCl can be fronted.

(20) [t_j proud of himself $*_{i/j}$]_x John_i doesn't consider Bill_j t_x

If we assume that only maximal projections can be fronted, then we are led to say that, before the movement of the predicate, the SCI-subject raises to a higher position, and that, when that movement operation is carried out, the subject is left behind (see Kitagawa 1985, Bowers 1993, Huang 1993). Now, by accepting the idea that there is a functional projection introducing the SCI, we can say that, first, the SCI-subject moves to the specifier of this projection (see footnote 13), and that later the lexical XP-shell, which contains the predicate, is preposed.

Notice, furthermore, that the anaphor that is contained within the fronted predicate in (20) can only be bound by the SCI-subject. This suggests that the fronted constituent contains the trace of the

See Sportiche 1988 for the idea that quantifiers do not float to the right of the DP, but rather are left stranded when that DP moves to the left. For the prohibition of movement to the right in general, see Kayne 1994.

moved SCI-subject, and that this trace binds the anaphor within its local domain, obeying condition A (see footnote 11). The sentence in (20) contrasts with examples like the one in (21).

(21) [which pictures of himself $_{i/j}$]_x did John_i think Bill_j liked t_x ?

Here the anaphor can be bound by either the subject of the matrix sentence or the subject of the embedded clause. This must be attributed to the assumption that the fronted constituent does not contain the trace of a subject here due to the simple fact that that constituent is not a predicate.¹⁴

Now, if the idea that the subject of a full sentence is base-generated in Spec, VP and the proposal that a SCl also contains a functional domain are adopted, then the two basic structural differences that were used to distinguish a SCl from a full sentence vanish. So what we have at this point is that both a SCl and a full sentence are constituents formed by a lexical XP-shell, which contains a subject in its specifier, and a functional domain, which introduces this XP-shell.

The verbal Complex Small Clauses that are explored in this dissertation (chapters 3, 4 and 5) point to the idea that a crucial difference between a full sentence and a SCl is found in that, at least in Romance and Germanic languages, the categorial value of X is V in a full sentence,¹⁵ whereas in a (C)SCl it is either N, P, A or a category that forms part of the extended projection of V, rather than the V itself (cf. (11)). A second difference between a full sentence and a SCl might lie in the type of functional domain that introduces each type of clause. As we have seen above, a full sentence is introduced by an IP- and a CP-projection. The functional domain of a (C)SCl might well be different.¹⁶

Keeping ourselves to the essentials of the Small Clause Theory, the updated structure of an argumental and adjunct SCl would be as represented in (22).

(22) a. $[_{FP} \quad [_{F'} \quad [_{XP} \quad DP \quad [_{X'} \quad X \quad]]]]$ (Argumental SCl)

¹⁴ Note that the constituent that is fronted in (21) does not constitute a local domain for the anaphor. This is so because this constituent is not a clause. Therefore, the anaphor will have to be bound on its way down to the position occupied by t_x . This means that it will be able to be bound by *John*, when the anaphor adjuncts to the matrix clause, or by *Bill*, when it moves down to the embedded clause.

¹⁵ As used here, the term `full sentence' would include gerundive and infinitival clauses.

¹⁶ I must already advance that it is not the intention of this dissertation to investigate the composition of the functional domain introducing a (C)SCI.

b. $[_{FP} \quad [_{F'} \quad [_{XP} \quad PRO \quad [_{X'} \quad X \quad]]]]$ (Adjunct SCl)

where X = N, P, A, (V)

Here FP stands for functional projection or, more specifically, for a still undefined functional domain. A close version of this structure has been used in Chung and McCloskey 1987, Contreras 1987, Raposo 1989, Suñer 1990, Haegeman 1994, Chomsky 1995, and den Dikken 1995, among many others.

The representation in (23), on the other hand, depicts the structure of a full sentence as currently understood.

$$(23) \quad \begin{bmatrix} CP & \begin{bmatrix} C' & C & \begin{bmatrix} IP & \begin{bmatrix} I' & I & \begin{bmatrix} VP & DP & \begin{bmatrix} V' & V \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

Summarizing, the syntactic structure that the Predication Theory, the Complex Predicate Theory and the Small Clause Theory assign to the reduced predication that we have in the complement position of sentences like the one in (2a), repeated here as (24), is as represented in (25).

(24) I consider *John intelligent*.

(25) a. I [VP consider [DP John] [AP intelligent]] (Predication Theory)
b. I [VP [[V consider]-[A intelligent]] [John]] (Complex Predicate Theory)¹⁷
c. I [VP consider [AP John [A' intelligent]]] (Small Clause Theory)

In this dissertation, I fundamentally follow the line initiated by Stowell and, more generally, the approach developed by the proponents of the Small Clause Theory. Therefore, I assume the structures in (22). The rationale that has led me to choose this theory over the other ones is simple. First, the semantic relationship that an argumental SCl establishes with the head that selects it, say V, is that of a V-*clause* relationship, rather than that of a V-*noun phrase* relationship. This suggests that the syntactic unit DP-XP is a clause from the very start, as postulated by the Small Clause

¹⁷ This is the structure that we would have at an initial syntactic level, that is, before moving the A(P) *intelligent* to a position to the right of the DP *John*.

Theory. Secondly, there exists a great amount of empirical evidence that clearly shows that an argumental SCl is constituted of a single constituent. And thirdly, I think that it is plausible from a conceptual viewpoint, and desirable from a theoretical perspective, to adopt the idea that the subject of X is base-generated in the specifier of the maximal node projected by X in a SCl, more so if the hypothesis that the subject of V is base-generated in Spec, VP in ordinary full sentences turns out to be true. Were this the case, we would only need to say that, in any type of predication, the subject is base-generated within the maximal phrase projected by the head of the predicate, independently of the category of that head and the type of functional domain that introduces the XP-shell.

1.3 Framework

The theoretical framework that I adopt to explain how the constructions investigated in this dissertation work is that established by the *Generative Grammar* (GG), and more specifically the approach developed in the *Principles-and-Parameters* (P&P) model (Chomsky 1981, Chomsky and Lasnik 1993). Nonetheless, I also make use of some technical modifications of this theory that have been recently put forward in the so-called *Minimalist Program* (MP) (Chomsky 1993, 1995, 1998).

1.3.1 The Language Faculty

The GG vindicates the idea that the language faculty is an inherent property of the human cognitive system of the mind / brain. In this theory, it is assumed that humans are endowed with a language faculty that contains an initial state (S_0). The theory of this initial state has been called *Universal Grammar* (UG). It is claimed that this initial state passes through different states until it arrives at a steady stage. These different states would be nothing but a range of episodes of a still unsteady grammar that changes in tune with the available evidence that the child acquires by experience, whereas the steady stage is the *Grammar* of the particular language that the individual has already acquired.

The knowledge and understanding that an individual has of his language is called the *competence* or the *I*-language of that individual, where *I* is meant to refer to individual, internal and intensional. The *I*-language has two components: a *Lexicon* and a *Computational System* for the human language (C_{HL}). The lexicon stores the grammatical, phonological and semantic information of lexical elements. On the other hand, the C_{HL} , which is invariant across languages, selects the items from the lexicon to form *Structural Descriptions*, namely sound and meaning pairings (π , λ). This mechanism allows the *I*-language to generate infinite structural descriptions out of finite properties.

The information encoded in the structural descriptions, that is, in the sound and meaning pairings (π, λ) , is accessible to the *performance* systems of the individual. The phonological information that appears in the structural description (π) is interpreted by the articulatory-perceptual system (A-P), namely by the sensorimotor system. The interface level in which this occurs is called the *Phonetic Form* (PF). On the other hand, the semantic, cognitive, conceptual, and pragmatic information (λ) is interpreted by the conceptual-intentional system (C-I), that is, by the system of the mind / brain involved in thought, referring, planning, and so on. This interface level is called the *Logical Form* (LF).

According to the MP, the PF and the LF are the only two interface levels or *levels of representation* of a structural description. This is a significant reduction with regard to the P&P model, which, apart from these two levels, also assumes the existence of a *Deep Structure* (DS) and a *Superficial Structure* (SS). The DS is proposed as an intermediate level that relates the lexicon and the computational system. In other words, the DS presents (pre-) syntactic configurations that reveal the semantic relation of the elements contained in particular structural descriptions. On the other hand, the SS is considered to be an intermediate level that connects the DS and the external interface levels, namely the PF and the LF.

1.3.2 The Theoretical System

The basic claim of the P&P approach is that a *language* is a system of universal principles with a finite set of finitely valued parameters, and that *language variation* is a direct result of the different possible settings of these parameters. The implemental role of the MP lies in that it intends to eliminate all redundancies in the P&P model as far as possible. So the main tenet of the MP is that everything is subject to general requirements of economy, simplicity, symmetry, nonredundancy, and so on. From the MP perspective, then, a *language* is a sort of "perfect system," that is, a system in which all these conditions must necessarily be satisfied.

According to the MP, the computational system forms structural descriptions (π, λ) by means of *select, merge* and *move*. The lexical items that will appear in a particular structural description are taken to be grouped in a pre-syntactic stage. The array formed by these lexical items is called the *numeration* of that particular structural description. Now the function of *select* consists in choosing lexical items from a numeration and introducing them into the derivation. *Merge*, on the other hand, joins distinct syntactic objects - or phrases - together. Finally, *move* targets the highest position of the syntactic object at a particular stage of the derivation and moves a lexical item already present in the syntactic object to that position. At any arbritary point of the derivation, the information contained in the syntactic object is split. This point is called *Spell-Out*. The operation Spell-Out strips away the phonological features (π), which enter the morphological component and then the PF, from the semantic and syntactic features (λ), which continue towards the LF. Only the operations that have been carried out before Spell-Out feed the PF. Hence it is said that these operations have been applied at the *overt syntax*. The operations that are carried out after this point, on the other hand, are said to be triggered at the *covert syntax*, since they do not feed the PF.

The MP proposes that movement of lexical items throughout a derivation is reduced to a process of *feature-checking*. The idea is that lexical items are assigned formal features that will need to be checked with certain functional heads during the derivation. There are two types of formal features: *strong* features and *weak* features. If a formal feature is strong it means that it must be checked off at the overt syntax, that is, before Spell-Out. Conversely, if it is weak it must wait until the covert syntax due to economy constraints. The covert operations are ruled by *Procrastinate*, which states that LF operations are more economical, namely less costly, than overt ones. For the MP, then, *language variation* is the result of a morphological issue, since the position that a specific lexical item will occupy in a sentence in a set of different languages will depend on the strong / weak nature of the formal features of that particular item in each one of these languages.

In (26), an elementary scheme of the system of the language faculty as understood in the MP is represented.



(26)

1.3.3 Modules of Grammar

In the P&P as well as in the MP there are *modules* of Grammar. Two of these modules are the *Theta-Criterion* (Chomsky 1981, but see also Gruber 1965, 1976 and Jackendoff 1972) and the *Case Filter* (Chomsky 1980, 1981, Rouveret and Vergnaud 1980). These two modules state the following:

(27) *Theta-Criterion*

- (i) Every θ -role must be assigned to just one argument chain.¹⁸
- (ii) Every argument chain must be assigned just one θ -role.

(28) *Case Filter*

Every phonetically realized NP - or DP - must be assigned (abstract) Case.

The Theta-Criterion rules the *semantic* licensing of the arguments that may appear in a syntactic object. So it states that, for an argument to be semantically licensed in a clause, it must be predicted in the so-called *theta-grid* of a lexical head. For example, a phrase can be an internal argument of a transitive V if it is assigned a theta-role, typically *Patient* or *Theme*, by that V, or a phrase can be an external argument of a predicate if it is assigned a theta-role, typically *Agent* or *Experiencer*, by that predicate.¹⁹

It has been suggested that the theta-role that an external argument can bear is predicted in the theta-grid of a lexical head X but assigned by the whole predicate (but also see section 2.3.2.2 in chapter 2). An external argument is the argument that is base-generated outside X'.

¹⁸ An *argument chain* is a sequence of arguments which bear occurrences of a given index.

¹⁹ In the literature, *Patient* and *Theme* have been defined as the person or thing undergoing the action expressed by the predicate, and the person or thing moved by the action expressed by the predicate, respectively. *Agent* and *Experiencer*, on the other hand, have been defined as the one who intentionally initiates the action expressed by the predicate, and the entity that experiences some (psychological) state expressed by the predicate, respectively (these definitions are taken from Haegeman 1994: 49). Other theta-roles that have been proposed are *Cause, Goal, Instrument, Location*, etc.

The Case-Filter, on the other hand, rules the formal or *grammatical* licensing of the NPs, or DPs, that may appear in a sentence. For instance, it states that, in languages like English and Spanish, the DP that functions as the subject of a finite clause must be assigned *nominative* Case by I, whereas it must be assigned *accusative* Case by V if that DP functions as the direct object of the clause.²⁰

Consider the sentences in (29) and (30).

- (29) a. It seems that Bill will attend the party.
 - b. *John seems that Bill will attend the party.
- (30) a. It is unclear what Bill is doing.
 - b. *It is unclear what Bill to do.

On the one hand, the contrast in (29) is accounted for by appealing to the Theta-Criterion. The sentence in (29b) is ungrammatical because the DP *John* does not receive a theta-role. This is so since this DP is base-generated in the subject position of a sentence that is headed by the raising verb *to seem*, that is, a type of verb that cannot assign external theta-roles. Conversely, the phrase that is base-generated in the subject position of the matrix sentence in the example in (29a) is the expletive *it*, namely a phrase that does not require a theta-role because it is not an argument (Agent, Experiencer, etc.). Hence the sentence is acceptable.

On the other hand, the contrast in (30) is explained by the Case Filter. The subject of the embedded clause in (30a), namely *Bill*, can check the nominative Case that is assigned by the finite I of its clause. Differently, in (30b) the DP *Bill* cannot check nominative Case, or any other Case, because I is nonfinite. Hence the ungrammaticality of the sentence.²¹

There have been some attempts to relate the Theta-Criterion and the Case Filter. It has been held, for instance, that Case makes theta-assignment visible. Chomsky and Lasnik (1993) (see also Chomsky 1986b) have formalized this concept by means of what they have called the *Chain Condition*, which is defined in (31).

²⁰ It has been often held in the literature that Case assigners are those categories bearing the feature [-N], that is, Vs [-

N +V] and Ps [-N -V], apart from I, as opposed to Ns [+N -V] and As [+N +V] (see Stowell 1981).

²¹ Note that the nominative Case that is assigned by the matrix I is already checked by *it*, whereas the A *unclear* is not a Case assigner (see the previous footnote).

(31) *Chain Condition*

Every argument chain must be headed by a Case position and must terminate in a theta-role position.

The Theta-Criterion was proposed in the P&P approach as a property of the DS, in the sense that this criterion had to be satisfied at that level. As pointed out above, the DS is no longer admitted in the MP. So the position that the MP takes regarding the Theta-Criterion is that this module of Grammar does not have an independent significant role. But, as pointed out in Chomsky 1995 (p. 214, footnote 24), this criterion is not dispensable at LF since, if it is violated, the derivation receives a defective or gibberish interpretation, as occurs in (29b).

As far as Case is concerned, it is proposed in early versions of the MP (Chomsky 1993) that (structural) Case is checked within a functional projection in a Spec-Head agreement configuration. This predicts that at some point of the derivation every DP contained within a syntactic structure must move to the specifier of an agreement projection (AgrP) to check Case. In languages like English and Spanish, a DP-object, for instance, will move to the specifier of an AgroP to check accusative Case, whereas a DP-subject will raise to Spec, AgrsP in order to check nominative Case.²² The existence of these and other agreeing projections has been recently put into question in Chomsky 1995, 1998. Since this issue is still under investigation, I will keep using these two projections in this essay. But, importantly, nothing to be presented here is altered if these agreeing projections are finally eliminated.

1.3.4 The X-bar Theory

The structural format that I employ in this work is that established by the standard *X-bar theory* (Jackendoff 1977, Chomsky 1981, 1986a, and subsequent work). In this theory, it is assumed that a head X, lexical or functional, projects two bar levels, which are represented as X' and X'' (= XP). The specifier of XP is a sister of X', whereas the complement of X is the sister of X. This is depicted in (32).

²² In the syntactic structure AgroP and AgrsP are projected immediately above VP and TP, respectively.



The computational system, then, will take lexical items from the numeration and will present them in the X-bar format as the derivation proceeds.

The MP introduces an addendum to the X-bar scheme in (32), which says that the X'-level and the specifier position of X are not projected in the syntactic structure if they are not required. This means that X' cannot appear immediately below an unbranched XP, and that Spec, XP cannot be present unless it is needed to host some lexical item.

In conclusion, the two fundamental pillars that sustain the theoretical framework that I use in this dissertation are simplicity and economy. On the one hand, the general principle called *Full Interpretation* (FI) forbids the presence of superfluous symbols in the representations (see Chomsky 1986b). This means that, apart from the presence of sets of uninterpretable features which must be *deleted* throughout the computation once they have been checked off, a syntactic object cannot contain symbols that do not contribute to the interpretation of that syntactic object. On the other hand, the general principle of economy forbids superfluous steps in a derivation. This means that computational operations can only apply as a *Last Resort* strategy in order to avoid the violation of some condition. The operation merge is costless by definition, whereas attract / move is necessary to account for the displacement of phrases from the position in which they are first merged to the position where these phrases show up at the overt syntax or are interpreted at LF. Thus, attract / move is understood as a morphologically driven operation that is triggered as a last resort strategy. All in all, it is predicted that, if the principles that are established by this theoretical framework are satisfied, the derivation will *converge*. Otherwise, it will *crash*.

1.4 Outline

This work is organized as follows. In chapter 2, I present the *Complex Small Clause*-model (CSCI) that I defend in this dissertation and explain the rationale that motivates it. I claim that the CSCI-

model represents the syntactic organization of those constructions that behave like simple SCIs but the predicate of which is constituted of a second predicative link between a DP-subject and an X'predicate. I call this second predicative relationship the *internal predication* of the CSCI. I argue that the subject of the CSCI is the DP that is base-generated in the specifier of the phrase projected by a functional head F. I claim that F is the highest functional head of the extended projection of a lexical head X and the category that functions as the head of the CSCI. I call the predicative relationship that is established between the DP-subject base-generated in Spec, FP and the F'predicate the *external predication* of the CSCI.

The CSCI-model that is defended here intends to capture the idea that a predication can in turn be predicated of a subject. From a conceptual perspective, this means that a *situation*, that is, an event or a state of affairs, can be predicated of an *individual*. I claim that this occurs when the speaker links a particular individual **x** with a real or potential situation **s** that contains that individual as a participant. In the subsequent chapters, the CSCI-model is applied to several complex constructions the behavior of which is shown to derive from the structural scheme that is proposed in this work.

In chapter 3, I explore the first construction that responds to the CSCI-model previously presented in chapter 2. This construction is the so-called *Pseudo-Relative*, a construction widely used in the Romance languages. An example in Spanish is provided in (33).

(33) He visto a Juan que corría.
have.I seen to-ACC Juan that ran.he-IMPERF
`I saw Juan running.'

I claim that in the Pseudo-Relative the subject of the internal predication is a null pronoun pro, and that the subject of the external predication is either a lexical DP, *Juan* in (33), or a PRO, depending on whether the construction functions as an argumental or adjunct CSCl.

In chapter 4, I introduce the *Prepositional Infinitival Construction*, which is the second example of CSCl investigated in this dissertation. The Prepositional Infinitival Construction is the construction that some Romance (and non-Romance) languages employ instead of the Pseudo-Relative. An example in European Portuguese is given in (34).

I saw the children at run-_{INF}-(3PL) 'I saw the children running.'

I claim that the subject of the internal predication of the Prepositional Infinitival Construction can be either a null pronoun pro or a PRO. These two possibilities depend basically on the agreement properties of the infinitive, which can appear inflected or uninflected. I argue that in the Prepositional Infinitival Construction the subject of the external predication is either a lexical DP, *os meninos* `the children' in (34), or a PRO, and that this is determined by the function that this construction carries out in the sentence. That is, depending on whether it functions as an argumental or adjunct CSCI.

In the second part of chapter 4, I argue that the C *que* that appears in the Pseudo-Relative functions as an aspectual marker. More specifically, I show that in this construction the C *que* behaves like the locative P a that is found in the Prepositional Infinitival Construction. The behavior of the C *que* and the P a as aspectual markers explains the progressive interpretation of these two constructions and their complementary distribution within the Romance family.

In chapter 5, I present the third and last type of verbal CSCl that is examined in this dissertation. This construction is the one that I call *Gerund Construction*, which is the counterpart of the Pseudo-Relative and the Prepositional Infinitival Construction in languages like English:

(35) I saw John running.

Following the same procedure utilized in the previous chapters, I show that the subject of the internal predication of the Gerund Construction is a PRO, and that the subject of the CSCl is a lexical DP, *John* in (35), if the construction appears functioning as an argumental CSCl, or a null pronoun PRO if it functions as an adjunct CSCl.

In this chapter, I also explain the mechanism that provides theses three constructions (Pseudo-Relative, the Prepositional Infinitival Construction, and the Gerund Construction) with a progressive interpretation. I claim, first, that the internal predication of each one of these three constructions displays an atomic domain similar to that of a mass noun. Secondly, that the C that introduces these atomic domains in a CSCI turns that domain into a plurality. And, thirdly, that the aspectual marker *que* in the Pseudo-Relative, *a* in the Prepositional Infinitival Construction, and -

ing in the Gerund Construction selects a temporal set out of that plurality,²³ the result of which is a singularity. Hence the progressive interpretation.

In chapter 6, I defend the idea that there are also nonverbal CSCls, that is, CSCls the lexical head of which is either an N or an A. This type of CSCl is found in Romance as well as in the Germanic languages. Some examples are given in (36) and (37) for Spanish and English, respectively.

- (36) a. Tomaron *a Juan por tonto*. took.they to-_{ACC} Juan for fool `They took Juan for a fool.'
 - b. Juan pasa por jugador de baloncesto.
 Juan passes.he for player of basketball
 `Juan passes for a basketball player.'
- (37) a. They took *John for a fool*.
 - b. John passes for a soldier.
 - c. I regard John as my best friend.

I claim that in these two constructions the subject of the internal predication is a PRO and that the subject of the external predication is the lexical DP *Juan / John* that precedes the (semi-) lexical head F. In these examples, F corresponds to the particle *por* in (36) and *for / as* in (37). In chapter 7 some general conclusions are drawn.

All in all, the common threshold that links all the constructions investigated in this dissertation is their behavior as SCIs and their structural organization as CSCIs. The variety of the constructions that respond to the CSCI-model and the diversity of the languages in which they are found suggests that the CSCI-model that is defended in this work is a universal structure. So, in principle, we expect this CSCI-model to be also a useful scheme to explain the behavior of other constructions from other languages.

²³ When applied to verbal domains, the notion of plurality refers to progressive or iterative interpretations of the event expressed by that verbal domain.

The Complex Small Clause-Model

"The natural and appropriate strategy is to construct hypotheses with regard to particular grammars and with regard to linguistic theory, confronting the entire complex with data from various languages for confirmation." (Noam Chomsky)

2.1 The Complex Small Clause-Model

The Complex Small Clause-model (CSCl) that I defend in this dissertation is depicted in (1). I assign the representation in (1a) to *argumental CSCls*, and the one in (1b) to *adjunct CSCls*.



In both representations, a null subject pronoun pro or PRO is merged with X'. The categorial value of X can, in principle, correspond to any lexical category, namely N, P, A or V. On the other hand, a lexical DP or a null pronoun PRO is merged with F', where F stands for functional category. The constituent introduced by F' will function as the predicate of the CSCl, whereas the argument in Spec, FP, that is, the lexical DP in (1a) and PRO in (1b), will function as the subject of the construction.

As the reader may have already noticed, the structural organization of the lexical XP-shell in (1), here in boldface, is identical to the structural organization of the lexical domain of either a full sentence or an ordinary SCl (see section 1.2 of the introductory chapter). So what makes the structure in (1) different from that of a full sentence or SCl is the existence of an FP-layer containing a DP or PRO in its specifier. The goal of this chapter is to present the conditions that permit the connection of an XP-shell with this type of FP-layer, and hence the formation of a CSCl. The structural organization of the CSCl-model is explored in section 2.2. The internal organization of this construction is examined in section 2.3. Finally, the semantic organization of a CSCl is addressed in section 2.4.

The theoretical examination of the CSCI-model is made here with a eye toward capturing the uniformities that we will see in the particular instances of CSCI explored in the subsequent chapters. So the constructions examined from chapter 3 through chapter 6 will probe and challenge the theoretical body that is constructed in the present chapter.

2.2 The Structural Organization of a Complex Small Clause

There is the general agreement that *lexical categories* are associated with *functional categories*, and that *lexical projections* are complements of *functional projections*. This idea was initially supposed to be true of those structural domains headed by a V. So it was argued that a V appears normally linked to a functional category inflection (I) and to a complementizer (C) (see Chomsky 1981, Koopman 1984, Pollock 1989). More recently, this proposal has been extended to other structural domains, for instance, those headed by an N (Abney 1987, Eguren 1988, Longobardi 1990, Picallo 1991, Valois 1991, Bernstein 1993, Cinque 1993b, Roca 1997) or by an A (Abney 1987, Suñer 1990, Corver 1991, 1997). It is held, then, that an N may be associated with a functional category gender (Gen), a category number (Num), and a determiner (D). Precisely, this latter functional category has been often considered the nominal counterpart of C, since D supplies the reference of the nominal expression that it introduces. On the other hand, A has been related to a functional category degree (Deg), which would host degree heads such as *so* in expressions like *so wonderful*, and aspect (Asp), which licenses the aspectual properties of A.

In the literature there have been some attempts to explain the mechanism that regulates the combinatorial possibilities of a particular lexical head X with the existing sets of functional categories, on the one hand, and, on the other, the way by which this specific lexical category X winds up being connected with the class of functional categories that it combines with.

An interesting approach that addresses the first issue, that is, the combinatorial possibilities of lexical and functional heads, has been already advanced in Grimshaw 1991. The basic idea of Grimshaw's work consists in taking functional projections as *extended projections* of lexical heads.²⁴ Following the X-bar theory (see section 1.3.4 in chapter 1), Grimshaw holds that an X, which in her system would belong to a level 0 (L0) simply because X is a head, can project to X' (L1), and this X', in turn, to XP (L2). She further argues that this extension of X can only be made if, and only if, both the *categorial features* and the *functional specification* of X are preserved throughout the structure.

This system maintains the idea that the value of the *categorial features* of a head corresponds to the specification that this head receives in the dual system of [+/- N +/- V] proposed in Chomsky 1970. According to this system, V is assigned the value [-N +V]; N [+N -V]; A [+N +V]; and P [-N -V]. As far as the *functional specification* of a head is concerned, it is claimed that *lexical categories* receive the value zero {F0} because they lack any functional properties, and that

²⁴ This approach is also advocated by the *Categorial Identity Thesis* proposed in van Riemsdijk 1998.

functional categories are assigned the value {F1} if they are immediately introducing a lexical domain. Otherwise, they receive the value {FN}, where N is a number superior to 1. Grimshaw formulates this idea as follows:

(2) x is the *perfect head* of y, and y is a *perfect projection* of x iff:

- (a) y dominates x,²⁵
- (b) y and x share all categorial features,
- (c) all nodes intervening between x and y share all categorial features,
- (d) the F value of y is the same as the F value of x.

where n *intervenes* between x and y if y dominates x and n; n dominates x, and n does not dominate y. (Grimshaw 1991: 3)

Thus, for instance, V (x) is a *perfect head* of VP (y), and VP a *perfect projection* of V because the categorial value of V and VP is in both cases [-N + V], and their functional specification is $\{F0\}$ since they both belong to a lexical XP-shell.

Obviously, the most interesting part comes up when the combination is between two distinct perfect projections. For these cases, Grimshaw proposes the principle in (3).

(3) x is the *extended head* of y, and y is an *extended projection* of x iff:

- (a) y dominates x,
- (b) y and x share all categorial features,
- (c) all nodes intervening between x and y share all categorial features.

(d) If x and y are not in the same perfect projection, the F value of y is higher than the F value of x. (Grimshaw 1991: 4)

The generalization in (3) states that V (x), for example, is an *extended head* of CP (y), and CP an *extended projection* of V because the categorial value of V and CP is [-N +V], and their functional specifications do not coincide. This is so since the functional specification of V is $\{F0\}$ and the functional specification of CP is $\{F2\}$. The functional specification of V is $\{F0\}$ because V is

²⁵ Recall the definition of *dominance* cited in chapter 1:

 $[\]alpha$ dominates β if every segment of α dominates β .

lexical, whereas the functional specification of CP is {F2} because CP is not the functional projection immediately dominating the VP-shell, since IP intervenes between CP and VP.

The MP provides us with a mechanism to answer the second question pointed out above, to wit, the way by which a lexical category ends up being connected with a functional category. In the MP it is argued that lexical elements may need to check features within functional projections in order for these lexical elements to be correctly interpreted at LF (see section 1.3 in chapter 1).

We have empirical facts that clearly show that there exists a connection between the phifeatures (ϕ) of the functional heads that make up the extended projection of a lexical head and the ϕ features of that lexical head.²⁶ For example, the gender and number features of a D must be identical with the gender and number features of the N that it dominates. This consonance is morphologically manifested in languages like Spanish, as illustrated in (4).

(4) { Los / *el } libros están sobre la mesa. the-MASC-PL / the-MASC-SG books-MASC-PL are on the table `The books are on the table.'

Although the gender and number features are not overtly visible in D in other languages, it seems reasonable to suppose that the same mechanism applies in these cases as well. Therefore, the various specifications of gender and number that the D *the* may have in English must also coincide with the gender and number specification of the N that it dominates.²⁷

(5) *The books* are on the table.

As it is well-known, the same phenomenon holds within a verbal domain. Languages like West Flemish demonstrate morphologically that the agreement properties of C must match the agreement properties of V through I. This is shown in (6), taken from Haegeman 1994: 131.²⁸

²⁶ Phi-features are agreement features, that is, person, number, and gender.

²⁷ For the idea that N ends up raising to D to check features, see Longobardi 1994 and 1996. Notice, incidentally, that, if the DP is occupying the subject position of the clause, then the number specification of I will in turn have to match the number specification of D.

²⁸ In Modern Irish the C also displays properties of the verbal inflection, such as tense and negation (see Chung and McCloskey 1987).

(6) a. ... da den inspekteur da boek gelezen eet that-_{SG} the inspector that book read has-_{SG}
b. ... dan d' inspekteurs da boek gelezen een that-_{PL} the inspectors that book read have-_{PL}

Again, this feature matching would also apply to those languages in which this relationship is not morphologically manifested. This is the case of Spanish, (7), and English, (8).

- a. ... que el inspector ya ha leído ese libro
 b. ... que los inspectores ya han leído ese libro
- (8) a. ... *that* the inspector *has* already *read* that book
 - b. ... that the inspectors have already read that book

Let us return now to the CSCI-structure in (1). According to the mechanism just outlined, for the XP-FP combination to be legitimate the functional projection FP must be necessarily interpreted as an extended projection of the lexical head X. This means that the functional specification of F will have to be higher than the functional specification of X, and that the categorial value of F will have to match the categorial value of X, or at least not contradict the categorial value of this X. This is what the subindex x in the projection of F stands for in the representations in (1). At the same time, it is also predicted that all the functional categories that may intervene between XP and FP in a CSCl, where the dots appear in (1), will have to share that categorial specification.

On the other hand, following the insight just pointed out to account for the structures from (4) through (8) above, it seems reasonable to suppose that in a CSCl the lexical head X {F0} eventually raises to F in order to check features. As in the other cases, the derivation is expected to converge if the features that are checked coincide. Otherwise, the derivation will crash.

As mentioned in section 1.2 of the introductory chapter, it has been argued that SCIs also possess a functional domain. At this point, this proposal should not be surprising, bearing in mind that this functional domain will serve to license the features of the lexical head X of the SCI. More controversial, however, is the hypothesis that sustains that there exists a specific functional node that introduces the functional domain of all types of SCI. In the literature on this topic, this distinct functional node has received several names. For instance, it has been called PredP, following
Bowers (1993); IP (Kitagawa 1985, Hornstein and Lightfoot 1987); TP (Tang 1997); or AgrP (Raposo and Uriagereka 1990, Suñer 1990, Chomsky 1993, den Dikken 1995, Haegeman 1994, Guéron and Hoekstra 1995, among many others). Since the thesis presented in this work does not depend at all on how this particular functional node associated with SCls, if any, is called, I will just refer to it as ZP.

The rationale that has led so many linguists to posit a ZP-projection in this type of construction is manifold. First of all, ZP is taken as a sort of inclusiveness projection, that is, a projection that dominates the whole SCI-structure (i.e., the lexical XP-shell and the functional domain associated to X). Secondly, ZP stands as *the* projection that unifies all different kinds of SCIs. So, in structural terms, any SCI can be defined as a construction introduced by ZP. And, thirdly, ZP is usually presented as the functional projection that legitimates the subject-predicate relationship in a SCI. This presumably occurs once the SCI-subject and the SCI-head move to Spec, ZP and to the ZP-head, respectively.

If we accept the existence of this ZP, then the CSCI-model in (1) would be completed once the ZP-node is added to the top of the structure, that is, just above FP. In this position, ZP would license the predicative relationship between the subject in Spec, FP, and F, and would also indicate that the construction that it introduces is a type of SCI. If instead we adopt a radically minimalist theory, then we must simply disregard the existence of this ZP-projection. From this perspective, we would say that the predicative link that is established between the argument in Spec, FP and F is licensed within the FP-projection. But notice that this option implies having to accept that the operation merge allows checking, as already suggested in Chomsky 1995 (p. 393, footnote 131) and developed later in Chomsky 1998.²⁹

Summarizing, the predicative relationship that is established in a CSCl between the subject of the construction and the head of the predicate must be licensed as in any other type of SCl. The procedure to achieve this will, of course, depend on our favorite syntactic theory. But, importantly

²⁹ In the system laid out in Chomsky 1995, the CSCI-subject would not be able to check its ϕ -features in Spec, FP in the structure in (1) because this DP-subject is not in the checking domain of F (cf. Chomsky 1998). This is so since this DP does not head a nontrivial chain, that is, a two-member chain. The solution that Chomsky proposes for regular SCIs consists in saying that the head of the construction, F in (1), is assigned a strong [nominal-] feature as it is drawn from the lexicon. This assures the overt movement of the DP-subject to an outer specifier of F and, hence, the checking relation between DP and F. This is depicted in (i).

⁽i) $[_{FP(Spec2)} DP_i [_{(Spec1)} t_i [_{F'} F ...]]]$

for our purposes here, whatever option this might be, it is not expected to alter in any substantial way the essential structural organization of the CSCl-model as depicted in (1).

2.3 The Internal Organization of a Complex Small Clause

The novelty that the CSCI-structure in (1) propounds lies in the idea that the subject of this type of construction is directly merged with F'. In other words, that the CSCI-subject is base-generated in Spec, FP. For this operation to be possible, I claim that FP must correspond to the *highest node* of the extended projection of the lexical head X. This condition will ensure two basic facts. On the one hand, the formal licensing of the elements that are contained within the constituent introduced by F in a position within that constituent. And, on the other hand, the licensing of a predication relationship within the constituent introduced by F.

The hypothesis that the subject of a CSCl is base-generated in Spec, FP along with the idea that the constituent introduced by F hosts a subject-predicate relationship leads us to say that the syntactic object introduced by FP is constituted of two predicative domains which are both part of the same extended projection. The first predicative domain is made up of the subject in Spec, XP and the constituent introduced by K', whereas the second one is formed by the subject in Spec, FP and the constituent introduced by F'.³⁰ This is schematically represented in (9).

³⁰ This situation clearly differs from those contexts in which either a proposition (CP) or an ordinary SCI (XP) functions as a complement of, say, a V. In these latter cases, we would also have two predications but each one would be situated in a different extended projection. That is, the extended projection of the lexical head of the proposition (the embedded V) or SCI (X), and the extended projection of the matrix V.



byiously the situation that we have in (9) cannot occur across the board. In the previous section, we discussed the conditions that must be satisfied for the XP-FP combination to be possible. In the remainder of this section I will discuss the conditions that permit, first, the *legitimization* of the CSCI-subject in Spec, FP in the structure in (9) (section 2.3.1) and, secondly, the *licensing* of the two subjects in the CSCI-model (section 2.3.2).

2.3.1 The Legitimization of the CSCI-Subject

The idea has been generally accepted that the licensing of a subject-predicate link is carried out by means of a local Spec-Head agreement relationship between the subject of the construction and the head of the predicate.³¹ We have seen that in a CSCI the subject of the lexical XP-shell is the DP

³¹ Rizzi's 1991 work puts forward the so-called Wh-Criterion, which states the following:

⁽i) The Wh-Criterion

a. A wh-operator must be in a Spec-Head configuration with a [+wh] X.

base-generated in Spec, XP, whereas the argument that functions as the subject of the construction is the DP that appears in Spec, FP. For these two subject-predicate links to be licensed, then, the DP in Spec, XP and the DP in Spec, FP must eventually establish a local Spec-Head agreement with X and F, respectively, since X and F are the heads of their predicates.

On the other hand, I pointed out in the previous section that in (9) the lexical head X must raise up to F, because F is the highest functional head of the extended projection of X, and that, for the structure to be legitimate, the ϕ -features of X and the ϕ -features of F must match.³² Now, if X and F must agree with their respective subjects, and X and F must share the same ϕ -features, then we can infer from this that the ϕ -features of the subject in Spec, XP and the ϕ -features of the subject in Spec, FP will have to be necessarily identical.

This matching, however, does not imply that these two arguments must also possess the same referent, namely the subindex that {pro / PRO} and {DP / PRO} share in the representation in (9). This is so since they both could perfectly well share the same ϕ -feature specification but not the same referent. For example, the subject of the XP-shell could refer to an individual called, say, *Hillary*, and the subject of the CSCl to an individual named *Ms. Rodham-Clinton*. From this we would be right to say that these two arguments, *Hillary* and *Ms. Rodham-Clinton*, share the same ϕ -feature specification, that is, third person, feminine, singular. But, of course, we would be wrong to sustain that they must also share the same referent since *Hillary* and *Ms. Rodham-Clinton* could, or could not, refer to the same individual.

What I would like to propose here is that the fact that the subject of the XP-projection and the subject of the FP-projection must refer to the same referent in a CSCl is a way to legitimize the "extra" subject of the construction, namely the subject of the FP-projection. Notice that here this argument is an "extra" subject in the sense that it appears within an extended domain that already

b. A [+wh] X must be in a Spec-Head configuration with a *wh*-operator.

Rizzi also extends this idea to the licensing of [+neg] features, whereas in Dubinsky and Williams 1995 a similar proposal is made for the [+temporal] feature. Along the same lines, we could tentatively formalize the licensing of a subject-predicate link as in (ii), where [+predicative] X makes reference to the head of the predicate.

- (ii) Predication Criterion
 - a. A subject must be in a Spec-Head configuration with a [+predicative] X^0 .
 - b. A [+predicative] X^0 must be in a Spec-Head configuration with a subject.

³² Recall the examples in (4)-(5) and (6)-(8) above, in which the ϕ -features of N and I / V must match the ϕ -features of D and C, respectively.

contains an argumental subject, that is, the subject of the XP-projection. In order to demonstrate this, I will compare the structure of ordinary SCls, the structure of a very special construction in Irish, and the CSCI-structure as it appears in (9). But before proceeding with this comparison, let me outline some properties of the Irish construction that I will use here as it is described in McCloskey and Sells 1988.

To begin with, consider the Irish sentence in (10).

(10) Tá $eagla_j$ [SCl t_j orthu pro.] be-PRES fear on-them `They are afraid.'

In this example it can be observed that the copula *tá* 'be' is combined with a SCI. This SCI is headed by the inflected P *orthu* 'on-them'.³³ Here the P overtly agrees in person and number with its complement, which is a null pronoun pro.³⁴ On the other hand, the SCI-subject is the phrase *eagla* 'fear'. This phrase is base-generated in Spec, PP and raises to the Spec, IP of the matrix clause at Syntax.³⁵ Now the interesting thing for our purposes here is that, in northern Irish dialects (Ulster Irish), the construction in (10) can appear embedded in the following way:

(11) Níor mhaith liom [na páistí_i $eagla_j$ a bheith [_{SCl} t_j orthu pro_i.]] I-would-not like the children fear be-_{INF} on-them `I would not like the children to be afraid.'

According to McCloskey and Sells (1988), *eagla* `fear' functions in this sentence as the object of the infinitival verb *a bheith* `be-_{INF}', whereas the lexical DP *na páistí* `the children' behaves like the

³³ For ease of exposition, the agreeing P is translated into English here as P plus a pronoun.

³⁴ When a P appears inflected, the pronoun cannot be overt. For the idea that there is null pronoun pro following the P in these cases, see McCloskey and Hale 1984, McCloskey 1986, Chung and McCloskey 1987, and McCloskey and Sells 1988.

³⁵ The superficial word order in Modern Irish finite clauses is V S O. This means that the movement of the SClsubject to Spec, IP is masked by the movement of the verb to a higher position. To make things clearer, the movement of the verb is not represented in (10).

subject of the infinitival clause. ³⁶ They cite several arguments that support this analysis. For instance, the syntactic distribution of the embedded clause in (11) is in consonance with the regular superficial word order of nonfinite clauses in northern Irish dialects, which is S O V. On the other hand, the idea that in (11) *eagla* `fear' functions as the object of the infinitive is suggested by the particle *a* which is regularly associated with the accusative Case assigned to the object of transitive verbs. They claim that, apart from transitive verbs, this particle can exceptionally show up with the verbs *a theacht* `to come', *a dhul* `to go', and *a bheith* `to be'. Finally, a clue that indicates that the DP *na páistí* `the children' does occupy Spec, IP in (11) is provided by examples like the one in (12), in which the lexical subject *sibh* `you' appears following the negative C *gan*.

(12) Ba mhaith liom gan [*sibh*_i eagla_j a bheith [scl t_j oraibh pro_i.]]
I-would-like _{COMP-NEG} you fear be-_{INF} on-you
`I would like for you not to be afraid.'

Notice, furthermore, that the word order in (12) also shows that this subject is not topicalized or left dislocated. Were this the case, *sibh* 'you' would show up preceding the C *gan*.

Unlike languages such as English and Spanish, Irish possesses a productive mechanism of Case assignment by default. So in a nonfinite sentence the lexical subject can be assigned accusative Case within its clause boundary. In the example in (11), then, the lexical DP *na páistí* `the children' can be assigned this unmarked Case in the Spec, IP of the infinitival clause.

McCloskey and Sells call the phrase that functions like a subject in this type of construction, *na páistí* 'the children' in (11) and *sibh* 'you'in (12), an *extra subject*. This argument is called an extra subject here because this phrase is base-generated in the subject position of a sentence the head of which is a copula, that is, a type of V that typically does not assign external theta-roles. McCloskey and Sells claim that two conditions must be satisfied for this extra subject to be legitimized in this

(i) Níor mhaith liom [$eagla_i$ a bheith [$_{SCl} t_i$ ar na páistí.]] I-would-not-like fear be- $_{INF}$ on the children `I would not like the children to be afraid.'

See also McCloskey and Sells 1988 for strong arguments against a raising hypothesis of the syntactic subject in (11) from the complement position of P to Spec, IP.

³⁶ There also exists the version in which the lexical DP in Spec, IP appears in the position occupied by the null pronoun pro. In this case, however, the P cannot be inflected. Compare (i) with (11) in the text.

structural context. The first condition that they point out is that this subject must obligatorily bind the argumental null pronoun pro that follows the inflected P. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of sentences like the one in (13) (cf. (11)).

(13) *Níor mhaith liom [na páistí_i eagla_j a bheith [$_{SCl}$ t_j oraibh *pro*_k.]] I-would-not-like the children fear be-_{INF} on-you

In this example the extra subject *na páistí* `the children' and the agreeing P *oraibh* `on-you' do not possess the same person and number specification. Hence, the sentence is ruled out.

The second condition is that the null pronoun pro that is bound by the extra subject must be necessarily interpreted as a *semantic subject*, that is, as the person who carries out the action expressed by the verb. We can see this by comparing (14) and (15). The translation of (15) is the intended meaning of the ungrammatical sentence.

- (14) B'fhearr liom [*sibh*_i Gaeilge a bheith dhá labhairt agaibh *pro*_i anseo.]
 I-would-prefer you Irish be-_{INF} speak-_{PROG}-_{PASS} at-you here
 `I would prefer for you to be speaking Irish here.'
- (15) *Tá Séan_i labhartha agam pro leis pro_i.
 be-_{PRES} Séan speak-_{PASS} at-me with-him
 `Séan has been spoken to by me.'

In (14) the extra subject *sibh* 'you' corefers with the agent of the embedded passivized clause. So the sentence is accepted. In contrast, in (15) the extra subject *Séan* is coindexed with the internal argument of the passivized verb, that is, an argument that is not interpreted as the semantic subject of the passivized verb *labhartha* 'spoken'. Therefore, the sentence is ruled out.

Let us return now to the idea pointed out above, to wit, the idea that in a CSCl the two subjects must coincide in reference because this is a way to legitimize the extra subject that appears within an extended domain that already contains an argumental subject. First of all, consider the sentence in (16a).

- (16) a. I consider *John intelligent*.
 - b. [EP2 I consider [EP1 John intelligent.]]

In this example we have an ordinary SCl functioning as the complement of the verb *consider*. If the theory of the extended projection presented above is applied to this sentence, then we can see that this construction contains (at least) two extended projections: one initiated by the lexical head of the SCl, namely the A *intelligent*, and one initiated by the head of the sentence, that is, the V *consider*. As can be observed in the representation in (16b), each one of these two extended projections (EP) legitimizes its own subject. Thus, the subject of the SCl and the subject of the sentence can refer to different individuals. Here these individuals are *John* and *I*, respectively. The Spanish example in (17) shows that exactly the same facts hold even when the restructuring process of the SCl-predicate has already been triggered at Syntax.

- (17) a. Yo considero *inteligente a Juan*.
 - b. [EP2 *Yo* considero inteligente_i [EP1 a Juan t_i .]]

Let us now see what happens in the Irish construction containing an extra subject. The example in (11) is reproduced here as (18a).

- (18) a. Níor mhaith liom *na páistí eagla a bheith orthu*.
 I-would-not like the children fear be-_{INF} on-them
 `I would not like the children to be afraid.'
 - b. Níor mhaith liom [$_{EP2}$ na páistí eagla_j a bheith [$_{EP1}$ t_j orthu pro_i.]]

To begin with, the constituent introduced by the copula functions like an ordinary SCI. The head of this SCI, which here is the inflected P *orthu* `on-them', starts its own extended projection. The same is true of the V *a bheith* `to be'. This means, then, that like in the previous case the infinitival sentence in (18a) contains (at least) two extended projections. Again, each one of these two extended projections legitimizes its own subject. As depicted in (18b), the subject of the SCI is *eagla* `fear', whereas the subject of the infinitival clause is *na páistí* `the children'.³⁷ But, as mentioned above, in this construction the subject of the EP2 must obligatorily bind the argumental null pronoun pro that follows the inflected P (see (13)), and this pro must be interpreted as a semantic subject (see (14)-(15)). As has already been commented on, these are two requirements

³⁷ By 'subject of the SCl' I mean the argument that is base-generated in Spec, PP. Recall that, according to what has been pointed out above, *eagla* 'fear' ends up functioning as the object of the copula in this type of construction.

that must necessarily be satisfied to legitimize the presence of this extra subject in this structural position.

Finally, consider the CSCI-structure proposed in this dissertation, which appears simplified in (19a).

(19) a.
$$[_{FP} DP_i \ [_{F'} F \dots \ [_{XP} \ \{pro_i / PRO_i\} X \]]]$$

b. $[_{EP1} DP_i F \dots \ \{pro_i / PRO_i\} X \]$

As I have been claiming, F is an extended projection of the lexical head X. This means that the projections that make up a CSCI form a single extended projection, as represented in (19b). This single extended projection contains two subjects, which are the null subject {pro / PRO} in Spec, XP, and the DP in Spec, FP. As we will see in the following chapters, there are two requirements that must necessarily be satisfied to legitimize the appearance of this extra subject in this structural position. The first requirement is that this extra subject must obligatorily bind an argumental null pronoun pro or PRO situated within the constituent introduced by F. And the second one is that this null argument pro or PRO must be interpreted as the *grammatical subject* of the domain introduced by F. So the following contrast is found in a CSCI:

(20) a.
$$*[_{FP} DP_i [_{F'} F ... [_{XP} {pro / PRO} V_{PASS} (by DP_i)]]]$$

b. $[_{FP} DP_i [_{F'} F ... [_{XP} {pro_i / PRO_i} V_{PASS} (by DP)]]]$

The structure in (20a) is ruled out because the subject in Spec, FP is coindexed with the Agent of the passivized V, namely an argument that does not function as the grammatical subject of the passive clause. On the other hand, (20b) is acceptable because here the subject in Spec, FP is coindexed with the internal argument of the passivized V, that is, the argument that functions as the grammatical subject of the passive clause.

The fact that the CSCI-subject cannot be coindexed with an argument contained within the internal predication if this argument does not function as the grammatical subject of that predication is referred to in the following chapters as the *subject-object asymmetry*. The effects that this phenomenon predicts can be schematically represented as follows:

Now the general conclusion that can be drawn from this discussion is that, if an extra subject appears in a construction, this extra subject will have to be legitimized. In the Irish construction, the extra subject is legitimized by being coindexed with the *semantic subject* of the embedded clause because the extra subject, on the one hand, and the other arguments of the clause, on the other hand, are base-generated in two different extended projections. In a CSCl, however, the extra subject is legitimized by being coindexed with the *grammatical subject* of the internal predication because the extra subject and the other arguments of the clause are base-generated within the same extended projection.

2.3.2 The Licensing of the two Subjects

As I have already pointed out, the internal predication of a CSCl is formed by the constituent introduced by X' and the subject in Spec, XP, whereas the external predication of a CSCl is formed by the constituent introduced by F' and the subject in Spec, FP. My next purpose is to show how these two subjects are formally licensed in the CSCl-model that is proposed here.

2.3.2.1 The Internal Predication

The subject of the CSCI-internal predication is the argument that satisfies both the thematic requirements of X(P) and the *Extended Projection Principle*-feature (EPP) of the X'-predicate (since Chomsky 1981, 1982, Rothstein 1983).

It has been claimed that all theta-marking is carried out in a strictly local fashion, including the assignment of external theta-roles. For us this means that the subject of the lexical XP-shell in the representation in (9) cannot be base-generated in any other position but within XP. On the other hand, the EPP states that every predicate must have a subject, and this subject can be either argumental or expletive.³⁸ If the constituent introduced by X' functions as a predicate in (9), as I am claiming here, then a phrase is expected to function as the subject of this predicate. In a CSCl, this phrase can be either the argument that is interpreted as the grammatical subject of the internal predication or an expletive associated with this argument. In this latter case, the expletive will have to be directly merged with a functional category situated between the XP-projection and the head F.

The next question to ask is how the subject of the internal predication gets Case in a CSCl. Recall from the introductory chapter that theta-role and Case are the two properties that license an argument, or a chain. My claim is that the subject must check Case in a position within the

³⁸ In Chomsky 1995: 232, the EPP is reduced to the checking of a strong D-feature of the head of the predicate. In a regular proposition, the strong D-feature would be provided by I.

constituent introduced by F. Thus, if there is a functional projection between the lexical XP-shell and the head F that provides, say, nominative Case, then this subject will check it off. Otherwise, if this Case is not available, then the subject will presumably check a null Case. In the former situation, this argument will be a pro, whereas in the latter one, it will be a PRO.

2.3.2.2 The External Predication

As in the previous case, we would also expect the subject of the CSCl, that is, the argument basegenerated in Spec, FP to satisfy the thematic requirements of F(P) and the EPP-feature of the F'predicate, and to check Case.

On the one hand, the phrase in Spec, FP will satisfy the EPP-feature of the F'-predicate. In this case, this phrase cannot be an expletive associated with an argument contained within the constituent introduced by F since in a CSCI Spec, FP is an A-position.

On the other hand, we will see in the following chapters that the subject of the CSCl must check structural Case in a position outside the clausal domain when this subject is a lexical DP, as in an argumental (C)SCl, (1a). If this subject is a PRO, as in an adjunct (C)SCl, (1b), then it will presumably check a null or default Case. Therefore, as far as Case is concerned, the argument that is base-generated in Spec, FP in a CSCl, be it either a lexical DP or a PRO, will behave exactly like the argument that is base-generated in Spec, XP in a regular SCl.

Certainly, it is not so obvious to determine how the CSCl-subject receives its theta-role in Spec, FP. Let me explore some options very briefly.

A first choice would consist in saying that the subject of the CSCl is assigned a theta-role by the *lexical head* of the construction, which in (9) is X. There are at least two important reasons to disregard this option. The first problem is that, if we accept this assumption, then we must also accept that a lexical head, or a predicate, can assign two theta-roles to two subjects, or external arguments. In other words, X would theta-mark the subject of the internal predication in Spec, XP and the subject of the CSCl in Spec, FP. This stance seems unlikely for obvious reasons. For instance, we might wonder why regular sentences cannot have two argumental subjects if a V can provide each one of them with a theta-role. A second problem lies in that this hypothesis leads us to say that the argument that is base-generated in Spec, FP in a CSCl, that is, a position *external* to the XP-shell, can be assigned an internal theta-role (Pacient, Theme, etc.), that is, a theta-role typically

assigned to arguments occupying an *internal* position. For example, this would occur when X is an unaccusative or a passive V (see (20b))³⁹

A second option would be to postulate that the head that assigns a theta-role to the subject of the external predication is F. The immediate advantage of this assumption over the previous one is that now the theta-assignment would obey locality, as required by the Theta-Criterion. Yet this

³⁹ The difficulties that this hypothesis generates could be solved by adopting a system like the one proposed in Grimshaw and Mester 1988 for constructions containing light Vs in Japanese. The system that Grimshaw and Mester call *Argument Transfer* states that the most prominent theta-role that a lexical-head X may possess can be transferred to the argument that functions as the subject of an upper head Y. In the constructions that Grimshaw and Mester explore, Y would be a light V, whereas in a CSCI Y would correspond to the functional head F. This mechanism would work as follows:

(i)	X (Agent, Theme)	\Rightarrow	Х	(Theme)
	Y		Y	(Agent)
(ii)	X (Theme)	\Rightarrow	Х	()
	Y		Y	(Theme)

In (i), the lexical head X has two arguments, an Agent and a Theme. The most prominent argument of X, namely the Agent, is transferred from X to the head Y. This is indicated by the arrow. In (ii), the argument transferred from X to Y is Theme, since this is the only argument that X possesses.

This hypothesis carries some nice consequences for the CSCI-model defended here. First of all, it solves the problem concerning the type of theta-role that is assigned to the CSCI-subject, along with the lexical head that predicts this theta-role. Secondly, by adopting this mechanism, we would need to say that the subject in Spec, FP is not coindexed with the subject of the internal predication, but with the most prominent theta-role of X. And thirdly, this system allows XP to be an open constituent, since XP gives away one of its theta-roles. This would explain why this XP can be interpreted as a predicate. Nonetheless, this hypothesis also carries nontrivial problems for the CSCI-model as presented in this dissertation. And most of these problems are related to the role that the subject of the internal predication carries out in this structure. For example, in a CSCI the subject of the internal predication checks structural Case within the constituent introduced by F; it checks the EPP-feature of the X'-predicate; and it triggers the agreement on the lexical head X, which suggests that this subject and X establish a local Spec-Head relationship at some stage of the syntactic derivation. All this indicates that there *is* an argumental subject within the internal predication, as opposed to what the Argument Transfer mechanism would predict were it applied to the CSCI-model.

alternative leaves us with the difficult task of reconciling this possibility with the general idea that only *lexical* heads can specify the theta-roles that are assigned in a construction.

A third hypothesis, more likely in my opinion, is based on the idea that the whole constituent that is predicated of the subject of the external predication is the unit that assigns the theta-role to that subject, namely the F'-constituent. A first advantage of this hypothesis is that it is in tune with the assumption that, in a sentence, the V by itself is not the element that assigns a theta-role to the subject of the construction, but the whole V'/ I'-constituent (Chomsky 1981, Marantz 1984). Thus, if this idea turns out to be correct for the verbal domain that appears in regular sentences, it would be natural to think that a similar process also applies when this domain is that of a CSCI. A second advantage that derives from this hypothesis is that it allows us to account for the notion that the semantic role of the CSCI-subject must be similar in all types of CSCI. As we will see in section 2.4 shortly below, what we are doing in every single example of CSCI is putting together an individual, which is the subject of the CSCI, and a situation, which is what the predicate of the CSCI describes. So *a priori* it is natural to believe that the semantic relationship that this individual will establish with this situation will be similar in every token of CSCI. In fact, this is what is predicted by the so-called *Uniformity of Theta Assignent Hypothesis* (UTAH), proposed in Baker 1988: 46 (see also Grimshaw 1990). The UTAH states the following:

(22) Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH)

Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure.

Thus, according to the UTAH, the subjects of particular tokens of the CSCI-model in (9) are expected to establish an identical, or at least a close, semantic relationship with their respective predicates. This is so since they all are arguments that are base-generated in the same position, namely Spec, FP. As I have already pointed out above, this hypothesis seems to be more efficient than the previous ones. For example, it tells us that the CSCI-subject receives a theta-role from its predicate, just like the subject of an ordinary sentence. But this only answers a part of the problem, since we still do not know which head predicts this theta-role (the verb in an ordinary sentence).

An alternative view to the one examined so far is provided by what we can call a pure configurational approach. In a configurational approach, it is suggested that, after all, the Theta-Criterion is not an essential factor required for licensing a subject (Williams 1980, Rothstein 1983,

1995, Heycock 1991, Hale and Keyser 1993, Moro 1995, Mateu 1999).⁴⁰ Following this hypothesis, the subject of a CSCl would be licensed because it is an argument that can be interpreted as the subject of the F'-predicate. A clear advantage of this approach over the ones cited above lies in the fact that this hypothesis is not only useful in accounting for the presence of an extra subject in a CSCl. For instance, it would also explain the licensing of the SCl-subject in examples of the following type ((23a) is from Moro 1995: 116, and (23b) is cited in Rothstein 1995: 511 and attributed to Heycock 1991):⁴¹

(23) a. John considers [sci these [his best pictures of Mary.]]

b. [*That man*] seems [as if his children kept him up all night.]

It is reasonable to suppose then that the solution that may be ultimately adopted to explain the semantic licensing of the elements that make up the constructions in (23) will be also appropriate for accounting for our examples of CSCl.⁴²

(i) Predication Condition:

Every syntactic predicate must be syntactically saturated. (p. 503)

(ii) NP licensing

NPs that are not predicational are licensed by internal θ-marking or as subjects of predicates. (p.

511)

This suggestion coincides with the idea that *external* arguments are not specified in the argument structure of lexical heads. In terms of Hale and Keyser (1993), an external argument is not part of the *Lexical Relational Structure* of a lexical head.

⁴⁰ According to Rothstein (1995), this is possible if the concept of `subject' is defined as "subject of a syntactic predicate" instead of "subject of a clause." She puts forward the following two principles:

⁴¹ Moro notes that the lexical head *pictures* in (23a) assigns its internal and external theta-roles to *Mary* (Patient) and *his* (Agent), respectively. The question that he poses concerns the type of theta-role that would be assigned to the subject of the SCl, that is, *these*, and the assigner of this theta-role.

⁴² Note, incidentally, that a pure configurational hypothesis must also predict the syntactic effects that a thematic approach attributes to the DP-subject being theta-marked. For instance, that this theta-marked DP needs Case to be visible or that it can move further up to an A-position (see (23b)).

The common idea that can be drawn from the thematic and structural perspective is that the CSCl-subject must establish a semantic relationship with its predicate, and that this semantic relationship will have to be preserved in any type of CSCl.

In conclusion, the subject of the internal predication and the subject of the external predication will both be licensed in the structural organization that the CSCI-model in (9) propounds. That is, the two subjects will form part of two independent chains, each one containing a theta-role and Case. Or, alternatively, both subjects will maintain a structural relationship with a syntactic predicate and will check Case.

2.4 The Semantic Organization of a Complex Small Clause

2.4.1 A Situation as a Predicate

In very general terms, a regular SCl-configuration allows us to attribute a property or state that is supposed to be true of an individual (or object) to that individual (or object). For example, in a SCl like that in (24a) the property \mathbf{p} , where \mathbf{p} means *intelligent*, is taken to hold of the individual \mathbf{x} , where \mathbf{x} refers to *Mary*.

- (24) a. I consider *Mary intelligent*.
 - b. I consider $[\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{p}]$

The basic idea that the CSCI-model intends to capture is the belief that the ontological categories susceptible of being predicated of an individual are not only properties and states, but also *situations*. Here I understand the term 'situation' as involving both *events*, which are dynamic situations, and *states of affairs*, which are static situations, that is, situations that hold throughout some stretch of time. The CSCI-model defended in this work, then, can be taken as an attempt to conflate this tenet with the basic SCI-structure put forward by the Small Clause Theory. Schematically, this could be represented as in (25) (cf. (24)).

(25) a.
$$[_{FP} Mary_i [_{F'} F ... [_{XP} \{ pro_i / PRO_i \} X]]]$$

b. $[\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{s}]$

Here s stands for situation, whereas x refers to an individual called *Mary*, just like in the previous case.

In the particular examples of CSCl that I explore in this dissertation, the situation **s** can be either a *sentence* or a *small clause*. For the domain of the internal predication to be a sentence, the

categorial value of the lexical head X must be V. This is so since V projects the functional domain of a sentence, typically IP and CP (chapters 3, 4 and 5). If the categorial value of X is nonverbal, that is, N, A or P, then X will be associated with the type of functional projections that appear in ordinary SCls, whatever these projections are (chapter 6). These two possibilities are schematically represented in (26).

(26) a.
$$[_{FP} DP_i \ [_{F'} F \ [_{Sentence} pro_i / PRO_i X \]]]$$
 where $X = V$
b. $[_{FP} DP_i \ [_{F'} F \ [_{SCl} PRO_i X \]]]$ where $X = N, A, (P)^{43}$

As has been already pointed out above, the subject of the CSCl must be coindexed with the grammatical subject of the internal predication of the construction. In other words, the CSCl-subject must corefer with a participant of the situation that is expressed by the internal predication. This is a property that immediately distinguishes a CSCl from a regular SCl the predicate of which denotes an eventuality. This latter case is exemplified by the Spanish sentence in (27a) and by its English counterpart in (27b).

(27) a. $Juan_i$ estaba [SC1 (PP) t_i [P' en [DP la inauguración del nuevo museo de la ciudad.]]] b. $John_i$ was [SC1 (PP) t_i [P' at [DP the opening of the new museum of the city.]]]

As we will see, the subject of the internal predication, namely the individual that the CSCIsubject must corefer with, must be represented in the situation by a null pronoun pro or PRO (see (26)). The obvious question at this point is why this must be so. There are two reasons that can account for this. First of all, it seems plausible to believe that a situation can be predicated of an individual only if that situation is an "open" constituent. For a situation to be an open constituent, it only needs to contain an argument that is not explicitly tied to some particular individual or object. In other words, it must contain at least one variable to bind. In the literature, it has been proposed that the null pronouns pro and PRO are what has happened to be called *minimal NP arguments* or minimal expressions (see Picallo 1991, Chomsky 1995, among many others). They are called minimal NP arguments because they are NPs (or DPs) that lack independent phonetic features, an intrinsic semantic content, and appear in the structure without referential and other properties. All

⁴³ In chapter 6, I only discuss examples of nonverbal CSCl the lexical head of which is either an A or an N. Future research should confirm or dismiss the possibility in which X can also be a P.

this makes these elements undetermined and, hence, candidates to be bound by a referential argument.

My claim is that the minimal arguments pro and PRO are the elements that allow the situation in which they appear to be an open constituent, and thereby a potential predicate. Now, in a CSClconfiguration, this potential predicate *can* end up functioning as a predicate because there is a potential subject in the structure that this open constituent can be predicated of, namely the argument that is merged with F'. In a CSCl, this null subject pro or PRO will be bound by either the lexical subject in Spec, FP, if the construction is an argumental CSCl, or a lexical argument outside the CSCl-domain via the PRO in Spec, FP, if the construction is an adjunct CSCl.

And secondly, the presence of a null pronoun pro / PRO in the CSCI-internal predication, instead of an overt pronoun, is further favored by economy principles, and more precisely by the *Avoid Pronoun Principle*. The Avoid Pronoun Principle (since Chomsky 1981) states that a null pronoun is more economic than an overt one and, hence, that this latter must be left out whenever possible. To illustrate this, consider the sentence in (28), from Reuland 1983: 130.

(28) The minister_i was standing in the pulpit without $\{PRO_i / ??him_i\}$ saying a word.

In this example the lexical DP *the minister* binds the null pronoun PRO that functions as the subject of the embedded clause. As indicated by the two question marks preceding the overt pronoun *him*, the null pronoun PRO is highly preferred over the phonologically realized pronoun, as predicted by the Avoid Pronoun Principle. The sentences in (29) serve to show that, in (28), there is nothing that in principle could prevent a lexical DP from being licensed in a position following the P *without*.⁴⁴

(29) a. The minister_i was standing in the pulpit without *the acolyte*.

(i) a. (*Ello) llueve.

b. (*Allò) plou.

- c. (*Ciò) piove.
 - it rains

In these pro-drop languages the use of an overt pronoun is emphatic, which is a situation that rarely raises when the pronoun involved is the weather *it*. Hence the results in (i).

⁴⁴ Similarly an overt pronoun in the subject position of a weather verb yields an ungrammatical sentence in pro-drop languages like standard Spanish, (ia), Catalan, (ib), and Italian, (ic).

b. John left without *me* telling him to.

In conclusion, the condition that states that the subject of the CSCl must corefer with the grammatical subject of the internal predication and the condition that states that this latter argument must be phonologically null are two internal principles that constrain the concatenation of a lexical XP-shell with an FP-layer containing a subject in its specifier, and hence the formation of a CSCl.

2.4.2 The Semantic Role of the FP-Head

In the CSCI-model that is proposed here, F is the head that links the situation s and the individual x. As already mentioned, F is the highest functional head of the extended projection of the lexical head X. This means that F must be compatible with the lexical head X. For F to be compatible with X, the categorial specification of both heads must coincide, or at least must not contradict each other. But, apart from that, these two heads must also be semantically compatible. For F and X to be semantically compatible, the semantic value that F possesses must be consistent with the meaning of X. As we will see in the following chapters, F may have either an *aspectual* value or a *modal* meaning in the examples of CSCI investigated in this work. More specifically, we will see that F has an aspectual meaning in the verbal CSCls examined here (chapters 3, 4, and 5), and a modal meaning in the nonverbal CSCls (chapter 6). By and large, the common property that we can draw from these two semantic values is that they both supply information about the speaker's perspective with regard to the eventuality expressed. For instance, if F possesses an aspectual value, it will provide information related to the internal temporal organization of the situation that this F introduces. On the other hand, if F has a modal meaning, it will provide information related to the presupposition or true existence of the situation that it precedes. This is, then, the semantic contribution of F in the CSCI-model presented here.

2.5 Summary

In this chapter I have presented the CSCI-model that will allow us to explain the behavior of the verbal and nonverbal examples of CSCI that are considered in the following chapters. The discussion has examined the structural organization of this type of construction, as well as its internal and semantic organization.

As far as the structural organization is concerned, we have seen that a CSCl is composed of a lexical domain and a functional domain. As in other constructions, the functional specification of the elements that form the functional domain of a CSCl must be higher than the functional

specification of the lexical head of the construction, and the categorial value of the functional domain must match, or at least not contradict, the categorial value of the lexical domain.

We have also seen that the structural domain of a CSCl contains two subjects: the CSCl-subject, which is the DP that is base-generated in the specifier of the highest functional projection of the construction, and the subject of the lexical domain of the CSCl. It has been noted that this is an exceptional situation since both subjects are situated within the same extended domain. I have argued that, for the CSCl-subject to be legitimized in this syntactic configuration, it must be coindexed with the grammatical subject of the lexical domain. We have also seen that these two subjects are formally licensed in the CSCl-model since each one of these two subjects creates its own chain containing a theta-role and Case or, alternatively, each one of these two subjects maintains a structural relationship with a syntactic predicate and checks Case.

In the last section, I have claimed that the predicate of the CSCl denotes a situation, that is, an event or a state of affairs, in which the individual that the CSCl-refers to is a participant. I have argued that this individual must be represented in the CSCl-predicate by a minimal expression, that is, a null pronoun pro or PRO. On the other hand, I have indicated that the CSCl-head provides aspectual or modal information, which will modify the situation that this head introduces.

The Pseudo-Relative

"All change is scary, but it's the only way to growth." (Laura Schlessinger)

3.1 The Pseudo-Relative

The so-called *Pseudo-Relative* (PR) is a construction that is found in the majority of the Romance languages. This construction is composed of a DP, a C, and a finite verb which agrees in person and number with that DP. As the examples in (1) illustrate, the PR is generally accepted in these languages when it is combined with a perception verb.

(1)	a.	He visto	а		Juan	que	corría.	(Spanish)
	b.	He vist		en	Joan	que	corria.	(Catalan)
	c.	Eu vin	а		Xoán	que	corría.	(Galician)
	d.	J'ai vu			Jean	qui	courait.	(French)
	e.	Ho visto			Gianni	che	correva.	(Italian)
	f.	Vitti	а		Gianni	chi	scappava.	(Calabrian)

g.	Am vazut	pe	Ion	са	fugea.	(Romanian)
h.	Vi	а	Xuan	que	corría.	(Asturian)
i.	He bisto	а	Chuan	que	correba.	(Aragonese)
	have.I seen	to-ACC the	John	that	ran.he-IMPERF	
	`I saw John	running.'				

In other structural contexts, the acceptance of the PR varies depending on the Romance language used. This can be observed by comparing the Spanish, Catalan, and Italian sentences in (2)-(7). In these examples, the PR appears with a verb like *to catch* or *to find*, (2); functioning as a complement of a noun, (3); in an absolute construction, (4); in a locative construction, (5); with a verb like *to remember*, (6); and as a free expression, (7).

(2)	a.	*He	encontrado	а		Juan	que	robaba.	(Spanish) ⁴⁵
	b.	He	trobat		en	Joan	que	robava.	(Catalan)
	c.	Но	incontrato			Gianni	che	rubava.	(Italian)
		have.I	found	to-ACC	the	John	that	stole.he-IMP	ERF
		`I caugl	ht John steal	ing.′					

(3) a. *La fotografía de Juan que baila el tango ha sido la más vendida.(Spanish)
b. *La fotografía d'en Joan que balla el tango ha estat la més venuda. (Catalan)
c. La fotografía di Gianni che balla il tango è stata la più venduta.(Italian)
the picture of the John that dances the tango is been the most sold
`The picture of John dancing the tango was the one which sold the most.'

(4)	a. *Con	Juan	que	habla,	no	haremos	nada.	(Spanish) ⁴⁰
	b.??/*Amb e	n Joan	que	parla,	no	farem	res.	(Catalan)

10

 (i) Pintó a la niña que era una monada. painted.(s)he to-_{ACC} the girl that was.she a cute `The girl was painted very cute.'

⁴⁵ The ungrammaticality of this sentence in Spanish contrasts with the grammaticality of a sentence like (i), taken from Demonte and Masullo 1999: 2473.

In this example, the CP *que era una monada* `that she was cute' functions as a predicate, and modifies the object *la niña* `the girl'. As the grammatical contrast between this sentence and the example in (2a) in the text already indicates, these two sentences cannot be taken as tokens of the same construction.

c. Con *Gianni che parla*, non faremo niente. (Italian) with the John that speaks.he-IMPERF no do.will.we nothing
 `With John speaking, we will never do anything.'

(5)	a.	*En	la cocina	hay	una	olla	(de agua)	que	hierve.	(Spanish)
	b.	А	la cuina	hi ha	una	olla	(d'aigua)	que	bull.	(Catalan)
	c.	In	cucina	c´è	una	pentona	(d'acqua)	che	bolle.	(Italian)
		in t	he kitchen	there is	а	pot	of water	that	boils.it	
`In the kitchen there is a pot of water boiling.'										

(6)	a. '	*Recuerdo a		Juan	que	partía.	(Spanish)
	b.?'	?Recordo	en	Joan	que	marxava.	(Catalan)
	c.	Ricordo		Gianni	che	partiva.	(Italian)
		remember.I to-ACC	the	John	that	left.he-IMPERF	
		`I remember John l					

(7)	a.	Niñas	que	bailan	un	vals.	(Spanish)
	b.	Nenes	que	ballen	un	vals.	(Catalan)
	c.	Bambine	che	ballano	un	valzer.	(Italian)
		girls	that	dance.they	а	waltz	
		`Girls danc					

As one might have noticed, the elements that identify the PR, namely DP plus CP, coincide with the elements that typically constitute a *Relative* (R) clause. This parallelism can be clearly seen by comparing the Spanish sentence in (8), which has a PR as a complement, with a sentence like that in (9), which contains a R clause in the subject position.

- (8) He visto a Juan que corría.
 have.I seen to-_{ACC} Juan that ran.he-_{IMPERF}
 `I saw Juan running.'
- (9) El chico que corría es mi primo.

⁴⁶ As we will see in the following chapter, this sentence improves both in Spanish and in Catalan if an element reinforcing the progressive value of the event expressed by the PR is introduced.

the boy that ran.he-IMPERF is my cousin `The boy who was running is my cousin.'

However, despite this apparent similarity there are many arguments that strongly demonstrate that the PR and the R clause are not the same construction (hence the name 'Pseudo-Relative'). A first clue that suggests that the construction that we are examining here is not a R clause is provided by its meaning. In the PR, the string introduced by the C *que* does not modify the lexical DP that it generally follows. Instead this string expresses an event in progress in which the individual that the lexical DP refers to is a participant. In this sense, then, the PR behaves just like the (verbal) gerund in languages like English (see chapter 5). Notice that this is the form that is used here when the PR is translated into this language. Many other arguments have been cited in the literature to prove the distinct nature of the PR with regard to both the restrictive R, and the nonrestrictive R (see, for instance, Rosselló and Solà 1987, Guasti 1988, 1992, Cinque 1992, Rafel 2000a). Some of these arguments are the following:⁴⁷

(i) The DP introducing the PR can be a proper name. This distinguishes the PR, (10), from the restrictive R, (11).⁴⁸

- (10) He visto a *Juan* que corría en el maratón.
 have.I seen to-_{ACC} Juan that ran.he-_{IMPERF} in the marathon
 `I saw Juan running in the marathon.'
- (11) *He conocido a *Juan* que corría en el maratón. have.I met to- $_{ACC}$ Juan that ran.he- $_{IMPERF}$ in the marathon

(ii) That DP can be cliticized and extracted in the PR, (12). These operations, however, are barred in the R, (13).

⁴⁷ The examples that I use here are in Spanish, but crucially the same grammatical results are obtained when these tests are applied to the other Romance languages that possess the PR. To make things clearer, I combine the PR with the perception verb *ver* `to see', which is a verb that typically takes this construction (see (1)), and the R clause with the verb *conocer* `to know' / `to meet', which does not accept the PR as a complement. So the DP-CP string can only be interpreted as a R clause when it appears with this latter type of verb.

- (12) a. Lo he visto que besaba a María. him have.I seen that kissed.he-_{IMPERF} to María `I saw him kissing María.'
 - b. A JUAN he visto que besaba a María.
 TO JUAN have.I seen that kissed.he-IMPERF to María
 'JUAN I saw kissing María.'
 - c. ¿A quién has visto que besaba a María?
 to who have.you seen that kissed.(s)he-IMPERF to María
 `Who did you see kissing María?'
- (13) a. *Lo he conocido que besaba a María. him have.I met that kissed.he-IMPERF to María
 - b. **AL CHICO* he conocido que besaba a María. TO.THE BOY have.I met that kissed.he-_{IMPERF} to María
 - c.*;*A quién* has conocido que besaba a María? to who have.you met that kissed.(s)he-_{IMPERF} to María

(iii)In the PR the preceding DP can only be interpreted as the subject of the finite verb that appears in this construction, (14), whereas the DP can correspond to any argument of the finite verb that shows up in the R, (15).

- (14) a. He visto a *Juan* que besaba a María.
 have.I seen to-_{ACC} Juan that kissed.he-_{IMPERF} to María
 `I saw Juan kissing María.'
 - b. *He visto a *María* que (la) besaba Juan. have.I seen to-_{ACC} María that her kissed.he-_{IMPERF} Juan

⁴⁸ The nonrestrictive R clause can be introduced by a proper name as well. However, in this construction there is an intonation break between the preceding DP and the rest of the sequence that is not observed in the PR. Normally, this intonation break is graphically represented by a comma.

- (15) a. He conocido al chico que besaba a María.
 have.I met to.the boy that kissed.he-IMPERF to María
 `I met the boy who was kissing María.'
 - b. He conocido a *la chica* que besaba Juan have.I met to-_{ACC} the girl that kissed.he-_{IMPERF} Juan 'I met the girl whom Juan was kissing.'

(iv) The C *que* can only be replaced by other relative pronouns, like *el cual*, *la cual* (`who'), when that *que* heads a R clause. Compare (16) and (17).

- (16) *He visto a Juan *el cual* corría.have.I seen to-_{ACC} Juan the who ran.he-_{IMPERF}
- (17) La chica a *la cual* di los documentos ha desaparecido.
 the girl to-_{ACC} the who gave. I the documents has.she disappeared
 `The girl who I gave the documents to has disappeared.'
 - (v) The constituent headed by the C que can only be extraposed in the PR:
- (18) Acabo de ver a *Juan* ahora mismo *que corría por el parque*.
 finish.I of see to-_{ACC} Juan now right that ran.he-_{IMPERF} through the park
 `I have just seen John right now running in the park.'
- (19) *Acabo de conocer al estudiante ahora mismo que corrió en el maratón.finish.I of know to.the student now right that ran.he in the marathon

(vi)Contrastive stress on the constituent headed by the C *que* triggers a determinerless constituent negation in the PR, (20). Conversely, contrastive stress on the string introduced by the C *que* triggers the presence of a determiner in the R, (21).

(20) He visto a Juan que se llevaba los víveres, no que have.I seen to- $_{ACC}$ Juan that $_{SE}$ took.he- $_{IMPERF}$ the provisions no that

los cargaba en el camión. them load in the truck `I saw Juan taking the provisions, not loading them into the truck.'

(21) He encontrado al chico que se llevó los víveres, no *el que* have.I met to.the boy that _{SE} took.he the provisions no the that los cargó en el camión.
them load in the truck
`I met the boy who took the provisions, not the one who loaded them into the truck.'

(vii) The tense of the PR must match the tense of the matrix sentence, (22). This property is not observed in the R, (23).

- (22) He visto a María que { *corría / *corre / *correrá* } en el maratón. have.I seen to-_{ACC} María that ran.she-_{IMPERF} / runs.she / run.will.she in the marathon
- (23) He conocido a la chica que { *corría* / *corre* / *correrá*} en el maratón. have.I met to the girl that ran.she-IMPERF / runs.she / run.will.she in the marathon `I met the girl who {was running / is running / will run} in the marathon.'

(viii) The PR does not accept perfective auxiliaries or a perfective tense, (24), contrary to the R which accepts these verbal forms, (25).

- (24) *He visto a María que { *había corrido / ha corrido / corrió* } en el maratón.
 have.I seen to María that had.she run / has.she run / ran.she-PERF in the marathon
- (25) He conocido a la chica que { había corrido / ha corrido / corrió } have.I met to the girl that had.she run / has.she run / ran.she-PERF en el maratón.
 in the marathon
 `I met the girl who {had run / has run / ran} in the marathon.'

(ix) The PR and the R can cooccur without being coordinated, (26). This is not possible when both constructions are R clauses, (27).

(26) He visto al estudiante

have.I seen to.the student

[R que correrá en el maratón] [PR que se entrenaba con Juan.] that run.will.he in the marathon that SE trained.he-IMPERF with Juan 'I saw the student who is going to run in the marathon training with Juan.'

 (27) *He conocido al estudiante have.I met to.the student
 [R que correrá en el maratón] [R que se entrena con Juan.]
 that run.will.he in the marathon that SE trains.he with Juan

My purpose in the next section is to examine three syntactic structures that at first sight could be thought of as possible analyses for the PR. As we will see, these three syntactic structures differ from each other basically with regard to the element that occupies the specifier of the CP-projection and the status of that position in each case. The discussion of these three possible syntactic approaches will lead us to the analysis of the PR in terms of a Complex Small Clause in section 3.1.2.

3.1.1 Three Possible Approaches to Account for the Syntax of the Pseudo-Relative

3.1.1.1 An Op Raising to Spec, CP

The standard analysis that has been proposed for R clauses in the Generative Grammar is the one depicted in (28b).

(28) a. The book that you bought

b. $[_{DP} \text{ The book}_i [_{CP} Op_i [_{C'} \text{ that } [_{IP} \text{ you bought } t_i]]]]$

In this structure, the CP appears modifying the DP *the book*. Within the CP-projection, an operator (Op) moves from an IP-internal position to Spec, CP. From this position, this Op receives the referential value from its antecedent, namely the nominal phrase *the book*, and binds the gap that it has left behind. Since this gap is bound from an A-bar position, it will be interpreted as a variable.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ In Kayne 1994, an alternative analysis for R clauses is proposed. This alternative analysis states that the CP in the structure in (28b) is selected by a D, and that the so-called antecedent, that is, *book* in (28), raises from a position within the CP to Spec, CP. This is represented in (i) (cf. (28b)).

⁽i) $\begin{bmatrix} DP \\ D' \end{bmatrix}$ the $\begin{bmatrix} CP \\ book_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C' \\ c' \end{bmatrix}$ that $\begin{bmatrix} P \\ P \end{bmatrix}$ you bought $t_i \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

Obviously there is nothing that in principle prevents us from assigning the syntactic structure in (28b) to the PR. Thus, we could say that the analysis of the perception verb complement in (29a) is as represented in (29b).

- (29) a. He visto *a Juan que corría*. have.I seen to Juan that ran.he `I saw Juan running.'
 - b. $[_{DP} Juan_i [_{CP} Op_i [_{C'} que [_{IP} t_i corría]]]]$

As in the previous case, here the CP-projection functions as a modifier of the nominal phrase *Juan*. In Spec, CP, we find an Op, which raises there from a position within IP. This Op receives the referential value from its antecedent, that is, *Juan*, and binds the trace that it has left behind.

Now, as the reader might have already noticed, the analysis in (28b)/(29b) can explain the syntactic behavior of the R clause in the examples from (10) through (27). But, importantly, it cannot account for the different syntactic behavior that the PR shows in those examples. In fact, many of the differences between these two constructions that can be observed in those examples point to the idea that only R clauses must be analyzed as a complex DP. For instance, a DP-complex analysis would predict that the whole DP-complex is the constituent that will eventually check structural Case. The contrast between the examples in (30) and (31), however, shows that this prediction is only correct when the construction we are dealing with is a R clause, but it is not when the construction involved is the PR.

- (30) a. He conocido a *la chica que corría*. Yo todavía no *la* conozco. have.I met to the girl that ran.she I yet no her meet
 `I met the girl who was running. I haven't met her yet'
 - b. *He conocido a la chica que corría. Yo todavía no la conozco que corría.
- (31) He visto a María que corría. Yo también la he visto que corría.
 have.I seen to María that ran.she-IMPERF I too her have.I seen that ran.she
 `I saw María running. I saw her running too.'

In this work I will keep using the traditional analysis since, for our purposes here, no crucial consequences derive from Kayne's approach.

On the one hand, the sentences in (30) contain an example of a R clause. Now the contrast between (30a) and (30b) shows that the string *la chica que corría* `lit. the girl that ran.she-IMPERF' is a complex DP, since the whole complex is the constituent that must be replaced by the accusative clitic *la* `her'. The sentence in (31), on the other hand, contains an example of PR. In contrast to the previous case, the grammaticality of this example indicates that the sequence *María que corría* `lit. María that ran.she-IMPERF' is not a complex DP here, since the clitic *la* `her' can only replace the DP *María*. This demonstrates then that the phrase that checks accusative Case in this sentence is only *María*.

Secondly, as it is well-known, the left branch of a complex DP cannot be moved leaving the rest of the constituent behind (see Ross 1967). Now the DP-complex analysis correctly accounts for the fact that the antecedent of a R clause cannot be moved leaving its modifier behind. This is illustrated in (32).

(32) *A la chica he conocido que corría.to the girl have.I met that ran.she

But, again, this analysis does not explain why this operation is possible when the construction we are dealing with is the PR, as shown by the well-formedness of (33).

(33) A Juan he visto que corría.to Juan have.I seen that ran.he`Juan I saw running.'

Thirdly, a R clause cannot be replaced by a neuter clitic, for instance, the neuter clitic *lo* `it' in Spanish. This is shown in (34).

(34) *He conocido a la chica que corría. Yo también *lo* he conocido. have.I met to the girl that ran.she-IMPERF I too it have.I met

This can be interpreted as a direct consequence of the fact that this construction is a nominal phrase, instead of, say, a clause. Interestingly enough, the PR can be resumed by this neuter clitic, as illustrated in (35).

(35) He visto a María que corría. Yo también *lo* he visto.

have.I seen to María that ran.she-IMPERF I too it have.I seen 'I saw María running. I saw it too.'

Once again, the grammatical result that is obtained here would run against the idea of treating the PR as a complex DP.

Apart from all this, the analysis of the PR in terms of a complex DP would neither explain the subject-object asymmetry (cf. (14) and (15)), and the temporal and aspectual restrictions (cf. (22)/(23) and (24)/(25)) that are observed only in this construction. Notice that these phenomena would not be expected from an analysis that postulates the movement of an Op from a position inside IP to Spec, CP.

3.1.1.2 An Op Base-Generated in Spec, CP

Consider the type of R clause that shows up in (36a) (from Kayne 1984) and the analysis that has been proposed for this construction, which here appears in (36b).

(36) a. The book that I was wondering whether I would get *it* in the mail

b. $[_{DP} \text{ The book}_i \ [_{CP} \ Op_i \ [_{C'} \text{ that } \ [_{IP} \ I \text{ was wondering} \ [_{CP} \text{ whether } \ [_{C'} \ [_{IP} \ I \text{ would get } it_i \text{ in the mail }]]]]]]$

In (36b) it can be observed that the resumptive pronoun *it* shows up in the position where the trace of an Op would be expected to be found in a regular R clause (cf. (28b)). The presence of a resumptive pronoun in this type of construction has been claimed to be the result of a last resort operation, which is triggered in order to avoid the violation of the *Empty Category Principle* (ECP) (Chomsky 1977).⁵⁰ The ECP would be violated here since neither the Op nor a trace of this Op would govern the original trace locally, that is, from the specifier of the lowest CP. This is so because this position is already occupied by the wh-phrase *whether*.

Recently it has been suggested that in this type of construction the Op is base-generated in Spec, CP, instead of raising from a position within IP (Engdahl 1985, McCloskey and Sells 1988, Cinque 1990), and that Spec, CP is in these cases an A-position, instead of an A-bar position (McCloskey 1990, Shlonsky 1992).

⁵⁰ The ECP requires that traces must be properly governed:

⁽i) α properly governs β if, an only if, α theta-governs β or α antecedent-governs β .

⁽ii) α theta-governs β if, and only if, α governs β and α theta-marks β .

⁽iii) α antecedent-governs β if, and only if, α governs β and α is coindexed with β .

The former assumption would capture three nontrivial facts. First of all, the presence of a pronoun in the base position, instead of a gap as would be expected were movement involved. Secondly, the grammaticality of the construction itself, since the movement of the Op from the position where the pronoun *it* appears to the specifier of the highest CP in (36) would violate subjacency. And thirdly, the lack of crossover effects or weak crossover effects that is observed in these structures.

On the other hand, the idea that Spec, CP is an A-position in (36) comes from the assumption that in these constructions the C contains agreement features (see also Rizzi 1990, Déprez 1990).⁵¹ According to Shlonsky (1992), the argumental nature of this position predicts the fact that a parasitic gap cannot be licensed in a R clause containing a resumptive pronoun. The reason for this is that a parasitic gap can only be licensed if it is bound by a phrase occupying an A-bar position, as in (37).

- (37) a. The book that John filed without reading *e*.
 - b. [DP The book [CP Op_i [C' that [IP John filed t_i [without reading e_i]]]]]

Furthermore, it is argued that the resumptive pronoun in (36) behaves like a pronoun at Syntax and like a variable at LF. This would immediately account for the lack of strong and weak crossover effects and the impossibility of licensing a parasitic gap in this construction, since these phenomena only apply at the overt Syntax. As expected, all these effects do hold in an ordinary R clause, since in this type of construction the trace is interpreted as a variable at all levels of representation.⁵²

Now, if we apply the analysis in (36b) to the PR that appears in the sentence in (38a), we would obtain the structure in (38b).

- (38) a. He visto a Juan que corría.have.I seen to Juan that ran.he`I saw Juan running.'
 - b. $[_{DP} Juan_i [_{CP} Op_i [_{C'} que [_{IP} pro_i corría]]]]$

⁵¹ This hypothesis is highly substantiated by the morphological alternation of C in Irish. In the literature, aL is the form that has been used to represent the C that appears in R clauses with a gap in this language, whereas aN represents the form of the C that is found in R clauses containing a resumptive pronoun. As Chung and McCloskey (1987) point out, "[t]he L of aL is merely a device to indicate that the particle induces the lenition mutation on a following verb, thus distinguishing it from the indirect relative particle [aN], which does not." (footnote 32, p. 222)

For the tests and data that show, and hence support the analysis in (36b), I refer the reader to the references cited in the text.

As in (36b), here the Op is base-generated in Spec, CP, which is an A-position, and a null subject pronoun pro occupies the subject position of the embedded finite clause.

As the reader might have already noticed, the same problems pointed out in the previous section in order to discard the structure of a regular R clause for the PR, namely the analysis in (29b), can also be reproduced here to discount the analysis in (38b) for the construction under investigation. And the main reason for this lies in that in (38b) the PR is treated again as a complex DP. But, apart from that, there is a particular property in the analysis in (38b) that is worth mentioning at this point. This property makes reference to the idea that the PR contains a resumptive pronoun.

First of all, the examples in Spanish and French in (39) illustrate that a resumptive pronoun is allowed in R clauses in Romance, just like in English (cf. (36)). The sentence in (39b) is from Haegeman 1994: 409.

- (39) a. La *chica*_i a la cual *le*_i iba a dar los documentos ha desaparecido.
 the girl to the who her went. I to give the documents has she disappeared
 `The girl who I was going to give the documents to has disappeared.'
 - b. Voici l' *homme*_i que Maria *lui*_i a parlé.
 here.is the man that Maria him has.she talked
 `Here is the man who Maria has talked to.'

Now consider the examples of PR that appear as the perception verb complement in (40) and (41).

- (40) *He visto a *María* que besaba Juan. have.I seen to María that kissed.he-_{IMPERF} Juan
- (41) *He visto a *María* que *la* besaba Juan. have.I seen to María that her kissed.he-_{IMPERF} Juan

On the one hand, the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (40) shows that in the PR the lexical DP cannot be coindexed with a gap in the object position of the clause introduced by the C *que*. But, on the other hand, the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (41) tells us that this sentence does not improve at all if this DP is coindexed with a phonologically realized pronoun. This suggests that resumptive pronouns are not involved in the P, independently of the syntactic status that we may

finally assign to this construction. Otherwise, the example in (41) should sound much better than the sentence in (40).⁵³

3.1.1.3 The DP Raising to Spec, CP

A third possible analysis that could be assigned to the PR consists in saying that Spec, CP is not occupied by an Op, but by the lexical DP itself. This DP would raise to Spec, CP from the subject position of the embedded IP, as schematically represented in (42b). This approach has been advocated by Gross (1968), Schwarze (1974), and Radford (1975), among others.

- (42) a. He visto a Juan que corría.have.I seen to Juan that ran.he`I saw Juan running.'
 - b. $[_{CP} Juan_i [_{C'} que [_{IP} t_i corría]]]$

With regard to the two previous approaches, the most interesting thing that the analysis in (42b) offers is that it allows us to clearly distinguish the structure of the PR from the structure of a R clause. Thus, all the differences between these two constructions mentioned up to this point can be attributed to their different syntactic status. That is, a R clause is a complex DP (see (28b) and (36b)), whereas the PR is a CP. Of course, this is a welcome result. The analysis in (42b), on the other hand, states that the structure of the PR is identical to the structure of an ordinary proposition. The only difference between the PR and an ordinary proposition would merely lie in the peculiarity that the DP-subject must overtly move to Spec, CP only in the PR.

Indeed the analysis in (42b) is the simplest one that could be expected for the PR, since it just reproduces what is apparently observed. However, there are compelling arguments that show that this simplicity is obtained by ignoring important syntactic and conceptual facts. I will discuss some of these facts in turn.

- (i) He visto a *Juan* que *lo* llevaban preso. have.I seen to-_{ACC} Juan that him carried.they arrested `I saw Juan while he was being taken away under arrest.'
- (ii) He visto a *Juan* que *le* daban golpes por todos lados. have.I seen to-_{ACC} Juan that him gave.they hits for all sides `I saw Juan while he was being beaten up.'

⁵³ Campos (1995) provides the following sentences as intances of PR:

The interesting thing here is that in these Spanish examples the DP that precedes the C *que*, namely *Juan*, does not corefer with the subject of the embedded verb, but with its object in (i) and indirect object in (ii). The object and indirect object are represented by the accusative and dative clitic *lo* `him' and *le* `him', respectively. In the appendix to this chapter, I argue that these constructions are not examples of PR.

3.1.1.3.1 Syntactic Problems

The syntactic problems that derive from the analysis in (42b) make reference mainly to the movement of the DP from Spec, IP to Spec, CP. First of all, suppose that this DP checks nominative Case and the EPP-feature in the specifier of the finite IP, as usual. This DP would then move to Spec, CP, according to this analysis. So far nothing seems to be particularly problematic. But the drawbacks immediately arise when we have to say that this DP moves further up from Spec, CP to a position within the matrix clause to check accusative or nominative Case. These two possibilities are exemplified in (43). The sentence in (43a) is in Spanish and the one in (43b) in French, from Cinque 1992: 26.

- (43) a. Lo he visto que corría. him have.I seen that ran.he `I saw him running.'
 - b. Le garçon a été vu qui courait.
 the child has.he been seen that ran.he
 `The child was seen running.'

A first technical problem that arises from the examples in (43) for the analysis in (42b) is that in these examples the DP would check two structural Cases, that is, the nominative Case assigned by the embedded finite I, and the accusative provided by the matrix verb in (43a) and the nominative supplied by the matrix finite I in (43b). Now the problem arises because a DP cannot check two structural Cases, at least in the Romance languages.⁵⁴ Secondly, in (43) the DP would move from the embedded Spec, IP (an A-position), to Spec, CP (an A-bar position), and, finally, to a position within the matrix clause, presumably Spec, AgroP in (43a) and Spec, IP in (43b), again an A-position. The result of this movement would be a mixed (sandwiched) [A, A', A] chain, that is, an inadmissible type of chain according to the Minimalist Program. And, thirdly, in the analysis in (42b) the DP would move to Spec, CP only in order to check structural Case by a later movement

⁵⁴ In minimalist terms, Case is a [-interpretable] feature. This means that it is erased once it is checked off and, hence, inaccessible for further operations.

Pesetsky (1995: 209) suggests that the movement of an argument from one theta-position to another theta-position is possible if both theta-positions have the same semantic relation, that is, are assigned the same theta-role. He claims that this is plausible since the chain will contain just one type of theta-role. As we will see shortly below (section 3.1.2), I claim that Spec, CP is an A-position in the PR. So, in Pesetsky's hypothesis, the movement of the DP from a position within IP to Spec, CP should not cause any problem in the PR. But he goes on to add that the two arguments must not check distinct Cases. Otherwise, they would be dissimilar in Case features (footnote 178, p. 321). Examples like (43a)

towards the matrix clause. Again, this operation runs against minimalist ideas, more specifically against the idea that α cannot move in order for this α to check some feature through a later operation.

Furthermore, a nontheory-internal problem that also demonstrates the implausibility of the analysis in (42b) for the PR is that this construction can be found in locative constructions in languages like Catalan, as shown in (44a) (see also (5) above). Nonetheless, it is not possible for an ordinary CP to appear in this structural context, as illustrated in (44b).

- (44) a. Aquí hi ha *en Joan que estudia*.
 here _{LOC} has the Joan that studies.he
 `Here there is Joan studing.'
 - b. *Aquí hi ha *que en Joan estudia*. here _{LOC} has that the Joan studies.he

Of course, this constrast would be surprising if the structure of the PR and the structure of a regular CP-complement were identical, that is, the structure of a regular CP-construction.⁵⁵

3.1.1.3.2 Conceptual Problems

The conceptual problems that derive from the analysis in (42b) concern both the interpretation of the PR and the interpretation of the perception verb in the example in (42a), repeated here as (45).

(45) He visto *a Juan que corría*. have.I seen to Juan that ran.he

- (i) a. *I saw [$_{CP}$ him_i [$_{C'}$ that [$_{IP}$ t_i was running.]]]
 - b. **Who*_i did you say [_{CP} t_i [_{C'} that [_{IP} t_i left yesterday?]]]
- (ii) a. *I saw [$_{CP}$ him_i [$_{C'} \varnothing$ [$_{IP}$ t_i was running.]]]
 - b. Who_i did you say [$_{CP} t_i$ [$_{C'} \emptyset$ [$_{IP} t_i$ left yesterday?]]]

in the text show that this is not what we have in the PR, since here the subject checks nominative within the embedded IP and accusative within the matrix clause.

⁵⁵ We might also wonder why languages like English do not have the PR if the movement of the DP-subject is the only operation involved in this construction. The ungrammaticality of (ia), for instance, could be explained by appealing to the *that*-trace effect, just like the ungrammaticality of (ib). But it would be more difficult to account for the ungrammaticality of (iia), in which the C is null. Compare (iia) with (iib).

'I saw Juan running.'

First of all, it is claimed in the literature that the syntactic category CP is associated with the ontological category of *proposition*, whereas IP is linked to the ontological category of *event*.⁵⁶ Very roughly, here I take `proposition' to be a statement that can be true or false, and `event' an occurence with a space-time location.⁵⁷

On the other hand, it is well-known that a perception verb can receive an *epistemic* (intellectual) interpretation and a *nonepistemic* (sensible) one. The epistemic meaning of a perception verb is generally obtained when this verbal head is combined with a complement that is semantically understood as a proposition. This is illustrated in the examples in (46).

(46) a. I saw that Mary was running in the marathon (when I saw all her family there.)

b. I saw that Mary can speak French.

In these sentences, the meaning of the perception verb *to see* is similar to the meaning of typical epistemic verbs such as *to realize*. On the other hand, the nonepistemic meaning of a perception verb is found when its complement refers to an event, as in (47).

(i) CP > IP > VP > DP

⁵⁶ According to Grimshaw 1990, 1991 (and references cited there), the *Canonical Structural Realization* of proposition, event, and action is CP, IP, and VP, respectively.

Here I follow Jackendoff 1990 in assuming that a complex conceptual category can be projected at Syntax as a simpler syntactic category, but that this move cannot be carried out the other way around. For instance, in a hierarchical structure like that in (i), a proposition can be projected at Syntax as a CP, DP, or any other syntactic category between CP and DP, whereas an event can be projected as an IP, DP, or any other syntactic category between IP and DP. But, crucially, there is no way for an event to show up at Syntax as a CP, since this syntactic category is higher in the hierarchical structure than IP.

⁵⁷ The distinction between proposition and event has proven to be especially useful in perceptual reports, since it accounts for the intensional/extensional behavior of the verbal complement of the perception verb (see Barwise 1981, Barwise and Perry 1981, Barwise and Perry 1983, Higginbotham 1983, Neale 1988, van der Does 1991). Simplifying, if the complement of a perception verb is propositional, this complement is taken as *intensional* or opaque. This means that the words that are used in the complement cannot be replaced by equivalent descriptions if the truth value of the sentence is to be preserved. For instance, if both the sentence in (i) and the equation in (ii) are true, this does not imply that the sentence in (iii) must also be necessarily true.

⁽i) John saw that Bill Clinton is running in the marathon.

⁽ii) 'Bill Clinton = The U.S. president'

⁽iii) John saw that the U.S. president is running in the marathon.

It could well be the case that yesterday John saw that 'Bill Clinton' is running in the marathon this afternoon at the same time that he has no idea whether 'the U.S. president' is going to run in this marathon.

Conversely, if the complement of a perception verb is an event, this complement is claimed to be *extensional*, since the truth value of the sentence is not altered by substitution. Thus, if the sentence in (iv) and the equation in (v) are both true, so would be the sentence in (vi).

⁽iv) John saw Bill Clinton run in the marathon.

⁽v) `Bill Clinton = The U.S. president'

⁽vi) John saw the U.S. president run in the marathon.

In this case, (vi) is true even if John is unaware of the equation in (v). Whatever the case, John saw an individual x run in the marathon, and x happened to be 'Bill Clinton', who is also 'the U.S. president'.
- (47) a. I saw Mary driving my car.
 - b. I saw John kill that man.

These examples are interpreted as perceptual reports. This means that, for these sentences to be true, the subject of the perception verb *to see* must have been the direct visual experiencer of the event that is expressed by the embedded clause.

Now, if we were to adopt the analysis in (42b) for the PR, then we would be implicitly claiming, first, that this construction is semantically interpreted as a proposition, since its syntactic category is a regular CP-constituent, and, secondly, that the perception verb that selects this constituent has an epistemic reading, because this verb selects a proposition. The facts, however, show that things are different since the PR is interpreted as an event, and the perception verb that selects this construction is interpreted in its nonepistemic (sensible) reading. To see this, consider first of all the following Spanish examples:

- (48) a. *He visto [PR a María que corría en el maratón] en el momento have.I seen to María that ran.she in the marathon in the moment en que he visto a toda su familia allí. in that have.I seen to all her family there
 - b. He visto [CP que María corría en el maratón] en el momento have.I seen that María ran.she in the marathon in the moment en que he visto a toda su familia allí.
 in that have.I seen to all her family there
 `I saw that María was running in the marathon when I saw all her family there.'

- (49) a. He visto [PR a María que { corría / *corre } en el maratón.]have.I seen to María that ran.she / runs.she in the marathon
 - b. He visto [_{CP} que María { corría / corre } en el maratón.] have.I seen that María ran.she / runs.she in the marathon

'I saw that María {was / is} running in the marathon.'

On the one hand, the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (48a) must be attributed to a semantic incompatibility between the ontological category of the PR and the epistemic meaning of the perception verb. The epistemic interpretation of the perception verb is forced here by the presence of the temporal adjunct *en el momento en que he visto a toda su familia allí* `when I saw all her family there', which expresses the cause that has led the subject of the perception verb to figure out the event that is contained within the propositional complement of that perception verb. Now the problem that arises in (48a) lies in that the ontological category of the perception verb complement, namely the PR, is not propositional, but that of an event. This means that this event must have been directly perceived by the subject of the main clause. In other words, it requires a nonepistemic (sensible) interpretation of the perception verb. As expected, the sentence becomes fully grammatical when the PR is replaced by a regular CP-complement, which is associated with the ontological category of proposition. This is shown by the wellformedness of (48b).

The example in (49a), on the other hand, illustrates once again that the tense of the PR must coincide with the tense of the matrix clause. At this stage, we can attribute this requirement to the fact that the PR can only be combined with a perception verb with a nonepistemic meaning, and that this interpretation is only possible when the temporal value of the main clause and the temporal value of the verbal complement coincide. Importantly, when the tense of the PR does not match the tense of the main clause, the whole sentence becomes deviant, as the ungrammaticality of the example in (49a) indicates. In other words, the temporal mismatch between the tense of the PR and the matrix tense does not trigger the epistemic interpretation of the perception verb. The example in (49b) shows that this temporal mismatch is possible when the complement is an ordinary CP.

An additional requirement for the PR to appear as a complement of a nonepistemic perception verb is that the event that this construction refers to must necessarily be susceptible of being visually perceived, if the perception verb involved is the verb *to see*. Consider the following pair of sentences:

- (50) a. *Vi a Juan que *sabía* francés. saw.I to Juan that knew.he-_{IMPERF} French.
 b. Vi que Juan *sabía* francés.
 - b. Vi que Juan sabía francés.
 saw.I that Juan knew.he-IMPERF French `I saw that Juan can speak French.'

In (50a) the embedded verb is *saber* `to know', that is, a verb that denotes an internal cognitive process, and the construction in which this verb is inserted is the PR, namely a construction that is linked to the ontological category of event. As we have just seen above, this latter property requires a nonepistemic (sensible) interpretation of the perception verb. So the ungrammaticality of this sentence must be attributed to the fact that the process that the verb *saber* `to know' expresses cannot be directly perceived by the subject of the matrix sentence. The ungrammaticality of (50a) tells us that this is the case. The grammaticality of the sentence in (50b), on the other hand, indicates that this type of verb can be combined with a perception verb when it is inserted into a full CP-complement, that is, a structure that denotes a proposition.

A further argument that demonstrates that the perception verb possesses a different meaning when it is combined with the PR from the meaning that it has when this type of verb is combined with an ordinary CP-structure, and hence that these two complements are linked to different ontological categories, is shown by the fact that the PR and an ordinary CP-complement cannot be coordinated. This is illustrated in the examples in (51).

(51) a. *Vi [CP que Juan paseaba] y [PR a María que corría.] saw.I that Juan walked.he and to María that ran.she
b. *Vi [PR a Juan que paseaba] y [CP que María corría.] saw.I to Juan that walked.he and that María ran.she

The examples in (52) and (53), on the other hand, show that the sentences are wellformed when the constructions conjoined are of the same syntactic and semantic category.

- (52) Vi [_{CP} que Juan paseaba] y [_{CP} que María corría.] saw.I that Juan walked.he and that María ran.she `I saw that Juan was walking and that María was running.'
- (53) Vi [PR a Juan que paseaba] y [PR a María que corría.] saw.I to Juan that walked.he and to María that ran.she 'I saw Juan walking and María running.'

In the example in (52), we have conjoined two regular CP-complements, and each one of these CPs denotes a proposition. So the sentence is acceptable. In (53) we have conjoined two PRs, and each one denotes an event susceptible of being perceived. So this sentence is also acceptable.

From the evidence provided so far, it seems fair to conclude that the PR is a construction that can be only associated with the ontological category of event.⁵⁸ As a direct consequence of this, then, we would expect this construction not to be able to be selected by a perception verb with an epistemic reading, because this type of verb typically selects complements of a propositional nature.

Now the main problem for the structure in (42b), repeated here as (54b), lies in that it leads us to assume the following derivation from Semantics to Syntax for a sentence like the one in (42a), repeated here as (54a).

- (54) a. He visto a Juan que corría.have.I seen to Juan that ran.he`I saw Juan running.'
 - b. $[_{CP} Juan_i [_{C'} que [_{IP} t_i corría]]]$

First of all, we must suppose that the perception verb *to see* selects an internal argument that is linked to an ontological category of proposition. The propositional value of this complement would immediately identify the epistemic reading of the perception verb. At Syntax, this propositional complement would project a CP which, following Grimshaw, is the canonical structural realization of `proposition' (see footnote 12). At this level, the subject of the embedded clause would overtly move from a position inside IP to Spec, CP, and later to the matrix clause to check structural Case.

The two main drawbacks that derive from this procedure become clear at this point. On the one hand, we would have to say that the movement of the embedded subject from a position inside IP to a position preceding the C of its clause changes the ontological category of that clause from proposition to event. This is so since, as we have just seen, the PR can only express the meaning of an event. On the other hand, we would also have to say that this semantic change triggers a change in the meaning of the perception verb *to see* from an epistemic interpretation to a nonepistemic one, which is the meaning that an event requires. For obvious reasons, it seems unlikely that the interface from Semantics to Syntax (or viceversa) permits such complex semantic permutations.⁵⁹

(i) Juan vio a Bill Clinton que corría en el maratón.
 Juan saw to Bill Clinton that ran.he in the marathon
 `Juan saw Bill Clinton running in the marathon.'

⁵⁸ The interpretation of the PR as an event correctly predicts that the truth value of the sentence will not change if substitution applies:

⁽ii) `Bill Clinton = El presidente de los Estados Unidos'

⁽iii) Juan vio al presidente de los Estados Unidos que corría en el maratón.

^{&#}x27;Juan saw the president of the United States running in the marathon.'

If the sentence in (i) and the equation in (ii) are both true, so will be the sentence in (iii).

⁵⁹ Notice that these semantic changes do not occur when a *wh*-phrase is the element that undergoes movement. Compare (i) and (ii).

Before closing this section, let me remark that the PR should not be taken as an example of *prolepsis* either. Very roughly, prolepsis is a linguistic phenomenon that consists in introducing a phrase of the sentence in a position preceding the C of this sentence. As we can see in the Occitan examples in (55), from Sauzet 1989, this operation yields a word order that is very reminiscent of the word order that is found in the PR.

- (55) a. Sabi ton paire que vindrà.
 know.I your father that come.will.he
 `I know that your father is going to come.'
 - b. Pensi *aquel libre* que *lo* trobaràn pas jamai.
 think.I that book that it find.will.they _{NEG} never
 `I think that they will never find that book.'
 - c. Cresi pas *los dròlles* que *li* aguèsson donat de còcas.
 think.I _{NEG} the boys that them had.they given of cakes
 `I don't think that they have given any cake to the boys.'

In these examples, the DP *ton paire* 'your father' in (55a), *aquel libre* 'that book' in (55b), and *los dròlles* 'the boys' in (55c) are arguments of the embedded proposition, but in these sentences they show up preceding the C *que* 'that'.⁶⁰ Furthermore, each one of these arguments is coindexed with a resumptive pronoun that appears within the embedded IP. This pronoun is presumably a null pro in (55a), *lo* `it' in (55b), and *li* `them' in (55c).

Now a first important clue that tells us that the PR is not an example of prolepsis is that Spanish, Catalan, and many other Romance languages that possess the PR do not have constructions

⁽i) a. I have already seen $[_{CP} when_i [_{IP} John is going to run in the marathon t_i .]]$

b. Ya he visto $[_{CP} cuándo_i [_{IP} correrá Juan en el maratón t_i .]]$

⁽ii) *Ya he visto a $[_{CP} Juan_i$ que $[_{IP} t_i$ correrá en el maratón.]]

already have. I seen to Juan that run.will.he in the marathon The examples in (i) show that the movement of the *wh*-phrase *when / cuándo* to the specifier of the embedded CP alters neither the epistemic interpretation of the perception verb nor the propositional meaning of the subordinate clause. The example in (ii), on the other hand, shows that the movement of the DP *Juan*, in order to obtain the word order of the PR, would exceptionally alter the meaning of both the perception verb and the embedded clause.

⁶⁰ These DPs may end up in this position either by raising from an IP-internal position or by being directly merged there. This is reminiscent of the two hypotheses that have been put forward in the literature to account for the R clauses containing a resumptive pronoun, as we have seen in the previous section (section 3.1.1.2). The two basic differences between these two constructions, however, are found in that in the examples of prolepsis the structure involved is a CP, instead of a complex DP, and that the element that precedes the C is a lexical DP, instead of an Op.

Here I do not intend to provide a syntactic analysis for this construction, but see Sauzet 1989 and Campos 1995.

like those in (55). The ungrammaticality of the sentences in (56) and (57), in Spanish and Catalan respectively, attests to this.

- (56) a. *Sé *tu padre* que vendrá.⁶¹ know.I your father that come.will.he
 - b. *Creo *aquel libro* que ya no *lo* van a volver a encontrar. think. I that book that already no it go.they to go.back to find
 - c. *No creo *a los chicos* que *les* hayan dado ningún pastel. no think.I to the boys that them have.they given any cake
- (57) a. *Sé *el teu pare* que vindrà.
 - b. *Crec *el llibre* que ja no *el* tornaran a trobar.
 - c. *No crec *als nois* que *els* hagin donat cap pastís.

Compare these examples with the sentences in (58) and (59), which contain the PR.

⁶¹ Interestingly, this sentence is acceptable in Spanish if the P *de* `of' precedes the DP *tu padre* `your father':

(i) Sé *de tu padre* que vendrá.

know.I of your father that come.will.he `About your father, I know that he will come.'

At first sight, this could suggest that Spanish can also make use of some sort of prolepsis. Now the difference between Spanish and Occitan would lie in that in Spanish the phrase must be introduced by a P, whereas in Occitan either no P is needed or the P is phonologically null. But the ungrammaticality of the Spanish examples in (i) (cf. (55c) in the text) shows that things are more complicated than that.

- (ii) a. *Creo *del libro* que ya no lo van a volver a encontrar. think.I of.the book that already no it go.they to go.back to find
 - b. *Creo *de tu padre* que es un fanático.
 - think.I of your father that is he a fanatic

I leave this issue for further research.

(58) He visto a Juan que venía.have.I seen to Juan that came.he`I saw Juan coming.'

(59) He vist *en Joan* que venia.

Of course, this contrast would be surprising if the mechanism that legitimizes the presence of the DP in a position preceding the C, that is, the coindexation of this DP with a resumptive pronoun contained in the propositional CP-structure in the cases of prolepsis, were the same in both types of construction.

A second fact that separates the PR from an example of prolepsis is that in this latter case there is neither temporal restrictions nor subject-object asymmetry in the construction, as opposed to what we find in the PR. Compare the examples of prolepsis in (55a) and (55b), repeated here as (60) and (61), respectively, and the Spanish sentences containing a PR in (62) and (63).

- (60) Sabi ton paire que vindrà.know.I your father that come.will.he`I know that your father is going to come.'
- (61) Pensi *aquel libre* que *lo* trobaràn pas jamai.
 think.I that book that it find.will.they _{NEG} never
 `I think that they will never find that book.'
- (62) *Veo a Juan que vendrá.see.I to Juan that come.will.he
- (63) *He visto a *Juan* que (*lo*) besaba María. have.I seen to Juan that him kissed.she María

And finally, as we can see from the type of verb that the examples of prolepsis in (55) combine with, namely *to know* and *to think*, these constructions express the meaning of a proposition, rather than the meaning of an event. This is another property that separates this construction from the PR.

In conclusion, we have seen in this section that the syntactic properties that typically characterize the PR cannot be explained by adopting a *propositional* analysis that postulates either

the movement of the DP to Spec, CP, as the analysis in (42b) propounds, or the coindexation of the lexical DP with a resumptive pronoun, as in the cases of prolepsis.

3.1.2 A Complex Small Clause-Analysis for the Pseudo-Relative

The analysis that I defend here for the PR responds to the basic properties of the Complex Small Clause-model presented in chapter 2. Thus, the embedded constructions that appear in the Spanish and French sentences in (64) and (65), respectively, would be analyzed as depicted in (66).

(64) He visto a Juan que corría.have.I seen to Juan that ran.he`I saw Juan running.'

(65) J'ai vu Jean qui courait.



In this structure, the finite verb is the head of the VP-projection. Its external argument is the pro that appears in Spec, VP. In Spec, IP, there is an expletive, which is null, namely pro_{expl}, in pro-drop

languages like Spanish, and phonologically realized as *i* in French. Finally, a lexical DP or PRO is directly merged with C', so it shows up in its specifier, that is, Spec, CP.

My purpose in this section is, first, to demonstrate that a subject-predicate relationship is established in the PR, and hence that this construction is a type of (Complex) Small Clause (section 3.1.2.1). Secondly, to show that this type of (Complex) Small Clause comes in two varieties, either as an argumental CSCl or as an adjunct CSCl (section 3.1.2.2). And finally, to explore in some detail the elements that form the PR, and the organization of these elements according to the Complex Small Clause structure in (66) (section 3.1.2.3).

3.1.2.1 The Subject-Predicate Relationship in the Pseudo-Relative

The structure in (66) states that the lexical DP or PRO is base-generated in Spec, CP, which, similarly to the Spec, CP of a R clause containing a resumptive pronoun (see section 3.1.1.2 above), is an A-position. Since this lexical DP / PRO is not directly merged with V', but rather with an extended projection of V, namely C', the conjunction of the constituent introduced by C' with this lexical DP / PRO is expected to yield a type of subject-predicate relationship similar to that found in a SCl, as opposed to that found in an ordinary sentence. We have arguments that clearly show that the PR does behave like a SCl. Some of these arguments are the following (see also Rosselló and Solà 1987, Cinque 1992, and Guasti 1992, among others):

(i) First, the PR is not syntactically independent in the sense that it cannot be anchored in a temporal domain by itself. The relevant contrast, then, is that between (67), which is an example of PR, and (68), which is a regular sentence. The symbol # in (67) indicates that this type of predication would not be appropriate unless the temporal information of the clause can be recovered from extra linguistic sources.⁶²

- (67) #Juan que corríaJuan that ran.he-IMPERF`Juan running.'
- (68) Juan corría.Juan ran.he-_{IMPERF}`Juan was running.'

⁶² As we saw above, the PR can appear as a free expression in limited cases (see (7)), just like ordinary SCIs. See Suñer 1996 for some conditions that permit SCIs to appear as independent constructions in Romance.

(ii) When the PR is found functioning as the subject of a finite sentence, it may trigger singular agreement on the verb of that sentence even when the lexical DP preceding the C of the PR is plural. The Italian example in (69) is taken from Cinque 1992: 7.

(69) I minatori che picchiano degli studenti inermi è uno spettacolo the miners that beat up.they of.the students defenseless is a sight che fa star.
that makes feel bad
`Miners beating up defenceless students is a sight that makes one feel bad.'

This property derives from the fact that the constituent introduced by the C and the lexical DP constitutes a clausal domain.

(iii)The string introduced by the C can be negated, (70), coordinated, (71), and extraposed, (72).

- (70) He visto a Juan *que corría*, no *que saltase*.
 have.I seen to Juan that ran.he no that jumped.he-_{SUBJT}
 `I saw Juan running, not jumping.'
- a. No sólo he visto a Juan *que corría*, sino también *que saltaba*.
 not only have.I seen to Juan that ran.he but also that jumped.he
 `I didn't only see Juan running, but also jumping.'
 - b. He visto a Juan *que corría* y *que saltaba*.
 have.I seen to Juan that ran.he and that jumped.he
 `I saw Juan running and jumping.'
- (72) Vi a *Juan* ayer por la tarde *que corría por el parque*.
 saw.I to Juan yesterday by the afternoon that ran.he by the park
 `I saw Juan yesterday in the afternoon running in the park.'

All these properties are in accordance with the idea that the string introduced by the C is a predicate.

(iv)The structural contexts in which the PR is possible are the structural contexts in which a SCl of a more familiar type can be found. This is shown in the examples in (73).

- (73) a. He visto *a Juan que corría*. have.I seen to Juan that ran.he `I saw Juan running.'
 - b. He visto a Juan { con María / tendido en el suelo / borracho.}
 have.I seen to Juan with María / lain in the floor / drunk
 `I saw Juan { with María / lying on the floor / drunk.}'
 - (v) The PR can be coordinated with other types of SCI:
- (74) a. Al entrar, vi a María que fumaba marihuana y a Juan to.the enter, saw.I to María that smoked.she marihuana and to Juan *totalmente borracho*. totally drunk
 `When I entered, I saw María smoking marihuana and Juan totally drunk.'
 - b. Vi al sospechoso dentro de un coche negro y a una mujer saw.I to.the suspect inside of a car black and to a woman que salía rápidamente de la tienda de licores.
 that came.out.she quickly of the shop of liquors
 `I saw the suspect inside a black car and a woman quickly coming out from the

liquor store.'

The structure in (66) allows us to represent the idea that the lexical DP or PRO in Spec, CP is the subject of the CSCl; the sequence headed by the C *que*, the CSCl-predicate; and C, the head of the construction.

3.1.2.2 Argumental or Adjunct Complex Small Clause

As indicated in the representation in (66), the subject of this type of CSCl can be either a lexical DP or a PRO. The former possibility describes the cases in which the PR behaves like an argumental CSCl, whereas the latter one corresponds to the cases where this construction functions as an adjunct CSCl. Consider the examples that we have in (75) and (76) in Spanish and Catalan, respectively.

- (75) He visto a Juan que corría.have.I seen to Juan that ran.he`I saw Juan running.'
- (76) He enxampat *en Joan que robava*.
 have.I caught the Joan that stole.he
 `I caught Joan stealing.'

In (75) the PR is combined with the perception verb *to see*, and in (76) it appears with the verb *to catch*. Now traditional constituency tests tell us that the PR can be interpreted either as an argumental or adjunct CSCl in (75), whereas it can only be interpreted as an adjunct CSCl in (76). We will see this in turn.

3.1.2.2.1 The Pseudo-Relative as an Argumental Complex Small Clause

In this section, traditional constituency tests are applied to the PR when it combines with the perception verb *ver* `to see' and the verb *enxampar* `to catch'. The examples in which the verb is *to catch* are in Catalan, since the PR cannot be combined with that type of verb in Spanish (see (2a)).

(i) Right-Node Raising:

- (77) Yo he visto y María ha oído *a Juan que entraba en la habitación*.
 I have seen and María has heard to Juan that come in he in the room
 `I saw and María heard Juan coming into the room.'
- (78) *Jo he enxampat i la Maria ha sentit *en Joan que robava*.I have.I caught and the Maria has.she heard the Joan that stole.he
 - (ii) Focus-fronting:

- (79) ¡Hasta a Juan que bailaba un tango vimos ayer!
 even to Juan that danced.he a tango saw.we yesterday
 `Even Juan dancing a tango we saw yesterday!'
- (80) *Fins i tot *en Joan que ballava un tango* vam enxampar ahir! even and all the Joan that danced.he a tango caught.we yesterday
 - (iii) Neuter clitic *lo / ho* `it':
- (81) He visto a María que bailaba con Juan. Pedro también lo ha visto. have.I seen to María that danced.she with Juan Pedro also it has.he seen `I saw María dancing with Juan. Pedro saw it too.'
- (82) *He enxampat *la Maria que ballava amb en Joan*. En Pere have.I caught the Maria that danced.she with the Joan the Pere també *ho* ha enxampat.
 also it has.he caught

(iv) Answer:

- (83) ¿Qué viste ayer por la noche? *A Juan que corría por el parque*.
 what saw.you yesterday by the night to Juan that ran.he by the park
 `What did you see yesterday night? Juan running in the park.'
- (84) *Què vas enxampar ahir a la nit? En Joan que robava.what caught.you yesterday at the night the Joan that stole.he
 - (v) Clefting:
- (85) Fue a Juan que corría por el parque lo único que vi aquella noche. was.it to Juan that ran.he by the park the only.thing that saw.I that night `It was Juan running in the park that was the only thing that I saw that night.'

(86) *Va ser *en Joan que robava* l' única cosa que vaig enxampar aquella nit.was.it the Joan that stole.he the only thing that caught.I that night

(vi) Pseudoclefting:

- (87) Lo único que vi aquella noche fue a Juan que corría por el parque.
 the only.thing that saw.I that night was.it to Juan that ran.heby the park
 `The only thing that I saw that night was Juan running in the park.'
- (88) *L' única cosa que vaig enxampar aquella nit va ser *en Joan que robava*.the only thing that caught.I that night was.it the Joan that stole.he

(vii) Coordination:

- (89) He visto a Juan que corría y a María que saltaba.
 have.I seen to Juan that ran.he and to María that jumped.she
 `I saw Juan running and María jumping.'
- (90) *He enxampat *en Joan que corria* i *la Maria que saltava*.⁶³ have.I caught the Joan that ran.he and the Maria that jumped.she

(viii) Constructions not only ... but also:

(91) No sólo vi *a Juan que bailaba un tango* sino también *a María* not only saw. I to Juan that danced.he a tango but also to María

⁶³ This sentence is perfect if an intonational break is placed just after *en Joan* and *la Maria*:
(i) He enxampat en Joan # que corria i la Maria # que saltava.

This is not the relevant reading in (90), where no intonational break should be placed after these two DPs.

que bebía coñac.

that drank.she brandy

`I didn't only see Juan dancing a tango, but also María drinking brandy.'

*No només vaig enxampar *en Joan que ballava un tango* sinó també *la Maria* not only caught.I the Joan that danced.he a tango but also the María *que bevia conyac*.
 that drank.she brandy

As can be observed, the results that are obtained by applying these constituency tests to the PR clearly demonstrate that this construction can only be subcategorized for as a single constituent in one possible reading of the sentence in (75), that is, when the PR combines with a perception verb. This reading is not possible when the matrix veb is *enxampar* `to catch', as shown by the ungrammatical examples.

3.1.2.2.2 The Pseudo-Relative as an Adjunct Complex Small Clause

Some of these constituency tests are also useful in showing that the PR behaves like an adjunct CSCl in (76) and in one interpretation of (75). In this case, we expect the lexical DP and the PR to function as two independent constituents. This is illustrated in the following examples:

(i) Focus-fronting:

- (93) ¡Hasta a Juan vimos ayer que bailaba un tango! even to Juan saw.we yesterday that danced.he a tango `Even Juan we saw yesterday dancing a tango!'
- (94) Fins i tot *en Joan* vam enxampar ahir *que ballava un tango*! even and all the Joan caught.we yesterday that danced.he a tango `Even Joan we caught yesterday dancing a tango!'

(ii) Clitic *la* `her':

(95) He visto *a María que corría*. Pedro también *la* ha visto (*que corría*.) have.I seen to María that ran.she Pedro also her has.he seen that ran.she

'I saw María running. Pedro saw her too (running.)'

(96) He enxampat *la Maria que robava*. En Pere també *l'* ha have.I caught the Maria that stole.she the Pere too her has.he enxarpada algun cop (*que robava*.) caught.he some time that stole.she
`I caught Maria stealing. Pere has caught her too at times (stealing.)'

(iii) Answer:

- (97) ¿A quién viste *que corría por el parque* ayer por la noche? *A Juan*.
 to who saw.you that ran.he by the park yesterday by the night to Juan
 `Who did you see running in the park yesterday night? Juan.'
- (98) A qui vas enxampar ahir a la nit que robava? En Joan.
 to who caught.you yesterday at the night that stole.he the Joan
 `Who did you catch stealing yesterday night? Joan.'

(iv) Clefting:

- (99) Fue a Juan al único que vi que corría por el parque aquella noche. was.it to Juan to.the only that saw.I that ran.he by the park that night `It was Juan who was the only one that I saw running in the park that night.'
- (100) Va ser *en Joan* 1' únic que vaig enxampar *que robava* aquella nit.
 was.it the Joan the only that caught.I that stole.he that night
 `It was Joan who was the only one that I caught stealing that night.'
 - (v) Pseudoclefting:
- (101) Al único que vi que corría por el parque aquella noche fue a Juan.

to.the only that saw.I that ran.he by the park that night was.it to Juan `The only one that I saw running in the park that night was Juan.'

(102) L' únic que vaig enxampar *que robava* aquella nit va ser *en Joan*.
the only that caught.I that stole.he that night was.it the Joan
`The only one that I caught stealing that night was Joan.'

These tests show that in (76) and in one interpretation of (75) the matrix verb only subcategorizes for the lexical DP *en Joan / Juan*. In these cases, then, the PR must function as an adjunct clause. This means that the Spec, CP of the PR is occupied by a PRO which is controlled by the lexical object of the matrix clause, namely *en Joan / Juan*.

3.1.2.3 Internal Organization

In the following sections I concentrate on the elements that make up the PR and discuss their organization in the CSCI-structure presented in (66).

3.1.2.3.1 pro and Expletive

It is generally held that in Romance the verb of a finite clause already moves to the IP-head at Syntax (see Koopman 1984, Pollock 1989, Lightfoot and Hornstein 1994), and that in the Romance pro-drop languages the argumental subject pro remains within the VP-shell at this level. This latter assumption, in turn, has led to the idea that in the Romance pro-drop languages Spec, IP is occupied at Syntax by a null expletive subject pro_{expl}. The presence of this expletive in Spec, IP would be required by the EPP, which, as the reader will recall, states that a clause must have a subject at every syntactic level. In minimalist terms, we would say that this expletive is required to check the strong D-feature of T before Spell-Out.⁶⁴ The organization of these elements in such a way predicts the formation of a [pro_{expl}, pro] chain at Syntax. This chain will contain one theta-role and one Case. The theta-role is the one assigned to the argumental pro within the lexical VP-shell, whereas Case is checked by the argumental pro once its formal features raise to IP at LF. Notice that the formal features of the argumental pro will need to raise at LF to check nominative Case and ϕ -features since the pro_{expl} only satisfies the EPP, that is, it only checks the strong D-feature of T.⁶⁵ The

⁶⁴ As argued in Chomsky 1995, insertion of an expletive to satisfy the EPP is less costly than moving the subject there.

⁶⁵ The covert movement of the formal features of the argumental subject pro is not required in Chomsky's 1998 approach. In this version, Case and the ϕ -features would be transmitted to the argumental pro from IP to the baseposition of that pro.

general representation of a regular clause containing a null subject, then, would be as represented in (103b).

- (103) a. Leía el periódico.
 read.(s)he-IMPERF the newspaper
 `(S)he was reading the newspaper.'
 - b. $[_{CP} [_{C'} \oslash [_{IP} \text{ pro}_{expli} [_{I'} leia_v [_{VP} \text{ pro}_i t_v \text{ el periódico }]]]]$

Now it seems reasonable to suppose that the same internal organization that we see in the structure in (103b) also applies to the PR. This seems so since the elements that are contained within the constituent introduced by the C are identical in both constructions, according to the analysis of the PR in (66) and the analysis of a regular sentence in (103b). Therefore, in the PR the subject pro, which satisfies the argumental specification of the verb, or the predicate, remains within VP at Syntax. At this level, this pro is coindexed with an expletive pro_{expl} situated in Spec, IP. This pro_{expl} is the element that checks the EPP-feature of the IP. As in ordinary finite clauses, the argumental subject pro and the expletive pro_{expl} form a chain containing one single theta-role and one single Case, that is, the theta-role assigned to the argumental pro within VP and the nominative Case assigned by the finite I. This is schematically represented in (104b) (cf. (103b)).

- (104) a. He visto a Juan que leía el periódico.
 have.I seen to Juan that read.he-IMPERF the newspaper
 `I saw Juan reading the newspaper.'
 - b. [CP Juan [C' que [IP proexpli [I' leíav [VP proi tv el periódico]]]]]

The idea that there is an argumental pro in the internal predication of the PR is supported by several facts.⁶⁶ For instance, it is well known that a verb that lacks an external argument fails to assign accusative Case, and vice versa. That is, a verb that fails to assign accusative Case also fails to theta-mark an external argument. This idea is formulated by Burzio's Generalization (Burzio 1981, 1986):

⁶⁶ The idea that the PR contains an argumental pro is already proposed in Rosselló and Solà 1987, Guasti 1988, 1992, and Cinque 1992.

(105) Burzio's Generalization

If the verb can assign accusative Case to its object it must assign a theta-role to its subject.

Examples like the one in (106) show that, if the verb contained within the PR is a transitive verb, this verb must assign accusative Case to its object.

(106) He visto a Juan que *lo* leía.have.I seen to Juan that it read.he`I saw Juan reading it.'

In this sentence, the object of the verb *leía* `read-_{IMPERF}' is represented by the accusative form of the clitic, namely *lo* `it'. Thus, if Burzio's Generalization is correct, then examples of this kind demonstrate that the finite verb does also assign a theta-role to its subject in the PR. According to the CSCl-analysis in (66), this subject is the argumental pro.

Secondly, the argumental pro would be the argument that locally binds the anaphor that may appear in the object position of the VP-shell in the PR. Consider the example in (107).

(107) He visto a Juan que se afeitaba él mismo.
have.I seen to Juan that _{SE} shaved.he he himself
`I saw Juan shaving himself.'

The grammaticality of this sentence indicates that the anaphor *él mismo* `himself' can be bound within its local domain, which here is the domain of the internal predication of the CSCl. So the argument that must bind this anaphor must be the subject of this predication, namely the null subject pro.

And, thirdly, the quantifier *todos* `all' would be modifying the argumental pro situated in Spec, VP in the sentence in (108).

(108) He visto a tus alumnos que corrían *todos* hacia el gimnasio.
have.I seen to your students that ran.they all towards the gym
`I saw your students all running towards the gym.'

Recall from the introductory chapter that a quantifier can appear in the phonological sequence modifying a subject or a trace of that subject.

The CSCI-model that was presented in chapter 2, on the other hand, states that the subject of the internal predication of the construction must necessarily be null. For the PR this means that the null subject pro cannot be phonetically realized. Consider the following sentences:

(109) *He visto a Juan que (él) leía (él) el periódico (él). have.I seen to Juan that he read.he he the newspaper he

In this example, the null pronoun pro of the sentence in (104) has been replaced by an overt pronoun. As can be observed, the sentence is ungrammatical, as predicted by the CSCI-model.⁶⁷

3.1.2.3.2 pro in French

An obvious question that arises at this point is why French possesses the PR if Modern French, as opposed to Old French, is a nonpro-drop language (see Adams 1987). This paradox has already been addressed by Guasti (1988, 1992), and the answer that she provides is adopted in the analysis of the PR put forward by Cinque (1992). In this work I will not discuss Cinque's analysis (see Rafel 1997), but let me comment very briefly on Guasti's proposal since the structure presented here resembles, and owes, a great deal to hers.

Guasti's analysis of the PR is the one depicted in (110b) (cf. (104b)).

- (110) a. He visto a Juan que leía el periódico.
 have.I seen to Juan that read.he-IMPERF the newspaper
 `I saw Juan reading the newspaper.'
 - b. [AgrCP Juan [AgrC' que [IP proi [I' leíav [VP ti tv el periódico]]]]]

As can be observed, the most significant difference between Guasti's structure and mine lies in that in her analysis the syntactic category of the PR is not CP, but AgrCP.

As we have already seen in section 3.1.1.3 above, the PR does not behave like a proposition, that is, like a constituent headed by a regular C. So what Guasti was trying to find, according to my own interpretation of her work, was a category lower than C in the structure but at the same time high enough so as to accommodate the head *que* that shows up in the PR. And she finds this

⁶⁷ Notice that this property distinguishes the internal predication domain of the PR from the predication domain of a regular sentence, in which an overt pronoun is perfectly acceptable:

⁽i) \acute{El} leía el periódico.

[`]He was reading the newspaper.'

category in the AgrCP put forward by the split-CP hypothesis (Shlonsky 1993, but also see Poletto 1992, Rizzi 1995). This hypothesis states that the projection that is usually referred to as CP is in fact constituted of two projections, which are CP and agreement CP (AgrCP).

Guasti argues that AgrCP is an agreement projection that is found immediately below CP, and that this is the category that introduces the PR. In order to demonstrate that the C possesses agreement features in the PR, she invokes the *que / qui* alternation in French. As it is well known, it is claimed that the form *qui* is the agreeing counterpart of the C *que* in this language (see Rizzi 1990). Now what is relevant for Guasti's theory is that it is not *que*, but *qui* that is the form that always appears in the PR in French:

(111) J'ai vu Jean { *que / qui } courait.
I have seen Jean that ran.he
`I saw Jean running.'

She also suggests that the lexical DP, *Juan* in (110), is base-generated in Spec, AgrCP, and that from this position it *licenses* the agreement features contained in the AgrCP-head. These agreement features, in turn, would exceptionally *license* and *identify* the argumental pro that occupies Spec, IP in her analysis of the PR.

According to Guasti, in French, a nonnull-subject language, the agreement features of *qui* can only identify a third person pro, singular or plural. She stipulates that this is so because *qui* is only specified for third person features. In pro-drop languages, on the other hand, this pro can refer to any person and number, since the content of pro in this type of language is recovered by a strong I, rather than by the agreement features of the AgrCP-head. This hypothesis attempts to capture the contrast between the French sentences in (112)-(113) and their Spanish and Catalan counterparts in (114)-(115) and (116)-(117), respectively. The French examples in (112)-(113) are taken from Guasti 1988.

- (112) a.?/*Pierre me voit qui parle à Jean.
 Pierre me sees.he that talk.I to Jean
 `Pierre sees me talking to Jean.'
 - b.?/*Pierre te voit qui parles à Jean.
 Pierre you-_{SING} sees.he that talk.you to Jean
 `Pierre sees you talking to Jean.'

- c.?/*Pierre *nous* voit *qui parlons à Jean*. Pierre us sees.he that talk.we to Jean `Pierre sees us talking to Jean.'
- d.?/*Pierre vous voit qui parlez à Jean.
 Pierre you-_{PL} sees.he that talk.you to Jean
 `Pierre sees you talking to Jean.'
- (113) a. Pierre *la* voit *qui parle à Jean*.
 Pierre her sees.he that talks.she to Jean
 `Pierre sees her talking to Jean.'
 - b. Pierre *le* voit *qui parle à Jean*.
 Pierre him sees.he that talks.he to Jean
 `Pierre sees him talking to Jean.'
 - c. Pierre *les* voit *qui parlent à Jean*.
 Pierre them sees.he that talk.they to Jean
 `Pierre sees them talking to Jean.'
- (114) a. Pedro *me* vio *que hablaba con Juan*.`Pedro saw me talking to Juan.'
 - b. Pedro *te* vio *que hablabas con Juan*.`Pedro saw you-_{SING} talking to Juan.'
 - c. Pedro *nos* vio *que hablábamos con Juan*.`Pedro saw us talking to Juan.'
 - d. Pedro *os* vio *que hablabais con Juan*.
 `Pedro saw you-_{PL} talking to Juan.'
- (115) a. Pedro *la* vio *que hablaba con Juan*.`Pedro saw her talking to Juan.'
 - b. Pedro *lo* vio *que hablaba con Juan*.`Pedro saw him talking to Juan.'

- c. Pedro *los* vio *que hablaban con Juan*.`Pedro saw them talking to Juan.'
- (116) a. En Pere *em* va veure *que parlava amb en Joan*.
 - b. En Pere et va veure que parlaves amb en Joan.
 - c. En Pere ens va veure que parlàvem amb en Joan.
 - d. En Pere us va veure que parlàveu amb en Joan.
- (117) a. En Pere *la* va veure *que parlava amb en Joan*.
 - b. En Pere *el* va veure *que parlava amb en Joan*.
 - c. En Pere els va veure que parlaven amb en Joan.

As can be observed, the PR is highly marginal in French when the subject of the embedded finite clause is a first or second person. Conversely, the construction is perfectly acceptable when the subject is a third person. On the other hand, the examples in Spanish and Catalan show that this asymmetry does not exist in the Romance pro-drop languages that possess the PR.⁶⁸

My position on this point relies on Taraldsen's (1996) general analysis of the *que / qui* alternation. Taraldsen shows that the form *qui* in French actually corresponds to the C *que* plus the expletive i, which derives from the neuter pronoun id in Latin. He argues that i is an expletive that lacks gender and number features. So i will not control verbal agreement or require an indefinite associate, as opposed to the French expletive il.

This way of accounting for the *que / qui* alternation in French stems from some observations from Vallader, a Rhato-Romance variety spoken in the Engadine, in Switzerland. Vallader, a nonnull-subject language, also has the same *cha / chi* alternation as in French, as shown in (118). The examples in Vallader are Taraldsen's.

(118) a. *Qualas mattas* crajast { *cha / chi } cumpraran quel cudesch?

⁶⁸ Instead of the sentences in (112), French would use an infinitive or a construction with the prepositional locution *en train de* `in stretch of'. This is shown in (i).

⁽i) a. Je t' ai vu courir.

I you have seen run-_{INF} `I saw you run.'

b. Je t' ai vu en train de courir. I you have seen in stretch of run- $_{INF}$

which girls think.you that buy.will.they that book `Which girls do you think will buy that book?'

b. *Qual cudesch* crajast { cha / *chi } las mattas cumpraran?
which book think.you that the girls buy.will.they
`Which book do you think the girls will buy?'

In contrast to French, however, Vallader does not only use the expletive i in structures in which the subject has been extracted, as in (118a), but also when the subject appears postverbally in embedded, (119), as well as in main clauses, (120).

(119) ... la spranza { *cha / chi } turnaran quels temps docts.
the hope that return.will those times erudite
`... the hope that those erudite times will return.'

(120) I turnaran quels temps docts.
it return.will.they those times erudite
`Those erudite times will return.'

Now Taraldsen's idea consists in saying that the number feature of the IP-head needs to agree with the argumental subject of its clause. In Vallader the number feature of I is weak. This means that this feature will be checked off at LF once the argumental subject raises to the position occupied at Syntax by the expletive *i* to check nominative Case and ϕ -features. Recall that Vallader is a nonpro-drop language. In French, on the other hand, the number feature of I is strong. This means that this feature must be checked off before Spell-Out. In the structural contexts in which the subject has been extracted through CP, the strong number feature of I will be able to raise to C in order to establish a checking relationship with the subject (or a copy of this subject) situated in Spec, CP. This strategy, however, is not available in the structures in which the subject is postverbal, since Spec, CP does not contain any copy of that subject. Hence the ungrammaticality of the French counterparts of (119) and (120).⁶⁹

[`]I saw you running.'

⁶⁹ This approach to the *que / qui* alternation in French is reminiscent of the *Complementizer Contraction* rule proposed in Pesetsky 1982: 308:

⁽i) Complementizer Contraction

 $XP_i \quad que \rightarrow qui_i / _[_{IP} t_i$

If we extend Taraldsen's analysis of *qui* to the form *qui* that appears in the PR in French, then we must say that the element that occupies Spec, IP is an expletive, more precisely the expletive *i*. Since languages, such as Spanish, Catalan, and Italian are pro-drop languages, this expletive will be null, namely pro_{expl} .⁷⁰

Now the main technical difference between the PR and the type of construction that Taraldsen analyzes, namely constructions in French in which the subject has been extracted through Spec, CP, lies in the fact that, in the PR in French, the strong number feature of I sets up a Spec-Head relationship at Syntax with an argumental phrase that is base-generated in Spec, CP. Now this operation is possible in the PR because the argument that is base-generated in Spec, CP in this construction must necessarily corefer with the argumental subject pro that is contained within the embedded VP-shell (see the analysis in (104b)).⁷¹ Therefore, in this construction, the strong number feature of I does not agree directly with the argumental subject of its clause (pro) or a copy of this subject, but it does agree indirectly with this subject by agreeing with the lexical DP or PRO that is base-generated in Spec, CP.

On the other hand, the wellformedness of the sentences like those in (121) and (122), in which the lexical subject appears postverbally, tells us that the number feature of I is weak in other Romance languages like Spanish (121) and Catalan (122), just like in Vallader (cf. (119)-(120)).

- (121) a. ... la esperanza de que pro_{expl} volverán aquellos tiempos doctos.
 b. pro_{expl} volverán aquellos tiempos doctos.
- (122) a. ... l'esperança que pro_{expl} tornaran aquells temps doctes.
 b. pro_{expl} tornaran aquells temps doctes.

This means that in these languages the weak number feature of I will be checked off at LF once the subject raises to IP to check nominative Case and ϕ -features. In contrast to Vallader, however, here the expletive can be null since Spanish and Catalan are pro-drop languages.

In conclusion, this interpretation of the *que / qui* alternation leads us to say that in the PR the number feature of I sets up a checking relationship with the argument in Spec, CP at Syntax only in French. At LF, on the other hand, the argumental pro in Spec, VP raises to IP to check nominative

The rule in (i) states that the form *qui* appears when the C is adjacent to a subject-trace that is coindexed with a phrase (XP) situated in Spec, CP.

⁷⁰ Notice that we arrive at the same conclusion pointed out in the previous section (section 3.1.2.3.1), namely that there is an expletive in the Spec, IP of the PR (cf. (103) and (104)).

Case and to be licensed and identified by I. This LF-movement is also carried out in French and in the Romance pro-drop languages that have the PR. At this level, the IP-head can license and identify this pro in French only if this null argument bears a third person feature, which is the unmarked person, or the no-person according to Benveniste 1966.⁷² Differently, this pro is licensed and identified by the IP-head in any person and number in the pro-drop languages as usual.⁷³

The hypothesis that Guasti proposes to account for the licensing of pro in the PR in French also carries other nontrivial problems. For instance, the assumption that qui is an agreeing form that is valid for all persons in French. This is puzzling since it is not usual to find a single agreeing form in those languages in which the C really agrees with a nominal phrase. For example, this is the case of West Flemish, as shown in (123), from Haegeman 1994: 131.

a. ... da den inspekteur da boek gelezen eet. (123)that the inspector that book read has `... that the inspector has read that book.'

> b. ... dan d' inspekteurs da boek gelezen een. that the inspectors that book read has `... that the inspectors have read that book.'

Secondly, Guasti has to stipulate that the agreeing C qui somehow receives the agreement specification from the element in Spec, CP in constructions such as that in (124), from Guasti 1988: 47.

Moi, qui suis toujours la première à monter dans le bus, cette fois je l'ai raté. (124)

'I, who am always the first to get on the bus, this time I missed it.'

- (ii) *pro* klar ist, da β er nicht kommen wird. will
 - clear is that he not come
 - 'It is clear that he will not come.'

⁷¹ Recall from chapter 2 that in a CSCI the the subject of the external predication can only be legitimized if, and only if, it corefers with the subject of the internal predication.

That the properties of pro have something to do with its licensing is clearly seen in languages like German, in which only nonargumental null subjects pro can be licensed. Compare (i) and (ii).

mit ihm gesprochen. (i) **pro* hat

has.he with him spoken

⁷³ Notice that, in this analysis, the argumental pro is licensed and identified by the IP-head even in French, in contrast with Guasti's proposal.

In this example, the agreeing C *qui* would presumably receive the feature specification of first person singular from the Op in Spec, CP. Surprisingly, though, this mechanism would not be able to apply to the agreeing C *qui* in the PR, where *qui*, according to her, has *intrinsic* third person features. Compare (124) and (125).

(125) ?/*Pierre me voit *qui* parle à Jean. Pierre me sees.he that talk.I to Jean

According to the analysis presented here, the contrast between (124) and (125) would simply derive from the idea that some mechanism allows the licensing of a first person Op in the French sentence in (124) (just like in English), whereas the embedded IP-head cannot identify a first person pro in (125) in French (just like in English).

Thirdly, her analysis implies the existence of two C *que* in Spanish and Catalan, one with (see the analysis in (110b)), and one without agreement features. It would seem rather speculative, in my opinion, to try to determine where C contains agreement features and where it does not, especially bearing in mind the role that the IP-head has in identifying the null subject pro in these pro-drop languages.

And last, but not least, Guasti's analysis would lead us to accept that the agreement projection of CP, namely AgrCP, can appear in the structure even when the CP-projection is absent.

3.1.2.3.3 The Lexical DP

In chapter 2, I claimed that the subject of a CSCl is base-generated in Spec, FP, and that FP is the highest node of the extended projection of the lexical head of the construction. In the PR, the subject of the construction is base-generated in Spec, CP since CP is the highest extended projection of the verb. The relationship between V and CP, and all the projections in between, is represented in the structure in (66) by means of the subindex *v*. If this construction is an argumental CSCl, the subject that will be base-generated in Spec, CP will be a lexical DP. In those contexts in which this type of CSCl is selected by a verb, this lexical DP will check structural Case within the matrix clause, as in ordinary SCls (see (126)). In the examples in (127), for instance, the Case checked is accusative. This is suggested by the accusative form of the clitic that is used when that DP is cliticized onto the matrix verb.

(126) I consider her intelligent.

(127)	a.	Lo he visto	que	corría.	(Spanish)
	b.	L' he vist	que	corria.	(Catalan)
	c.	Eu vin-o	que	corría.	(Galician)
	d.	Je <i>l'</i> ai vu	qui	courait.	(French)
	e.	L' ho visto	che	correva.	(Italian)
	f.	U vitti	chi	scappava.	(Calabrian)
	g.	L' am vazut	ca	fugea.	(Romanian)
	h.	Vilu	que	corría.	(Asturian)
	i.	L'he bisto	que	correba.	(Aragonese)

(him_ACC) have. I seen (him_ACC) that ran.he-IMPERF

'I saw him running.'

As usual, when accusative Case is not available, this DP will need to move further up in the structure to check Case. Typically this occurs when the matrix verb is passivized. In this situation, the DP checks the nominative Case that is provided by the matrix I. Compare (127) and (128). These latter examples are from Guasti 1992: 249.⁷⁴

- (128) a. Marie a été vue qui embrassait Jean. (French)
 Marie has.she been seen that kissed.she Jean
 `Marie was seen kissing Jean.'
 - b. *Maria* è stata vista che baciava Gianni. (Italian)

- (i) a ?*María fue vista que besaba a Juan. María was.she seen that kissed.she to Juan `María was seen kissing Juan.'
 - b. ?Esta mañana *el diputado* ha sido visto que se dirigía hacia la comisaría.
 this morning the deputy has he been seen that _{SE} went he towards the police station `This morning the deputy was seen going towards the police station.'
- (ii) a. ??La Maria va ser vista que besava en Joan.

⁷⁴ The counterpart of this sentence is marginal both in Spanish, (ia), and in Catalan, (iia).

b. ?Aquest matí *el diputat* ha estat vist que es dirigia cap a la comissaria.

This might be due to the marked status that passive constructions have in general in these languages. Notice that the examples in b are slightly better than the examples in a.

The possibility of moving the lexical DP *Marie / Maria* in the examples in (128) derives straightforwardly from the idea that Spec, CP is an A-position in the PR. Consider the structural representation of these sentences, according to the CSCI-model that is defended in this work.⁷⁵

(129)

 $[CP [IP [A-position]] Maria_i$ è stata vista $[CP [A-position]] t_i [C' che [IP pro baciava Gianni]]]]]$

In this structure the DP *Maria* would move from the Spec, CP, where it is base-generated, to the Spec, IP of the matrix clause, where it checks nominative Case. This movement creates a legitimate [A, A] chain, since that chain is uniform (cf. section 3.1.1.3.1).⁷⁶

The subject of the PR, on the other hand, can also be an anaphor bound by the matrix subject. Again, this fact is expected since this characteristic is also found in regular (argumental) SCls. Compare (130) with the examples in (131) and (132), in Spanish and Catalan, respectively.

(130) Mary considers *herself* intelligent.

- (131) No lo pudimos convencer hasta que se vio a sí mismo que salía no him could.we convince until that sE saw.he to himself that exit.he por la puerta de atrás en la cinta de vídeo que grabamos.
 by the door of back in the tape of video that recorded.we `We could not convince him until he saw himself exiting through the back door on the video tape that we recorded.'
- (132) No el vam poder convèncer fins que *es* va veure *a sí mateix* que sortia per la porta del darrere en la cinta de video que vam gravar.

⁷⁶ Notice, incidentally, that the idea that the lexical DP is base-generated in Spec, CP in the PR supports Kayne's (1994) statement that the *Doubly Filled Comp Filter* (Chomsky and Lasnik 1977) should be specified to see phrases in Spec, CP only when they are *wh*-phrases. This can be observed by comparing the examples in (i) with the examples in (ii) and (iii). The examples in b are the Spanish counterparts of the English phrases in a, whereas (iii) is an example of PR. In (iia) I use the analysis that Kayne 1994 ^{proposes for R clauses (see footnote 6).}

(i)	a.	I don't know	[CP	$[_{Wh} when]_i$	[C′	(*that)	[_{IP} sh	e is coi	ning	<i>t</i> _i .]]]	[+ Wh]
	b.	No sé	[CP	[_{Wh} cuándo] _i	[C'	(*que)	[_{IP} v	endrá	t _i .]]]	[+ Wh]
(ii)	a.	The	[CP	$[_{NP} book]_i$	[C'	that	[_{IP} I	read	t _i]]]	[- Wh]
	b.	El	[CP	[_{NP} <i>libro</i>] _i	[C′	que	[IP	leí	ti]]]	[- Wh]
(iii)	Н	e visto a	[CP	$[_{DP} Juan]_i$	[C'	que	[_{IP} pr	o _i cor	ría.]]]	[- Wh]
The Doubly Filled Comp Filter states that a C cannot be overt if an overt wh-phrase occupies Spec, CP.											

⁷⁵ For simplicity, I will not represent the movement of the finite verb from V to I or the presence of an expletive in Spec, IP unless it is relevant for the discussion.

The CSCI-model presented in chapter 2 states that the subject of a CSCI must corefer with the grammatical subject of the internal predication. As it has been already commented on in section 3.1.2.3.2 above, for the PR this means that the lexical DP, or the PRO, that is base-generated in Spec, CP has to corefer with the argumental subject pro (see (66)). The grammatical contrasts that are observed in the sentences in (133)-(135) show that this is correctly predicted.

- (133) He visto a *Juan*i que (*pro*i) corría.
 have.I seen to Juan that ran.he
 `I saw Juan running.'
- (134) *He visto a $Juan_i$ que (pro_j) corría. have.I seen to Juan that ran. {(s)he / I}-IMPERF
- (135) *He visto a *Juan*_i que (*pro*_j) corrían. have.I seen to Juan that ran.they-_{IMPERF}

In the example in (133), the CSCI-subject, *Juan*, is coindexed with the pro that functions as the grammatical subject of the internal predication. Therefore, the sentence is acceptable. Conversely, the subject of the CSCI and the subject of the internal predication of the construction do not share the same referent in the examples in (134) and (135), as the subindices indicate. Hence their ungrammaticality.⁷⁷

The hypothesis that the subject of a CSCl can only be coindexed with the *subject* of the internal predication is also supported by the examples of PR that appear in (136).

(136) a. He visto a *Juan*i que (*pro*i) entregaba a María a la policía.
have.I seen to Juan that handed.over.he to María to the police
`I saw Juan handing María over to the police.'

⁷⁷ Compare the sentences in (134) and (135) with the grammatical sentences in (i) and (ii).
(i) He visto a *Juan*_i cuando (*yo*_j) corría. have.I seen to Juan when I ran.I-IMPERF

[`]I saw Juan while I was running.'
(ii) He visto a Juan_i cuando (los niños_j) corrían. have.I seen to Juan when the children ran.they-_{IMPERF}
`I saw Juan while the children were running.'

- b. *He visto a *María*_i que Juan (la_i) entregaba a la policía.
- c. *He visto a *la policía*i que Juan (*les*i) entregaba a María.

Here the sentence in (136a) is acceptable because the CSCl-subject, *Juan*, corefers with the subject of the internal predication, *pro*, whereas the sentences in (136b) and (136c) are ruled out because the CSCl-subject, *María* and *la policía* `the police', is coindexed with the direct and indirect object of the internal predication, that is, *la* `her', and *les* `them', respectively.

On the other hand, the claim that the CSCl-subject can only be coindexed with the *grammatical* subject of the internal predication, instead of, say, the semantic subject as in the Irish construction that was discussed in section 2.2.1 of chapter 2, is confirmed by examples of the following type:

- (137) J'ai vu Jean_i et Marie_j qui (pro_{i, j}) entraient.
 I have seen Jean and Marie that came.in.they
 `I saw Jean and Marie coming in.'
- (138) He visto a *Juan*_i que (*pro*_i) era detenido por la policía.
 have.I seen to Juan that was.he arrested by the police
 `I saw Juan being arrested by the police.'

In the French sentence in (137), the CSCI-subject, *Jean et Marie*, corefers with the grammatical subject of the unaccusative verb *entraient* `came in', that is, with an internal argument of the internal predication. Likewise, the CSCI-subject *Juan* in the Spanish example in (138) corefers with the grammatical subject of the embedded passivized verb *era detenido* `was arrested', which again corresponds to a semantic object. In accordance with the analysis in (66), the structure of the sentences in (137) and (138) would be as shown in (139) and (140).

(139) J'ai vu [_{CP} Jean et Marie_i [_{C'} qu(e) [_{IP} i_i [_{I'} entraient_v [_{VP} t_v pro_i]]]]] (140) He visto a [_{CP} Juan_i [_{C'} que [_{IP} pro_{expl i} [_{I'} era ... [_{XP} detenido pro_i]]]]]

In these structures, it can be observed that the lexical DP that is base-generated in Spec, CP, *Jean et Marie* in (139) and *Juan* in (140), corefers with a null semantic object pro, which in turn is

Differently from the C *que* that shows up in the PR, here the temporal adverb *cuando* `when' introduces an adjunct clause. In other words, *cuando* does not head a CSCl. Therefore, the lexical object of the perception verb, namely *Juan*, and the grammatical subject of the embedded clause can refer to different individuals.

coindexed with the expletive in Spec, IP, pro_{expl}. This latter coindexation would indicate that the null semantic object pro is interpreted as the subject of the internal predication.

3.2 Three Types of C: Modifier, Propositional, and Predicational

The analysis of the PR in terms of a CSCl leads us to a general conclusion regarding the semantic value that the C *que* may possess. Consider the examples in (141), and their structural representation in (142).

- (141) a. *El libro que compró Juan* está sobre la mesa.
 the book that bought.he Juan is on the table
 `The book that Juan bought is on the table.'
 - b. Luis dijo *que Juan compró un libro*.`Luis said that Juan bought a book.'
 - c. He visto a Juan que compraba un libro.
 have.I seen to Juan that bought.he a book
 `I saw Juan buying a book.'
- (142) a. el [NP [N' libroi [CP Opi [C' que [IP compró ti Juan]]]]] está sobre la mesa.
 b. Luis dijo [CP [C' que [IP Juan compró un libro]]]
 c. He visto a [CP Juan [C' que [IP proi compraba un libro]]]

As can be observed, each one of the examples in (141) contains the C *que*. However, the value of this C differs from case to case. In (141a), for instance, the C *que* functions as a relative pronoun and, as a such, it heads the CP-constituent that modifies the N *libro* 'book' (see (142a)). In (141b), on the other hand, the C *que* introduces the propositional complement that is selected by the matrix verb, *dijo* 'said', (see (142b)). And finally, in (141c) *que* heads the CSCl that is selected by the perception verb *he visto* 'have seen', (see (142c)).

The different semantic value that the C *que* has in the constructions in (141) can be tentatively specified by means of three features, which are [+/- modifier], [+/- propositional], and [+/-

predicational].⁷⁸ The following combinations would characterize the value of the C *que* in the examples in (141):

(143)	a.	[+ modifier], [- propositional], [- predicational]	for (141a)
	b.	[- modifier], [+ propositional], [- predicational]	for (141b)
	c.	[- modifier], [- propositional], [+ predicational]	for (141c)

Now the specific feature combination that the C *que* may possess will determine the status of its specifier, and hence the element that will be able to occupy this position. For example, Spec, CP may be left empty or may be occupied by either an Op or a phrase. In this latter case, the Op or the phrase may end up in Spec, CP either by movement, in which case Spec, CP would be an A-bar position, or merge, in which case Spec, CP would be an A-position. The features that can be used to define the properties of Spec, CP in each one of these potential situations are [+/- operator], [+/- phrase], and [+/- movement]. The five combinations that we have in (144)-(146) are exemplified in (147)-(149).⁷⁹

- (144) a. [+ operator], [- phrase] / [+ movement]b. [+ operator], [- phrase] / [- movement]
- (145) a. [- operator], [+ phrase] / [+ movement]b. [- operator], [- phrase] / [- movement]
- (146) [- operator], [+ phrase] / [- movement]
- (147) a. El libro_i [$_{CP} Op_i$ [$_{C'}$ que [$_{IP}$ compró Juan t_i]]] está sobre la mesa. the book that bought.he Juan is on the table `The book that Juan bought is on the table.'

⁷⁸ It is important to remark that here the term `predicational' is more precise than the term `predicational' as used in Rizzi 1990. Rizzi employs the term `predicational' to refer to the CP that modifies an N in a relative clause, that is, what I have called `modifier' here. By being more precise, I mean that the constituent introduced by C' in (141c) is predicational in the same way that the constituent introduced by V'/ I' in a sentence and X' in a SCI is predicational.

⁷⁹ The slash that is used in these combinations is a mere symbol to distinguish the nature of the features [+/- operator] and [+/- phrase] from the feature [+/- movement]. The former two features make reference to the nature of the lexical item in question, whereas the latter one refers to a syntactic process.

- b. Al estudiante_i [$_{CP} Op_i$ [$_{C'}$ que [$_{IP} le_i$ van a dar un premio]]]⁸⁰ to the student that him going to give a price `The student who they are going to give a price to.'
- (148) a. Luis preguntó $[_{CP} qu\acute{e}_i \ [_{C'} \oslash [_{IP} había comprado Juan t_i ayer.]]]$ Luis asked.he what had.he bought Juan yesterday `Luis asked what Juan had bought yesterday.'
 - b. Luis dijo [CP [C' que [IP Juan compró un libro.]]]
 Luis said.he that Juan bought.he a book
 `Luis said that Juan bought a book.'
- (149) He visto a [CP Juan [C' que [IP proi compraba un libro.]]]
 have.I seen to Juan that bought.he a book
 `I saw Juan buying a book.'

In (147a), the specifier of the [+modifier] C *que* is occupied by an Op which raises there from an IP-internal position (see section 3.1.1.1). An Op is also found in the specifier of the [+modifier] C *que* in the example in (147b). The only difference with regard to (147a) is that in (147b) that Op is base-generated in that position. In other words, movement is not involved in this case (see section 3.1.1.2). On the other hand, in (148a) the specifier of the (null) [+propositional] C is occupied by a wh-phrase, which raises there from an IP-internal position. In (148b) the specifier of the [+propositional] C is left empty, that is, it is occupied by neither an Op nor a phrase.⁸¹ Finally, a

⁸⁰ The use of the C *que* 'that' in this type of construction is not accepted by the Spanish grammars. Normatively, (147b) would be:

⁽i) Al estudiante *a quien* le van a dar un premio to the student to whom him going to give a price

[`]The student who they are going to give a price to.'

If in the phenomenon of prolepsis (see section 3.1.1.3) the lexical DP is base-generated in the specifier of the [+propositional] C (recall that this DP is coindexed with a resumptive pronoun situated within IP), then this type of construction would represent the feature combination in (i) for the specifier of the propositional C *que*.

⁽i) [-operator], [+phrase] / [-movement]

phrase is base-generated in the specifier of the [+predicational] C *que* in the construction in (149) (see section 3.1.2).

3.3 Summary

In this chapter we have examined a first construction that responds to the CSCI-model that was presented in chapter 2. This construction is the so-called *Pseudo-Relative*, which is found in the majority of the Romance languages.

We have seen that the PR behaves like a SCl, and also that the predicate of this SCl is syntactically more complex than the predicate of an ordinary SCl. I have claimed that this construction is formed by an internal predication and an external predication. The former one is constituted of a null argumental subject pro and the constituent introduced by V', or more specifically I'. The latter one, on the other hand, is constituted of a lexical DP or PRO, which is base-generated in Spec, CP, and the constituent introduced by C'.

We have also seen at work the conditions that the CSCI-model establishes for the good formation of a CSCI. For instance, we have seen that the subject of the PR is base-generated in the specifier of the highest extended projection of the lexical head of the clause, namely Spec, CP, since the lexical head of the construction is V. Furthermore, the subject of the internal predication and the subject of the external predication must possess the same referent, and the former must be necessarily null.

Notice that the difference between (i) and (146) in the text would lie in the semantic value of the CP-head. In (i) the C *que* is [+propositional], whereas in (146) it is [+predicational].

Appendix: Campos' examples^{*}

In Campos 1995: 211, the following pair of Spanish sentences are cited as instances of PR:

- a. Lo vi que lo llevaban preso.
 him-ACC saw.I that him-ACC carried.they arrested
 `I saw him while he was being carried away under arrest.'
 - b. Lo vi que le daban golpes por todos lados.
 him-ACC saw.I that him-DAT gave.they hits for all sides
 `I saw him while he was being beaten up.'

As can be observed, in these examples the accusative pronoun that appears cliticized onto the matrix verb, namely *lo* `him', does not corefer with the grammatical subject of the embedded verb, but with its object in (1a) and indirect object in (1b). These two arguments are represented by the accusative and dative clitic *lo* `him-_{ACC}' and *le*-_{DAT} `him', respectively.

Now examples of this kind, first, run against the data that have been provided in this chapter and, secondly, put into question the CSCI-model as it is formulated in chapter 2. But we have nontrivial arguments to think that the examples in (1) are not real instances of PR, and hence real tokens of a CSCI. To begin with, Campos points out (footnote 15, page 211) that not all speakers accept the constructions in (1) when the pronoun that appears cliticized onto the matrix clause in these sentences is replaced by a lexical DP, as shown in (2).

- (2) a. Vi a Juan que lo llevaban preso.
 saw.I to-ACC Juan that him-ACC carried.they arrested
 `I saw Juan while he was being carried away under arrest.'
 - b. Vi a Juan que le daban golpes por todos lados.
 saw.I to-ACC Juan that him-DAT gave.they hits for all sides
 `I saw Juan while he was being beaten up.'

^{*} I would like to express my gratitude to Héctor Campos for helping me with the data that are discussed in this appendix.
This grammatical contrast would be really surprising if these constructions were true examples of PR since the preference of one variant over the other is not found when the construction *is* a PR.

Secondly, Campos already notes that the constructions in (1) are not possible in other Romance languages. On page 235 he cites the French counterpart of the Spanish sentence in (1a). As it can be observed in (3), this sentence is ungrammatical in French.

- (3) *Je l' ai vu qu'on l' arretaît.
 - I him-ACC have. I seen that somebody him-ACC arrested

Interestingly enough, the two sentences in (1) are not accepted in all varieties of Spanish either. For example, they are not accepted in Iberian Spanish and in the varieties of American Spanish that I have checked, namely Argentinian, Peruvian, Guatemalan, and Mexican Spanish.^{82, 83}

Thirdly, the embedded constructions that appear in the examples in (1) cannot be replaced by a gerund in Spanish, as shown in (4).

(4) a. *He visto a Juan llevándolo preso. have.I seen to Juan carrying.him arrested
b. *He visto a Juan dándole golpes por todos los lados. have.I seen to Juan giving.him hits by all the sides

This is surprising since, as we will see in chapter 5, a language like Spanish admits both the PR and the gerund as a perception verb complement.⁸⁴

And finally, Campos (p.c.) accepts sentences like the one in (5).

(5) Vi a Juan que había terminado las compras. saw.I to Juan that had.he finished the shopping

⁸² I would like to thank Angela diTullio for inquiring for me about the grammaticality of these sentences in Argentinian; Carlos Gatti and Juan Carlos Godenzzi for Peruvian; Karla Rodríguez Meyer for Guatemalan; and Alejandro Gómez Gómez for Mexican Spanish.

⁸³ A note must be added to this affirmation. As Angela diTullio pointed out to me, she obtained mixed results when she asked about the "grammaticality" of the sentences in (1). Some native speakers rejected these examples right away (herself included), whereas other speakers accepted (1a). In this latter group, (1b) was claimed to be very weird. Now the position of this second group reminds me of the response that I often obtained when I asked about the grammaticality of the sentences in (1) to Iberian Spanish speakers. Many speakers indicated that "these sentences are very weird but understandable." So these mixed results (especially with regard to the example in (1a)) may be interpreted as a direct consequence of what the speakers understand by the term "grammatical." That is, as "grammatically correct" or as "understandable."

⁸⁴ Notice that the gerund, which is the form that is used to translate the PR into English, is not possible in these cases either.

'I saw Juan when he had already finished shopping.'

As can be observed, in this example the perception verb complement does not contain an imperfective verbal form, and does not express an event in progress, which are two important properties that typically characterize the PR. Now the acceptance of the type of sentence that is cited in (1) and the acceptance of the type of sentence that appears in (5) may indicate that both types respond to the same syntactic pattern, a syntactic pattern that differs from the one assigned to the PR in this work.

On the other hand, the examples in (1) are accepted in a language like Catalan but only if the constituent introduced by the C *que* is interpreted as an adverbial modifier. Consider the examples in (6) and (7).

- (6) a. El vaig veure que el detenien.
 him-ACC saw.I that him-ACC arrested.they
 `I saw him {at a time at which / when} he was arrested.'
 - b. ?El vaig veure que el pegaven per tot arreu.
 him-_{ACC} saw.I that him-_{ACC} hit.they for all everywhere
 `I saw him while he was being beaten up.'
- (7) He vist en Joan que l' autobús ja marxava.
 have.I seen the Joan that the bus already left.it
 `I saw Joan as the bus was already leaving.'

As we will see in section 4.2.2.1 in chapter 4, these sentences are acceptable because the C *que* is interpreted here as an adverbial head. More precisely, in these examples *que* means something like *at a time at which* or *when*. As expected from this interpretation, the DP object that is selected by the matrix verb and the string introduced by the C *que* do not form a single constituent in the examples in (6) and (7). Hence the ungrammaticality of examples like the ones in (8) and (9), in which the object and the adverbial adjunct have been preposed as a single syntactic unit.

(8) a. *EN JOAN QUE EL DETENIEN va ser l'única cosa que vaig veure ahir.

the Joan that him arrested.they was.it the only thing that saw.I yesterdayb. *EN JOAN QUE EL PEGAVEN va ser 1' única cosa que vaig veure ahir.the Joan that him hit.they was.it the only thing that saw.I yesterday

(9) *EN JOAN QUE L' AUTOBÚS JA MARXAVA he vist.the Joan that the bus already left.it have.I seen

At this stage, we could think that Campo's examples are actually like the Catalan examples in (6) and (7). That is, that the constituent introduced by the C *que* in the sentences in (1) is an adverbial adjunct. But we have two conclusive arguments to discount this position. The first argument is that in (1) the lexical DP *Juan* and the string introduced by the C *que* can be preposed as a single unit, according to Campos (p.c.). This is shown in (10).

- (10) a. A JUAN QUE LO LLEVABAN PRESO fue lo único que vi. to-_{ACC} Juan that him carried.they arrested was.it the only that saw.I
 `Juan being carried away under arrest was the only thing that I saw.'
 - b. A JUAN QUE LE DABAN GOLPES POR TODOS LADOS to-ACC Juan that him-DAT gave.they hits for all sides fue lo único que vi.
 was.it the only that saw.I
 `Juan being beaten up was the only thing that I saw.'

And secondly, the counterpart of the Catalan sentence in (7) is totally out in Campo's dialect:

(11) *He visto a Juan que el autobús ya se marchaba. have.I seen to- $_{ACC}$ Juan that the bus already $_{SE}$ left.it

These two facts indicate, then, that the perception verb complement that appears in the sentences in (1) cannot be treated like the adverbial adjuncts that show up in the Catalan sentences in (6) and (7).

In short, it seems that the embedded constructions in (1) are not instances of PR. Therefore, they are not counterexamples to the data and discussion that have been provided in this chapter. Here I leave the issue concerning the syntactic analysis of this type of construction for further research.

The Prepositional Infinitival Construction and its relationship with the PR

"Como el diccionario da el significado de las raíces, a la gramática incumbe exponer el valor de las inflexiones y combinaciones, y no sólo el natural y primitivo, sino el secundario y el metafórico, siempre que hayan entrado en el uso general de la lengua." (Andrés Bello)

4.1 The Prepositional Infinitival Construction

European Portuguese does not possess the PR despite being a Romance language. So the examples

in (1) are ungrammatical.

(1) a. *Eu vi os advogados que trabalhavam.⁸⁵

I saw the lawyers that worked.they-IMPERF

- b. *Eu vi-os que trabalhavam.
 - I saw them that worked.they-IMPERF

Instead this language uses the so-called *Prepositional Infinitival Construction* (PIC). The PIC is composed of a DP, the locative P a, and an infinitival verb, which can be inflected in person and number.⁸⁶ If the infinitive shows up inflected, it must agree with the DP. An example of the PIC is given in (2), where it combines with a perception verb.

(2) Eu vi os advogados a trabalhar(em).

I saw.I the lawyers at work-INF-(AGR)

'I saw the lawyers working.'

Interestingly, the Romance languages that have the PR do not have the PIC. For instance, the PIC is not possible in Spanish, as shown in (3), Catalan,⁸⁷ (standard) Italian,⁸⁸ French, Romanian, etc.

- (i) a. *El* veig *a venir*. him see I at come-_{INF} 'I see what he is up to.'
 - b. *Ho* he sentit *a dir*. it have.I heard at say-_{INF} `I heard people talk about it.'

(ii) *Ouvi-o a dezir.

⁸⁵ This sentence is grammatical only if the constituent introduced by the C *que* is interpreted as a modifier, that is, as a relative clause.

⁸⁶ For details on the inflected infinitive in European Portuguese, see Raposo 1981, 1987, and 1989.

⁸⁷ In Catalan there are a few idioms the composition of which resembles that of the PIC. Some examples are provided in (i).

As the translations into English already suggest, these few cases cannot be considered examples of the PIC. First of all, they do not express what the PIC expresses, that is, an event in progress (see (2)). In other words, the sentences in (i) do not mean something like "I see him coming" or "I heard people talking about it." And secondly, a sentence like (ib) is totally out in European Portuguese if the PIC is used:

(3) *He visto a los abogados a trabajar.have.I seen to-ACC the lawyers at work-INF

The constituent that the P a introduces in the PIC describes an event in progress in which the individual that the lexical DP refers to is a participant. In this sense, then, the meaning of this construction is just like the meaning of the PR in Romance (chapter 3) and the meaning of the gerund in languages like English, as the translations of the PIC into this language already indicate.

Like the PR, the PIC can also be found in European Portuguese with verbs like *to catch* or *to find*, (4); functioning as a complement of a noun, (5); in absolute constructions, (6); in locative constructions, (7); with verbs like *to imagine*, (8); as free expressions in limited cases, (9); and with a copula, (10) (cf. (4)-(10) with (2)-(7) in chapter 3).

- (4) Ele apanhou os advogados a dormir(em) no sofá.
 he caught the lawyers at sleep-INF-(AGR) on the sofa
 `He caught the lawyers sleeping on the sofa.'
- (5) A fotografia do *João a bailar o tango* foi a mais vendida.
 the picture of João at dance-_{INF} the tango was the most sold
 `The picture of João dancing the tango was the one which sold the most.'
- (6) Com *o João a falar*, não faremos nada.
 with the João at speak-_{INF} no do.will.we nothing
 `With João speaking, we will never do anything.'

⁸⁸ As we will see in section 4.2.2.5 below, the PIC can be used in very specific contexts in standard Italian and more generally in some Italian dialects.

- (7) Ali estão *eles a fazer(em) asneiras*.
 here are they at do-_{INF}-(AGR) silly things
 `Here they are doing silly things.'
- (8) Não imaginava *os meninos a trabalhar*.
 no imagined.I the children at work-_{INF}
 `I couldn't imagine the children working.'
- (9) Ele a jogar andebol com o Barcelona, ela a velejar.
 he at play-_{INF} handball with the Barcelona she at sail-_{INF}
 `He playing handball with the Barcelona team, she sailing.'
- (10) O João esta a correr.
 the João is at run-_{INF}
 `João is running.'

In the first part of this chapter, I show that the syntactic and semantic behavior of the PIC is in accordance with the general Complex Small Clause-model presented in chapter 2. This construction, then, constitutes a second example of verbal CSCI. In the second part of the chapter (section 4.2), I show that the head of the PR behaves just like the head of the PIC, in the sense that both the predicational C *que* and the locative P *a* function as aspectual markers that operate on the internal predication that they introduce.

4.1.1 A Complex Small Clause-Analysis for the Prepositional Infinitival Construction

114

The syntactic analysis that I defend here for the embedded construction that appears in the example in (11) is depicted in (12).

(11) Eu vi os advogados a trabalhar(em).
I saw.I the lawyers at work-INF-(AGR)
`I saw the lawyers working.'



In this structure, the infinitival verb is the head of a VP-projection. Its external argument is the pro or PRO that occupies Spec, VP. The null argument pro appears when the infinitive shows up inflected, whereas PRO is found when the infinitive is not inflected. In Spec, IP, there is a null expletive pro_{expl} or PRO_{expl} . The head of the CP-projection that introduces the IP is null, that is, \emptyset_{C} . Immediately above that CP, there is the P *a*, which heads the highest functional projection of the verb in the structure in (12). Finally, the lexical DP or PRO is directly merged with P', so it appears in the specifier of this projection, namely Spec, PP.

The structure of the PIC put forward in (12) is virtually identical to the ones proposed in Raposo 1989. Compare (12) with Raposo's structures which are reproduced here in (13).

(13) a. $[PP \text{ os advogados}_i [P' a [P Pro_i [I' [VP t_i trabalharem]]]]]$ b. $[PP \text{ os advogados}_i [P' a [CP [PRO_i [I' [VP t_i trabalhar]]]]]]$

As can be observed, the two basic differences that distinguish the CSCI-analysis in (12) from the structures in (13) concern the functional projections that form part of the extended domain of the infinitive, and the position that the null subject occupies at Syntax. On the one hand, Raposo proposes that the P *a* introduces the IP-node when the infinitive appears inflected (see (13a)), and a CP-node when the infinitive is not inflected (see (13b)). Following the Government and Binding approach, which requires PRO not to be governed, he claims that, in this latter context, the CP-node would prevent the PRO in Spec, IP from being governed by P. In contrast, the CSCI-analysis in (12) states that the CP-node appears in the structure independently of the agreement properties of the

infinitive. This position intends to capture the idea that CP is part of the extended domain of the infinitive, and consequently that its presence in the structure is not determined by the feature specification of I, but by the V that this CP is associated with. Notice, incidentally, that this idea is perfectly in tune with Chomsky's 1998 definition of control infinitivals. According to Chomsky, control infinitivals

"fall together with finite clauses, headed by C selecting nondefective T (with tense-modal structure and a full complement of ϕ -features). Like other CPs, they generally undergo movement and clefting and can appear as root expressions (typically with *wh-phrase* Spec or as discourse fragments), and [null] structural Case is assigned to the subject of T. These properties are common to CPs and distinguish them from raising / ECM infinitivals headed by a Tdef [defective tense], lacking C and tense structure and assigning no Case to subject, and lacking the distributional freedom of CP." (p. 19)

According to the analysis in (12), the subject of the infinitival must be also controlled. But differently from ordinary control contexts, in the PIC that subject is not controlled by the subject or object of the matrix verb, but by an argumental phrase that is base-generated in the specifier of the highest extended projection of the infinitive, namely in Spec, PP.⁸⁹

On the other hand, the CSCI-structure in (12) incorporates the hypothesis that states that at Syntax null subjects remain in the position where they are base-generated, namely in Spec, VP, and that, in these cases, Spec, IP is occupied by an expletive. As has been already pointed out in section 3.1.2.3.1 in chapter 3, this hypothesis has been proposed for the null subject pro in Romance. More

⁸⁹ This would explain the specific differences that may arise between the construction containing a control infinitival that Chomsky refers to in his definition and the control infinitival in the PIC.

recently, however, this idea has also been extended to the null subject PRO (see, for instance, Baltin 1995).

In the remainder of this section, I show that the PIC forms a subject-predicate relationship, and that this construction is a type of (Complex) Small Clause (section 4.1.2). Then I show that the PIC can function as either an argumental or adjunct Complex Small Clause (section 4.1.3). Finally, I discuss the organization of the elements that make up this construction according to the analysis in (12) (section 4.1.4).

4.1.2 The Subject-Predicate Relationship in the Prepositional Infinitival Construction

The structure in (12) states that the lexical DP or PRO is merged with an extended projection of V, which in this case is P'. The conjunction of the constituent introduced by P' with the lexical DP or PRO yields a subject-predicate relationship similar to that established in an ordinary SCI. The same kind of arguments that were used in section 3.1.2.1 in the previous chapter to show the clausal status of the PR can be utilized once again at this point to demonstrate the clausal status of the PIC. Some of these arguments are the following:

(i) First of all, the PIC is not syntactically independent in the sense that it cannot be anchored in a temporal domain by itself. Thus, (14) can only be used out of the blue when the temporal information of the clause can be recovered from extra linguistic sources.

(14) #Os meninos a ler(em).

the children at read-INF-(AGR)

`The children reading.'

(ii) The PIC may trigger singular agreement on the matrix verb when this construction occupies the subject position of the sentence even when the lexical DP that introduces the PIC is plural:

(15) Os meninos a trabalhar(em) é uma visão horrivel.
the children at work-_{INF}-(AGR) is a sight horrible
`Children working is a terrible sight.'

(iii)The sequence introduced by the P *a* can be negated, (16), coodinated, (17), and extraposed, (18).

(16) Eu vi os meninos *a ler*, não *a trabalhar*.
I saw the children at read-_{INF} no at work-_{INF}
`I saw the children reading, not working.'

(17) Eu vi os meninos a ler e a comer.
I saw the children at read-_{INF} and at eat-_{INF}
`I saw the children reading and eating.'

(18) Eu vi os meninos esta tarde a comer no jardim.
I saw the children this afternoon at eat-_{INF} in the garden
`I saw the children this afternoon eating in the garden.'

All these properties are expected from the idea that the string introduced by the P *a* is a predicate.

(iv) The contexts in which the PIC is possible are the contexts in which a SCl of a more familiar type can be found:

- (19) a. Eu vi os meninos a trabalhar(em).
 I saw the children at work-INF-(AGR)
 `I saw the children working.'
 - b. Eu vi os meninos {com a Maria / nus.}
 I saw the children with the Maria / naked
 `I saw the children {with Maria / naked.}'

From this, we can conclude that the PIC is a clause, and more specifically a CSCl. The subject of that CSCl is the lexical DP or PRO that is found in Spec, PP in the structure in (12); the CSCl-predicate, the sequence headed by the P a; and the head of the construction, the locative P a.

4.1.3 Argumental or Adjunct Complex Small Clause

As represented in the structure in (12), the CSCI-subject, namely the argument that is basegenerated in Spec, PP, can be either a lexical DP or a PRO. The former possibility intends to accommodate those cases in which the CSCI functions as an argument, whereas the latter one would represent those cases where the construction behaves like an adjunct.

In the following section, I make use of the same type of constituency tests that were used to demonstrate the argumental or adjunct nature of the PR but this time in order to show that this distinction also applies to the PIC. Again, these tests indicate that the PIC can function as an argumental CSCl when it combines with a perception verb, (20), but only as an adjunct CSCl when it appears with verbs like *to catch*, (21).

- (20) Eu vi os advogados a trabalhar(em).
 I saw.I the lawyers at work-_{INF}-(AGR)
 `I saw the lawyers working.'
- (21) Ele apanhou os advogados a dormir(em) no sofá.
 he caught the lawyers at sleep-_{INF}-(AGR) on the sofa
 `He caught the lawyers sleeping on the sofa.'

4.1.3.1 The Prepositional Infinitival Construction as an Argumental Complex Small Clause

First of all, let us see some tests that suggest that the PIC can be interpreted as a constituent in one possible reading of the sentence in (20). These tests are the following:

(i) Focus-fronting:

(22) Os meninos a trabalhar(em), eu não vi.
the children at work-_{INF}-(AGR) I no saw
`The children working, I didn't see.'

(ii) Answer:

(23) Sabes o que eu vi? *Ele a jogar andebol com o Barcelona*.know.you what that I saw he at play handball with the Barcelona`Do you know what I saw? Him playing handball with the Barcelona team.'

(iii) Clefting:

(24) Foi os meninos a trabalhar(em) que eu vi.
was.it the children at work-_{INF}-(AGR) that I saw
`It was the children working that I saw.'

(iv) Pseudoclefting:

(25) O que eu vi foi *os meninos a trabalhar(em)*.
what that I saw was.it the children at work-INF-(AGR)
`What I saw was the children working.'

The grammaticality of these sentences indicates that in this one-constituent reading the PIC that appears in (20) is the object selected by the matrix verb vi `saw'.

4.1.3.2 The Prepositional Infinitival Construction as an Adjunct Complex Small Clause

The ungrammatical sentences that are obtained when these constituency tests are applied to the PIC when this construction combines with a verb like *to catch* (see (21)) reveal that the lexical DP and the constituent introduced by the P a do not form a constituent in these cases. This is illustrated in the following examples:

(i) Focus-fronting:

(26) **Os meninos a fumar(em)*, ele não apanhou. the children at smoke-_{INF}-(AGR) he no caught

(ii) Answer:

(27) *Sabes o que ele apanhou? Os meninos a fumar(em).know.you what that he caught the children at smoke-INF-(AGR)

(iii) Clefting:

(28) *Foi *os meninos a fumar(em)* que ele apanhou. was.it the children at smoke-_{INF}-(AGR) that he caught

(iv) Pseudoclefting:

(29) *O que ele apanhou foi os meninos a fumar(em).what that he caught was.it the children at smoke-INF-(AGR)

In the example in (21), then, only the lexical DP *os advogados* `the lawyers' must be the object that is selected by the matrix verb *apanhou* `caught'. This means that, in this sentence, the PIC is an adjunct CSCl the subject of which is a PRO that is controlled by this lexical object.

4.1.4 Internal Organization

123

In this section, I concentrate on the elements that make up the PIC and discuss their distribution within the CSCI-structure presented in (12).

4.1.4.1 pro / PRO and Expletive

The analysis in (12) states that the constituent introduced by P contains a null argumental subject pro or PRO and a null expletive subject pro_{expl} or PRO_{expl} . The argumental subject pro appears when the infinitive is inflected. At Syntax, pro stays within VP, whereas the null expletive pro_{expl} checks the EPP-feature in Spec, IP. Later, at LF, the formal features of the argumental pro raise to IP to check nominative Case and ϕ -features, just like in finite clauses in Romance pro-drop languages (see section 3.1.2.3.1 in the previous chapter). This is schematically represented in (30b).

(30) a. Eu vi os meninos a lerem o livro.

I saw the children at read-INF-3PL the book

'I saw the children reading the book.'

b.

 $[PP \text{ os meninos } [P' \text{ a } [CP [C' \overline{\mathcal{O}}_{C} [IP pro_{expl_i} [I' lerem_v [VP pro_i t_v o livro]]]]]]]$

The argumental subject PRO, on the other hand, is found when the infinitive is uninflected. In the literature, it has been claimed that the null subject PRO also remains within VP at Syntax (see, for instance, Baltin 1995). If this assumption turns out to be correct, then we will have to assume that a null expletive PRO_{expl} is merged with I', and that this expletive is the element that checks the EPP-feature at Syntax. Similarly to pro, the formal features of PRO will raise to IP at LF to check null Case (see Chomsky and Lasnik 1993), and ϕ -features. This is depicted in (31b).

(31) a. Eu vi os meninos a ler o livro.
I saw the children at read-_{INF} the book.
`I saw the children reading the book.'

b.

 $[PP \text{ os meninos } [P' \text{ a } [CP [C' \emptyset_C [IP PRO_{expl i} [I' ler_v [VP PRO_i t_v \text{ o livro }]]]]]]$

In the two versions of the PIC, the null argumental subject and the null expletive create a chain bearing one single theta-role and one single Case. When the infinitive is inflected, this chain is $[\text{pro}_{expl}, \text{pro}]$, and the Case checked is the nominative assigned by the finite IP-head. If the infinitive is uninflected, then the chain is $[\text{PRO}_{expl}, \text{PRO}]$, and the Case checked is the null Case provided by the infinitival I. In both cases, the chain carries the theta-role that is assigned to the argumental pro or PRO in the position where this argument is base-generated, that is, within the lexical VP-shell (see (30) and (31)).

As predicted by the CSCI-model presented in chapter 2, the null subject of the internal predication of the PIC cannot be phonologically realized. This is shown in (32).

- (32) *Eu vi os meninos a (eles) ler(em) (eles) o livro (eles).
 - I saw the children at they read-INF-(AGR) they the book they

As can be observed in this example, the pronoun *eles* `they' cannot appear in the construction even when the infinitive is inflected, that is, in a context where the IP-head does assign nominative Case.⁹⁰

4.1.4.2 The Lexical DP

In the CSCI-structure in (12) it is claimed that the subject of the PIC is directly merged with P'. When the whole construction functions as the complement of a verb, the subject of the PIC must be a lexical DP. In this structural context, this lexical DP will check structural Case within the matrix clause. In the sentence in (33), for instance, the CSCI-subject checks accusative Case. This is suggested by the accusative form of the clitic *os* `them'.

(33) Eu vi- os a ler(em) o livro.
I saw.I them at read-_{INF}-(AGR) the book
`I saw them reading the book.'

It is important to remark here that, as shown in (33), the lexical subject of the PIC checks accusative Case within the matrix clause independently of the inflected properties of the infinitive. This is expected since the nominative Case that is assigned by the IP-head of the internal predication is checked off by the subject of the internal predication, namely pro.

In the contexts in which accusative Case is not available, the lexical DP will need to move further up in the structure to check another Case. This occurs, for instance, when the matrix verb is passivized. As illustrated in the examples in (34), from Raposo 1989: 290, the lexical DP must move to the subject position of the matrix clause in order to check nominative Case.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Recall from the previous chapter that this is also the case in the PR, where the V is always finite.

Interestingly, the following contrast is cited in Duarte 1992: 148-149:

⁽i) a. Os meninos foram vistos a comer gelados.

(34) a. Os actores foram vistos a representar a cena.
 the actors were they seen at perform-_{INF} the scene
 `The actors were seen performing the scene.'

b. Os actores foram vistos a representarem a cena.
the actors were they seen at perform-_{INF-3PL} the scene
`The actors were seen performing the scene.'

The grammaticality of the examples in (34), on the other hand, also supports the idea that Spec,

PP is an A-position in the PIC. This is so since in (34) the DP os actores `the actors' has moved

the children were they seen at eat-INF ice cream

`The children were seen eating ice cream.'

b. *Os meninos foram vistos a comerem gelados.

the children were they seen at eat- $_{\rm INF\mathchar`-3PL}$ ice cream

These examples show that the movement of the subject of the PIC to the subject position of the passive clause yields an ungrammatical sentence only when the infinitive contained within the PIC is inflected. The example in (ib), then, contrasts with the one in (34b) in the text. This situation leads us to think that there is an idiolectal variation between the two authors, Duarte and Raposo.

I must add that all my (native) informants of European Portuguese accepted the sentence in (34b) in the text, as well as the sentence in (ib), but they also noticed the marked status of the construction when the infinitive is inflected. João Andrade Peres points out to me that the acceptability of these two sentences improves if the distance between the participle and the lower verb is increased, as shown in (ii).

- (ii) a. Os actores foram vistos várias vezes a representarem a cena.
 - `The actors were seen performing the scene several times.'
 - b. Os meninos foram vistos frequentemente a comerem gelados.
 - `The children were frequently seen eating ice cream.'

The idiolectal variation that is observed here between Duarte and Raposo's judgments is reminiscent of what we find when the construction involved is the PR in Romance. Recall the contrast pointed out in section 3.1.2.3.3 above between French (also Italian) and Spanish (also Catalan), reproduced here in (iii) and (iv), respectively.

- (iii) Marie a été vue qui embrassait Jean.
 - Marie has she been seen that kissed she Jean 'Marie was seen kissing Jean.'
- (iv)?*María fue vista que bes*aba* a Juan.

It might well be the case that the marked status of the passive construction, at least in some Romance languages, along with the agreement properties of the embedded verb may have something to do with respect to both the idiolectal variation regarding the acceptance of the PIC in this structural context in European Portuguese, and the dialectal contrast regarding the acceptance of the PR in the same structural context in the Romance family. The study of these contrasts is beyond the scope of this work, so I leave this issue for further research.

from Spec, PP, which is a A-position according to the CSCI-analysis defended here, to the subject position of the matrix clause, which is also an A-position. This yields a well-formed [A, A] chain. This operation is represented in (35).

(35) $[_{CP} [_{IP [A-position]} os \ actores_i \ for am vistos [_{PP [A-position]} t_i [_{P'} a [_{CP} [_{C'} \varnothing_C [_{IP} \{PRO / pro\} representar(em) a \ cena]]]]]]$

Notice, incidentally, that if the DP *os actores* `the actors' were base-generated within the embedded IP, then the movement of this argument to the subject position of the matrix clause would create a mixed (sandwiched) [A, A', A] chain. This would be so because this argument would move from an A-position within the embedded IP-node; to Spec, PP, which would be an A'-position in this analysis; and, finally, to the matrix Spec, IP, again an A-position. So as a result we would expect an ungrammatical sentence, contrary to the facts.

Like in any other (argumental) SCl, the subject of the PIC can also be an anaphor. This is shown in the example in (36).

(36) Os meninos viram-se *uns aos outros* a correr(em).
the children saw.they ones to.the other at run-_{INF}-(AGR)
`The children saw each other running.'

In this sentence, the subject of the PIC is the anaphor *uns aos outros* `each other', and here it is bound by the subject of the matrix clause, that is, the DP *os meninos* `the children'.

Another important fact that confirms the CSCI-status of the PIC is that the subject of the external predication, that is, the argument that is base-generated in Spec, PP, must corefer with the subject of the internal predication, namely the null subject PRO or pro. Consider the following examples:

(37) Eu vi os advogados_i a {PRO_i / pro_i} trabalhar(em).
I saw the lawyers at work-INF-(3PL)
`I saw the lawyers working.'

(38) *Eu vi *os advogados*_i a { PRO_j / pro_j } trabalhar(em). I saw the lawyers at work-_{INF}-(3PL)

(39) *Eu vi o João_i a (pro_j) trabalharem.

I saw the João at work-INF-3PL

In (37) the CSCI-subject corefers with the null subject PRO or pro contained within the internal predication. Therefore, the construction is acceptable, as predicted by the CSCI-model. Conversely, this condition is satisfied neither in (38) nor in (39), hence their ungrammaticality. In the example in (38), the subject of the CSCI, *os advogados* 'the lawyers' and the subject of the internal predication possess the same person and number specification when this latter subject is a pro. We know this because the person and number specification of the null subject pro is morphologically expressed by the inflectional suffix of the infinitive. Here the suffix is *-em*, that is, a third person plural form. When the subject of the internal predication is a PRO, the DP *os advogados* 'the lawyers' and this PRO may or may not share the same person and number information. Nonetheless, in all three contexts the sentence is ruled out because the DP *os advogados* 'the lawyers' and the null subject PRO / pro do not share the same reference. In (38) this is indicated by the different subindex that is assigned to these two subjects. In (39), on the other hand, the two subjects, *João* and *pro*, share neither the person and number specification nor the referent.

A second revealing property that tells us that the PIC is a CSCl is the subject-object asymmetry that is observed in this construction. In the PIC the CSCl-subject can only corefer with the *subject* of the internal predication. Consider the sentences in (40).

- (40) a. Eu vi *os meninos*_i a { PRO_i / pro_i } comer(em) o bolo. I saw the children at eat-_{INF}-(AGR) the cake `I saw the children eating the cake.'
 - b. *Eu vi *o bolo* a (os meninos) comer(em) (os meninos.) I saw the cake at the children eat-_{INF}-(AGR) the children

In (40a), the DP *os meninos* `the children' is coindexed with the subject pro or PRO of the internal predication. As expected, the sentence is acceptable. Conversely, the subject of the CSCl in the example in (40b), namely the DP *o bolo* `the cake', corefers with the object of the internal predication, and the sentence is ruled out.

That the CSCI-subject must corefer with the *grammatical* subject of the internal predication in the PIC as well is shown by examples like those in (41) and (42). The sentence in (42) is from Raposo 1989: 295.

- (41) Eu vi o João_i a (PRO_i) saír de casa.
 I saw the João at go.out of house
 `I saw João leaving home.'
- (42) Eu vi *as raparigas*_i a (PRO_i) ser beijadas pelos rapazes. I saw the girls at be kissed they by the boys

'I saw the girls being kissed by the boys.'

As can be observed, in (41) the CSCI-subject *o João* corefers with the grammatical subject of the internal predication, which here corresponds to the internal argument of the unaccusative verb *saír* 'to leave'. Something similar occurs in the sentence in (42), where the CSCI-subject *as raparigas* 'the girls' corefers with the thematic object of the passivized verb *ser beijadas* 'be kissed'. The syntactic representations of these two sentences would be as depicted in (43) and (44) for (41) and (42), respectively.

(43)

Eu vi $[PP o João_i [P' a [CP [C' <math>\emptyset_C [IP PRO_{expli} [I' sair_v [VP t_v PRO_i]]]]]]$

(44)

Eu vi $[PP \text{ as raparigas}_i [P' \text{ a } [CP [C' <math>\emptyset_C [IP PRO_{expli}[I' \text{ ser } ... [XP beijadas PRO_i]]]]]]$

In these structures, the CSCI-subject, *o João* in (43) and *as raparigas* `the girls' in (44), corefers with the semantic object of the internal predication, PRO. This latter argument, in turn, is coindexed with the expletive PRO_{expl} that occupies Spec, IP. This second relationship indicates that the semantic object is interpreted as the subject of the internal predication. Hence the wellformedness of these CSCIs.

4.2 The C in the Pseudo-Relative: From C to P

In the second part of this chapter I show that the C *que* does not behave like a regular (propositional) C in the PR, and that it ultimately functions as an aspectual marker. More precisely, I claim that the C *que* behaves like the locative P *a* that appears in the PIC. I argue that the fact that

this C cannot close the T-chain of its clause is a consequence of the first assumption, and that the progressive interpretation of the PR derives from the second one.

4.2.1 Some Relevant Facts that Show that the PR and the PIC Behave Alike

Up to this point, we have seen that the PR and the PIC have the same semantics, that is, they describe an event in progress (see the translations into English), and also that they both respond to the CSCI-model that was presented in chapter 2. A closer examination of these two constructions reveals furthermore that the internal mechanism that operates within each one of them must not be significantly different. The following sections substantiate this observation.

4.2.1.1 Complementary Distribution

As has been already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the PR and the PIC are in complementary distribution. For instance, a language like Spanish possesses the PR, (45), but it does not possess the PIC, (46).

- (45) a. He visto a los abogados que trabajaban.
 have.I seen to-ACC the lawyers that worked.they-IMPERF
 `I saw the lawyers working.'
 - b. Los he visto que trabajaban.
 them have.I seen that worked.they-IMPERF
 `I saw them working.'
- (46) a. *He visto *a los abogados a trabajar*. have.I seen to-_{ACC} the lawyers at work-_{INF}

b. *Los he visto a trabajar.

them have.I seen at work-INF

Conversely, European Portuguese does not admit the PR, (47), and, instead, it uses the PIC, (48).

(47) a. *Eu vi os advogados que trabalhavam.I saw the lawyers that worked.they-IMPERF

b. *Eu vi- os que trabalhavam.

I saw them that worked.they-IMPERF

(48) a. Eu vi os advogados a trabalhar(em).
I saw.I the lawyers at work-_{INF}-(AGR)
`I saw the lawyers working.'

b. Eu vi- os a trabalhar(em).

I saw them at work-INF-(AGR)

'I saw them working.'

4.2.1.2 The PR and the PIC Denote Events

The PR and the PIC denote events, rather than propositions. We know this because, when these constructions combine with a perception verb, this verb must necessarily be interpreted in its

nonepistemic (sensible) reading. Consider the following examples in Spanish and European Portuguese, respectively:

- (49) Vi *a Juan que corría*.saw.I to Juan that ran.he`I saw Juan running.'
- (50) Eu vi *o João a correr*.
 I saw.I the João at run-_{INF}
 `I saw João running.'

The only interpretation that these sentences admit is the one in which I must have seen John running with my very own eyes. The examples in (49) and (50), then, contrast with examples like the ones in (51) and (52).

- (51) Vi que Juan corría.saw.I that Juan ran.he`I saw that Juan was running.'
- (52) Eu vi que o João corria.I saw.I that the João ran.he`I saw that João was running.'

Here the perception verb *ver* `to see' combines with a CP-complement, that is, a syntactic category that is associated to the ontological category of proposition. Consequently, the perception verb must be interpreted in its epistemic (intellectual) reading. This means that, for these sentences to be true,

I do not need to have necessarily seen the event contained within the proposition, namely John running. For example, I could have only seen the name 'John' on the list of the participants in a marathon. So from this I could have *seen (realized)* that John was running in that marathon.

The interpretation of the PR and the PIC as events, rather than as propositions, and the consequent nonepistemic (sensible) interpretation of the perception verb that they may combine with straightforwardly explains the deviance of the following sentences:

- (53) *Vi a Juan que *sabía* francés. saw.I to Juan that knew.he French
- (54) *Eu vi o João a saber francês.I saw.I the João at know-_{INF} French

In the Spanish sentence in (53) the perception verb *ver* 'to see' combines with the PR, whereas in its European Portuguese counterpart in (54) it combines with the PIC. As can be observed, the verb that is employed in the PR and in the PIC is the verb *saber* 'to know'. This verb expresses a cognitive state that is not susceptible of being directly perceived. Now, as it has just been pointed out, the PR and the PIC only accept an interpretation of event, so the perception verb that these constructions may combine with can only be interpreted in its nonepistemic (sensible) reading. Therefore, the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (53) and (54) must be attributed to a semantic incompatibility between the meaning of the verb *saber* 'to know' and the meaning of the perception verb *ver* 'to see'.

As expected, the verb *saber* 'to know' can be found as a perception verb complement when the syntactic structure of that complement is related to the ontological category of proposition. This occurs when the complement is a regular CP. This is illustrated in (55) and (56).

- (55) Vi que Juan sabía francés.saw.I that Juan knew.he French.`I saw that Juan could speak French.'
- (56) Eu vi que o João sabia francês.I saw that the João knew French`I saw that João could speak French.'

4.2.1.3 Aspectual Restrictions

Another property that both the PR and the PIC share is that the verb contained within these constructions cannot be perfective. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (57) and (58).

- (57) *He visto a Juan que *ha comido*. have.I seen to Juan that has.he eaten
- (58) *Eu vi os meninos a *ter(em)* comido.I saw the children at have-_{INF}-_(AGR) eaten

As we will see in some detail in section 5.4 in the following chapter, the ungrammaticality of these sentences must be attributed to a conflict between the aspectual value of the C *que* and the P *a* in the

PR and in the PIC, respectively, and the internal temporal structure of a perfective verb. In very general terms, this conflict arises because the aspectual heads *que* and *a* must localize a temporal point out of the internal temporal domain of the event that they precede. But this can only be possible if that event is presented as unbounded, a requirement that a perfective form of the verb does not satisfy.

Now the obvious question that arises from all these parallelisms between these two constructions is what makes the PR and the PIC virtually identical. From the CSCI-analysis assigned here to these two constructions, we can already say that their similar behavior can be a direct consequence of their similar syntax. That is, they both are constituted of a verbal head, which is a finite verb in the PR and an infinitive in the PIC; a null argumental subject pro or PRO that functions as the subject of the internal predication; and a lexical subject or null PRO that functions as the subject of the internal predication. Furthermore, this latter subject must corefer necessarily with the grammatical subject of the internal predication.

But apart from this nontrivial coincidence in their structural scheme, there is also an apparently important difference that separates these two constructions. This difference is that the phonologically realized element that intervenes between the verb and the subject of the external predication is the C *que* in the PR, (59), whereas in the PIC it is the locative P a, (60).

(59) [_{CP} { Juan_i / PRO_i } [_{C'} que [_{IP} pro_i leía el libro]]] Juan that read.he-_{IMPERF} the book `Juan reading the book'

(60)
$$[PP \{ João_i / PRO_i \} [P' a [CP [C' $\emptyset_C [IP PRO_i]er o]ivro]]]]]$
João at read-INF the book
'João reading the book'$$

Now we know that the locative P a that shows up in the PIC is the element that provides the construction with its progressive interpretation. To see this, compare (61) and (62).

(61) Eu vi o João a comer o bolo.

I saw the João at eat_{INF} the cake 'I saw João eating the cake.'

(62) Eu vi o João comer o bolo.
I saw the João eat-_{INF} the cake
`I saw João eat the cake.'

In (61) the perception verb complement is the PIC. In this example, this construction describes an event in which João eats a cake, and, more precisely, a step or degree of the event of eating the cake. On the other hand, the perception verb complement in the sentence in (62) is an infinitival clause that lacks the locative P a. As in the previous example, this complement describes an event in which João eats a cake, but here the event of eating a cake is presented as started, carried out, and finished. In other words, this complement describes the whole event of eating the cake. Notice, incidentally, that the aspectual distinction between the PIC in (61) and the infinitival clause in (62) is maintained in the translations of these examples into English. Thus, the PIC is translated by means of a verbal gerund, whereas the infinitival clause is translated by means of the so-called bare infinitive.

At this point a second and more specific question arises. If the PR also expresses an event in progress just like the PIC, as we will see in section 4.2.3.2 shortly below, we might wonder where this progressive interpretation comes from in this construction. The answer that I offer here is that the progressive interpretation of the PR is provided by the C *que*, which in this construction behaves like an aspectual marker that operates on the imperfective verb.⁹² This means that the only element that distinguishes the PR and the PIC, namely the head of the CSCl, ends up behaving alike in both constructions.⁹³

4.2.2 C as a P: Some Arguments in Favor

In the following sections I provide some arguments that support *a priori* the idea of treating the C *que* as an aspectual marker in the PR.

4.2.2.1 The Adverbial Value of the C que in Some Romance Languages

The idea that the C *que* possesses an aspectual value in the PR is not so surprising in light of the fact that *que* may have an adverbial value in some Romance languages. Consider the Catalan sentences in (63) and their Italian counterparts in (64). The Italian examples are from Cinque 1992: 25.

(63) a. En Pere la vaveure que estava diluviant.

the Pere her saw.he that was.it pouring

`Pere saw her {when / at a time at which} it was pouring.'

⁹² It could be thought *a priori* that in the PR the progressive interpretation is provided by the imperfective verb. But note that the imperfective form of a verb only indicates that the event described is not completed. In other words, it does not express a step or degree of that event.

⁹³ The idea that the C *que* and the P *a* are related when they head a CSCl is in tune with recent research which has shown the close relationship between these two categories. For example, in Emonds 1985 it is claimed that Cs are a subset of the set P. In Kayne 1981 and Rizzi 1982, on the other hand, it is argued that the P *de* and *di* that can be found preceding an infinitive in French and Italian, respectively, are actually Cs. And, more recently, Dubinsky and Williams (1995) have claimed that temporal Ps in English (e.g. *after*, *before*, *while*) have undergone a process of recategorization from P to C.

- b. He vist en Joan *que* ell ja se n'anava.
 have.I seen the Joan that he already _{SE} went.he
 `I saw Joan {when / at a time at which} he was leaving.'
- (64) a. Paolo la vide *che* stava piovendo a dirotto.
 Paolo her saw.he that was.it raining to excessive
 `Paolo saw her {when / at a time at which} it was pouring.'
 - b. Ho visto Gianni *che* lui se ne stava già andando have.I seen Gianni that he _{SE} was.he already walking
 `I saw Gianni {when / at a time at which} he was leaving.'

In these sentences the C *que / che* has an adverbial value, in the sense that its meaning makes reference to a temporal point at which the event described by the clause that it introduces coincides with the event expressed by the matrix sentence. In other words, here the C *que / che* means something like *when* or *at a time at which*.

Now my claim is that the C *que / che* that shows up in the PR also has temporal properties. Unlike the C *que / che* that appears in the constructions in (63)-(64), however, in the PR this C cannot connect the event that it introduces with the event described by the matrix sentence. And this is so because in the PR the C *que / che* does not introduce the whole clausal complement of the matrix verb, but only the predicate of that complement. That is, it only introduces the predicate of the CSCI. So the idea is that in this structural context the temporal information that is provided by the C que / che is directed towards modifying the internal temporal structure of the event that it precedes, namely the event described by the internal predication. Hence the ultimate aspectual value of *que / che* in this construction.⁹⁴

The idea that the scope of the C que / che in its adverbial use is the whole embedded clause, whereas the scope of the C que / che in its aspectual use is only the predicate of a CSCl helps us understand the lack of several restrictions only in the former case. For instance, the appearance of the adverbial C que / che is less restricted than the presence of the aspectual C que / che. Thus, an adjunct clause introduced by the adverbial C que / che can modify any sentence as long as the semantics of both clauses are compatible.

Secondly, the clause that the adverbial C que / che introduces may have all its arguments phonologically realized, as shown by the Catalan example in (65).

(65) Em vaig adormir que {ella / l' Eulàlia} encara havia de matar el seu marit me fell.asleep that she / the Eulàlia still had.she of kill-INF the her husband 'I fell asleep {when/at a time at which} {she/Eulàlia} had not killed her husband yet.'

This contrasts with the fact that the grammatical subject of the internal predication must be phonologically null in the PR, (66).

vist la Maria que {*ella / la Maria*} corria. (66) *He have.I seen the Maria that she / the Maria ran.she

And thirdly, the adverbial C que / che does not require the verb that it precedes to be in an imperfective form, (67), as opposed to the aspectual C que / che in the PR, (68). These examples are in Catalan.95

⁹⁴ The mechanism by which this is achieved is presented in section 5.4.1 in chapter 5. 141

- (67) He arribat que en Joan ja s'ho *havia menjat* tot.
 have.I arrived that the Joan already it had.he eaten all
 `I have arrived {when / at a time at which} Joan had already eaten it all.'
- (68) *He vist en Joan que ja s'ho *havia menjat* tot.have.I seen the Joan that already it had.he eaten all

Interestingly, the C *que* cannot have the adverbial interpretation in all Romance languages. For instance, the counterparts of the Catalan and Italian sentences in (63) and (64) above are ungrammatical in Spanish, (69), and French, (70).

- (69) a. *Pedro la vio *que* estaba diluviando.Pedro her saw that was.it pouring
 - b. *He visto a Juan que él ya se iba.
 have.I seen to Juan that he already se left.he-IMPERF
- (70) a. *Je la voit qu'il pleuvait.
 - I her see.I that it ran.it
 - b. *J'ai vu Jean qu'elle sortait du cinéma.

I have.I seen Jean that she went.out.she of cinema

The lack of the (temporal) adverbial interpretation of the C *que* in sentences of this type in Spanish and French should not be taken as a problem for the hypothesis that the C *que* has an aspectual

⁹⁵ The sentence in (68) is grammatical if the C *que* is interpreted as adverbial. In this sense, (68) would mean something like I saw Joan {when / at a time at which} (s)he had already eaten it all. This is not the relevant reading here

value in the PR also in these languages. There are two major reasons for believing this. First of all, here we are dealing with two values of the C *que*, that is, an adverbial value and an aspectual one. Therefore, the absence of the former value in one particular language should not necessarily imply the absence of the latter value in the same language. And, secondly, the structural contexts in which these two values are licensed do not coincide. This means that in a particular language the aspectual C *que* may well be licensed in the specific structural organization of the PR, whereas in that language the adverbial C *que* might not be licensed in the structural configuration in which this value of the C appears.

From this second argument, we would in principle expect the (temporal) adverbial value of the C *que* to be licensed in other structural contexts of the language. In fact, this is what we find. In Spanish, for instance, the C *que* can have a temporal value in the structural configuration of a R clause. Compare the following sentences, from Bosque 1990a: 214:

- (71) a. No veo bien desde *que* tuve el accidente.no see.I well from that had.I the accident`I cannot see properly since I had the accident.'
 - b. No veo bien desde *donde* estoy.
 no see.I well from where am.I
 `I cannot see properly from where I am standing.'

In (71a) the C *que* must be used instead of the temporal adverb *cuando* `when'. However, the use of the C *que* is not possible in (71b) because here the adverb *donde* `where' makes reference to a

⁽see the appendix to chapter 3).
place. This contrast, then, shows that the temporal interpretation of the C *que* can be licensed in this structural configuration in Spanish (cf. (69)).⁹⁶

4.2.2.2 Balearic Catalan: que vs. qui

In the variety of Catalan spoken in the Balearic Islands, *que* is the neuter form of the C. This C is used to introduce ordinary embedded constructions, (72), and R clauses in those contexts in which the antecedent does not corefer with the grammatical subject of the R clause, (73a). If the antecedent of the R clause corefers with the grammatical subject, then the form that appears is *qui*, as shown in (73b). (I thank Zulema Borràs for providing me with these examples).

- (72) Ha dit { que / *qui } son pare vindria.
 have.he said that his father come.would.he
 `He said that his father would come.'
- (73) a. El llibre { que / *qui } té sa germana
 the book that has.she his/her sister
 `The book that his/her sister has'
 - b. El noi { *que / qui } va venir ahir
 the boy that came.he yesterday
 `The boy who came yesterday'

As far as the PR is concerned, *qui* is the form of the C that is always found in this variety. This is illustrated in (74).

⁹⁶ According to the Real Academia Española 1989, "[1]os vocablos relativos que empleamos como conjunciones temporales son: *cuando, cuanto, como* y *que*." § 3.2.1.3, p. 539.

(74) He vist en Joan {*que / qui } corria.
have.I seen the Joan that ran.he-IMPERF
`I saw Joan running.'

Of course, this is not surprising, but in fact expected, if we assume that the que / qui alternation that is observed in this variety of Catalan is like the que / qui alternation that is found in French (see section 3.1.2.3.2 in chapter 3). But this parallelism can only be apparent, since Balearic Catalan is a pro-drop language just like standard Catalan and unlike French. In other words, the vowel *i* that appears in the C *qui* in this variety cannot be considered a subject clitic. An argument that strongly substantiates this position is that in Balearic Catalan the form *qui* is also found in sentences of the following type:

(75) He arribat {*que / qui} l'autobús ja havia marxat.
have.I arrived that the bus already had gone
`I arrived {when / at a time at which} the bus had already left.'

In this example, the C *qui* must be used despite the presence of an overt subject, *l'autobús* `the bus', in a position immediately following the C, *qui*, and preceding the auxiliary, *havia* `had', in the embedded clause. Therefore, here *i* (or its trace) and *l'autobús* `the bus' cannot both be occupying the subject position of the embedded clause.

The importance of a construction like that in (75), however, does not lie only in the fact that it shows that the form *qui* in Balearic Catalan must be distinguished from the form *qui* in French. As can be observed, in (75) *qui* stands as the adverbial form of the C. That is, *qui* possesses a temporal meaning. Now it might well be the case that the appearance of the form *qui* in the PR (see (74))

may be indicating morphologically that this C has an aspectual value in this construction. In other words, *qui* may be indicating overtly that the C has a temporal value that operates on the internal temporal structure of the event that it introduces.⁹⁷

4.2.2.3 Salentino: ka vs. ku

Calabrese (1992) shows that Salentino, a dialect of Puglia in Italy, possesses the neuter C ka, (76a), and the C ku, (76b).

ka addzu raddzone. (76) Kretu a. believe.I that have.I reason 'I believe I am right.'

> b. Lu Karlu ole *ku* bbene krai. the Karlu wants.he that comes.he tomorrow 'Karlu wants to come tomorrow.'

Calabrese argues that in Salentino the construction that is composed of the C ku plus a finite verb is used in sentences like that in (77a) because this language lacks the version in which an infinitive is employed, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (77b).

- 'I saw the glass of water moving.' b.
 - L'he vist qui es movia.
 - it have.I seen that itself moved.it

⁹⁷ In standard Catalan qui means `who', as opposed to que which means `that'. Now the examples of PR in (i) clearly show that the form qui that appears in this construction in Balearic Catalan does not mean `who'.

vist sa got d'aigua qui es (i) a. He movia. have.I seen the glass of water that itself moved.it

^{&#}x27;I saw it moving.'

Note that in these examples the subject of the CSCl is an inanimate object, that is, sa got d'aigua `the glass of water'.

- (77) a. Lu Karlu ole *ku bbene krai*.the Karlu wants.he that comes.he tomorrow`Karlu wants to come tomorrow.'
 - b. *Lu Karlu ole *inire krai.* the Karlu wants.he come-_{INF} tomorrow

Conversely, in other Romance languages like Spanish, the option in which a C plus a finite verb is used is ruled out in this context, (78a), in favor of the infinitive construction, (78b).

(78) a. *Carlos quiere *que viene mañana*.Carlos wants.he that comes.he tomorrow

b. Carlos quiere *venir mañana*.
 Carlos wants.he come-_{INF} tomorrow
 `Carlos wants to come tomorrow.'

The general conclusion that Calabrese arrives at in his study is that the "special" C ku in Salentino functions as an "anaphoric tense" that mediates between the matrix verb and the embedded verb.

Now the distinction between the C ka and the C ku in Salentino is revealing for our purposes here because the C ku behaves in a very interesting way similar to what I claim to be the aspectual C *que* in the PR. For instance, Calabrese claims that the C ku, which is [+anaphoric tense], "constrains the freedom of the *tense* of the embedded clause" (p. 279) (my italics). Thus, a sentence introduced by the C *ku* cannot contain a past tense, as illustrated in (79) from Calabrese 1992: 278.

(79) *Oyyu/ulia la Maria ku *ssiu* ddai mprima. want.I- $\{PRES / PAST\}$ the Maria that went.she-PAST there before

Furthermore, he adds that the present and the perfect that can be found in the embedded clause only indicate aspectual distinctions, that is, whether or not the event described by the embedded clause is accomplished at the time indicated by the matrix verb. This is shown in the examples in (80), from Calabrese 1992: 278.⁹⁸

- (80) a. Oyyu la Maria ku *bbae* ddai mprima.
 want.I-PRES the Maria that come.she-PRES there before
 `I want Maria to go there before.'
 - b. Ulia la Maria ku *bbae/ia ssiuta* ddai mprima want.I-PAST the Maria that go.she-{PRES/PERF} there before
 `I wanted Maria to have gone there before.'

Something similar occurs with the [+aspectual] C *que* in the PR. The only difference lies in that in this case the information that is affected is not tense, but the aspectual specification of the

⁹⁸ There are two things that should be noted here. On the one hand, the lexical subject of the embedded (propositional) clauses in (80), namely *la Maria*, cannot appear between the C *ku* and the embedded finite verb. According to Calabrese, this is so because the C *ku* is cliticized onto the verb that it introduces. It must be remarked, furthermore, that this subject checks nominative Case within the embedded clause. This is one important property that distinguishes this type of (propositional) clause from the PR. Notice that both constructions have a similar word order. On the other hand, in sentences like those in (80) Spanish would use a subjunctive finite clause introduced by the C *que*. That is, it would use neither an infinitive clause nor a finite clause introduced by a "special" C. By a "special" C, I mean a C cliticized onto the embedded finite verb. Compare (80a) in the text with the Spanish example in (i).

⁽i) Quiero que María vaya allí antes. want.I that María goes.she-_{SUBJUNCT} there before `I want María to go there before.'

predication that this C introduces, that is, the aspectual information of the internal predication of the CSCI. For instance, the sentences in (81) show that the [+aspectual] C *que* does not constrain the temporal specification of the internal predication in the PR. Compare these examples with the sentence in (79) above.

- (81) a. He visto a Juan que *corría*.have.I seen to Juan that ran.he-PAST`I saw Juan running.'
 - b. Veo a Juan que *corre*.
 see.I to Juan that runs.he-PRES
 `I see Juan running.'
 - c. Veremos a Juan que *correrá* (en los mejores maratones.) see.will.we to Juan that run.he-_{FUT} in the best marathons
 `We will see Juan running in the best marathons.'

The sentences in (82), on the other hand, show that the [+aspectual] C *que* does constrain the aspectual specification of the internal predication in the PR (cf. (80)).

(82) a. *He visto a Juan que { corrió / estuvo corriendo / había corrido.}
 have.I seen to Juan that ran.he-perf / was.he-perf running / had.he run

Thus, the infinitival version must only be used in Spanish when the subject of the matrix clause and the subject of the embedded clause corefer (see (78)).

b. He visto a Juan que { *corría* / *estaba corriendo*.} have. seen to Juan that ran.he-IMPERF / was.he-IMPERF running

As can be observed here, only imperfective forms of the verb are allowed in this construction (see also section 4.2.1.3 above).

Now a conclusion that can be drawn at this point is that, in Salentino, the C ku constrains the tense of the clause that it introduces (see (79)), instead of the aspectual information of that clause (see (80)), because ku is a [+anaphoric tense] C.⁹⁹ Conversely, in Romance, the C *que* that shows up in the PR constrains the aspect of the predication that it precedes (see (81)), instead of the temporal information of that predication (see (82)), because *que* is a [+aspectual] C.

A comparison of the data in Salentino and the data in Romance also allows us to establish a tentative parallelism with regard to the complementary distribution of the PR and the PIC within the Romance languages. This tentative parallelism consists in saying that the PR, which is composed of the [+aspectual] C *que* and a finite verb, is used in languages like Spanish because this type of languages lacks the infinitive version of the construction, namely the PIC. The contrast is illustrated in (83).

- (83) a. Carlos ha visto a Juan que corría.
 Carlos has.he seen to-_{ACC} Juan that ran.he-_{IMPERF}
 `Carlos saw Juan running.'
 - b. *Carlos ha visto a Juan a correr.Carlos has.he seen to-_{ACC} Juan at run-_{INF}

⁹⁹ Recall that the present and the perfect forms of the verb indicate aspectual distinctions.

Conversely, the option in which a [+aspectual] C and a finite verb is used is ruled out in European Portuguese, (84a), in favor of the infinitive version, which is accepted, (84b). Compare these sentences with the examples in (77) and (78) above.

(84) a. *O Carlos viu *o João que corria*. the Carlos saw.he the João that ran.he-IMPERF

b. O Carlos viu *o João a correr*.
the Carlos saw.he the João at run-_{INF}
`Carlos saw João running.'

Summarizing, Calabrese shows that *ku* acts simultaneously as a C and as an anaphoric tense in Salentino. Here I claim that in the PR in Romance the C *que* behaves like both a C, in the sense that it is the head that typically introduces a finite clause in Romance, and an aspectual marker, since it provides the construction with a progressive interpretation (see section 5.4 below).

4.2.2.4 Dutch and German

Consider the examples in (85) and (86) from Dutch and German, respectively. (I thank Hans Broekhuis and Gretel de Cuyper for providing me with the Dutch data).

(85) Jan was een brief aan het schrijven.

Jan was a letter at the write 'Jan was writing a letter.'

(86) Jan war am Schreiben eines Briefes.

These sentences contain a construction that is very reminiscent of the PIC in European Portuguese. This construction is composed of a nominalized infinitive (*schrijven / Schreiben*), a locative P (*aan / an*),¹⁰⁰ and a lexical DP (*Jan*), which is interpreted as the subject of the infinitive. In the examples in (85) and (86), this DP has overtly raised to the subject position of the copular sentence. Like the PIC in European Portuguese, this construction also expresses an event in progress, an interpretation that is provided by the locative P *aan / an*.

Now an interesting thing that the constructions in (85) and (86) show us is that the strategy consisting in combining a (nominalized) verb and a locative P in order to express an event in progress is not so unusual crosslinguistically. But more importantly for our purposes here, they also show that a functional category associated with the (nominalized) verb intervenes between this verb and the locative P. Since the infinitive is nominalized in Dutch and German, this functional category is the D *het* and *dem*, respectively. In European Portuguese, on the other hand, the functional category that intervenes between the verb and the locative P *a* in the PIC is a C, because in this language the infinitive is verbal. In the Romance languages, the C only shows up overtly in finite clauses. So we must assume that this head is null in the PIC, as represented in the analysis of this construction in (12) above. As expected, the C is overt in the PR since the clause that this C introduces is finite. Now, in this construction, this C would function simultaneously as the functional category associated with the verb and as the element that supplies the aspectual information that the locative P provides in the PIC and in the Dutch and German construction in (85) and (86) above.

4.2.2.5 The PIC in Italian

¹⁰⁰ Am in German is the suppletive form of the P an `at' plus the D dem `the'.

As we have already seen in section 3.1 in chapter 3, the PR can combine with perception verbs and verbs like *to catch* in standard Italian. This is shown in the examples in (87) and (88).

- (87) a. L' ho visto che correva.him have.I seen that ran.he`I saw him running.'
 - b. L' ho visto che faceva il cretino con Maria.
 him have.I seen that did.he the cretin with Maria
 `I saw him flirting with Maria.'
- (88) L' ho sorpreso che rubava.him have.I caught that stole.he`I caught him stealing.'

Interestingly enough, in some Italian dialects the PR can be replaced in these contexts by the PIC. The example in (89) is from the Falconara dialect (Anna Cardinaletti, p.c.); (90) from the Venice dialect (Giuliana Giusti, p.c.); (91) from Rome (Gennaro Chierchia and Patrizia Pacioni, p.c.); and (92) from Naples (Donatella Gagliardi, p.c.).

- (89) L' ho visto a corre.¹⁰¹
 him have.I seen at run
 `I saw him running.'
- (90) L' ho visto a fa'l cretino co Maria. him have.I seen at do-INF the cretin with Maria

'I saw him flirting with Maria.'

- (91) L' ho sorpreso a rubare.
 him have.I caught at steal-INF
 `I caught him stealing.'
- (92) Ho sorpreso Gianni *a correre*.
 have I caught Gianni at run-_{INF}
 `I caught him running.'

More generally, the PR cannot be combined with a copula in standard Italian, just like in the rest of the Romance languages as we will see in chapter 5. This is shown in (93).

- (93) a. *Siamo stati *che ballavamo dalle 3 alle 5*.were.we been that danced.we of the 3 to the 5
 - b. *Quando me ne andai, rimasero che guardavano la televisione.
 when I _{PART} left remain.they that watched.they the TV

The interesting point here is that in copular sentences standard Italian must use either a gerund or, more importantly for our purposes in this chapter, the PIC. For instance, the PIC must be employed in the examples in (94). These examples are from Albertocchi and Zannier 1990: 139-141.

(94) a. Siamo stati *a ballare dalle 3 alle 5*.
were.we been at dance-INF of the 3 to the 5
`We have been dancing from 3 to 5.'

¹⁰¹ In this dialect, the infinitive suffix *-re* is dropped.

b. Quando me ne andai, rimasero a guardare la televisione.
 when I _{PART} left remain.they at watched-_{INF} the TV
 `When I left, they stayed watching TV.'

In the sentence in (94a) the PIC is required because the progressive situation that is described is temporally specified. In (94b) the PIC must be used because the progressive situation that the matrix sentence expresses keeps going on after the action indicated by the temporal adjunct.

All these examples would demonstrate once again the close relationship between the PR and the PIC, and hence the close relationship between the C *che* of the PR and the P *a* of the PIC.

4.2.3 How C Differs from a C and Resembles a P in the Pseudo-Relative

In this section I show that in the PR the C *que* cannot close the temporal chain of the finite clause that it introduces. That is, I show that in this construction the C *que* does not behave like a regular C. And, secondly, I discuss some consequences that derive from the function of this C as an aspectual marker.

4.2.3.1 The C Cannot Close the Temporal Chain in the Pseudo-Relative

As currently understood, a temporal chain (T-chain) is composed of three temporal points, which establish two temporal relations. The three temporal points are the so-called *Event Time, Reference Time*, and *Speech* or *Utterance Time*. In the syntactic structure, these three points are associated with VP, IP (or TP), and CP, respectively. The two temporal relations that these three temporal points establish involve the Reference Time and the Event Time (R, E), and the Speech Time and the Reference Time (S, R). This is schematically represented in (95) (for details, see Enç 1987, 1996, Hornstein 1990, Zagona 1990, 1991, Giorgi and Pianesi 1993, Stowell 1993, Guéron and Hoekstra 1995, Ormazabal and Uribe-Etxebarria 1995).



According to the organization in (95), CP is the highest syntactic projection of the sentence that is related to the T-chain of that sentence. Now the way in which the highest temporal point of the T-chain ends up being connected with the lower temporal points in the syntactic structure, especially the connection that is established between the Speech Time and the Reference Time, has been formulated in the literature in various but similar ways. For instance, Zagona (1990) argues that the Reference Time must move to Spec, CP for its licensing, whereas Guéron and Hoekstra (1995) claim that a Temporal Operator (TO) occupies Spec, CP, and that from this position it licenses the Reference Time. Here I will adopt this latter hypothesis for the sake of the argument that I am presenting in this dissertation.

If in the PR the C behaves like an aspectual marker, instead of a regular C as I am claiming here, we would expect the T-chain of this construction to be incomplete. This would be so since this T-chain would be composed of an Event Time and a Reference Time, which would be provided by the VP- and the finite IP-node, respectively. But at the same time it would lack a TO or the temporal point that indicates the Speech Time, which is commonly supplied by a regular CP-node. Now the empirical evidence that confirms that the T-chain of the PR must indeed be incomplete is provided by the following contrast:

- (96) He visto a Juan que {corría / *corre / *correrá} en el maratón.have.I seen to Juan that ran.he-IMPERF / runs.he / run.will.he in the marathon
- (97) He visto que Juan {corría / corre / correrá} en el maratón.
 have.I seen that Juan ran.he-IMPERF / runs.he / run.will.he in the marathon
 `I saw that Juan {ran / runs / will run} in the marathon.'

The sentence in (96) shows that the PR cannot be temporally independent from the matrix clause, as opposed to what occurs in an ordinary CP-complement, (97).

Now my proposal is that apparently the PR possesses all the elements that are required to establish an independent T-chain, namely a VP, an IP, and a CP. Nevertheless, the ultimate aspectual value of the CP-head in this construction prevents the CP-projection from functioning as an ordinary CP-node, in the sense that it cannot provide the clause that it precedes, namely the internal predication, with a TO, that is, a Reference Time. As a result, the incomplete T-chain of the construction will need to be connected to another CP-projection containing a TO. In the example in (96) this projection is the CP that introduces the matrix sentence.¹⁰²

The connection that must be established between the T-chain of the PR and the TO of the matrix clause in (96) is presumably mediated by the Event Time of the matrix sentence. This means that the T-chain of the PR must eventually adjoin to the matrix Event Time in order to be evaluated with regard to the matrix TO. This would account for the necessary matching between the temporal specification of the two T-chains, namely the T-chain of the PR and the T-chain of the matrix clause.

¹⁰² The absence of a TO in the PR cannot be only attributed to the presence of a phrase in Spec, CP. As already pointed out in section 3.1.1.3.2 above, the movement of a phrase to Spec, CP does not normally alter the T-chain of the clause introduced by that CP. This is shown in (i) for English and in (ii) for Spanish.

⁽i) I still don't know [CP where i [C' \emptyset [IP John {ran / runs / will run} t_i .]]]

⁽ii) Todavía no sé $[_{CP} donde_i [_{C'} \oslash [_{IP} \{ corrio / corre / correrá \} Juan t_i .]]]$

In contrast, the ordinary properties of the CP-projection in the propositional complement in the example in (97) allow the embedded clause to set up its own T-chain, and hence its own temporal specification. This explains the temporal independence of the embedded clause with regard to the matrix clause in sentences of this type.

The next question to ask is what happens when the PR appears in a higher structural position than the matrix Event Time. This configuration would be expected to be problematic if the T-chain of the PR must obligatorily adjoin to the matrix Event Time to be evaluated with regard to the matrix TO. But it would not be so if the T-chain of the PR could be connected to the matrix TO independently of the matrix Event Time. The former option predicts that the PR will only be found in a lower position than the matrix verb, namely below the Event Time of the matrix TO, that is, not necessarily below the Event Time of the matrix TO, that (99).^{103, 104}

 (98) a. *La fotografía de *Juan que baila el tango* ha sido la más the picture of Juan that dances.he the tango has.it been the most vendida. (Spanish)

- b. María ha fotografiado a *Juan bailando el tango*.
- 'María took a picture of Juan dancing the tango.'

b. La {visión / imagen} de Juan bailando el tango me persigue allá donde voy.

¹⁰³ It could be argued that the ungrammaticality of (98) derives from the fact that, in Spanish, for instance, the verb *fotografiar* subcategorizes for a gerund, instead of the PR. Compare (ia) and (ib).

⁽i) a. *María ha fotografiado a Juan que bailaba el tango.

María has.she photographed to Juan that danced.he the tango

But the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (98) cannot only be attributed to this fact since the PR cannot appear as a complement of a noun derived from the verb *ver* `to see' either. Compare (i) and (ii). Recall that the verb *to see* can be combined with the PR in Spanish.

 ⁽ii) a. *La {visión / imagen} de Juan que { baila / bailaba } el tango me persigue the vision image of Juan that dance.he danced.he the tango me follows allá donde voy. there where go.I

[`]The vision / image of Juan dancing the tango follows me wherever I go.'

¹⁰⁴ The PR cannot establish its own T-chain in Spanish, (i), and Catalan, (ii), even when this construction functions as a complement of a noun situated in an object position. In this case, only the gerund form *bailando / ballant* `dancing' is possible.

 ⁽i) Queremos ver la fotografia de Juan {*que baila(ba) / bailando} con María. want.we see the picture of Juan that dances(ed).he dancing with María `We want to see the picture of Juan dancing with María.'

sold.

`The picture of Juan dancing the tango was the one which sold the most.'

- b. *La fotografia d'en Joan que balla el tango ha estat la més venuda. (Catalan)
- c. *Fotografia lui *Ion ca dansa tango* s'a vandut cel mai bine. (Romanian)

(99) a. La fotografia di <i>Gianni che balla il tango</i> è stata la più venduta. (If	alian)
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

b.	A fotografia i	Gianni c	'aballa u tangu	fudi a chju	venduta.	(Calabrian)
----	----------------	----------	-----------------	-------------	----------	-------------

c. La photo de Jean qui danse le tango est la plus vendue. (French)

In these sentences, the PR appears in the subject position of the matrix sentence, and it functions as a complement of a noun. Now the different grammatical result that is obtained here depending on the Romance language used suggests that both options pointed out above are at work. Thus, the deviance of the examples in (98) would be explained by appealing to the idea that the Event Time of the PR cannot be adjoined to the matrix Event Time because the PR is in a higher position and, importantly, the Event Time of the PR cannot be evaluated with regard to the matrix TO independently in this type of language. On the other hand, the grammaticality of the sentences in (99) must be attributed to the idea that the Event Time of the PR can set up a temporal relationship with the matrix TO without having to incorporate into the matrix Event Time in such languages.

As expected, the same contrast is obtained in other types of constructions where similar structural conditions hold. This is the case of absolute constructions. Compare the examples in (100) with the ones in (101).¹⁰⁵

⁽ii) Volem veure la fotografia d'en Joan {*que balla(va) / ballant} amb la Maria.

¹⁰⁵ This type of construction improves in languages like Spanish, (i), and Catalan, (ii), when temporal or aspectual modifiers are introduced. The example in (ic) is from Suñer 1990: 458.

 ⁽i) a. ?Con Juan que *siempre* habla, nunca haremos nada.
 with Juan that always speaks.he never do.will.we nothing `With Juan always talking, we will never do anything.'

b. Con Juan que *habla* y *habla*, nunca haremos nada.

(100)	a.	*Con	Juan	que	habla,	nunca	haremos	nada.	(Spanish)
		with	Juan	that	speaks.he	never	do.will.we	nothing	
		`With Juan speaking, we will never do anything.'							

b.	*Amb en Joan que parla, mai farem res.	(Catalan)
c.	*Cu Ion ca vorbeste, nu vom face nimic.	(Romanian)

(101)	a.	Con Gianni che parla, non faremo mai niente.	(Italian)
	b.	Cu Gianni chi parla, non facimu mai nenti.	(Calabrian)
	C.	Avec Jean qui parle, on va rien faire.	(French)

We might wonder at this point whether the difference between these two groups of languages stems from a more general account. I believe that the answer is affirmative. This is suggested by another contrast that separates these two groups of languages once again. Consider the examples from (102) through (105).

(102) a. La fotografía de *Juan bailando el tango* ha sido la más vendida. (Spanish) the picture of Juan dancing the tango has been the most sold `The picture of Juan dancing the tango was the one which sold the most.'

with Juan that speaks.he and speaks.he never do.will.we nothing

[`]With Juan talking and talking, we will never do anything.'

c. Con el niño de los vecinos que no *paraba* de llorar, nos fue imposible pegar ojo. with the child of the neighbors that no stopped he of cry us was impossible stick eye `With the neighbors's child who wouldn't stop crying, it was impossible for us to sleep.'

⁽ii) a. (?)Amb en Joan que *sempre* parla, mai farem res.

b. Amb en Joan que *parla i parla*, mai farem res.

c. Amb el nen dels veïns que no parava de plorar, ens va ser impossible d'aclucar l'ull

Actually this improvement is expected since these modifiers provide information that helps the PR to set its own temporal framework. The fact that the same improvement is not observed in the structural contexts of the examples in (98) must be attributed to the semantic properties of the P *with* that appears in absolute constructions. In these

- b. La fotografia d'en Joan ballant el tango ha estat la més venuda. (Catalan)
- c. Fotografia lui *Ion dansand tango* s'a vandut cel mai bine. (Romanian)
- (103) a. Con *Juan hablando*, nunca haremos nada. (Spanish)
 with Juan speaking, never do.will.we nothing
 `With Juan talking, we will never do anything.'
 - b. Amb *en Joan parlant*, mai farem res. (Catalan)c. Cu *Ion vorbind*, nu vom face nimic. (Romanian)
- (104) a. *La fotografia di *Gianni ballando il tango* è stata la più venduta. (Italian)
 b.??La photo de *Jean dansant le tango* est la plus vendue. (French)
- (105) a. *Con *Gianni parlando*, non faremo mai niente. (Italian)b. *Avec *Jean parlant*, on va rien faire. (French)

These sentences are exactly the same as the ones that we have just mentioned above except for the fact that here the PR has been replaced by a gerund. The noteworthy thing is that in these cases we get precisely a reversal of the grammatical results that we obtained there. That is, in these examples a gerund is possible only in those languages in which the PR was precluded in the sentences above, and vice versa.

Now my claim is that the option that allows the incomplete T-chain of the PR to be directly evaluated with regard to the matrix TO, that is, independently of the matrix Event Time,¹⁰⁶ is

constructions, the P with indicates that the clause that it introduces is the cause of the event expressed by the matrix sentence.

¹⁰⁶ The independence with regard to the matrix Event Time in these cases is clearly seen in Italian where the past or the present tense can be used in sentences like that in (i).

available only as a default strategy in order to mend the impossibility of using a gerund in those particular positions in these languages.¹⁰⁷ The idea that this is a default strategy is suggested by the following contrast in Italian:

- (106) a. Ho visto *Gianni che correva*.have. I seen Gianni that ran.he`I saw Gianni running.'
 - b. *Ho visto *Gianni che correrà*.have.I seen Gianni that run.will.he

The ungrammaticality of (106b) shows that the Event Time of the PR must obligatorily adjoin to the Event Time of the matrix clause when this latter is situated in a position above the PR. Now, if the incomplete T-chain of the PR could always make use of the matrix TO by itself, then there would be nothing that would in principle prevent the sentence in (106b) from meaning something like *Ho visto che Gianni correrà* ('I saw that Gianni is going to run'), in which the tense of the embedded clause differs from the tense of the matrix clause, and the perception verb is interpreted in its epistemic meaning. As we can see in (106b), this is not the case.

Summarizing, in this section I have argued that the aspectual properties of the C in the PR prevents this construction from having its own TO. This explains why its incomplete T-chain needs to adjoin to the Event Time of the matrix clause in order to be evaluated with regard to the matrix TO. I have also shown that the T-chain of the PR can make use of the matrix TO as a default strategy in those configurations in which this construction occupies a position above the matrix

⁽i) La fotografia di Gianni che {*ballava / balla*} il tango è stata la più venduta. the picture of Gianni that danced.he dances.he the tango is been the most sold

[`]The picture of Gianni dancing the tango was the one that sold the most.'

¹⁰⁷ As we will see in chapter 5 below, both the PIC and the gerund can be considered the nonfinite versions of the PR.

Event Time. We saw that this option is only possible in the languages in which a gerund (the nonfinite version of the PR) is not available in that particular position, such as Italian and French.

4.2.3.2 C as an Aspectual Marker in the Pseudo-Relative

As has been already mentioned in section 4.2.1 above, the PR has a progressive interpretation, which, according to the idea presented in this study, is obtained through the aspectual C *que*. In this section I show some consequences that derive straightforwardly from the progressive interpretation of this construction and, more specifically, from the function of the C *que* as an aspectual marker.

To start off, compare the sentences in (107) and (108).

- (107) He visto a Juan que cruzaba la calle.have.I seen to Juan that crossed.he the street`I saw Juan crossing the street.'
- (108) He visto a Juan cruzar la calle.
 have.I seen to Juan cross-_{INF} the street
 `I saw Juan cross the street.'

The example in (107) contains the PR as a complement of the perception verb, whereas the perception verb complement in the sentence in (108) is an infinitive clause. In the former case, the complement describes an event in which Juan crosses the street and, more precisely, a step or degree of the event of crossing the street. In contrast, in the latter case, the complement describes an event in which Juan crosses the street of crossing the street is presented as started, carried out, and finished. In other words, the infinitival clause describes the

whole event of crossing the street.¹⁰⁸ Again, the translation of these constructions into English already gives us a first clue regarding the aspectual differences that exist between these two types of complement. As can be observed, the PR and the infinitive clause are translated into English by means of a gerund and a bare infinitive, respectively. Now this clue is supported by several empirical facts. For instance, the grammatical contrast that is observed between the two examples in (109) and (110), which are the result of adding an adjunct to the sentences in (107) and (108) above.

(109) Vi *a Juan que cruzaba la calle*, pero de repente apareció un camión saw.I to Juan that crossed.he the street but suddenly appeared a truck y lo atropelló.
and him ran.over.it

'I saw Juan crossing the street, but suddenly a truck appeared and ran over him.'

(110) *Vi *a Juan cruzar la calle*, pero de repente apareció un camión saw.I to Juan cross-_{INF} the street but suddenly appeared a truck y lo atropelló.
and him ran.over.it

The ungrammaticality of the example in (110) derives from the semantic conflict existing between the meaning of the perception verb complement and the meaning of the adjunct. On the one hand,

I saw the João eat-_{INF} the cake `I saw João eat the cake.'

¹⁰⁸ Compare this pair of examples with the sentences in (61) and (62) above, repeated here as (i) and (ii), respectively. (i) Eu vi o João *a* comer o bolo.

I saw the João at eat-_{INF} the cake `I saw João eating the cake.' (ii) Eu vi o João comer o bolo.

the infinitival complement expresses an event, and indicates that this event is started, carried out, and finished. On the other hand, the adjunct also describes an event, and indicates that this event occurs before the accomplishment of the event expressed by the infinitive and that it prevents this earlier event from being accomplished. Hence the semantic conflict.

In contrast, the grammaticality of the sentence in which the PR is used as a complement, instead of an infinitive, indicates that the meaning of the PR is not incompatible with the meaning of that adjunct. From this fact, then, we arrive at the conclusion that the PR can make reference only to a temporal stage of the event that it expresses. In other words, the PR can describe an event without implying the accomplishment of that event. As defended in this dissertation, the element that provides the PR with this progressive interpretation is the aspectual marker *que*.

A second fact that derives from the aspectual properties of the PR is found in the restriction regarding the type of event that can be inserted in the structural configuration of the PR. Consider the following examples:

- (111) a. *En un minuto he visto a Juan que parpadeaba sólo una vez.in a minute have.I seen to Juan that blinked-IMPERF only one time
 - b. *En un minuto *lo* he visto *que parpadeaba sólo una vez*. in a minute him have.I seen that blinked-_{IMPERF} only one time
- (112) En un minuto he visto que Juan parpadeaba sólo una vez.
 in a minute have.I seen that Juan blinked.he-IMPERF only one time
 `In a minute I saw that Juan blinked only once.'

In the examples in (107) and (108) in the text the contrast is between the PR and the infinitive clause, whereas in (i) and (ii) the contrast is between the PIC and the infinitive. As can be observed, the aspectual contrast between these two pair

In all three sentences the embedded verb is inherently punctual. That is, the event that this type of verb describes is conceptualized as a short and discrete event in which both the initial and final temporal points of that event are in view at once.¹⁰⁹ Now the deviance of the examples in (111) is straightforwardly accounted for by adopting the idea put forward here. That is, these sentences are ungrammatical because the aspectual value of the C *que* in the PR, which resembles the value of the locative P *a* in the PIC, is incompatible with the aktionsart of punctual verbs. And this is so because this type of verb does not display a set of temporal points which the aspectual marker *que* can operate on (I return to this in section 5.4 below). On the other hand, the grammaticality of the sentence in (112) indicates that the C *que* that heads a regular proposition does not function as an aspectual marker. Thus, the lexical aspect or aktionsart of the embedded verb will not be constrained by any element in this type of construction.

Interestingly, the sentences in (111) become grammatical if the modifiers *en un minuto* `in a minute' and *sólo una vez* `only once' are dropped:

- (113) a. He visto a Juan que parpadeaba.
 have.I seen to Juan that blinked-IMPERF
 `I saw Juan blinking.'
 - b. Lo he visto que parpadeaba.
 him have.I seen that blinked-IMPERF
 `I saw him blinking.'

The reason for this lies in that here the aspectual marker *que* can operate on the embedded verb by iterating the punctual event that this verb describes.

of sentences is exactly the same.

¹⁰⁹ See Vendler 1967 for a classification of types of verbs according to their *lexical aspect* or *aktionsart*.

Thirdly, the idea that the C *que* functions as an aspectual marker in the PR helps us understand why the verb has to appear in an imperfective form in this construction, as shown in (114).

- (114) a. He visto a Juan que { *corría* / *estaba corriendo*.} have.I seen to Juan that ran.he-_{IMPERF} / was.he running
 - b. *He visto a Juan que { *corrió* / *había corrido*.} have.I seen to Juan that ran.he-_{PERF} / had.he run

As it is well-known, an imperfective form denotes the unboundedness of the event that the verb refers to. In other words, the event is presented as a continuous or unfinished process. This contrasts with the meaning of perfective forms of the verb, which indicate the completion of the event. Now the aspectual restriction that is observed in the PR is immediately explained bearing in mind the aspectual role that the C *que* has in this construction. In (114a) the aspectual C *que* will be able to operate on the embedded event because this event is presented as unbounded. That is, the internal temporal domain of this event is constituted of a set of temporal points. This will allow the aspectual C *que* to localize an internal temporal point contained within that domain. Hence the progressive interpretation of the PR. Conversely, the aspectual C *que* will not be able to operate on the embedded event in (114b) because this event is presented as bounded. That is, its internal temporal domain is constituted of one single temporal point, which is the temporal point that refers to the accomplishment of this event. Thus, the C will not be able to localize an internal temporal point contained within this single temporal point. I will take up this issue in section 5.4 in the following chapter, where I present in some detail the mechanism that operates within the PR, the PIC, and the Gerund Construction.

To conclude this section, let me just remark that the aspectual C *que* that is found in the PR constrains the domain that it precedes, that is, the internal predication of the CSCl, just like other

elements of the language do. For instance, the particle *se* in Spanish can only operate on verbs the object of which is a DP, instead of an NP. This is shown in the contrast between (115a) and (115b).

- (115) a. Se comió dos hamburguesas.
 SE ate.he two hamburguers
 `(S)he ate two hamburguers.'
 - b. *Se comió hamburguesas.

Or, as noted by de Miguel (1990), the conjunction *cuando* `when' in the Spanish sentences in (116) can only introduce a clause containing a verb in an imperfective tense. These examples are from de Miguel 1990: 18.

- (116) a. {*Fuimos / *ibamos*} al cine ayer.
 went.we-_{PERF} / went.we-_{IMPERF} to the cinema yesterday
 `We went to the cinema yesterday.'
 - b. *Cuando* {**fuimos* / *ibamos*} al cine ayer, nos encontramos
 when went.we-_{PERF} / went.we-_{IMPERF} to the cinema yesterday us met.we
 con Pedro.
 with Pedro

`When we were going to the cinema yesterday, we met Pedro.'

Compare these sentences with the examples in (114) above. So, in this sense, the aspectual C *que* does not differ from these other elements.

4.2.4 C and P: Aspectual Markers or Temporal Connectors

The arguments provided up to this point tell us that the C *que* in the PR, (117), and the P *a* in the PIC, (118), are aspectual markers which operate on the event that they introduce. Furthermore, in both cases these aspectual markers are the head of the construction, namely the head of a CSCI.

- (117) He visto a María que corría.have.I seen to María that ran.he`I saw María running.'
- (118) Eu vi a Maria *a* correr.I saw the Maria at run-_{INF}`I saw Maria running.'

We have also seen, on the other hand, that the C *que* that heads an ordinary proposition does not possess aspectual properties, in the sense that this type of C does not modify the event that it precedes. In this case, the C is simply related to the temporal properties of the event that it introduces. More specifically, it is the highest head related to the T-chain of that event. The function of the C *que* in the example in (119) then is to connect the embedded clause with the matrix clause. (119) He visto que Juan ha corrido.have.I seen that Juan has.he run`I saw that Juan has run.'

In Romance the locative P *a* can also bear a temporal specification and function as a clausal connector, just like the C *que* in (119). An example in European Portuguese is provided in (120), taken from Rigau 1992.

(120) Ao entrares tu, a Maria saiu.
at.the enter-_{INF}-2SG you the Maria went.out.she
`Upon your coming in, Maria left.'

According to Rigau 1992, the P a in examples of this sort behaves like a temporal operator that designates the temporal simultaneity between the event described by the embedded clause and the event expressed by the matrix sentence. She claims that the connection between these two clauses is possible because in these constructions the infinitival clause is situated in a position that is related to the matrix I' or T'.¹¹⁰ Another interesting point that Rigau refers to is that this P a presents this temporal coincidence as punctual.

Now the conclusion that can be drawn by comparing (117) and (119), on the one hand, and (118) and (120), on the other, is that the temporal information that the C *que* in (117) and the P *a* in (118) have must be directed towards modifying the embedded event that they introduce because these two heads do not succeed in reaching the IP, or TP, of the matrix clause. The reason for this lies in that, as we already know, the C *que* in the PR and the P *a* in the PIC head a CSCI. That is, they are not the highest functional head introducing the whole construction. Conversely, the C *que*

¹¹⁰ In the example in (120), in particular, the adjunct would be occupying a Topic position. For arguments that strongly indicate that the infinitive is not nominalized in this type of construction, see Hernanz 1982 and Rigau 1992.

in (119) and the P a in (120) are the highest elements introducing the whole clause. This means that the temporal information that these two heads have will be able to connect the embedded clause that they introduce with the matrix clause, and hence the T-chains of these two clauses. This explains the *aspectual* interpretation of *que* and *a* in (117) and (118), and their function as *temporal connectors* in (119) and (120).

4.3 When C is not a P

There are constructions in Romance that resemble the PR. In this section, I demonstrate that this similarity reduces to an accidental coincidence of the elements that make up these constructions and the word order in which these elements are presented in the sequence. More specifically, I show that the C *que* in these other constructions does not behave like an aspectual marker.

To begin with, consider the following sentences in Spanish, (121), and Catalan, (122).

- (121) a. Quiero *una botella de agua que esté fría*.
 want.I a bottle of water that be.it-_{SUBJCT} cold
 `I want a bottle of cold water.'
 - b. La quiero que esté fría.
 it want.I that be.it-_{SUBJCT} cold
 `I want it cold.'
- (122) a. Vull una ampolla d'aigua que sigui freda.
 - b. La vull que sigui freda.

As can be observed, the embedded sequence that follows the matrix verb in (121a) and (122a) is composed of a DP, the C *que*, and a finite clause. Like in the PR, the DP is semantically interpreted

as the subject of the embedded finite verb. Furthermore, in these examples this DP also checks accusative Case within the main sentence, as shown in (121b) and (122b). Similarities of this kind, then, may lead us to think that these constructions are in fact instances of PR, and hence instances of a CSCl (see, for example, Laka and Quer 1996).

The most immediate problem for this conclusion, however, is found in the fact that the embedded sequences in (121) and (122) do not denote an event in progress. For example, these sequences cannot be translated by means of a gerund in languages like English, as shown in (123). Nor is this option possible in Spanish and Catalan either, which are languages that also accept the gerund (see chapter 5). This is illustrated in (124) and (125) in Spanish and Catalan, respectively.

(123) a. *I want a bottle of water being cold.b. *I want it being cold.

(124) a. *Quiero una botella de agua estando fría.b. *La quiero estando fría.

- (125) a. *Vull una ampolla d'aigua essent freda.
 - b. **La* vull *essent freda*.

My claim here is that the examples in (121) and (122) are not examples of PR. Hence they cannot be assigned the analysis that I propose for this construction in this work.

Other arguments that support this claim are the following. First of all, the sequence introduced by the C *que* in these examples can be immediately preceded by the coordinating conjunction *pero* / *però* `but':

(126) a. Quiero una botella de agua, pero que esté fría.

want.I a bottle of water but that be.it cold `I want a bottle of water, but I want it cold.'

- b. La quiero, *pero* que esté fría.
 it want.I but that be.it cold
 `I want it, but I want it cold.'
- (127) a. Vull una ampolla d'aigua, però que sigui freda.
 - b. La vull, però que sigui freda.

This fact is important here since the presence of *pero* / *però* `but' does not alter the general meaning of the sentences.

Secondly, other Romance languages also possess the syntactic combination that appears in (121a) / (122a) but, interestingly enough, they do not admit the structure in (121b) / (122b), in which the DP shows up cliticized onto the matrix verb by means of an accusative clitic. The examples in (128) are in Italian.

(128) a. Voglio una bottiglia d'acqua che sia fredda.

b. *La voglio che sia fredda.

Obviously, the sentence in (128b) would be expected to be well-formed if the complement in (128a) were a true PR. The only possible way to express the intended meaning in (128b) in Italian is as illustrated in (129).

(129) La voglio fredda.

it want.I cold

`I want it cold.'

The same structure is also correct in Spanish, (130), and Catalan, (131).

- (130) La quiero fría.
- (131) La vull freda.

Thirdly, the structure in (121a) / (122a) is found in European Portuguese as well, as shown in (132a). This is revealing given the fact that the PR is not possible in this Romance language, as has been already discussed above. Furthermore, the preceding DP cannot appear cliticized onto the matrix verb in this language either, just like in Italian. This is illustrated in (132b) (cf. (128b)).

- (132) a. Quero uma garrafa de agua que esteja fria.
 - b. *Quero-a que esteja fria.

Again, the correct structure to express the intended meaning of (132b) is the same as in Italian, as shown in (133) (cf. (129)).

(133) Quero-a fria.

Fourth, the replacement of the construction headed by the C *que* by the PIC in European Portuguese yields an ungrammatical sentence. This is illustrated in (134).

(134) a. *Quero *uma garrafa de agua a estar fria*. want.I a bottle of water at be-_{INF} cold b. *Quero-*a a estar fria*. want.I it at be-_{INF} cold

And finally, the verb *querer* `to want' does not typically select the PR. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the example in (135).

(135) *Quiero *a Juan que corra en el maratón*. want.I to Juan that runs.he-_{SUBJCT} in the marathon

This example contrasts with the grammaticality of the sentence in (136) in which the verb *querer* `to want' combines with a CP, that is, a propositional complement.

(136) Quiero que Juan corra en el maratón.
want.I that Juan runs.he-_{SUBJCT} in the marathon
`I want Juan to run in the marathon.'

All these facts indicate that the embedded constructions in (121) and (122) are not instances of PR, and hence that they must be analyzed in a different way. I leave this issue for further research.

4.4 Summary

In this chapter we have seen that the so-called *Prepositional Infinitival Construction* also responds to the CSCI-model that was presented in chapter 2. This construction then stands as the second example of CSCI that is put forward in this work.

We have seen that the PIC behaves like an ordinary SCI. However, its distinguishing trait lies in its internal composition. Like the PR, this construction is also constituted of two predication domains. The internal predication domain is formed by a null argumental subject pro or PRO and the constituent introduced by V', or more specifically I'. The external predication, on the other hand, is constituted of a lexical DP or PRO, which is base-generated in Spec, PP, and the constituent introduced by P'.

In the examination of this second instance of CSCl, we have seen that the general conditions established by the CSCl-model must be also satisfied in this construction. For instance, the subject of the PIC is base-generated in the specifier of the highest extended projection of the lexical head of the clause, which in this case is Spec, PP. Furthermore, the subject of the internal predication and the subject of the external predication must possess the same referent, and the former must necessarily be null.

In the second part of this chapter (section 4.2), I have claimed that the only phonetically realized elements that separate the PR from the PIC, namely *que* and *a*, respectively, behave alike. That is, both *que* and *a* function in these constructions as an aspectual marker. The aspectual interpretation of these two elements accounts for the progressive interpretation of these two constructions.

I have provided arguments that indicate that the C *que* that appears in the PR does not behave like the C *que* that introduces a regular proposition, and I have also discussed the consequences that derive from treating the C *que* in the PR as an aspectual marker.

Appendix: The Pseudo-Relative headed by a modal or factive C

The purpose of this appendix is to show that the PR may be also headed by what I tentatively call a *modal* C in languages like Catalan and by a *factive* C in the Balkan languages. The existence of these two variants, then, serves to reinforce the idea that the C *que* in the type of PR investigated in

this dissertation is not a regular C, but a C with specific semantic properties, that is, aspectual properties.

As we have already seen in chapter 3, the PR in a language like Catalan is headed by the C *que*, as shown in (1).

(1) He vist *en Joan que corria darrera la Maria*.
have.I seen the Joan that ran.he after the Maria
`I saw Joan running after Maria.'

The interesting thing is that in this language the PR can also be headed by the modal C *com* `as'. An example is provided in (2).

(2) He vist *en Joan com corria darrera la Maria*.
have.I seen the Joan as ran.he after the Maria
`I saw Joan as he was running after Maria.'

Now a particularly important fact regarding the embedded construction in (2) is that this construction can be interpreted here as a single constituent. So, as expected, constituency tests can be successfully applied to this construction. This is shown by the following grammatical sentences:

(i) Focus-fronting:

(3) (?)Fins i tot *en Joan com corria darrera la Maria* vam veure ahir!even and all the Joan as ran.he after the Maria saw.we yesterday

'Even Joan running after Maria we saw yesterday.'

(ii) Neuter clitic ho `it':

(4) Vaig veure en Joan com corria darrera la Maria. Tothom *ho* va veure.
saw.I the Joan as ran.he after the Maria. everybody it saw
`I saw Joan running after Maria. Everybody saw it.'

(iii)Answer:

(5) (?)Saps què vam veure ahir? En Joan com corria darrera la Maria.
know.you what saw.we yesterday the Joan as ran.he after the Maria
`Do you know what we saw yesterday? Joan running after Maria.'

(iv)Pseudo-clefted:

(6) L'única cosa que vaig veure va ser *en Joan com corria darrera la Maria*.
the only thing that saw.I was the Joan as ran.he after the Maria
`The only thing that I saw was Joan running after Maria.'

(v) Clefted:

(7) (?)*En Joan com corria darrera la Maria* va ser l'única cosa que vaig veure.the Joan as ran.he after the Maria was the only thing that saw.I

'Joan running after Maria was the only thing that I saw.'

The tests in (ii)-(v), furthermore, show that this construction is a clause, instead of, say, a complex DP. Note that the elements *ho* `it', *què* `what', and *l'única cosa* `the only thing', which in these tests are referring to the construction under discussion, are elements that refer to an event rather than to a (complex) DP. The appropriate forms for this latter construction would be *el* `him', *qui* `who', and *l'únic* `the only one', respectively.

On the other hand, the following set of properties demonstrates that the characteristics that typically define the PR headed by the aspectual C *que* also defines the PR headed by the modal C *com*. First of all, the lexical DP that precedes the C *com* also checks accusative Case within the matrix clause when this construction functions as a perception verb complement. This is shown in (8).

(8) L' he vist com corria darrera la Maria.
him have.I seen as ran.he after the Maria
`I saw him as he was running after Maria.'

This means that this construction must also possess a null subject pro, which must be the argument that checks the nominative Case that is assigned by the finite IP-head of the construction.

Secondly, that lexical DP must necessarily corefer with the *subject* of the internal predication, as the contrasts in (9) indicate.

(9) a. Jo mateix vaig veure *en Joan*_i com (*pro*_i) pegava els nens.
I self saw.I the Joan as beat.he the children 'I myself saw Joan as he was beating the children.'
b. *Jo mateix vaig veure en Joani com (proj) pegaven els nens.

I self saw.I the Joan as beat.they the children

- c. *Jo mateix vaig veure *els nens*_i com (en Joan) (*els*_i) pegava (en Joan.)
 - I self saw.I the children as the Joan them beat.he the Joan

Again, the subject of the internal predication that the lexical DP must corefer with must be the *grammatical subject* of the internal predication, instead of, say, its semantic subject. Therefore, the lexical DP will have to corefer with the internal argument of the embedded verb if this argument functions as the grammatical subject of the internal predication. The sentences in (10) illustrate this.

- (10) a. Jo mateix vaig veure *en Joan*_i com quèia (*pro*_i).
 - I self saw.I the Joan as fell.he
 - 'I myself saw Joan as he was falling.'

- b. Jo mateix vaig veure *en Joan*_i com era apallissat (*pro*_i) per una banda
 I self saw.I the Joan as was.he beaten by a gang de brètols.
 - of hooligans
 - 'I myself saw Joan as he was beaten by a gang of hooligans.'

In these sentences, the verb contained in the PR is an unaccusative verb in (10a), and a passive verb in (10b). This means that the argument that ends up functioning as the grammatical subject of the internal domain is a semantic object. This is, then, the argument that the lexical DP will have to corefer with.

As in the PR headed by the C *que*, the subject of the internal predication must also be null in this variant, that is, a pro. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (11) in which an overt pronoun shows up.

(11) *He vist en Joan_i com ell_i corria darrera la Maria. have.I seen the Joan as he ran.he after the Maria

Notice, incidentally, that this is one property that distinguishes this type of PR from the English construction introduced by the particle *as*. Compare (11) and (12).

(12) I saw John_i as he_i was running after Maria.

Fourth, the tense of the construction has to match the tense of the matrix clause. Furthermore, the embedded verb must also be in an imperfective form. These two properties are illustrated in the examples in (13) and (14), respectively.

- (13) He vist en Joan com {*corria* / **correrà*} darrera la Maria.
 have.I seen the Joan as ran.he / run.he.will after the Maria
- (14) He vist en Joan com {*corria / *havia corregut / *ha corregut*} darrera la Maria.
 have.I seen the Joan as ran.he-IMPERF / had.he run / has.he run after the Maria

And finally, as has already been discussed in section 4.2.3.1 above, the PR cannot appear in a position higher than the Event Time of the matrix clause in a language like Catalan. The Catalan example cited in (98b) above is repeated here as (15).

(15) *La fotografia d' *en Joan que balla el tango* ha estat la més venuda.
 the picture of the Joan that dances.he the tango has.it been the most sold

Now the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (16) indicates that the same constraint applies to the PR headed by the modal C *com*.

(16) *La fotografia d' *en Joan com balla el tango* ha estat la més venuda.
 the picture of the Joan as dances.he the tango has.it been the most sold

All these tests, then, indicate that, from a syntactic viewpoint, the PR headed by the modal C *com* behaves just like the PR headed by the aspectual C *que*.

In section 4.2.3.2 above, I argued that the progressive interpretation of the PR headed by the aspectual C *que* explains the grammaticality of sentences like the one in (17), in which the adjunct denies the accomplishment of the event described by the PR.

(17) He vist *en Joan que creuava el carrer*, però de cop ha aparegut have.I seen the Juan that crossed.he the street but suddenly has.it appeared un camió i l' ha atropellat.
a truck and him has.it run.over.it

'I saw Joan crossing the street, but suddenly a truck appeared and ran over him.'

Now consider the example in (18), in which the PR that is headed by the aspectual C *que* in (17) has been replaced by a PR headed by the modal C *com*.

- (18) *He vist *en Joan com creuava el carrer*, però de cop ha aparegut have.I seen the Juan as crossed.he the street but suddenly has.it appeared un camió i l' ha atropellat.
 - a truck and him has.it run.over.it

As can be observed, the sentence that is obtained is ungrammatical. The ungrammaticality of this sentence shows us two things. First, it demonstrates that the progressive interpretation of the PR in (17) must not be attributed to the imperfective form of the verb that this construction contains. As has been already mentioned above (see footnote 8), an imperfective form of a verb only indicates that the event described is not completed, rather than a step or degree of that event, which is what the progressive meaning expresses. And, secondly, it shows that in (18) the particle *com* does not have the function that the particle *que* has in (17). As I am claiming here, in (17) *que* possesses an aspectual value, whereas the value of *com* in (18) is modal. As a modal particle, *com* indicates the true existence of the totality of the event that it introduces. In other words, it indicates that that event is accomplished. Hence the ungrammaticality of (18).¹¹¹

The idea that the particle *com* possesses a modal value in this type of PR places this variant closer to the type of PR that is found in the Balkan languages, where the head of the construction is a *factive* C.

¹¹¹ In an example like that in (i), in which the event expressed by the internal predication is situated in a future, the particle *com* presents that event as an event that is expected to be accomplished.

 ⁽i) Des d'aquí veurem en Joan com creuarà el carrer.
 from of here see.we.will the Joan as cross.he.will the street
 `From here we will see Joan as he crosses the street.'

In Greek, for instance, the C *oti* differs from the C *pou* in that the former is used to indicate that the situation described by the clause that it precedes is possible, whereas the latter is utilized to introduce a factive clause. Consider the following sentences, from Varlokosta 1994: 241:

(19) Fovame *oti* tha taksidepso moni mou.I am scared that will travel alone`I am afraid that I will travel alone.'

(20) Fovame *pou* tha taksidepso moni mou.I am scared that will travel alone`I am afraid that I will travel alone.'

In the example in (19), where the embedded clause is introduced by the C *oti*, it is claimed that `that I will travel alone' is just a possibility. In contrast, the sentence in (20), where the C that heads the embedded clause is *pou*, says that `that I will travel alone' is a fact.

Now the interesting thing for our purposes here is that Greek possesses a construction that behaves fundamentally like the PR in Romance. An example is given in (21). (The Greek examples are from Angela Ralli, p.c.).

(21) Ida ton Jani pou etrexe.saw.I the_{-ACC} Jani that ran.he`I saw Jani running.'

As can be observed, the C that heads this type of PR in Greek is the factive C *pou*, instead of the nonfactive C *oti*.^{112, 113}

As in the other two variants of PR, the lexical DP *ton Jani* in the construction in (21) does not check the nominative Case assigned by the finite IP-head of the internal predication, but the accusative Case assigned by the matrix verb. This can be observed in the example in (22).

(22) *Ton* ida pou etrexe. him saw.I that ran.he `I saw him running.'

Furthermore, the construction in (21) can appear in a position higher than the Event Time of the matrix clause, just like the PR headed by *che* in languages of the Italian-type. This is shown in (23).

- (23) a. I fotografia tu *Jani pou xorevi tango* pulithike perissotero.
 the picture of Jani that dances.he tango has-been-sold.it much-more
 `The picture of Jani dancing the tango was the one which sold the most.'
 - b. Me *ton Jani pou mila* den tha kanume pote tipota.
 with the Jani that speaks.he, no _{FUT} do.we never nothing
 `With Jani talking, we will never do anything.'

- saw.I that left.he
- `I saw that he left.'

¹¹² When a perception verb is combined with a complement introduced by the nonfactive C *oti*, the interpretation of the perception verb is epistemic. The example in (i) is from Varlokosta 1994: 241:

⁽i) Idha oti efige.

Note that here *oti* does *not* head a PR. It merely introduces a proposition, namely an ordinary CP-constituent. ¹¹³ Here I do not discuss the question whether the particle *com* in Catalan, which here I have tentatively called a ¹⁰⁴ modal C', and the `factive C' *oti* in Greek are the same type of C. Notice that *a priori* the modal meaning of *com* as a head that expresses actuality or true existence is very close to the meaning of *oti* as a head that expresses factivity.

The type of PR in which a factive C is utilized is also found in other Balkan languages like Serbo-Croatian, (24), and Macedonian, (25). (These examples are from Olga Miseska Tomic, p.c.).

- (24) Videla sam *Huana kako trchi*.seen am.I Huan that runs.he`I see Huan running.'
- (25) Go vidov Huana kako trcha.him see.I Huan that runs.he`I see Huan running.'

Again, the lexical DP that precedes the factive C *kako*, namely *Huana*, checks accusative Case within the matrix clause in the examples in (24) and (25). This is illustrated in (26) and (27) in Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian, respectively.

- (26) Videla sam ga kako trchi.seen am.I him that runs.he`I see him running.'
- (27) Go vidov kako trcha.him see.I that runs.he`I see him running.'

Like Greek (see (23)), this type of PR can also appear in a position higher than the Event Time of the matrix clause, as shown in (28) in Serbo-Croatian and in (29) in Macedonian.

- (28) Slika *Huana kako igra tango* bila je najvise prodavana.
 picture Huan.of that dances.he tango been is most sold
 `The picture of Huan dancing the tango was the one which sold the most.'
- (29) Fotografijata na *Huan kako igra tango* najmnogu se prodavashe.

All in all, there are two general conclusions that can be drawn from the data presented in this appendix. On the one hand, the PR can be headed crosslinguistically by at least three types of predicational C. First, the predicational C *que / che* (Spanish, Catalan, Italian, French, etc.), which has an *aspectual* value. Secondly, the predicational C *com* (Catalan), which possesses *modal* properties. And, finally, the predicational C *pou* (Greek) or *kako* (Serbo-Croatian and Macedonia), which has a *factive* meaning.¹¹⁴ In all three cases, this predicational C heads a CSCl and modifies the event that it introduces.

And, secondly, the C *que / che* that shows up in the PR in the Romance languages should not be treated as the neuter C *que / che* that is found introducing a proposition in these languages. This idea is supported here by the modal and factive properties that the C has in the type of PR that has been examined in this appendix.

¹¹⁴ As I have already suggested, it could well be the case that these two latter ones might be the same type of C.

The Gerund Construction and its relationship with the PR and the PIC

"Never let 'hard to do' get in the way of something worth doing."

(Laura Schlessinger)

5.1 The Pseudo-Relative, the Prepositional Infinitival Construction, and the Gerund Construction

In the previous chapters we saw that the Pseudo-Relative (PR) and the Prepositional Infinitival Construction (PIC) are both constructions that respond to the Complex Small Clause-model (CSCI) that is defended in this dissertation. It was argued that, apart from many other specific details, the close structural relationship that these two constructions share is what basically accounts for their complementary distribution in Romance.

In the first part of this chapter I introduce and explore a third instance of verbal CSCI. This third example of CSCI is the construction that here I will call the *Gerund Construction* (GC). In the second part of the chapter (section 5.4), I present and discuss the mechanism that provides the PR, the PIC, and the GC with a progressive interpretation.

But before discussing the syntactic behavior of the GC in detail, let me first present some crosslinguistic data that will allow us to see *a priori* the close relationship between the PR, the PIC, and the GC.

5.1.1 The Pseudo-Relative in Romance

In chapter 3 it was argued that the PR is a construction that is employed in the majority of the Romance languages to express an event in progress. We saw that the PR can be combined with perception verbs in Italian, (1a), French, (1b), Spanish, (1c), and Catalan, (1d), whereas in other structural contexts this construction is not always accepted in all these languages. For instance, the PR is possible in absolute constructions in Italian, (2a), and French, (2b), whereas it is precluded in Spanish, (2c), and Catalan, (2d).

- a. Ho visto *Gianni che ballava il tango*.
 have.I seen Gianni that danced.he the tango
 `I saw Gianni dancing the tango.'
 - b. J'ai vu Jean qui dansait le tango.
 - c. He visto a Juan que bailaba el tango.
 - d. He vist en Joan que ballava el tango.
- (2) a. Con *Gianni che parla*, non faremo mai niente.
 with Gianni that speaks.he no do.will.we never nothing
 `With Gianni talking, we will never do anything.'
 - b. Avec Jean qui parle, on va rien faire.
 - c. *Con Juan que habla, nunca haremos nada.¹¹⁵
 - d. *Amb en Joan que parla, mai farem res.

On the other hand, it was pointed out in chapter 4 that the PIC, which is the construction that is commonly used in European Portuguese to describe an event in progress, is not accepted in any of these structural contexts in (standard) Italian, (3a)/(4a), French, (3b)/(4b), Spanish, (3c)/(4c), and Catalan, (3d)/(4d).

(3) a. *Ho visto *Gianni a ballare il tango*.have.I seen Gianni at dance-_{INF} the tango

¹¹⁵ See footnote 21 in chapter 4.

- b. *J'ai vu Jean a danser le tango.
- c. *He visto a Juan a bailar el tango.
- d. *He vist en Joan a ballar el tango.
- (4) a. *Con *Gianni a parlare*, non faremo mai niente. with Gianni at speak-_{INF} no do.will.we never nothing
 - b. *Avec Jean a parler, on va rien faire.
 - d. *Con Juan a hablar, nunca haremos nada.
 - d. *Amb en Joan a parlar, mai farem res.

Although the PIC is generally excluded in all these Romance languages, things are different when the GC is the construction considered. As can be observed in the examples in (5) and (6), some Romance languages reject the GC but, interestingly enough, others accept it.

(5) a. *Ho visto *Gianni ballando il tango*. have.I seen Gianni dancing the tango

b.??J'ai vu Jean dansant le tango.

- c. He visto a Juan bailando el tango.
- d. He vist en Joan ballant el tango.
- (6) a. *Con *Gianni parlando*, non faremo mai niente.with Gianni speaking no do.will.we never nothing
 - b. *Avec Jean parlant, on va rien faire.

- c. Con Juan hablando, nunca haremos nada.
- d. Amb en Joan parlant, mai farem res.

These examples show that the GC yields an ungrammatical sentence when it is combined with a perception verb or is inserted in an absolute clause in Italian, (5a)/(6a), whereas in French the resulting sentences are highly marginal, (5b)/(6b). Conversely, the sentences obtained are absolutely perfect in languages like Spanish,¹¹⁶ (5c)/(6c), and Catalan, (5d)/(6d). In fact, in these two languages the GC is the construction that must be used in absolute clauses. Compare (2c)-(2d) with (6c)-(6d).

5.1.2 The Prepositional Infinitival Construction in European Portuguese

As already discussed in chapter 4, European Portuguese does not accept the PR despite being a Romance language. Instead, this language must use the PIC. This can be observed by comparing the examples in (7), which contain the PR, with the sentences in (8), in which the PIC is utilized.

- (7) a. *Eu vi o João que leia o livro.I saw the João that read.he the book
 - b. *Com *o João que fala*, não faremos nada.
 with the João that speaks.he no do.will.we nothing
- (8) a. Eu vi os meninos a ler(em) o livro.
 - I saw the children at read- $_{INF}$ -(AGR) the book

¹¹⁶ American Spanish behaves just like Iberian Spanish in this respect. That is, it generally accepts both the PR and the GC.

'I saw the children reading the book.'

b. Com *os meninos a falar(em)*, não faremos nada.
with the children at speak-_{INF}-(AGR) no do.will.we nothing
`With the children talking, we will do nothing.'

As far as the GC is concerned, this construction is highly marginal in standard European Portuguese:

- (9) a.??Eu vi os meninos lendo o livro.I saw the children reading the book
 - b.??Com *os meninos falando*, não faremos nada. with the children speaking no do.will.we nothing

But, interestingly enough, the sentences in (9) are acceptable in the southern dialects of Portugal.

5.1.3 The Gerund Construction in English and Brazilian Portuguese

In chapters 3 and 4 it was mentioned that the PR and the PIC were translated into languages like English by means of the GC. At this stage, this fact is not surprising bearing in mind that (standard) English possesses neither the PR, (10), nor the PIC, (11).

- (10) a. *I saw John that was dancing the tango.
 - b. *With John that is talking, we will never do anything.

- (11) a. *I saw John at dance the tango.
 - b. *With John at talk, we will never do anything.

In this language, only the GC is possible, as shown in (12).

- (12) a. I saw John dancing the tango.
 - b. With John talking, we will never do anything.

Brazilian Portuguese, on the other hand, does not accept the PR, just like European Portuguese. Compare (13) and (7).

(13) a. *Eu vi o João que leia o livro.I saw the João that read.he the book

b. *Com o João que fala, não faremos nada.
 with the João that speaks.he no do.will.we nothing

But, more interestingly, this variety does not accept the PIC either, as opposed to European Portuguese. Compare (14) and (8).

(14) a. *Eu vi os meninos a ler(em) o livro.
I saw the children at read-_{INF}-(AGR) the book
b. *Com os meninos a falar(em), não faremos nada.
with the children at speak-_{INF}-(AGR) no do.will.we nothing

In Brazilian Portuguese only the GC can be employed in these structural contexts, just like English. This is shown in (15) (cf. (9)).

- (15) a. Eu vi os meninos lendo o livro.I saw the children reading the book
 - b. Com *os meninos falando*, não faremos nada. with the children speaking no do.will.we nothing

My purpose in the following section is to show that the GC behaves just like the PR (chapter 3) and the PIC (chapter 4), and that it also responds to the Complex Small Clause-model presented in chapter 2. This idea straightforwardly explains the relationship between the PR, the PIC, and the GC in the languages that are considered here.

5.2 The Gerund Construction

The construction that I simply refer to as the *Gerund Construction* (GC) in this work is apparently composed of a DP and a verb which bears the suffix *-ing* in English (*-ndo* in Spanish and *-nt* in Catalan). An example containing the GC is given in (16).

(16) I saw John running.

As shown in (16), the GC can appear as a perception verb complement. But this construction can be also found in other structural contexts. For instance, it can be found with verbs like *to catch*, (17); functioning as a complement of a noun, (18); in absolute constructions, (19); in locative

constructions, (20); with verbs like *to remember*, (21); as free expressions in limited cases, (22); and with a copula, (23), among other specific contexts.

- (17) I caught *John stealing*.
- (18) The picture of *John dancing the tango* was the one which sold the most.
- (19) With *John talking*, we will never do anything.
- (20) There is *a pot of water boiling* in the kitchen.
- (21) I still remember *John running*.
- (22) *Girls dancing a waltz.*
- (23) John is running.

The GC that I am interested in here should not be confused with the so-called *Reduced-Relative* (RR) clause:

(24) *The boy coming tomorrow* is my cousin.

The tests that were utilized in chapter 3 to distinguish the PR from a Relative (R) clause are useful once again to demonstrate that the GC and the RR clause are different constructions, despite their apparent similarity. Some of these tests are the following:

(i) First of all, the DP that introduces the GC can be a proper name, (25). This is not possible in the RR, (26).

- (25) I saw John running in the marathon.
- (26) **John coming tomorrow* is my cousin.

(ii) The DP can be pronominalized and extracted in the GC, (27). These operations, however, cannot be applied when the construction involved is the RR, as shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (28).

- (27) a. I saw *him* kissing Mary.
 - b. JOHN I saw kissing Mary.
 - c. Who did you see kissing Mary?
- (28) a. *I met *him* coming tomorrow last semester in Los Angeles.(cf. I met the student coming tomorrow last semester in Los Angeles.)
 - b. **THE STUDENT* I met coming tomorrow last semester in Los Angeles.
 - c. *Who did you meet coming tomorrow last semester in Los Angeles?

(iii)The relative pronoun *who* cannot be inserted in the GC without altering the meaning of the construction, (29). In contrast, the insertion of *who* in the RR does not alter the general meaning of the phrase, (30).

- (29) #I saw John *who* was running in the marathon.(cf. I saw John running in the marathon.)
- (30) The boy *who* is coming tomorrow is my cousin.

(iv) The sequence that the gerund introduces can only be extraposed in the GC. Compare (31) with (32).

(31) I saw John last semester in Los Angeles running in the marathon.

(32) *I met *the boy* last semester in Los Angeles *coming tomorrow*.

(v) The tense of the GC must match the tense of the matrix clause, (33). This property is not observed in the RR, (34).

- (33) I saw John running in the marathon {*yesterday* / **tomorrow*.}(cf. I saw that John is running in the marathon *tomorrow*.)
- (34) The man arriving *tomorrow was* my teacher.

(vi) The GC and the RR can co-occur without being coordinated, (35). This is not possible when both are RR clauses, (36).

- (35) I saw the student [_{RR} running in the marathon] [_{GC} training with John.]
- (36) *The student [_{RR} running in the marathon] [_{RR} training with John] has already arrived.

The results obtained by applying these tests, then, indicate that the GC and the RR are different constructions.

Here I assume that the syntactic structure of a RR is essentially like the syntactic structure of a R clause. Thus, the phrase in (37a) would be presumably analyzed as shown in (37b).¹¹⁷

(37) a. The man reading the newspaper

¹¹⁷ In Siloni 1995 in particular it is proposed that the null head \emptyset is a D in the structure in (37b). But notice that this idea does not account for the fact that in this construction the gerund is verbal. We know that because the verb can assign accusative Case to its object. Therefore, if here the gerund is verbal, it seems reasonable to think that, in principle, the highest extended projection of that V will be a CP, as depicted in (37b). It could be also the case that in (37) a null D introduces a CP-projection the head of which is also null.

b. [DP the [NP man [CP Op_i [C' $Ø_C$ [IP t_i reading the newspaper]]]]]

In this chapter I do not discuss the problems that would derive from applying the analysis in (37b) to the GC, since many of these problems would simply reproduce the drawbacks that arise from analyzing the PR as a R clause, already discussed in section 3.1.1.1 in chapter 3. More interestingly, my next goal is to show the serious problems that arise if what I call the "standard" analysis of the Propositional Gerund is assigned to the construction under investigation. This will lead us to the analysis of the GC in terms of a CSCl in section 5.2.2.

5.2.1 The Standard Analysis

The standard, and apparently the most simple analysis that is commonly assigned to the GC, (38a), is the one depicted in (38b) (for a discussion of different types of constructions containing a gerund, see, for instance, Gee 1975, 1977; Declerk 1982; Reuland 1983; Johnson 1988; Cinque 1992).

- (38) a. I saw John running.
 - b. $[_{CP} \ [_{C'} \ \mathcal{O}_C \ [_{IP} \ John_i \ [_{I'} \ [_{VP} \ t_i \ running \]]]]$

The analysis in (38b) states that the verb *running* heads a VP-projection. The subject of the construction, namely *John*, is base-generated in Spec, VP, as usual, and later it moves to Spec, IP to check the EPP-feature, and presumably null Case. The IP-projection, in turn, is introduced by a CP-projection the head of which is null, that is, $Ø_C$.

The following sections provide arguments that substantiate the idea that the GC in (38a) must not be analyzed as in (38b), and that the structure in (38b) is more appropriate for what I call the *Propositional Gerund* (PG), which appears in sentences like the one in (39a). (39) a. I hate everybody interrupting me all the time.

b. $[_{CP} [_{C'} Ø_C [_{IP} everybody_i [_{I'} [_{VP} t_i interrupting me all the time]]]]]$

5.2.1.1 Crosslinguistic Comparison

The phonological elements that constitute both the PG and the GC in English are basically identical. That is, these two constructions are formed by a verb bearing the suffix *-ing* and the arguments that this verb may select. Some examples of the PG and the GC are provided in (40) and (41), respectively.

- (40) a. I hate everybody telling me what I have to do.
 - b. I counted on *them finishing the book soon*.
- (41) a. I saw John driving a white van.
 - b. With John driving my van, we won't win the race.

Now the intuition that the embedded structures in (40) are linked to the ontological category of *proposition*, hence the name 'Propositional Gerund', is empirically supported by languages like Spanish and Catalan. As we have already seen in section 5.1 above, Spanish and Catalan possess the GC, just like English. Nevertheless, the gerund cannot be used in these languages in constructions like those in (40), where the PG appears. Thus, the Spanish counterparts of the English sentences in (40) are ungrammatical, as illustrated in (42).

- (42) a. *Odio a todo el mundo diciéndome lo que tengo que hacer.hate.I to all the world telling.me what that have.I that do
 - b. *Contaba con ellos terminando el libro pronto.

counted.I with they finishing the book soon

Not surprisingly, the construction that is employed in Spanish in these cases is a *that*-clause, which, recall from section 3.1.1.3.2 in chapter 3, is the syntactic category that typically expresses the ontological category of proposition. This is shown in (43).¹¹⁸

- (43) a. Odio que todo el mundo me diga lo que tengo que hacer.hate.I that all the world me tell.it what that have.I that do`I hate everybody telling me what I have to do.'
 - b. Contaba con *que ellos terminaran el libro pronto*.
 counted.I with that they finish.they the book soon
 `I counted on them finishing the book soon.'

As expected, the Spanish counterparts of the English sentences in (41) are grammatical. This is illustrated in (44).

- (i) a. *Teniendo tanto dinero*, yo no me preocuparía.
 having so.much money I no me worry
 `Having so much money, I wouldn't worry.'
 - b. *Estando el jefe allí*, no se atrevieron a decir nada.
 being the boss there no _{SE} dare to say anything
 `The boss being there, they didn't dare to say anything.'

¹¹⁸ The PG in Spanish and Catalan is only possible in the so-called (propositional) absolute constructions. Some examples in Spanish are provided in (i).

- (44) a. Vi *a Juan conduciendo una furgoneta blanca*.
 saw.I to Juan driving a van white
 `I saw Juan driving a white van.'
 - b. Con *Juan conduciendo mi furgoneta*, no ganaremos la carrera.
 with Juan driving my van no win.will.we the race
 `With Juan driving my van, we won't win the race.'

This is so since, in contrast to the previous cases, here we are not dealing with the PG, but with the GC, that is, a construction that is linked to the ontological category of *event*.

Furthermore, if the GC that appears in the sentences in (44) is replaced by a *that*-clause, namely a syntactic category that is associated with the ontological category of proposition, then the sentence either changes its meaning, (45a), or becomes ungrammatical, (45b).

- (45) a. #Vi que Juan conducía una furgoneta blanca.
 saw.I that Juan drove.he a van white
 `I saw that Juan was driving a white van.'
 - b. *Con *que Juan conduce mi furgoneta*, no ganaremos la carrera. with that Juan drives.he my van no win.will.we the race

Exactly the same holds for English. Compare the examples in (45) in Spanish with their English counterparts in (46).

(46) a. #I saw that John was driving a white van.

b. *With that John drives my van, we won't win the race.

5.2.1.2 Temporal Constraints

The temporal mismatch that can exist between the tense of the PG and the tense of the matrix sentence can be attributed to the propositional nature of the PG. This can be observed in examples like the one in (47).

(47) *Yesterday* I counted on them finishing the book *early next week*.

The ungrammaticality of (48), on the other hand, shows that this temporal mismatch is not permitted when the embedded clause is the GC, namely a construction that denotes an event.

(48) **Yesterday* I saw John running in the marathon *next week*.

Notice that (48) cannot mean something like (49), in which a proposition, that is, a *that*-clause, appears.

(49) *Yesterday* I saw that John is running in the marathon *next week*.

5.2.1.3 No Subject PRO

A third property that distinguishes the PG from the GC is found in the fact that the subject of the PG can be either a lexical DP or a PRO when this construction functions as a complement. In contrast, only a lexical DP-subject is allowed in the GC when this construction appears in a complement position. The relevant contrast, then, is that between the sentence in (50) and the one in (51).

(50) I hate {*everybody* / *PRO* } telling him what he has to do.

(51) I saw $\{John / *PRO\}$ watching the stars.

(cf. I saw *myself* watching the stars.)

Moreover, the PG is not accepted in a control context in Spanish. So the Spanish counterparts of the English sentences in (52) are also deviant, as shown in (53).

(52) a. Sometimes I_i hate (*PRO*_i) being a cop.

b. I_i don't remember (*PRO*_i) having been here before.¹¹⁹

(53) a. *A veces odio siendo policía.at times hate.I being cop

b. *No recuerdo *habiendo estado aquí antes*.no remember.I having been here before

In this context, Spanish must use an infinitival clause, as illustrated in (54).

(i) I still remember John running.

(ii) a. Todavía recuerdo a Juan corriendo.

still remember.I to Juan running

`I still remember Juan running.'

b. Encara recordo en Joan corrent.

¹¹⁹ The verb *to remember* is actually ambiguous in the sense that it can select both the PG, as in the sentence in (52b), and the GC, as in the example in (21) above, repeated here as (i)

In Romance, this verb combines with a *that*-clause, or with an infinitive if the matrix subject corefers with the embedded subject (see (53b)), when the complement denotes a proposition. If this complement denotes an event, then the verb combines with the PR in languages like Italian (see section 3.1 in chapter 3); the PIC in European Portuguese (see section 4.1 in chapter 4); and the GC in languages like Spanish, (iia), and Catalan, (iib).

(54) a. A veces (pro_i) odio (*PRO_i*) ser policía.
at times hate.I be-_{INF} cop
`Sometimes I hate being a cop.'

b. No (pro_i) recuerdo (*PRO_i*) haber estado aquí antes.
no remember.I have-_{INF} been here before
`I don't remember having been here before.'

5.2.1.4 DP-Movement

In the PG, the subject of the clause cannot undergo DP-movement. This can be observed in the examples in (55).

- (55) a. **The boys*_i were hated t_i eating the fish.
 - b. **John* was denied t_i singing the aria.

The grammaticality of the sentences in (56) serves to show that verbs like *to hate* and *to deny* can undergo passivization. So the ungrammaticality of the examples in (55) should not be attributed to the passive forms of the verbs used in these examples.

- (56) a. The boys_i are hated t_i .
 - b. The allegation_i was denied t_i .

Once again, the PG contrasts with the GC since, in this latter case, the subject of the clause can be moved to the subject position of the matrix sentence when the main verb is passivized. This is illustrated by the grammatical sentence in (57).

(57) John_i was seen t_i running.

5.2.1.5 Wide Scope Interpretation

An argument related to the previous one is that the PG strongly favors a narrow scope interpretation of its subject, as already noted in Reuland 1983: 112. In contrast, the GC allows both a narrow and a wide scope interpretation. To see this, consider the sentences in (58) and (59). (58) is from Reuland 1983: 112.

- (58) Cindy hated *everyone eating the fish*.
- (59) In that college, I've seen *every student taking part in an initiation*.

The example in (58), which contains the PG as a complement, cannot mean something like (60a). The only possible interpretation is (60b).

- (60) a.??[every x, x a person] Cindy hated [x eating fish.]
 - b. Cindy hated [every x, x a person] [x eating fish.]

In contrast, the sentence in (59), in which the GC shows up, allows the two interpretations in (61), that is, the wide and the narrow scope interpretation of the quantifier *every*.

- (61) a. [every x, x a student] I've seen [x taking part in an initiation.]
 - b. I've seen [every x, x a student] [x taking part in an initiation.]

5.2.1.6 Transparent Context

Another important semantic distinction that separates the PG from the GC lies in that the PG behaves like an opaque domain. Consider the sentences in (62).

- (62) a. Mary hates John interrupting her all the time.
 - b. John is the dean.
 - c. Mary hates the dean interrupting her all the time.

The opaque behavior of the PG is shown by the fact that the sentence in (62a) and the sentence in (62c) do not express the same truth value even if the equation in (62b) is true (see also footnotes 13 and 14 of chapter 3).

Again, the behavior of the PG contrasts with the behavior of the GC. Consider the following examples:

- (63) a. Mary saw John running.
 - b. John is the dean.
 - c. Mary saw the dean running.

In this case, the implication that is made in the sentence in (63c) is true if the equation in (63b) is also true.

5.2.1.7 No Expletive *there*

Finally, the expletive there can appear functioning as the subject of the PG, as shown in (64).

- (64) a. I remember *there* arriving three men.
 - b. You may count on *there* being a lot of trouble tonight.

Interestingly, this is not possible in the GC, as the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (65) illustrate.

- (65) a. *I saw *there* arriving three men.
 - b. *With *there* coming John tomorrow, we can leave on Thursday.

Very roughly, it has been argued in the literature that the expletive *there* must be associated with an NP, or DP, and that the chain that is established between these two elements must satisfy the standard conditions on movement. Thus, the example in (66a), taken from Chomsky 1995: 156, is deviant because the LF-movement of the associate, *a man*, towards the position occupied by the expletive, *there*, creates a violation of the ECP at this level. That this is so is suggested by the ungrammaticality of (66b), in which exactly the same movement has been carried out but this time at Syntax, that is, before Spell-Out.

- (66) a. **There*_i was thought that pictures of *a man*_i were on sale.
 - b. *A man_i was thought that pictures of t_i were on sale.

Now the ungrammaticality of the GC in (65a), for instance, could not be explained by appealing to some sort of violation involving movement. The main reason for this is that the LF-movement of the associate *three men* towards the position occupied by the expletive *there*, allegedly Spec, IP according to the standard analysis in (39b), would be perfectly possible at Syntax. Compare the two sentences in (67).

- (67) a. *I saw there_i coming three men_i.
 - b. I saw *three men*_i coming t_i .

In fact the PG demonstrates that this movement is legitimate both at LF and at Syntax, as shown in (68).

- (68) a. I remember *there*_i coming *three men*_i.
 - b. I remember *three men*_i coming t_i .

The contrast that is observed in (67), then, shows that the structure of the embedded clause in (67b) cannot be like the structure of the embedded clause in (67a), that is, the structure of the PG (see (39b)). More precisely, the contrast in (67) demonstrates that the lexical DP *three men* cannot be the internal argument of the unaccusative verb *coming* in the GC that appears in (67b).

Note, incidentally, that the fact that the expletive *there* cannot appear in the subject position of the GC immediately eliminates an analysis of this construction in terms of a bare IP-projection.

The general conclusion that can be drawn from the arguments presented so far is that the structure in (39b) may be appropriate for accounting for the semantic and syntactic behavior of the PG. But, crucially, this structure does not explain the different behavior that the GC has.

5.2.2 A Complex Small Clause-Analysis for the Gerund Construction

The analysis that I would like to propose here for the GC that is found in sentences like the one in (69) is as depicted in (70).

(69) I saw John running.



In this structure, the verb heads a VP-projection. In Spec, VP, there is an argumental PRO, which satisfies the thematic specification of the verbal head, or predicate. In Spec, IP, there is a null expletive PRO_{expl} that checks the EPP-feature of the internal predication. The head of the CP-projection is null, that is, $Ø_C$. Immediately above CP there is an F. This F is the head of the highest functional projection that is associated with the verb, and the head where the suffix *-ing* ends up checking features at LF. Finally, the lexical DP or PRO is merged with F'. So it appears in its specifier, that is, Spec, FP.

The goal of the following section is to demonstrate that the GC conveys a subject-predicate relationship similar to the one established in a regular SCl.

5.2.2.1 The Subject-Predicate Relationship in the Gerund Construction

The tests that were utilized in the previous chapters to show that the PR and the PIC set up a subject-predicate relationship are again useful at this stage to demonstrate that the GC also sets up a subject-predicate relationship. Some of these tests are the following:

(i) First of all, the GC is not syntactically independent. This means that the GC in (71) cannot be anchored in a temporal domain by itself, as the sentence in (72) can.

(71) #John running.

(72) John was running.

(ii) The GC may trigger singular agreement on the matrix verb when this construction is found functioning as the subject of a finite sentence. Crucially, this may occur even when the lexical DP that introduces the GC is plural, as shown in (73).

(73) John and Mary running *is* something not to be missed.

(iii)In the GC, the gerund can be negated, (74), coordinated, (75), and extraposed, (76).

(74) I saw John *running*, not *jumping*.

- (75) a. I didn't only see John *running*, but also *jumping*.
 - b. I saw John *running* and *jumping*.
- (76) I saw John yesterday in the afternoon *running in the park*.

All these properties are in accordance with the idea that the gerund is a predicate.

(iv) The structural contexts in which the GC is possible are the structural contexts in which other types of SCl can also be found. This is illustrated in (77).

- (77) a. I saw John running.
 - b. I saw John {with Mary / drunk / seated / green.}
 - (v) The GC can be coordinated with other types of SCI:
- (78) a. When I entered, I saw *Mary smoking marijuana* and *John totally drunk*.
 - b. I saw John working and Mary seated on the couch.

According to the analysis of the GC that is proposed here, the lexical DP or PRO in Spec, FP in the structure in (70) is the argument that functions as the subject of the CSCl; the sequence introduced by F', the CSCl-predicate; and F, the head of the construction.

5.2.2.2 Argumental or Adjunct Complex Small Clause

The analysis of the GC that is defended in this work predicts that this instance of CSCl will appear in a structural position functioning as either an argumental CSCl or an adjunct CSCl. In the former case, Spec, FP will host a lexical DP. In the latter, it will host a PRO, just like in regular SCls functioning as adjuncts.

Once again constituency tests can tell us whether the GC functions as an argumental or as an adjunct CSCl. In the following two sections we will see that the GC can be interpreted as an argumental or adjunct CSCl when it combines with a perception verb, (79), and only as an adjunct CSCl when it is found with verbs like *to catch*, (80).

- (79) I saw John running.
- (80) I caught John stealing.

5.2.2.2.1 The Gerund Construction as an Argumental Complex Small Clause

The tests used here predict the grammaticality of the sentence only when the lexical DP, *John* in (79), and the string following this DP, *running* in (79), form a single constituent. In this section these constituency tests are applied to the GC that appears with the perception verb *to see* and the verb *to catch*. The tests are the following:

(i) Right-Node Raising:

- (81) I saw and Mary heard John coming into the room.
- (82) *I caught and Mary heard *John stealing*.

(ii) Focus-fronting:

- (83) Even John dancing a tango we saw yesterday!
- (84) *Even *John dancing a tango* we caught yesterday!(iii) Neuter clitic *it*:
- (85) I saw Mary running. Peter saw *it* too.
- (86) *I caught Mary running. Peter caught *it* too.

(iv) Answer:

- (87) What did you see yesterday night? *John running on the main street*.
- (88) *What did you catch yesterday night? John stealing.

(v) Clefting:

- (89) It was *John running* that was the only thing that I saw that night.
- (90) *It was *John stealing* that was the only thing that I caught that night.

(vi) Pseudoclefting:

(91) The only thing that I saw that night was *John running*.

(92) *The only thing that I caught that night was *John stealing*.

(vii) Coordination:

- (93) I saw *John running* and *Mary jumping*.
- (94) *I caught *John running* and *Mary jumping*.

(viii) Constructions not only ... but also:

- (95) I didn't only see John dancing a tango, but also Mary drinking glasses of brandy.
- (96) *I didn't only catch *John dancing a tango*, but also *Mary drinking glasses of brandy*.

The results that are obtained in this section demonstrate that the lexical DP and the gerund only form a single constituent when they are combined with a perception verb, as opposed to what occurs when they appear with a verb like *to catch*. This means that only the former type of verb will be able to select the GC as its object.

5.2.2.2.2 The Gerund Construction as an Adjunct Complex Small Clause

The same type of tests can be used to show that the GC is an adjunct CSCl in (80) and in one interpretation of (79). The only difference with regard to the previous cases, however, lies in that this time we expect a grammatical sentence only when the lexical DP, *John* in (80), and the gerund, *stealing* in (80), are treated as two constituents. The tests are the following:

(i) Focus-fronting:
- (97) Even *John* we saw yesterday *dancing a tango*!
- (98) Even John we caught yesterday dancing a tango!

(ii) Clitic her:

- (99) I saw Mary running. Peter saw *her* (*running*) too.
- (100) I caught Mary stealing. Peter caught *her* (*stealing*) too.(iii) Answer:
- (101) Who did you see *running on the main street* last night? John.
- (102) Who did you catch *stealing* last night? John.

(iv) Clefting:

- (103) It was *John* who was the only one that I saw *running* that night.
- (104) It was *John* who was the only one that I caught *stealing* that night.

(v) Pseudoclefting:

- (105) The only one that I saw *running* that night was *John*.
- (106) The only one that I caught *stealing* that night was *John*.

The results obtained here demonstrate that the GC can also function as an adjunct CSCl. In this case, only the lexical DP is the argument selected by the matrix verb. This argument, in turn, will control the null subject PRO that is base-generated in the Spec, FP of the adjunct GC.

5.2.2.3 Internal Organization

In this section I examine the elements that constitute the GC, and their organization according to the CSCI-structure in (70).

5.2.2.3.1 PRO and Expletive

As in the other instances of CSCl that have been explored in the previous chapters, the internal predication of the GC also contains a null argumental subject, which here is a PRO, and a null expletive, which here is a PRO_{expl} . This is represented in (107b).

(107) a. I saw John reading the newspaper.

b.

 $[_{FP} John [_{F'} -ing [_{CP} [_{C'} Ø_C [_{IP} PRO_{expl i} [_{I'} [_{VP} PRO_i read- the newspaper]]]]]]]$

The idea that there is a null argumental subject PRO in the internal predication of the GC is supported by the fact that a null argumental subject PRO can be licensed within the domain of a gerund clause. This is clearly shown in sentences like the ones in (108), which contain a PG.

- (108) a. John kept walking slowly, while sweeping the road.
 - b. Rudy didn't remember *reading the letter*.

These sentences would presumably be analyzed as in (109) (cf. (107b)).

(109)

- a. John_i kept walking slowly, [CP [C' while [IP PRO_{expl} [I' [VP PRO_i sweeping the road]]]]]
- b. Rudy_i didn't remember $[_{CP} \quad [_{C'} \otimes_{C} \quad [_{IP} PRO_{expl} \quad [_{I'} \quad [_{VP} PRO_{i} \text{ reading the letter }]]]]$

Now the only difference between the structure in (107b) and the structures in (109) is that in these latter ones the argumental PRO is controlled by an argument that is situated in a position outside the domain of the PG, whereas in (107b) the argumental PRO is controlled by an argument situated in a position within the domain of the GC.

In the CSCI-structure in (107b), the null argumental subject PRO presumably remains within VP at Syntax (see Baltin 1995). This means that at this level this argument must be coindexed with a PRO_{expl} , which would be merged with I' and would check the EPP-feature of the clause. Later, at LF, the formal features of the argumental PRO will need to raise to IP to check null Case and ϕ -features. The chain formed by these two elements, then, is [PRO_{expl}, PRO], which contains a single theta-role and a single Case. At this stage, we can already see that the organization of the elements that are contained within the IP-node in the GC, (107b), does not differ at all from the organization of the elements that appear in an ordinary gerund clause, (109).

Notice, incidentally, that Chomsky's definition regarding the architecture of a control infinitival, reproduced in section 4.1.1 in chapter 4, can also be extended to the structure that makes up a control gerund. Recall that Chomsky's definition of control infinitivals is that they

"fall together with finite clauses, headed by C selecting nondefective T (with tense-modal structure and a full complement of ϕ -features). Like other CPs, they generally undergo movement and clefting and can appear as root expressions (typically with *wh-phrase* Spec or as discourse fragments), and [null] structural Case is assigned to the subject of T. These properties are common to CPs and distinguish them from raising / ECM infinitivals headed by a Tdef [defective tense], lacking C and tense structure and assigning no Case to subject, and lacking the distributional freedom of CP." (Chomsky 1998: 19)

So, as represented in the structures in (107b) and (109), both types of control gerunds would contain an IP as well as a CP-node.

As predicted by the general CSCI-model presented in chapter 2, an overt pronoun cannot appear as the subject of the CSCI internal predication in the GC either. Thus, the example in (110) is ruled out, and cannot have the meaning that the sentence in (111) has.

(110) *I saw $John_i he_i$ running.

(111) I saw *John*_i while *he*_i was running.

The null subject PRO, on the other hand, would be the argument that locally binds the anaphor in sentences like that in (112).

(112) I saw the boys shaving *themselves*.

According to the CSCI-analysis in (70), the local domain of the anaphor *themselves* in this construction is the internal predication. So the argument that must bind the anaphor within this local domain must be the null argumental subject PRO, that is, the argument base-generated in Spec, VP, instead of the lexical DP *the boys*, which is base-generated in Spec, FP.

5.2.2.3.2 The Lexical DP

In the structure in (70), FP is the highest functional projection associated with the lexical head of the construction, namely V. This means that the subject of the CSCl will be the phrase that is basegenerated in its specifier, that is, Spec, FP. As has been already pointed out, this phrase is a lexical DP when the CSCl is an argument and a PRO when it functions as an adjunct. In the structural contexts in which the GC functions as a complement of a verb, the lexical subject of the CSCl will check accusative Case within the matrix sentence. This is shown in (113).

(113) I saw him running.

When accusative Case is not available, then this argument will move further up in the structure to check another Case. If the matrix verb appears passivized, the Case checked will be nominative. This is illustrated in (114).

(114) He was seen running.

Note that the fact that the CSCI-subject can move to an A-position, as in the example in (114), is perfectly captured by the CSCI-structure in (70). This is so since, according to this analysis, the CSCI-subject would move here from Spec, FP where it is base-generated, that is, an A-position, to the subject position of the matrix clause, again an A-position. This operation, then, would yield a legitimate [A, A] chain. The structure of the sentence in (114) would be as represented in (115) (see section 5.2.2.3.2.2 shortly below for more details on this).

(115)

 $\begin{bmatrix} CP & [IP [A-position] John_i \text{ was seen } [FP [A-position] t_i & [F' - ing & [CP & [C' & \emptyset_C & [IP PRO run(n) -]]] \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

As expected, the subject of this type of argumental CSCl can also be an anaphor bound by the matrix subject, as shown in (116). This is expected since this possibility is also available in other types of (C)SCl occupying an argumental position, as illustrated in (117).

(116) The children saw *themselves* playing baseball.

(117) The children consider *themselves* intelligent.

The general CSCI-model that is proposed in this work states that the subject of a CSCI must corefer with the subject of the internal predication. This condition must also be satisfied in the GC. Consider the following examples:

- (118) I saw John_i (PRO_i) running.
- (119) *I saw John_i (PRO_j) running.
 - (cf. I saw John while I was running.)

In the example in (118), the CSCI-subject *John* corefers with the null subject of the internal predication, that is, PRO. So the sentence is acceptable. Conversely, the sentence in (119) is ruled out in the interpretation in which the CSCI-subject *John* and the null subject PRO do not refer to the same individual.

On the other hand, the examples in (120) show that the CSCI-subject has to corefer with the *subject* of the internal predication. In other words, the subject-object asymmetry also applies to the GC.

- (120) a. I saw John_i (PRO_i) giving a book to Mary.
 - b. *I saw *the book*_i John giving (it_i) to Mary.
 - c. *I saw Mary_i John giving the book (to her_i.)

The sentences in (120b) and (120c) are ungrammatical because the CSCI-subject, *the book* in (120b) and *Mary* in (120c), is linked to the object, *it*, and indirect object, *her*, of the internal predication, respectively.

Again, the subject of the type of CSCl under discussion must corefer with the *grammatical* subject of the internal predication. Consider the examples in (121) and (122).

- (121) I saw John_i and Mary_i ($PRO_{i,j}$) coming in.
- (122) I saw $John_i$ (*PRO*_i) being arrested by the police.

In the sentence in (121), the CSCI-subject *John and Mary* corefers with the internal argument of the unaccusative verb *come in*. Similarly, the CSCI-subject *John* in the example in (122) corefers with the thematic object of the passivized verb *be arrested*. Now the coreference between these two arguments is possible since in both sentences the semantic object of the internal predication functions as the grammatical subject of this predication. The structural representation of these examples would be as illustrated in (123) and (124) for (121) and (122), respectively.

(123)

I saw [FP John and Mary_i [F' -ing [CP [C' \emptyset C [IP PRO_{expli} [I' [VP com- PRO_i]]]]]]

(124)

I saw $[_{FP}$ John_i $[_{F'}$ -ing $[_{CP}$ $[_{C'} \varnothing_C$ $[_{IP}$ PRO_{expli} $[_{I'}$ be- ... $[_{XP}$ arrested PRO_i]]]]]]

In these structures, the CSCl-subject, which is the argument that is base-generated in Spec, FP, controls the object of the internal predication, namely the argumental PRO. This argumental PRO is, in turn, coindexed with the expletive PRO_{expl} in Spec, IP. This latter link indicates that the argumental PRO is interpreted as the subject of the internal predication of the CSCl. Hence the well-formedness of these CSCl-structures.

Finally, the idea that the subject of the GC is base-generated in Spec, FP is further supported by Spanish data. In Spanish, a lexical subject can appear either preceding or following a finite verb. In the former case, the subject is presumably occupying Spec, IP, whereas in the latter case it may be occupying the position in which it is base-generated, namely Spec, VP. An example is given in (125).¹²⁰

(125) He visto que (*Juan*) entraba (*Juan*).have.I seen that Juan went.in.he Juan`I saw that Juan was going in.'

Interestingly enough, when the lexical subject follows the verb in the GC the sentence is highly marginal even when the verb of the GC is unaccusative. This can be observed in the constrast between (126a) and (126b).

(126) a Vi *a Juan* entrando.saw.I to Juan going.in`I saw Juan going in.'

Recall, furthermore, that in Spanish finite verbs move from the head of the VP-projection to the head of the IP at Syntax.

¹²⁰ The pre- or post-verbal position that the subject may occupy in the sentence in Spanish and in other Romance languages has been related to discourse functions. On the one hand, it has been claimed that the subjects that appear in a pre-verbal position, presumably in Spec, IP, make reference to old information (unless they bear a heavy stress), whereas the subjects that show up post-verbally, presumably in Spec, VP, indicate new information (see Contreras 1976, Vallduví 1990, Cinque 1993a, Costa 1996, Picallo 1999).

b.??Vi entrando *a Juan*. saw.I going.in to Juan

The marginality of (126b), as opposed to the well-formedness of (126a), substantiates the hypothesis that the lexical DP *Juan* in (126) is not the subject of the unaccusative verb *entrar* `to go in', but rather the subject of the CSC1. Recall that, according to the CSC1-structure, the grammatical subject of the predication headed by the unaccusative verb *entrar* `to go in' in (126) is a PRO (see the structure in (123)).

The marginality of (126b), on the other hand, also indicates that the predicate of this type of CSCl cannot undergo restructuring at Syntax, at least not as easily as a regular SCl in Spanish. Compare (126) and the sentences in (127).

- (127) a. Considero *a Juan* inteligente.`I consider Juan intelligent.'
 - b. Considero inteligente a Juan.

5.2.2.3.2.1 Idiom Chunks

The well-formedness of the examples in (128) could be claimed to be problematic for the analysis of the GC that is defended in this chapter.

- (128) a. I saw *it* raining.
 - b. *It* is raining.

This would be so because the CSCI-analysis leads us to say that in these sentences the element *it* is base-generated in Spec, FP, and that, from this position, it controls the PRO that appears within the internal predication:

(129) a. I saw
$$[_{CSC1(FP)} it_i [_{F'} -ing [_{CP} [_{C'} \varnothing_C [_{IP} PRO_i rain-]]]]]$$

b. It_i is $[_{CSC1(FP)} t_i [_{F'} -ing [_{CP} [_{C'} \varnothing_C [_{IP} PRO_i rain-]]]]]$

Now the structures in (129) would be problematic as long as we assume that the pronoun *it* that appears in this type of sentences is unable to control an argumental PRO, as has been frequently taken for granted in the literature.

But consider the sentences in (130) ((130a) is from Chomsky 1980, and (130b, c) from Pesetsky 1995).

- (130) a. PRO_i having rained all day, it_i began to snow.
 - b. It_i tried to PRO_i rain all morning.
 - c. Did *it*_i ever succeed in *PRO*_i thundering and *PRO*_i hailing, as they'd predicted on TV?

In these examples it can be observed that the so-called quasi-argument *it* can in fact control a PRO. Therefore, the same relationship that *it* and *PRO* maintain in the sentences in (130) must be also expected to be possible when these two elements appear in other structural configurations. This is exactly what the syntactic analyses in (129) demonstrate. Thus, the grammaticality of the examples in (128) is not only unproblematic for us but, on the contrary, something to be expected.

Notice, incidentally, that in this sense the weather, or ambient, *it* behaves differently from the pure grammatical elements *there* and *it*, since these latter ones cannot control a null argument. This

is illustrated by the ungrammatical sentences in (131) ((131a) is from Baltin 1995, and (131b) from Pesetsky 1995).

(131) a. **There*_i was too likely to *PRO*_i be a commotion to be a serious discussion of the issue.

b. *After PRO_i becoming obvious that the gate was open, it_i seemed likely that something had happened.

The behavior of these pure grammatical elements straightforwardly explains the ungrammaticality of a sentence like the one in (132a).

(132) a. *I saw *there* coming three men.

b. I saw $[_{CSC1(FP)} there_i [_{F'} -ing [_{CP} [_{C'} \emptyset_C [_{IP} com- three men_i]]]]]$

According to the CSCI-structure in (70), the expletive *there* would be the subject of the CSCI, that is, the phrase that is base-generated in Spec, FP, as represented in (132b). Now the sentence in (132a) would be deviant for two reasons. The first one is that a pure grammatical element would be base-generated in the subject position of the CSCI, that is, a theta position (see section 2.3.2.2 in chapter 2). And the second one is that this pure grammatical element would be unable to control the argumental subject PRO that appears within the internal predication of the CSCI, just like the expletive *there* is unable to control the PRO in the example in (131a).

As expected, the expletive *there* can appear in the subject position of a PG. This is shown in (133a).

(133) a. I remember *there* coming three men.

b. I remember $[_{CP} \ [_{C'} \ \emptyset_{C} \ [_{IP} \ there_i \ coming \ three \ men_i \]]]$

This is so since in this case we are dealing with a regular propositional structure. Therefore, in this sentence the expletive *there* would be base-generated in Spec, IP, in other words a nontheta position. This is represented in (133b).

A situation similar to the case in (128) arises when the subject of the GC is interpreted as the subject of an idiom chunk. As shown by the sentences in (134), this configuration also yields a grammatical sentence.

- (134) a. I saw *the shit* hitting the fan.
 - b. The shit was hitting the fan.

The syntactic representation of the examples in (134), according to the analysis in (70), would be as follows:

(135)

a. I saw $[_{CSC1(FP)}$ the shit_i $[_{F'}$ -ing $[_{CP}$ $[_{C'} \oslash_C [_{IP} PRO_i hit(t)$ - the fan]]]]] b. The shit_i was $[_{CSC1(FP)}$ t_i $[_{F'}$ -ing $[_{CP}$ $[_{C'} \oslash_C [_{IP} PRO_i hit(t)$ - the fan]]]]]

But, once again, the grammaticality of the sentences in (134) is expected since in English the subject of an idiom chunk can be a pronoun bound by a DP.¹²¹ This is what the grammaticality of

(i) a. *He visto *la gorda que se armaba*.

¹²¹ This is not so clear for Romance. For instance, the lexical subject of the PR cannot bind the null subject pro of the internal predication when this lexical subject is interpreted as the subject of an idiom chunk. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (i) and (ii) in Spanish and Italian, respectively. The Italian example is from Cinque 1992, footnote 31, p. 29.

sentences like (136) and (137) tells us ((136) is from Rogers 1974, and (137) from Nunberg et al. 1994 (see also O'Grady 1998)).

(136) The shit_i looks (to me) like it_i 's gonna hit the fan.

(137) a. We thought *tabs*_i were being kept on us, but *they*_i weren't.

b. Kim's family pulled *some strings*_i on her behalf, but *they*_i weren't enough to get her the job.

c. Once someone lets *the cat*_i out of the bag, it_i 's out of the bag for good.

Notice that the well-formedness of sentences of this kind challenge the long-standing assumption in the generative tradition that holds that the subject of an idiom chunk cannot bind a pronoun or be a pronoun bound by a DP.

The sentence in (138) (from Rogers 1974: 99), on the other hand, shows that the pronoun *it* in (136) is not a resumptive pronoun that has been inserted in the structure as a last resort strategy in order to avoid a grammatical violation, for instance, to check the nominative Case of the embedded

- b. **La* he visto *que se armaba*.
- (ii) *Se vedi *i conti che tornaro*, puoi considerarti fortunato.

'If you see the calculations square, you can consider yourself lucky.'

Exactly the same results are obtained when the construction involved is the GC, as shown in the Spanish examples in (iii).

(iii) a. *He visto la gorda armándose.

`I saw the shit hitting the fan.'

b. **La* he visto *armándose*.

An explanation regarding the different constraints that rule the control of the subject of an idiom chunk in English and in Romance is clearly beyond the scope of this work. So I leave this issue for further research.

[`]I saw the shit hitting the fan.'

clause. Note that in (138) the subject of the embedded clause does not corefer with the subject of the main clause.

(138) The soup tastes like Maude has been at the cooking sherry again.

Therefore, the subject of the subordinate clause and the subject of the main clause must be two different arguments in (136) as well as in (138).

Interestingly, Rogers (1974) already notes that a DP cannot bind the pronoun that functions as the subject of an idiom chunk in structures where this idiom chunk is contained in a sentence more than one level down. Compare (139a), a sentence that Rogers (1974: 98) assigns two asterisks, with (136)-(137). The intended meaning of (139a) is that of (139b).

(139) a.***The shit*_i looks to me like Harry believes it_i 's going to hit the fan.

b. It looks to me like Harry believes the shit's going to hit the fan.

Furthermore, he notes that this pronoun cannot be bound if it does not function as the subject of the idiom chunk. An example that he provides to show this is reproduced here in (140), from Rogers 1974: 82 (cf. (136)).

(140) **The fan* looks (to me) like the shit's gonna hit *it*.

The ungrammaticality of this sentence demonstrates that the pronoun *it*, which here functions as the object of the idiom chunk, cannot be bound by the lexical DP *the fan*. As the reader might have already noticed, this effect is reminiscent of the subject-object asymmetry that operates in a CSCI.

5.2.2.3.2.2 HAVE and BE

Another fact that the analysis of the GC in terms of a CSCl can capture, and more specifically the proposal that the subject of the construction is base-generated in Spec, FP, concerns the (traditional) idea of considering the auxiliary *have* as a verbal head that results from the incorporation of a null prepositional head into the copula *be*.

In Kayne 1993,¹²² the structure in (141) is put forward to account for the *have-be* auxiliary alternation in nonpassive participle constructions.

(141) BE $[_{CP}$ $[_{C'} \oslash_{C} [_{IP} \text{ John drunk a beer }]]]$

In this structure, the copula *be* selects a CP-complement, which contains the past participle and the complements of this verb. The argument that functions as the subject of the constituent headed by the past participle, namely *John* in (141), will have to raise to the subject position of the matrix clause to check nominative Case. This means that this argument must move out of the embedded CP-structure. As usual, this movement must be carried out here through Spec, CP. Now the problem for this lies in that the movement of this subject through Spec, CP creates an illegitimate chain, that is, a mixed (sandwiched) [A, A', A] chain. This is so since this argument would move from the subject position of the embedded clause (A), to Spec, CP (A'), and, finally, to the subject position of the matrix clause (A). This operation is schematically represented in (142a). Kayne's hypothesis, then, consists in saying that this violation is avoided if the null prepositional C \emptyset_C is previously incorporated into the copula *be* (à la Baker 1988). This is depicted in (142b).¹²³

¹²² See the references cited in his work for previous hypotheses along the same lines.

¹²³ More specifically, Kayne represents this null prepositional C as P/C. For simplicity, I will refer to this head here as

(142) a. *John_i is $[_{CP} t_i \ [_{C'} \varnothing_C \ [_{IP} t_i \text{ drunk a beer }]]]$ b. John_i (\varnothing_C +be) = has $[_{CP} (t_i) \ [_{C'} t_C \ [_{IP} t_i \text{ drunk a beer }]]]$

This operation has two effects. On the one hand, the movement of the subject of the nonpassive past participle from the subject position of the embedded clause to the subject position of the matrix clause yields a legitimate [A, A] chain. This is so since now Spec, CP can be skipped. In minimalist terms, Spec, CP can be skipped because, after the incorporation of C into *be*, this position and the subject position of the matrix clause are *equidistant* from the subject position of the embedded clause.¹²⁴ The second effect is that the phonological realization of the complex formed by the copula *be* plus the null C \emptyset_C is *have*.

Now, if we assume a similar underlying structure for the GC, that is, a structure like that in (141), then we must assume that, for the embedded subject to move out of the CP-domain in order to check nominative Case in the subject position of the matrix clause, the C will have to incorporate into the copula *be*. This is depicted in (143b).¹²⁵ From this, we would expect the auxiliary that shows up in the sentence to be *have*, instead of *be*. But, as the ill-formedness of the sentence in (143a) indicates, this prediction is not correct.

(143)

a. *John has drinking a beer.

¹²⁴ Equidistance

 γ and β are equidistant from α if γ and β are in the same minimal domain. (Chomsky 1995: 356)

In (142b), then, Spec, CP and the subject position of the matrix clause are equidistant from the subject position of the embedded clause because the incorporation of C into *be* creates an enlarged minimal domain which includes Spec, CP and the subject position of the matrix clause.

¹²⁵ Notice that the same holds if an FP-projection is inserted immediately above CP in (143b). In this case, we would only need to say that C incorporates into F and then the whole complex into the copula *be*.

b. *John_i (\emptyset_{C} + be) = has [CP (t_{i}) [C' t_{C} [IP t_{i} drink-ing a beer]]]

If instead we adopt the analysis of the GC in terms of a CSCl, namely the structure in (70), then we predict that the CSCl-subject will be free to move out of the FP-domain towards the subject position of the matrix clause to check nominative Case. This is so since this subject would move from Spec, FP, which is the position where it is base-generated, that is, an A-position, to the subject position of the matrix clause, again an A-position. This movement would create a well-formed [A, A] chain. Furthermore, we would expect the auxiliary *be* to show up in the sentence, instead of *have*, since no element would have been incorporated into the copula. The example in (144a) tells us that this prediction is correct. The derivation of this sentence is represented in (144b).

- (144) a. John is drinking a beer.
 - b. John_i is $[FP t_i [F' \varnothing_F [CP [C' \varnothing_C [IP PRO_i drink-ing a beer]]]]]$

Notice, incidentally, that the movement operation that is carried out in (144) would not differ at all from the movement operation that the CSCI-subject undergoes in order to check accusative Case when this CSCI is combined with a perception verb. Compare (144) with (145).

- (145) a. I saw *him* drinking a beer.
 - b. I saw $him_i [FP t_i [F' \varnothing_F [CP [C' \varnothing_C [IP PRO_i drink-ing a beer]]]]]$

Or, more generally, it would not differ from the movement operation that the subject of a SCl undergoes when that SCl is combined with the copula *be*. Compare (144) with (145)-(146).

(146) a. John is at home.

b. John_i is $[PP t_i [P' at home]]$

The example in (147a), on the other hand, shows that the expletive *there* can appear as the grammatical subject of a nonpassive past participle. This means that, according to Kayne's analysis, this expletive is base-generated in the Spec, IP of the embedded clause and that, from this position, it raises out of the embedded CP-domain towards the subject position of the matrix clause after the incorporation of the null prepositional C \emptyset_C into the copula. This is schematically represented in (147b).

- (147) a. *There* (must) have arrived *many people*.
 - b. There_i (\emptyset_{C} + be) = have [_{CP} (t_i) [_{C'} t_{C} [_{IP} t_i arrived many people]]]

Now consider the sentence in (148a) and its structural representation in (148b).

(148) a. **There* are coming *many people*.

b. **There*_i are [FP t_i [F' -ing [CP [C' \emptyset_C [IP com- many people]]]]]

As in the example in (144), here a CSCl is combined with the copula *be*. This means that the null C $\emptyset_{\rm C}$ will not have to incorporate into the copula *be* for the CSCl-subject to be able to move out of the CSCl-domain to the subject position of the matrix sentence. And this is so because the CSCl-subject is base-generated in Spec, FP. This latter property is what explains the ungrammaticality of the example in (148). As we have already seen in the previous section (see example (132)), the

element that is base-generated in Spec, FP in a CSCl cannot be a pure grammatical element like *there* because Spec, FP is a theta-position in this construction.

Finally, Basque offers us further evidence in favor of the syntactic organization that is defended here for the GC. The only thing that we need to know about this language for our purposes here is that Basque is an ergative language. This means that the subject of a transitive will verb check ergative Case, whereas the object of a transitive verb and the subject of an unaccusative verb will check absolutive Case. An example is given in (149).

(149) Jonek leihoa apurtu du.
 Jon-_{ERG} window-_{ABS} break be
 `Jon breaks the window.'

Now the relevance of Basque comes from the construction that is used in this language to describe an event in progress. An example is provided in (150).

(150) Jon leihoa apur-tze-n dago
Jon-ABS window-ABS break-NOM-LOC be-3SG-ABS
`Jon is breaking the window.'

On the one hand, this sentence shows us that the head of the construction that is used in Basque to express an event in progress is also an aspectual head, that is, a particle indicating location. As in English, this head (-*n*) appears at Syntax attached to the verb. On the other hand, it can be observed in this construction that the object of the transitive verb *to break*, namely *window*, checks absolutive Case which, recall, is the Case typically checked by the object of a transitive verb. But in this sentence we can also see that the lexical DP *Jon* does not check ergative Case, which is the Case typically checked by the subject of a transitive verb, like the verb *to break* (see (149)). Instead, this

lexical DP checks absolutive Case. This suggests, then, that *Jon* is not the subject of the transitive verb *to break*. As defended in this work, in (150) *Jon* would be the subject of the CSCl that is headed by the locative head, that is, the phrase that is base-generated in Spec, FP. (I owe this observation to Jaume Mateu and Francesc Roca.)

5.2.2.3.3 Extractions

In Cinque 1992 (footnote 31, p. 29), it is claimed that the PR and the GC cannot share a similar analysis because of the different behavior that these two constructions show with regard to extraction. This is illustrated in the grammatical contrast that exists between the Italian sentence in (151), which contains the PR as a complement, and the English sentence in (152), where the complement is the GC.

(151) **Che strada*_i hai visto Gianni che stava attraversando t_i ? what street have.you seen Gianni that was.he crossing

(152) What street_i did you see John crossing t_i ?

The Italian example in (151) shows that the object contained within the PR cannot be extracted. Conversely, the English example in (152) shows that the extraction of the object out of the GC does not cause any problem at all.

Before considering this point, let me first address a more general question which arises from the grammaticality of the English sentence in (152). The question is why an argument contained within the GC can be extracted out of this construction in the first place if Spec, FP is not a possible escape hatch for this argument to move through. Recall that in the CSCI-analysis defended here Spec, FP is

occupied by the subject of the CSCl. So, in principle, we would expect the sentence in (153) to be as bad as the sentence in (154).

(153)

What street_i did you see [$_{CSCI(FP)}$ John [$_{F'}$ -ing [$_{CP}$ [$_{C'} \varnothing_C$ [$_{IP}$ PRO cross- t_i ?]]]]]

(154)

??What_i do you wonder [CP whether [C' \emptyset_C [IP John ate t_i ?]]]

The answer that I would like to offer here is that the CSCI-subject in Spec, FP in (153), *John*, does not stand as a barrier for the movement of the object, *what street*, out of the FP-domain because Spec, FP is not a potential escape hatch for the movement of this *wh*-phrase. And this is so because in a CSCI Spec, FP is an A-position. An argument in favor of this claim is that the grammatical result that we obtain in (153) coincides with the grammatical result that we obtain when the object of a regular SCI is extracted out of the domain of that SCI. Compare (153) with (155).

(155) a. Whom_i do you consider
$$[_{SC1(AP)}$$
 John $[_{A'}$ angry at t_i ?]]

b. *Whom*_i is
$$[_{SCl(AP)} John [A' angry at t_i ?]]$$

The grammaticality of these sentences indicates that the SCI-object, *whom*, can skip the specifier where the SCI-subject is base-generated, namely Spec, AP.

Conversely, Spec, CP in the structure in (154) would stand as a barrier for the movement of the object, *what*, out of the CP-domain because Spec, CP is a potential escape hatch for the movement of this *wh*-phrase, since here Spec, CP is an A-bar position.

Let us take up now the first question pointed out above, to wit, why an object can be extracted out of the GC in English, as opposed to the PR in Italian, if, as defended in this work, the PR and the GC share such a similar analysis.

To begin with, the Spanish and Catalan counterparts of the Italian sentence in (151) are also ungrammatical, as expected. This is illustrated in (156) and (157), respectively.

(156) ?*¿Qué calle_i lo has visto que { cruzaba / estaba cruzando} t_i ?

what street him have.you seen that crossed.he was.he crossing

(157) ?*Quin carrer_i l'has vist que { creuava / estava creuant } t_i ?

As mentioned above, Spanish and Catalan can use both the PR and the GC as a perception verb complement, in contrast to languages like Italian in which only the PR is possible. Now the interesting thing here is that the grammatical judgment that is obtained when the object is extracted out of the PR in Spanish and Catalan coincides with the grammatical judgment that is obtained when the object is extracted out of the GC in these two languages. Compare the sentences in (156)-(157) with the ones in (158)-(159), on the one hand, and (158)-(159) with their English counterpart in (152).

(158) $?*_{i}Qué calle_{i}$ lo has visto cruzando t_{i} ? what street him have.you seen crossing

(159) ?*Quin carrer_i l'has vist creuant t_i ?

Interestingly, the extraction of the object out of the PR yields a better result in some specific cases. This can be observed by comparing the Catalan examples in (160) with the one in (157).

(160) a. $Qu\dot{e}$ l' has vist que feia t_i en el laboratori?

237

what him have.you seen that did.he in the laboratory `What did you see him doing in the laboratory?'

b. *Què* l' has vist que muntava en el passadís t_i?
what him.have you seen that assembled.he in the corridor
`What did you see him assembling in the corridor?'

But, crucially, the same improvement is observed in these specific cases when the PR is replaced by the GC. Compare the examples in (160) with the examples in (161).

- (161) a. $Qu\dot{e}$ l' has vist fent t_i en el laboratori? what him have.you seen doing in the laboratory `What did you see him doing in the laboratory?'
 - b. *Què* l' has vist muntant t_i en el passadís?
 what him.have you seen assembling in the corridor
 `What did you see him assembling in the corridor?'

More generally, the extraction of a phrase out of the PR or out of the GC is much better when the phrase extracted is a PP. Some examples are provided in (162) in Spanish and (163) in Catalan.

(162) a. ¿*Con quién*_i lo has visto que hablaba t_i ?
with who him have.you seen that talked.he
`Who did you see him talking to?'

- b. *Con quién*i lo has visto hablando ti?
 with who him have.you seen talking
 `Who did you see him talking to?'
- (163) a. Amb qui_i l'has vist que parlava t_i ?

b. *Amb qui*_i l'has vist parlant t_i ?

In short, the Romance data provided here show us that the extraction of a phrase out of the PR or out of the GC is not as uniform as it could be thought at first sight. We have seen that extraction depends on either the type of example that we are dealing with or the syntactic category of the phrase extracted. But the point that must be highlighted here is that the PR and the GC do behave alike with regard to extraction in Romance. Now the contrast that is observed between extraction out of the PR and the GC in Romance, and extraction out of the GC in English may simply boil down to the distinct constraints that rule extraction in each class of language, rather than, say, to a difference in the structural organization of these constructions in each type of language. That this might be so is suggested by the results that are obtained when a phrase is extracted out of a regular SCI in each type of language. Consider the following examples. The sentences in (165) and (166) are in Spanish.

- (164) a. Whom_i do you consider [SCI (AP) John angry at t_i?]
 b. Whom_i is [SCI (AP John angry at t_i?]
- (165) a. ?¿*De qué*_i has notado [$_{SC1(AP)}$ harta t_i a María?] of what have.you noted fed.up to María `What did you see her fed up with?'

b. ¿De qué_i estaba [SCI (AP) harta t_i María?]
of what was.she fed.up María
`What was she fed up with?'

(166) a. ??; $Qu\acute{e}_i$ has visto [$_{CSC1(FP)}$ comiendo t_i a Juan?] what have.you seen eating to Juan `What did you see Juan eating?'

> b. $\partial Qu \dot{e}_i$ estaba [CSCI (FP) comiendo t_i Juan?] what was.he eating Juan `What was Juan eating?'

On the one hand, the examples in (164) show that English generally allows the extraction of objects out of the domain of an ordinary SCI. On the other hand, the (slight) contrast that is observed between the two sentences in (165) indicates that the extraction of an object out of a regular SCI-domain is generally accepted in Spanish when the SCI is combined with a copula, (165b). In other contexts, we obtain various degrees of acceptability, (165a).¹²⁶ Finally, the examples in (166) show that a CSCI behaves like a regular SCI in Spanish. That is, an object can be extracted out of the GC when that CSCI is combined with a copula, (166b), whereas the judgments are less clear in other contexts, (166a).

- (i) $\partial De qu'_i$ lo consideran culpable t_i ? of what him consider.they guilty
 - `What is he considered guilty of?'

¹²⁶ For instance, the example in (i) sounds better than (165a) in the text.

In conclusion, the contrast that is observed between the Italian example in (151) and the English sentence in (152) should not be taken as an argument indicating that the PR and the GC possess a different structural organization. Rather it may indicate that the constraints that rule extraction in these two languages are simply different.

5.2.2.4 Other Properties

Like the PR and the PIC (see section 4.2.1.2 in chapter 4), the verb contained within the GC must necessarily refer to an event susceptible of being directly perceived by the subject of the matrix clause when that construction is combined with a perception verb. Consider the example in (167).

(167) *I saw John *knowing* French.

This sentence is ungrammatical due to the semantic incompatibility that exists between the meaning of the verb *to know* and the meaning of the nonepistemic interpretation of the perception verb. Note that (167) cannot mean something like (168), in which the embedded clause is a proposition and the perception verb is interpreted in its epistemic (intellectual) meaning.

(168) I saw that John knows French.

Thus the contrast between (167) and (168) shows us once again that the GC is associated with the ontological category of event, rather than with the ontological category of proposition.

Similarly, the verb cannot be in a perfective form in the GC, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (169).

(169) *I saw John *having* already *read* all your books.

As in the PR and the PIC (see section 4.2.1.3 in chapter 4), the ungrammaticality of this sentence derives from a semantic conflict between the aspectual value of *-ing* and the internal temporal domain of the event expressed by a perfective form. As we will see in section 5.4 shortly below, this conflict arises because *-ing* must localize a temporal point out of the internal temporal domain of the event, and this is not possible if this event is presented as bounded, which is what a perfective form of the verb does.

Again, the clausal complement of a perception verb can contain a verb with a perfective form when the syntactic structure that contains this verb is a *that*-clause, that is, a syntactic structure associated with the ontological category of proposition. This is illustrated by the grammaticality of the sentence in (170).

(170) I saw that John had already read all your books.

In conclusion, we have seen in this section that the structural organization of the GC also responds to the structural organization established by the CSCI-model that is defended in this dissertation. Needless to say, this is a crucial property that helps us to understand, first, the complementary distribution of the PR, the PIC and the GC (see section 5.1), and, secondly, the syntactic and semantic facts that characterize all three constructions.

5.3 Three Values for the [-ing - \mathscr{D}_{C}] Interaction: Modifier, Propositional, and Predicational

The analysis of the GC in terms of a CSCl not only explains the semantic and syntactic properties of this construction, but it also fills a semantic and syntactic gap. As has already been pointed out above, we know that a gerund can function as a modifier or as a proposition. The former value is found in the so-called Reduced-Relative (RR) clause, whereas the latter is the one that I have

previously referred to as the propositional gerund (PG). An example of a gerund functioning as a modifier and as a proposition is provided in (171a) and (171b), respectively. Now the CSCI-analysis that is proposed for the GC in this work shows us that the gerund can have a third semantic value, that is, a predicational value. This predicational value is found in sentences like that in (171c).

- (171) a. *The boy arriving tomorrow* is my cousin.
 - b. I hate everybody interrupting me all the time.
 - c. I saw John reading the newspaper.

Abstracting away from the specific position in which the suffix *-ing* is interpreted at LF in each case, the structural representation of each type of gerund that appears in the examples in (171) would be as depicted in (172). Here F refers to the highest functional category associated with the lexical head of the construction, namely the verb.

(172)

a.	the	$[_{NP} [_{N'} boy$	'i [_{FP} Op _i	$[F' - ing / \mathcal{O}_C [IP t_i \text{ arriv- tomorrow }]]]]$ is my cousin
b.	Ι	hate	[FP	$[_{F'}$ -ing / $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}}$ $[_{IP}$ everybody interrupt- me all the time]]]
c.	Ι	saw	[_{FP} John	$[_{F'}$ -ing / \mathcal{O}_{C} $[_{IP}$ PRO _i read- the newspaper]]]

The different semantic value that derives from the interaction between *-ing* and \mathscr{O}_{C} in each case can be defined by means of three features, which are [+/- modifier], [+/- propositional], and [+/- predicational]. The feature specification for the constructions in (172) would be as follows:

(173)	a.	[+ modifier], [- propositional], [- predicational]	for (172a)
	b.	[- modifier], [+ propositional], [- predicational]	for (172b)
	c.	[- modifier], [- propositional], [+ predicational]	for (172c)

With regard to the elements that may occupy Spec, XP in each type of construction and the nature of this position, the features [+/- operator], [+/- phrase], [+/- movement] again prove to be useful at this point (cf. section 3.2). The feature combination in (174), (175), and (176) would define the Spec, XP of the RR, (172a), the PG, (172b), and the GC, (172c), respectively.

- (174) [+ operator], [- phrase] / [+ movement]
- (175) [- operator], [- phrase] / [- movement]
- (176) [- operator], [+ phrase] / [- movement]

The feature specification in (174) indicates that an Op raises from a position within IP to an initial position in the construction. This operation is triggered in the RR where the gerund, more specifically the constituent introduced by F, functions as a modifier. On the other hand, (175) states that neither an Op nor a phrase moves to an initial position of the clause. Obviously, this defines the PG. And, finally, (176) captures those cases in which a phrase is base-generated in an initial position of the construction. This property typically characterizes the GC as analized in this chapter, where movement is not involved.

In conclusion, the sentences in (171) tell us that the [$-ing / \mathcal{O}_C$] interaction can have three semantic values. The structures in (172), on the other hand, show that each one of these values must be in accordance with a specific internal organization of the elements that make up the construction in which they appear.

A generalization that derives from the proposal that is put forward in this section comes from the parallelism that is observed between the three semantic values of [$-ing - \mathcal{O}_C$] and the three syntactic structures in which these elements show up, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the three semantic values of the C *que* and the three syntactic structures in which this C appears that were discussed in section 3.2 in chapter 3. This parallelism can be seen by comparing the structures in (172) with the structures displayed in chapter 3 (section 3.2) for the Relative clause, a proposition, and the Pseudo-Relative. These latter are reproduced here as (177).

(177)

- a. el $[_{NP} [_{N'} libro_i [_{CP} Op_i [_{C'} que [_{IP} compró t_i Juan]]]]]$ está sobre la mesa the book that bought.he Juan is on the table `The book that Juan bought is on the table.'
- b. Luis dijo [_{CP} [_{C'} que [_{IP} Juan compró un libro]]] Luis said that Juan bought a book
- c. He visto a [CP Juan[C' que [IP proi compraba un libro]]]
 have.I seen to Juan that bought.he a book
 `I saw Juan buying a book.'

As can be observed, [*que*] and [*-ing* $/\mathcal{O}_{C}$] stand as two lexical choices that can be used to express the same three values. The analysis of the PR and the GC in terms of a CSCl allows us to see the third value that [*que*] and [*-ing* $/\mathcal{O}_{C}$] can have, that is, the predicational one.

5.4 Analytic or Synthetic

Up to this point we have seen that there are at least three constructions that can be used to express an event in progress. These constructions are the PR (chapter 3), the PIC (chapter 4) and the GC (section 5.2). As the data from (178) through (183) show, choosing from among these three constructions depends, first, on the language utilized and, secondly, on the structural context in which the construction is inserted.¹²⁷

- (i) a. Os meninos estao a correr.
 the children are at run-_{INF}
 `The children are running.'
 - b. *Os meninos estao a correrem.
- (ii) a. Los niños están corriendo.`The children are running.'
 - b. *Los niños están que corren.

the children are that run.they

`The children are running.'

The examples in European Portuguese in (i) show that the PIC can only be combined with a copula if the infinitive contained within the PIC is uninflected, (ia). Otherwise, the sentence is ruled out, (ib). As we know, the verb in the PR is always inflected. So it may be the case that the PR is prevented from combining with the copula, (iib), because of the same factors that prevent the PIC with an inflected infinitive from appearing in this context, whatever these factors are. If this suggestion is on the right track, then the Romance languages that normally use the PR would have to turn, in this structural context, to the noninflected version of the PR, which is the GC, (iia) (note that the verb is not inflected in this case), or to other constructions, like a prepositional locution, as in French, or the PIC, as in some cases in Italian (see section 4.2.2.5 in chapter 4).

In Spanish, sentences like the one in (iii) is perfect (cf. (iib)).

(iii) Los niños están que trinan.

the children are that trill.they

`The children are angry.'

¹²⁷ Here I leave for further research the question regarding the impossibility of combining the PR with a copula. But a possible way towards a scientific solution may be found in the following contrasts:

Spanish

(178)	a.	Juan está	{*a correr / *que corre / corriendo. }
	b.	Encontré a Juan	{*a correr / *que corría / corriendo. }
	c.	He visto a Juan	{*a correr / que corría / corriendo.}

Catalan¹²⁸

(179)	a.	<i>En Joan</i> està	{ * a	córrer / *que corre / corrent.	}
	b.	He trobat en Joan	{ *a	córrer / que corria / corrent.	}
	c.	He vist en Joan	{ *a	córrer / que corria / corrent.	}

Italian

(180)	a.	Gianni	è	{ * a	correre /*	*che corre	/ correndo.	}
	b.	Ho sorpreso	o Gianni	{ * a	correre / c	che correva	/*correndo.	}
	c.	Ho visto	Gianni	{ *a	correre / c	che correva	/*correndo.	}

These type of sentences involve a quantified predicate, which here is null. That is, the sentence in (iii) would something like:

(iv) Los niños están tan enfadados que trinan.

the children are so angry that trill.they

`The children are so angry that they trill.'

Therefore, they are not instances of PR (see Rafel and Suñer 1999).

128 In the variety of Catalan spoken in Valencia, the GC is the only construction accepted in the structural context of *b*, just like in Spanish. Conversely, in northern Catalonia (Alt Empordà) the PR is highly preferred over the GC in the structural contexts of *b* and *c*.

European Portuguese

(181)	a.	O João esta	{	а	correr	/	*que	corre	/	*correndo.	}
	b.	Eu encontrei o João	{	а	correr	/	*que	corria	/	*correndo.	}
	c.	Eu vi <i>o João</i>	{	a	correr	/	*que	corria	/	*correndo.	}

Brazilian Portuguese

(182)	a.	O João	esta {* a	correr /	*que	corre /	correndo.	}
	b.	Eu encontrei	o João { *a	correr /	*que	corria /	correndo.	}
	c.	Eu vi o Ja	oão {*a	correr /	*que	corria /	correndo.	}

English

(183)	a.	John is	{*at run /*that runs / running.}
	b.	I caught John	{ *at run / *that ran / running. }
	c.	I saw John	{*at run / *that ran / running. }

The alternation among these three constructions is also observed in some Italian dialects and in English. On the one hand, the PIC can be used instead of the PR or the GC in some Italian dialects. This is illustrated in the examples from (184) through (187). The examples in (184) are from the dialect of Rome (cf. (180a)) (Gennaro Chierchia and Patrizia Pacioni, p.c.); the ones in (185) are from the dialect of Naples (cf. (180b)) (Donatella Gagliardi, p. c.); (186) are from Falconara (cf. (180c)) (Anna Cardinaletti, p.c.); and the examples in (187) from Venice (cf. (180c)) (Giuliana Giusti, p.c.). The ungrammatical examples attempt to show the contexts where the PIC is not possible in each particular dialect. In these cases, the PR must be used if the matrix verb is a perception verb or a verb like *to catch*, and the GC if the matrix verb is the copula *be*.

(184) a. Che stai a fare?

what is.(s)he at do-_{INF} `What is (s)he doing?'

- b. L' ho sorpreso a rubare.
 him have.I caught at steal-_{INF}
 `I caught him stealing.'
- c. *L' ho visto *a rubare*. him have.I seen at steal-_{INF}
- (185) a. **Gianni* è *a correre*. Gianni is at run-_{INF}
 - b. L' ho sorpreso a correre.
 him have.I caught at run-_{INF}
 `I caught him running.'
 - c. Ho sorpreso *Gianni a correre*.
 have.I caught Gianni at run-_{INF}
 `I caught Gianni running.'
 - d. *L' ho visto *a correre*. him have.I seen at run-INF
- (186) a. L' ho visto a corre.

him have.I seen at run

'I saw him running.'

- b. ??Ho visto *Gianni a corre*. have.I seen Gianni at run
- (187) a. L' ho visto a fa'l cretino co Maria.
 him have.I seen at do-INF the cretin with Maria
 `I saw him flirting with Maria.'

b.??Ho visto *a tu padre a fa'l cretino co Maria*. have.I seen to your father at do- $_{INF}$ the cretin with Maria

In Modern English, on the other hand, the PIC can be used instead of the GC in very limited cases. For instance, the two options in (188) and (189) can be equally found.

- (188) a. There are *men at work*.
 - b. Security cameras saw the thieves at work.
- (189) a. There are *men working*.
 - b. Security cameras saw the thieves working.

More interestingly, it seems that both the PIC and the GC are intertwined in one single structure in archaic as well as in Modern dialectal English. This yields a sort of *reduplication* with regard to the aspectual element that provides the construction with a progressive interpretation. The

sentence in (190a), for example, is from Middle English, cited in Baugh and Cable 1993: 287; (190b) from literary / archaic English, taken from *The Collins English Dictionary*; and (190c) from Modern Appalachian English, cited in Romaine 1988:187.

- (190) a. He was $\{on > a\}$ laughing.¹²⁹
 - b. Come a-running.
 - c. He's been *a*-working all day.¹³⁰

As I claimed in the previous sections, the element that provides the PR, the PIC, and the GC with a progressive interpretation is the C *que*, the locative P a, and the suffix *-ing*, respectively. At syntax, these three heads appear associated with either a CP, a PP or a VP-node. This is schematically represented in (191).

(191) At Syntax



The representation in (191) leads us to say that the combination of an extended projection of V, or N, with either the aspectual C *que* or the locative P *a* in a CSCl is an *analytic* option that can be used to express an event in progress, whereas the combination of an extended projection of V with

¹²⁹ According to Baugh and Cable (1993: 287), the P on "weakened" to a and finally to \emptyset .

¹³⁰ That the gerund is verbal in Appalachian English is clearly seen in examples like that in (i), in which the semantic object of the verb is not preceded by the P *of*. I thank Craig Hilts for the discussion on Appalachian English.
the aspectual suffix *-ing* corresponds to the *synthetic* strategy for expressing the same thing. The analytic or synthetic status of the construction will be determined by the nature of the head that provides the structure with the progressive interpretation, namely the element that stands as the highest *functional head* of the CSCI. For instance, the C *que* and the P *a* in the PR and the PIC, respectively, can show up as independent heads in the structure because they are morphologically independent words. On the other hand, *-ing* is a suffix and, as such, it must appear attached to a head at Syntax. In the GC the head that this suffix is attached to is the verb, which is the *lexical head* of the CSCI.¹³¹ Of course, the syntactic distinction between these two versions should not prevent all these aspectual heads, namely *que*, *a* and *-ing*, from being interpreted at LF in the same position, that is, as the highest head of the extended projection of the verb. This notion is schematically represented in (192) (cf. (191)).¹³²

(i) He was a-hunting a deer.

¹³¹ A language like Basque, for example, would make use of a *synthetic* version by combining the extended projection of an N with a locative suffix. Recall the example cited in (150) above, repeated here in (i).

(i) Jon leihoa apur-tze-n dago.Jon window-_{ABS} break-_{NOM-LOC} be-_{3SG-ABS}

`Jon is breaking the window.'

On the other hand, Dutch and German use an *analytic* version by combining the extended projection of an N with a locative P. The examples cited in (85)-(86) in chapter 4 are repeated here in (iia) for Dutch and (iib) for German.

(ii) a. Jan was een brief *aan* het schrijven.

Jan was a letter at the write

'Jan was writing a letter.'

b. Jan war am Screiben eines Briefes.

¹³² This position accounts for the fact that Ps are usually incompatible with gerunds. As taken here, the gerund suffix would be a sort of attached P. But there are two (apparent) counterexamples to this idea. First, the examples in (190) in the text, which I have claimed to be examples of "reduplication" of the aspectual head. And, secondly, Spanish constructions of the following type:

(i) En llegando a la estación, me acordé de que había olvidado el billete.



The mismatch between the syntactic structure at the overt Syntax, (191), and the syntactic structure at the covert Syntax, or LF, (192), is perfectly captured by the analysis of these three constructions in terms of a CSCI:

(193)

a.				[CP	DP _i	[C′	que	[IP	pro _i	V	(Compl)]]]
b.	[PP	DP _i	[P′	а	[CP	[C′	$arnothing_{\mathrm{C}}$	[IP	$\{PRO_i / pro_i\}$	V	(Compl)]]]]]
c.	[FP	DP _i	[_F ′ -	ing _X	[CP	[c′	\varnothing_{C}	[IP	PRO _i	Vx	(Compl)]]]]]

in arriving at the station me remembered of that had.I forgotten the ticket

`When I was approaching the station, I remembered I had forgotten my ticket.'

In these constructions, the P *en* `in' introduces an adverbial clause, and connects this clause with the TP of the matrix clause (cf. section 4.2.4 in chapter 4).

That is, in each one of these structures there is a slot where the aspectual head is interpreted at LF, and this slot corresponds to the highest head of the extended projection of the V, which is the lexical head of the construction in all three cases.

The goal of the following sections is to show how the aspectual heads *que*, *a* and *-ing* operate in a CSCI-structure in order to provide the construction with a progressive interpretation.

5.4.1 The Mechanism

The basic idea that I would like to present here consists in saying that the C *que* in the PR, the P *a* in the PIC, and the suffix *-ing* in the GC are elements that individuate a singularity out of a plural temporal domain. It is in this sense, then, that they behave like aspectual markers. For this to be possible, I claim that the C that introduces the verbal domain must first shift the ordered set of temporal points provided by the IP (the aktionsart of the event) into a suitable domain, which, in the cases that we are investigating in this dissertation, is a plural domain.

In short, the thesis that I propose here is that the mechanism that Chierchia (1996, 1997, 1998) suggests to account for the distinction between count and mass nouns also applies to the verbal domain of a CSCl. I demonstrate this in the remainder of this chapter.

5.4.1.1 Something about Ns

Chierchia's work assumes the validity of the generally accepted idea that the domain of interpretation, or the domain of discourse, constitutes a complete, atomic, join semilattice (see Chierchia 1996, 1997 and references cited there). Schematically this is represented as follows:

(194)
$$\{a, b, c, d, ...\}$$

254

$$\{a, b, c\} \quad \{a, b, d\} \quad \{b, c, d\} \quad \{a, c, d\} \quad ...$$
$$\{a, b\} \quad \{a, c\} \quad \{a, d\} \quad \{b, c\} \quad \{b, d\} \quad \{c, d\} \quad ...$$
$$a \qquad b \qquad c \qquad d \qquad ... \qquad = \text{ Atoms}$$

The atoms that appear at the bottom of the representation in (194) refer to singularities, whereas the sets indicate pluralities. Here the atoms are components of sets, and the lower sets are components of the higher sets. The formulae that is used in (195), then, state that *b* is a component of the set $\{a, b, d\}$, and that the set $\{a, b\}$ is a component of the set $\{a, b, d\}$, respectively.

- (195) a. $b \le \{a, b, d\}$
 - b. $\{a, b\} \le \{a, b, d\}$

The novelty of Chierchia's work lies in the idea of what he calls the *Inherent Plurality Hypothesis* of mass nouns. As its name already suggests, this hypothesis states that a mass noun, say *furniture*, is an intrinsic plural form. That is, it "simply denotes a set of ordinary individuals *plus* all the pluralities of such individuals" (Chierchia 1997: 2) (the emphasis is Chierchia's).

The *Inherent Plurality Hypothesis* of mass nouns tries to capture the differences observed between the behavior of count nouns and that of mass nouns. Compare (196)-(197) and (198)-(199).

- (196) a. $|\text{table}| \approx \{a, b, c\}$
 - b. $| \text{tables} | \approx \{\{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$
- (197) a. That table is from Italy.
 - b. Those tables are from Italy.
 - c. Three tables are from Italy.

- (198) | furniture $| \approx [a, b, c, \{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{a, c\}, \{a, b, c\}]$
- (199) a. That furniture is from Italy.
 - b. *Those furnitures are from Italy.
 - c. *Three furnitures are from Italy.
 - d. {Those / three} *pieces of* furniture are from Italy.

The examples in (197) show us that a count noun, in this case *table*, can be pluralized or can function as the restrictor of a numeral. This is attributed to the fact that a singular count noun has individuals in its extension (see (196a)), and that a plural count noun has plural individuals or groups in its extension (see (196b)). Conversely, the examples in (199) demonstrate that these two operations yield an ungrammatical result when they are applied to a noun that denotes mass, in this case *furniture*. According to Chierchia's hypothesis, a mass noun cannot be pluralized because it already denotes a plurality (see (198)), and it cannot function as a restrictor of a numeral because its extension is the whole, instead of a range of sets (see (198)).

He further argues that in order to count we need to identify a suitable domain, and that for a natural language a suitable domain is a set of atoms. Therefore, a strategy for counting mass nouns consists in adding a classifier, that is, a relational noun, that turns the plurality, (198), into a set of atoms. This is the function of the noun *pieces* in the example in (199d).

5.4.1.2 Applying the Mechanism to the PR, the PIC, and the GC

To begin with, I assume that the lexical aspect or aktionsart of the eventuality that is provided by a verbal domain (Comrie 1976, Lyons 1977, de Miguel 1990) also constitutes a complete, atomic, join semilattice. This is represented in (200).

(200) $\{t1, t2, t3, t4, t5\}$ $\{t1, t2, t3, t4\} \{t2, t3, t4, t5\}$ $\{t1, t2, t3\}$ $\{t2, t3, t4\}$ $\{t3, t4, t5\}$ $\{t1, t2\}$ $\{t2, t3\}$ $\{t3, t4\}$ $\{t4, t5\}$ t1 t2 tЗ t5 = Atoms t4

In this structure, the atoms are temporal points, while the sets are groups of ordered temporal points.

As with a mass noun, I assume that the imperfective and infinitival forms of a verb also denote a set of individuals, which here would be individual temporal points (e.g. t1, t2, t3 ...), *plus* all the pluralities of such individuals (eg. [t1, t2, t3, t4, t5]). In other words, I assume that these verbal forms are also inherently plurals. Compare (198) with (201).¹³³

(201) a.
$$|\text{imperfective verb}| \approx [t2, t3, t4, \{t2, t3\}, \{t3, t4\}, \{t2, t3, t4\}]$$

b. $|\text{infinitive}| \approx [t1, t2, t3, t4, t5, \{t1, t2\}, \{t2, t3\}, \{t3, t4\}, \{t4, t5\}, \{t1, t2, t3\}, \{t2, t3, t4\}, \{t3, t4, t5\}, \{t1, t2, t3, t4\}, \{t2, t3, t4, t5\}, \{t1, t2, t3, t4\}, \{t2, t3, t4, t5\}]$

Now, for the examples of CSCl that we are examining here, I posit that the mechanism works as follows. First of all, the C that introduces the verbal domain in the PR, the PIC, and the GC (see the structures in (193), repeated here as (202)) would function in these structures as a type shifter. As a type shifter, it does two things. On the one hand, it turns the verbal domain that it introduces

¹³³ Here I take the gerund as an infinitival form. That is, I assume that the temporal information that is provided by the verbal root plus I in a GC is essentially like the temporal information that is supplied by the verbal root plus I in a (control) infinitival clause. Therefore, (201b) would also define the gerund, of course excluding the suffix *-ing*.

into a predicate.¹³⁴ On the other hand, and partly as a consequence of the first operation, it maps the mass denotation of this verbal domain into sets of atoms. That is, it turns (200) into (203). In this sense, then, the role of the C in (204) would be similar to that of the relational noun *pieces* in (205).¹³⁵

(202)

a.				[СР	DP _i	[C′	que	[IP	proi	V	(Compl)]]]
b.	[PP	DP _i	[P′	а	[CP	[C′	\varnothing_{C}	[IP	$\{PRO_i / pro_i\}$	V	(Compl)]]]]]
c.	[FP	DP _i	[F′	-ing _X	[CP	[C′	\emptyset_{C}	[IP	PRO _i	Vx	(Compl)]]]]]

(203)	$\{t1, t2, t3, t4, t5\}$						
	{t1	, t2, t3, t4} {t2	, t3, t4, t5}				
	$\{t1, t2, t3\}$	$\{t2, t3, t4\}$	$\{t3, t4, t5\}$				
	{t1, t2}	{t2, t3}	{t3, t4}	{t4, t5}			

(204)	[<i>C</i>	[IP (MASS)	$V_{\{IMPERF/INF\}}$]]	=	plurality
(205)	[pieces of	[NP (MASS)	furniture]]	=	plurality

And secondly, the aspectual marker *que* in the PR, *a* in the PIC, and *-ing* in the GC would behave as a function, in the sense that it would map a domain of representation containing

¹³⁴ This captures the idea that, apart from a [+modifier] value and a [+propositional] value, a C can also have a [+predicational] value, as we saw in sections 3.2 and 5.3 above.

¹³⁵ This approach finds a neat parallelism in nominal domains. On the one hand, it is contended that an NP can function as a predicate via type shifting (see Chierchia 1997 and references cited there). And, on the other hand, in Chierchia 1996: 25 it is claimed that the semantics of a null D can just be that of "SHIFT."

pluralities and would turn it into a singularity. The result of applying this operation, then, is a single set, that is, a singularity. Some possible sets are shown in (206).

- (206) a. $\{t1, t2\}$
 - b. $\{t1, t2, t3\}$
 - c. $\{t1, t2, t3, t4\}$

At this point, we can see that the role attributed here to the functions *que*, *a*, and *-ing* is similar to the role carried out by a numeral in a nominal domain. Recall that a numeral also singles out a set from a plural domain. The parallelism can be observed by comparing (207) and (208).

(207)	$[\{que, a, -ing\}]$	(PL)	С	[IP (MASS)	$V_{\{IMPERF/INF\}}]]]$	= singular set
(208)	[three	[(PL)	pieces of	[NP (MASS)	furniture]]]	= singular set

5.4.1.3 Some Immediate Consequences

Some consequences that derive from the procedure defended here are discussed in the following sections.

5.4.1.3.1 The Phonological Realization of the Type Shifter

Up to this point, I have been assuming that the type shifter is the C *que* in the PR¹³⁶ and a null C \emptyset_C in the PIC and in the GC. The assumption that this type shifter is indeed present also in these two latter structures is supported by the elements that make up similar constructions in other languages. For instance, as we already know from chapter 3, French makes use of the PR to describe an event

¹³⁶ Recall from section 4.2 in chapter 4 that I am claiming here that the C *que* in the PR functions simultaneously as a C and as an aspectual marker.

in progress with perception verbs and with verbs like *to catch*, among many other contexts. But, as in the rest of the Romance languages, the PR cannot be combined with a copula in this language. Now the interesting thing about French is that neither the PIC nor the GC can appear in this structural context either, as shown by the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (209).

(209) a. *Puisque nous sommes { a / en } visiter les monuments.
since we are at on visit-INF the monuments
b. *Puisque nous sommes visitant les monuments.
since we are visiting the monuments

Instead, a prepositional locution followed by an infinitive must be employed. This prepositional locution is formed by the locative preposition *en* `on' and the N *train*, which can be roughly translated as `stretch'. An example is given in (210).

(210) Puisque nous sommes *en train de visiter* les monuments.
since we are on stretch of visit-_{INF} the monuments
`Since we are visiting the monuments.'

On the other hand, as we already discussed in section 4.2.2.4 in the previous chapter, a progressive event can be described in languages like Dutch and German by means of a locative P, the definite D, and a nominalized verb. Some examples in Dutch are provided in (211).

(211) a. Jan is aan het werken.Jan is at the work`Jan is working.'

- b. Jan is aan het drinken.
 Jan is at the drink
 `Jan is drinking.'
- c. Jan is het kind aan het witschelden.
 Jan is the kid at the insult
 `Jan is insulting the kid.'

Now the relevance of these constructions for our purposes in this section lies in the fact that the type shifter that I have been referring to above appears here phonologically realized. In French, the type shifter is the relational N *train* `stretch', whereas in Dutch it is the definite D *het* `the'. In the system put forward in this dissertation, the procedure that the constructions in (210)-(211) would undergo is the following. First, the infinitive *visiter* `to visit' in French and the nominalized verb in Dutch (*werken / drinken / witschelden*) would provide a domain of representation similar to that of a mass noun (see (200)). Then, the relational N *train* `stretch' in French and the D *het* `the' in Dutch would turn this domain of representation into a countable domain (see (203)). And finally, the Ps *en* `on' and *aan* `at' in French and Dutch, respectively, would individuate a single set out of this countable domain (see (206)), yielding the progressive interpretation.¹³⁷

5.4.1.3.2 The Aspectual Markers Cannot Operate on Atoms

¹³⁷ Compare the Dutch example in (211a) in the text with the English sentence in (188a) above, repeated here as (i).

⁽i) There are *men at work*.

As can be observed, an interesting difference between these two sentences lies in the fact that the type shifter is overt only in the Dutch construction.

The idea that the type shifter (C) maps the mass denotation of the verbal domain that it introduces into sets of atoms, hence eliminating single atoms, is suggested by the ungrammaticality of the examples in (212)-(214).

- (212) a. *En un minuto, lo he visto *que* parpadeaba sólo una vez.
 in a minute him have.I seen that blinked.he-_{IMPERF} only a time.
 b. *En un minuto, lo he visto parpadea*ndo* sólo una vez.
 in a minute him have.I seen blinking only a time
- (213) *En un minuto, ouvio o João a soluçar solo uma vez.in one minute heard.I the João at hiccup-_{INF} only a time
- (214) *In a minute, I saw John blinking only once.

In these sentences the embedded verb is punctual. That is, the event that this verb describes is conceptualized as a short and discrete event in which both the initial and final temporal points of the event are in view at once. As a result, this type of verb will be unable to display a domain of representation containing multiple sets of ordered temporal points. Now the ungrammaticality of the examples in (212)-(214) indicates that the functions *que*, *a*, and *-ing* (also *-ndo* in the Spanish sentence in (212b)) cannot operate on single atoms. This fact, then, supports the idea that the temporal domain that these functions operate on are only constituted of sets of atoms, rather than single atoms. In other words, these sentences argue in favor of the step that goes from (200) to (203).

As expected, the sentences in (212)-(214) become grammatical when either the modifiers *in a minute* and *only once* are dropped or the functions *que*, *a*, or *-ing* are eliminated from the structure.

In the former case, these functions will be allowed to operate on sets of punctual events, yielding an iterative interpretation. This is shown in the examples in (215)-(217).

- (215) Lo he visto que parpadeaba.him has.I seen that blinked.he`I saw him blinking.'
- (216) Ouvio o João *a* soluçar.
 heard.I the João at hiccup-_{INF}
 `I heard João hiccuping.'
- (217) I saw him blinking.

Notice that the iterative interpretation of the event is precluded when the modifiers *in a minute* and *only once* show up in the sentence because there would be a semantic incompatibility between the meaning of the event and the meaning of these modifiers.

In the latter case, there would be no element that would map the mass denotation of the punctual event. So no conflict would arise. This is illustrated in the sentences in (218)-(220).

- (218) a. En un minuto, he visto que parpadeaba sólo una vez.in a minute have.I seen that blinked.he only a time`In a minute, I saw him blink only once.'
 - b. En un minuto, lo he visto parpadear sólo una vez.

in a minute him have. I seen blink-_{INF} only a time 'In a minute, I saw him blink only once.'

- (219) En un minuto, ouvio o João soluçar uma sola vez.
 in a minute heard.I the João hiccup-_{INF} a single time
 `In a minute, I heard João hiccup only once.'
- (220) In a minute, I only saw John blink once.

The embedded clause in (218a) is a regular *that*-clause, whereas in the other examples it is an infinitive clause. Note that the C *que* in (218a) does not head a CSCl, but an ordinary proposition. Therefore, *que* does not function as an aspectual marker in this sentence.

5.4.1.3.3 The Aspectual Markers Operate on Sets

The idea that the domain of representation of the event is constituted of different sets in the examples of CSCl under discussion is supported by the ambiguity that is observed in sentences of the following type:

- (221) a. Mary saw John crossing the street.
 - b. Peter saw John crossing the street.

One reading that these sentences may have is that Mary and Peter saw exactly the same thing. That is, John crossing the street during the stretch of time that goes from, say, t3 to t5. In this interpretation, the function *-ing* would single out the same temporal set from the plural domain

provided by the verbal predicate, namely the temporal set {t3, t4, t5}. But these sentences may also mean different things. For example, maybe Mary saw John crossing the street during the stretch of time that goes from, say, t3 to t4, whereas Peter saw John crossing the street during the stretch of time that goes from t4 to t6. In this case, the function *-ing* would be selecting different temporal sets, which are {t3, t4} and {t4, t5, t6}, respectively. Exactly the same would apply to the PR and the PIC.

5.4.1.3.4 Predicates vs. Arguments

I am claiming here that the C *que* and the null C \emptyset_C function as a type shifter when they appear in a CSCI. In this structural context, then, the role of these elements differ from the role that they have when they are introducing arguments. Consider the examples in (222)-(224).

- (222) He visto que Juan parpadeaba.have.I seen that Juan blinked.he-IMPERF`I saw that Juan was blinking.'
- (223) Ao entrares tu, a Maria saiu.
 at.the enter-INF-2SG you the Maria went.out.she
 `Upon your coming in, Maria left.'
- (224) I remember *telling you to do so*.

The embedded clauses that appear in these sentences do not function as predicates. This means that these sentences do not contain any element that behaves like a type shifter. Consequently, the interpretation of the verbal domain of these clauses as verbal domains denoting a mass-like domain, rather than a plural domain, is what will allow them to be interpreted as arguments or modifiers.

5.4.1.3.5 Aspectual Particles vs. Aspectual Verbs

I have argued that the aspectual particles *que*, *a*, and *-ing* operate on the plural domain that is provided by the verbal predicate after the intervention of a type shifter. Now aspectual verbs, like Spanish *empezar a* 'begin to', *acabar de* 'finish of', *volver a* 'come back to', among others, would differ from these aspectual particles in that these verbs do not individuate a singularity out of the domain of interpretation provided by the infinitive that they generally precede. And this is so because in the kind of sentences where these aspectual verbs are usually found there is no type shifter between the infinitive and the aspectual verb that maps the mass denotation of the infinitive into sets of atoms, that is, into a plurality. This means that these aspectual verbs will only be able to modify the whole mass domain, as opposed to the aspectual markers *que*, *a*, and *-ing*. This is what we find in sentences like that in (225).

(225) Juan *empieza a* cantar. Juan begins to sing

Here the aspectual verb *empieza a* `begins to' cannot select an (initial) temporal set out of the temporal domain displayed by the infinitival verb *cantar* `to sing' because this infinitival verb displays a mass-like domain (see (201b)). Thus, the aspectual verb *empieza a* `begins to' will be only able to modify the whole mass denotation that the infinitival verb *cantar* `to sing' provides. Note, incidentally, that this approach is in accordance with the generally accepted idea that

aspectual as well as modal verbs are auxiliaries in languages like Spanish. In other words, these verbs do not usually select clauses headed by a null C, let alone headed by a null predicational C.¹³⁸

5.4.2 Selecting Temporal sets: Parametric Variation

Interestingly, there is a parametric difference with regard to the extension of the temporal set that the aspectual markers *que*, *a*, and *-ing* (*-ndo* in Spanish and *-nt* in Catalan) can select. To see this, consider first the Spanish and Catalan examples in (226) and (227), respectively.

(226) a. Yo mismo lo he visto que arreglaba el coche I self him have.I seen that repaired.he-IMPERF the car (*hasta que ha terminado.)
until that has.he finished
`I myself saw him repairing the car until he finished.'

- (i) a. John is singing.
 - b. John is at home.

The interesting thing with regard to the copula *be* is that it can also combine with predicates that do not denote an event, like *at home* in (ib). This fact, then, clearly shows that the aspectual information that the copula provides the sentence with (recall the *ser / estar* alternation in Spanish) does not operate on the temporal domain of that predicate, just like the aspectual verb *empieza a* `begins to' does not operate on the temporal domain of the infinitive *cantar* `to sing' in (225) either. And we can see this because the predicate *at home* cannot display a temporal domain.

In Spanish the copula *ser* combines with individual-level predicates, (iia), whereas *estar* combines with stage-level predicates, (iib).

(ii) a. Juan es inteligente.

`Juan is intelligent.'

b. Juan *está* en casa.

'Juan is at home.'

¹³⁸ The same behavior would apply to the copula be:

- b. Lo he visto *que* hacía un pastel de manzana. (*Ahora him have.I seen that make.he-IMPERF a cake of apple. Now ya sé cómo se hace.)
 already know.I how SE do
 `I saw him making an apple cake. Now I finally know how to make one.'
- (227) a. Jo mateix he vist en Joan *que* arreglava el cotxe (*fins que ha acabat.)`I myself saw Joan repairing the car until he finished.'
 - b. He vist en Joan *que* feia un pastís de poma. (*Ara ja sé com es fa.)`I saw Joan making an apple cake. Now I finally know how to make one.'

As can be observed, in these sentences the PR is combined with a perception verb. Now these sentences become ungrammatical at the moment that the adjunct *until he finished* and the sentence *Now I finally know how to make one* are inserted in the examples in (a) and (b), respectively. The semantic property that this adjunct and this clause share is that they both force an interpretation in which the subject of the perception verb must have seen the whole event described by the perception verb complement. Therefore, the ungrammatical result that is immediately obtained when the adjunct in the cases in (a) and the sentence in the examples in (b) is introduced indicates that in Spanish and Catalan the aspectual marker *que* cannot select a temporal set large enough to cover the totality or a good part of the event described by the internal predication.

The Spanish and Catalan sentences contrast with their counterparts in Italian:

- (228) a. L'ho visto *che* riparava la macchina (?finché ha terminato.)
 - b. L'ho visto *che* faceva una torta. ((?)Ora so come si fa.)

Here the question mark is just an indication that these sentences are slightly less natural than the examples in (229) where the connector *mentre* (`as'/`while') is utilized.

- (229) a. L'ho visto *mentre* riparava la macchina finché ha terminato.
 - b. L'ho visto mentre faceva una torta. Ora so come si fa.

Now a fact that can help us understand why the PR can receive a broader interpretation in Italian than in Spanish and Catalan is found in that these latter languages can make use of the GC to express the situation that is described by the Italian examples in (228). As we already know, this option is precluded in Italian. This grammatical contrast is illustrated in the sentences in (230) in Spanish, (231) in Catalan, and (232) in Italian.

- (230) a. Yo mismo lo he visto arregla*ndo* el coche hasta que ha terminado.I self him have.I seen repairing the car until that has.he finished`I myself saw him repairing the car until he finished.'
 - b. Lo he visto haciendo un pastel de manzana. Ahora ya sé him have.I seen making a cake of apple. Now already know.I cómo se hace.
 how se do

'I saw him making an apple cake. Now I finally know to make one.'

- (231) a. Jo mateix l'he vist arreglant el cotxe fins que ha acabat.
 - b. L'he vist fent un pastís de poma. Ara ja sé com es fa.
- (232) a. *L'ho visto riparando la macchina finché ha terminato.
 - b. *L'ho visto facendo una torta. Ora so come si fa.

The examples in (233)-(235), on the other hand, show that the locative P that appears in the PIC in European Portuguese, (233), and in the construction with a nominalized infinitive in Dutch, (234), and German, (235), behaves more like the C *che* in the Italian PR and the suffix *-ndo / -nt* in the Spanish and Catalan GC than the C *que* in the Spanish and Catalan PR. That is, this locative P can also select large temporal sets.

- (233) Eu vi os meninos *a* escrever(em) uma carta das quatro as cinco.
 I saw.I the children at write._{INF-(AGR)} a letter from four to.the five
 `I saw the children writing a letter from four to five o'clock.'
- (234) Jan was van twee tot vier een brief *aan* het schrijvenJan was from two to four a letter at the write`Jan was writing a letter from two to four o'clock.'
- (235) Jan war von zwei bis vier Uhr am Schreiben eines Briefes.

Finally, there are specific cases in which the PR is preferred over the GC in languages like Spanish and Catalan, contrary to what we have just seen in the examples above in which the PR ((226)-(227)) is precluded in favor of the GC ((230)-(231)). Not surprisingly this usually occurs when the verb contained within the PR does not express a process. This is the case of verbs like *irse* 'to leave', *llevar* 'to carry' and, more generally, stative verbs.¹³⁹ This is shown in the examples in (236)-(238) in Spanish, and in their counterparts in Catalan in (239)-(241). (I thank María Antonia Martín Zorraquino for bringing out these contrasts for me.)

- (236) a. He visto a Juan que se iba de la fiesta.
 have.I seen to Juan that _{SE} left.he of the party
 `I saw Juan leaving the party.'
 - b.??He visto *a Juan yéndose de la fiesta*. have.I seen to Juan leaving of the party
- (237) a. He visto a Juan que llevaba una copa en una bandeja.
 have.I seen to Juan that carried.he a glass in a tray
 `I saw Juan carrying a glass on a tray.'
 - b.??He visto *a Juan llevando una copa en una bandeja*. have.I seen to Juan carrying a glass in a tray
- (238) a. He visto a Juan que estaba en la esquina.

(i) *Estando el jefe allí*, no se atrevieron a decir nada.
being the boss there no _{SE} dare to say anything
`The boss being there, they didn't dare to say anything.'

¹³⁹ In these languages, the gerund form of a stative verb can appear in the PG. Recall the Spanish example in (ib) in footnote 4, repeated here as (i).

have.I seen to Juan that was.he on the corner 'I saw Juan standing on the corner.'

- b. *He visto *a Juan estando en la esquina*. have.I seen to Juan standing on the corner
- (239) a. He vist *en Joan que se n'anava de la festa*.b.??He vist *en Joan anant-se'n de la festa*.
- (240) a. He vist *en Joan que portava una copa en una safata*.b.??He vist *en Joan portant una copa en una safata*.
- (241) a. He vist *en Joan que era a la cantonada*.
 - b. *He vist en Joan essent a la cantonada.

In these contexts, then, Spanish and Catalan behave more like Italian, which also must use the PR, (242), than English, which can only use the GC, (243).

- (242) Ho visto *Gianni che stava sull' angolo*.
 have.I seen Gianni that was.he on.the corner
 `I saw Gianni standing on the corner.'
- (243) I saw John standing on the corner.

The conclusion that can be drawn in this section is that the analytic and the synthetic versions of the same construction that is used to express an event in progress are in complementary distribution crosslinguistically (for example, Italian (PR) versus English (GC) or European Portuguese (PIC) versus Brazilian Portuguese (GC)), but they tend to be in complementary distribution in those languages where both versions are possible (for example, Spanish and Catalan (PR and GC)).

5.5 Summary

From chapter 3 through chapter 5 we have examined the syntactic and semantic properties of the PR, the PIC, and the GC. We have seen that an important general property that links these three constructions is that they all behave like SCIs rather than propositions.

The syntactic analysis that has been defended for each of these constructions is perfectly in accordance with the properties established by the general CSCI-model that was presented in chapter 2. More specifically, we have seen that in all three cases the subject of the construction is base-generated in the specifier of the highest extended projection of the lexical head of the clause, which in these examples is a V. From this position, this subject, which can be a lexical DP or a PRO, controls the null grammatical subject pro or PRO that is found within the internal IP-node. The result of this structural configuration is a domain of internal control, and hence a CSCI.

The idea that the PR, the PIC, and the GC are tokens of a single structure helps us to understand two important facts. On the one hand, the neat similarity among these constructions not only from a syntactic perspective but also from a semantic viewpoint. And, on the other hand, the complementary distribution that is observed among these three constructions. We have seen that this complementary distribution occurs crosslinguistically and within the same language. In this latter case, it has been shown that the use of one construction over the other depends generally on either the syntactic context or the meaning of the sentence in which the construction appears.

273

These three chapters have also presented specific proposals concerning the inner working of these constructions. I have claimed that the particles *que*, *a*, and *-ing* head the PR, the PIC and the GC, respectively, and that the PR and the PIC are just an analytic version of a construction that expresses an event in progress, whereas the GC stands as the synthetic version of the same construction. I have also shown the mechanism that yields the progressive interpretation in all these constructions. I have argued that in the PR, the PIC, and the GC the C, which is an extended projection of the V that these constructions contain, is a type shifter and, as a such, turns the verbal domain that it introduces into a predicate and maps the mass denotation of this verbal domain into sets of atoms. The result of this operation is a plurarity. In addition, it has been shown that the particles *que*, *a*, and *-ing* are aspectual markers that turn this plurality into a singularity. Hence the progressive interpretation of these constructions. I have also provided arguments that indicate that the C *que* of the PR behaves simultaneously like a C and like an aspectual marker, and that this latter value is not surprising given the adverbial value that the lexical item *que* can have in Romance, among other facts.

Chapter 6

Nonverbal Complex Small Clauses

"Por el esfuerzo bien aplicado se va llegando al esfuerzo sin esfuerzo."

(Ramiro A. Calle)

6.1 Nonverbal Complex Small Clauses

In this chapter I show that there are other constructions that also respond to the Complex Small Clause-model presented in chapter 2. The novelty that the constructions investigated in this chapter offer lies in that the lexical head of the construction is not a V, but an N or an A.

To begin with, consider the constructions that appear in italics in the sentences in (1) in English and in (2) in Spanish.¹⁴⁰

- (1) a. They took *John for a fool*.
 - b. John passes for a soldier.
 - c. They regard John as a good guy.

¹⁴⁰ Actually the Spanish sentence in (2a) is ambiguous. In one interpretation, which is the relevant reading here, *takefor* functions as a semantic unit (see section 6.2.2 below) and its meaning would resemble the meaning of the verb *to consider*. Thus, in this interpretation (2a) would roughly mean something like `Juan was considered a fool'. On the other hand, the verb *to take* can be interpreted in (2a) like the verb *to choose*. In this reading, then, *for* would simply introduce an adjunct clause, which would indicate the cause that led them to "choose" Juan. In this interpretation, (2a) would roughly mean something like `Juan was taken because of his foolishness'. This latter reading is the only one obtained when the AP *tonto* `fool' is preceded by the copula *ser* `to be', (i); when this AP is embedded within a DP, (ii); or when the subordinate construction in (2a) is coordinated with a clause introduced by *porque* `because', (iii) (see Gutiérrez Ordóñez 1986 and references cited there).

- (i) Tomaron a Juan por *ser* tonto.
 took.they to Juan for be-_{INF} fool
 `They took Juan because he was a fool.'
- (ii) Tomaron a Juan por *lo tonto que era*.
 took.they to Juan for the fool that was.he
 `They took Juan because he was such a fool.'
- (iii) Tomaron a Juan por tonto y porque sabían que no diría una sola palabra.
 took.they to Juan for fool and because knew.they that no say.would.he an only word
 `They took Juan because he was a fool and because they knew he would not say a word.'

- (2) a. Tomaron *a Juan por tonto*.
 took.they to-_{ACC} Juan for fool
 `They took Juan for a fool.'
 - b. Juan pasa por soldado.
 Juan passes.he for soldier
 `Juan passes for a soldier.'

Apparently these constructions are composed of a DP, a particle, and an XP.¹⁴¹ The particle is *for* or *as* in the English examples in (1), and *por* `for' in the Spanish sentences in (2). As far as the categorial value of X is concerned, it can be either nominal (N), as in the examples in (1) and presumably (2b), or adjectival (A), as in (2a).¹⁴²

In these constructions, the XP describes a property or an entity that holds for the DP. This means that, for instance, *a fool* in (1a) and *tonto* in (2a) are predicated of the DP *John* and *Juan*, respectively.¹⁴³ In fact, the predicative relationship between these two phrases can be independently established within a copular sentence. This is illustrated in (3).

(i) Tomaron a Juan por *muy* tonto.

`They took Juan for a big fool.'

- ¹⁴³ In this type of construction, proper names can also appear as predicates. This is shown in (i).
 - (i) a. They took John for Michael.
 - b. Tomaron a Juan por Miguel.

¹⁴¹ In the examples in b, this construction combines with the raising verb *to pass / pasar*. So, in these sentences, the DP would have moved to the subject position of the matrix clause at Syntax.

¹⁴² In contrast to English, the phrase *tonto* `fool' is adjectival in this construction in Spanish. Note that in this language *tonto* can be modified by the degree phrase *muy* `very', as shown in (i) (see also section 6.1.2.2.1 below).

- (3) a. John is a fool.
 - b. Juan es tonto.

The predicative relationship that is found in the embedded constructions in (1) and (2) suggests that at some point of the derivation the subject (DP) and the head of the predicate (X) set up a local Spec-Head agreement, presumably within a functional projection. Spanish, for instance, morphologically manifests the agreement in gender and number that holds between these two elements when the syntactic category of X is A.¹⁴⁴ Thus, in (4) the DP *tus hermanas* 'your sisters' triggers the agreement in gender (feminine) and number (plural) on the A *tontas* 'fools'.

(4) Tomaron a tus hermanas por { *tonto / *tonta / took.they to-ACC your sisters-FEM-PL for fool-MASC-SG fool-FEM-SG
*tontos / tontas. }
fool-MASC-PL fool-FEM-PL

As predicates, these proper names cannot be taken as referential. They would rather denote the physical or nonphysical properties that characterize the individual called *Michael* or *Miguel* in the examples in (i). In other words, the proper name is taken as intensional. This can also be seen in copular sentences:

(ii) Clarín {is / es} Leopoldo Alas.

For different philosophical argumentations regarding the semantics of proper names, see Ludlow 1997, part IV. See also Fernández Leborans 1999a and references cited there.

¹⁴⁴ In some cases, the DP and X may only agree in number when the syntactic category of X is N. This must be attributed to the inherent masculine or feminine properties of the N. An example is provided in (i).

(i) Tomaron a tus herman*as* por un*os* fantasmas.
 took.they to your sisters-FEM-PL for some-MASC-PL ghosts MASC-PL
 `They took your sisters for ghosts.'

In this sentence, it can be observed that the N fantasmas 'ghosts' keeps its inherent masculine properties.

`They took your sisters for fools.'

On the other hand, it seems that the DP, the particle, and the XP form a single complex constituent. For instance, the fact that the sentences in (1) and (2) do not presuppose the meaning of the sentences in (5) and (6) indicates that, in the former cases, the DP *John / Juan* does not have the same semantic relationship with the verb as it would have were this DP the semantic object or subject of that verb.

- (5) a. #They took John.
 - b. #John passes.
 - c. #They regard John.

(6) a. #Tomaron a Juan.

b. #Juan pasa.

This is another clue that suggests that the DP *John / Juan* is an argument of the embedded complex constituent in the sentences in (1) and (2).

In the next section, I present what I call the standard analysis of these constructions, and point out some nontrivial problems that derive from this approach (section 6.1.1). Then I introduce the analysis of this type of construction in terms of a Complex Small Clause (section 6.1.2). And finally, I provide arguments that indicate that the head of the Complex Small Clause behaves like a semi-lexical head in these cases (section 6.2).¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁵ In Spanish, as well as in English, there are other constructions the composition of which seems to be identical to the composition of the constructions that are discussed in this chapter. For instance, consider the Spanish examples in (i) and (ii).

⁽i) María la recibió como embajadora.

6.1.1 The Standard Analysis

The standard, and at first sight the most simple, analysis that has been proposed for the constructions under discussion is the one depicted in (7) (see, for instance, Hantson 1989 and Starke 1995).

 $(7) \qquad \begin{bmatrix} CP & \begin{bmatrix} C' & C & \dots & \begin{bmatrix} SCI(XP) & DP & X' \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

María her received.she as ambassador-_{FEM-SG} 'María received her as an ambassador.'

(ii) a. Los trataron de mafiosos.
 them treated.they of hoodlums-MASC-PL
 `They were treated as hoodlums.'

b. La puso de cocinera.
her put.(s)he of cook-FEM-SG
`She was employed as a cook.'

In the example in (i), the sequence introduced by *como* 'as' functions as an adjunct. This accounts for the optionality of this constituent in the sentence. Furthermore, this constituent can be predicated either of the object or the subject of the matrix clause. In the examples in (ii), on the other hand, the sequence introduced by *de* 'of' must be interpreted as a complement of the matrix clause. This explains why the presence of this complement in the sentence is obligatory. In contrast to the example in (i), this sequence can only be predicated of the object of the matrix verb. Now, despite these differences between the sentences in (i) and (ii) and despite the different semantic value of the particle *como* 'as' and *de* 'of' from case to case, it can be observed that all these constructions involve a subject (either *María* or *la* 'her' in (i), *los* 'them' in (iia), and *la* 'her' in (iib)) which agrees in gender and number with an N or an A (*embajadora* 'ambassador', *mafiosos* 'hoodlums', *cocinera* 'cook') that is introduced by a particle (*como* 'as', *de* 'of'). This fact makes me think

'them' in (iia), and *la* 'her' in (iib)) which agrees in gender and number with an N or an A (*embajadora* 'ambassador', *mafiosos* 'hoodlums', *cocinera* 'cook') that is introduced by a particle (*como* 'as', *de* 'of'). This fact makes me think that probably the CSCI-analysis that is defended in this chapter for the constructions in (1) and (2) in the text could also be extended to the examples in (i) and (ii). Of course, this idea should be confirmed or discarded by future research. For more on these types of constructions, see Navas Ruiz 1977, Gutiérrez Ordóñez 1986, Suñer 1990, Demonte and Masullo 1999.

If we apply this analysis to the constructions that appear embedded in the examples in (8), we obtain the representations in (9).

(8) a. They took *John for a fool*.

- b. They regard John as smart.
- (9) a. They took $John_i$ [CP t_i [C' for ... [SCI(DP) t_i a fool.]]] b. They regard $John_i$ [CP t_i [C' as ... [SCI(AP) t_i smart.]]]

First of all, the structure in (7) states that the X', *a fool* in the example in (8a) and *smart* in (8b), and the DP, *John*, constitute a Small Clause (SCI). This means that, following the Small Clause Theory, the DP *John* is an argument that is base-generated in the specifier of the phrase projected by the head of the predicate. This position is presumably Spec, NP in (8a)¹⁴⁶ and Spec, AP in (8b). In this position, this DP is assigned a theta-role by the SCI-predicate. Later, at some point of the derivation, the DP and the head of the predicate will move up to a functional projection, say ZP (see section 2.2 in chapter 2), in order to establish local Spec-Head agreement. In the structure in (7), the functional projection ZP would be found where the dots appear, that is, between the lexical XP-shell and C. This SCI, in turn, is selected by the particle *for* / *as*, which heads the construction that is subcategorized for by the verb in the examples in (8).

As represented in the structure in (7), these particles are treated as *prepositional complementizers* (see Emonds 1985, Hantson 1989, Starke 1995). On the one hand, they are claimed to be `prepositional' (P) because they are homophonous with Ps, (10), and because they can be left stranded in those languages that normally allow P-stranding, as English, (11).

¹⁴⁶ I say "presumably" since, as far as I know, we still lack substantial evidence regarding the position that the subject of a SCl is base-generated in when the predicate of that SCl is a DP.

- (10) a. This is for me.
 - b. As his friend, my opinions are probably biased.
- (11) a. Who do you take me *for*?
 - b. What do you regard him as?

On the other hand, they are called `complementizers' (C) since both can be found introducing a full sentence. This is illustrated in (12).¹⁴⁷

- (12) a. *For* me to go is impossible.
 - b. I did as I was told.

An advantage that is often pointed out by the proponents of the C status of the particles *for* and *as* in (8) is that by adopting this hypothesis we avoid having to say that in (8b), for instance, "P selects AP, an otherwise unattested fact" (Starke 1995: 245). But notice that this argument immediately collapses when we say that these particles do select a (small) clause in these constructions. Semantically, this means that P would not select a property, namely an A, but a subject-predicate relationship. And, from a syntactic viewpoint, P would not subcategorize for a bare AP-shell, but for the functional domain introducing that AP-shell.¹⁴⁸ Nonetheless, this new

- (i) Ba mhinic [_{CP} [_{C'} gan [_{SCl} é sa teach.]]]
 was often neg him in-the house
 `He was often not in the house.'
- ¹⁴⁸ Perhaps the ZP-node.

¹⁴⁷ The idea that these particles are Cs is in tune with the fact that, in some languages, SCls can be introduced by a C. In Irish, for instance, a SCl can be introduced by the prepositional C *gan*, which is a C that expresses sentential negation (see Chung and McCloskey 1987). This is illustrated in (i), from Chung and McCloskey 1987: 186.

perspective turns out to reinforce the idea of treating *for* and *as* as prepositional Cs, because now these particles may be considered the highest head of a *clausal domain*, that is, the clausal domain of the SCl. I will come back to this point in section 6.2 below.

Finally, in the representations in (9) it is assumed that the subject of the SCl, *John*, moves to the matrix clause to check structural Case. This movement is already carried out at Syntax, and it goes from Spec, XP, to Spec, CP, and, finally, to a position within the matrix clause, presumably the specifier of an agreement projection.¹⁴⁹ In the examples in (13) the Case checked is accusative, and is assigned by the matrix verb. The matrix verb cannot assign accusative in the sentences in (14), since it is a raising verb in (14a) and a passivized verb in (14b, c). So the Case checked by the DP here is the nominative that is assigned by the matrix IP-head.

- (13) a. They took *him* for a fool.
 - b. I regard *him* as smart.
- (14) a. *He* passes for a soldier.
 - b. *He* was taken for a fool.
 - c. He was regarded as smart.

In the following subsections I bring up some nontrivial problems for the analysis in (7).

6.1.1.1 The Relationship between the SCI-Subject and the Prepositional C

A first question that immediately comes up by adopting the analysis in (7) is why the prepositional C, in particular *for*, cannot assign Case to the subject of the SCl that it precedes in these constructions. This is surprising, bearing in mind that in English the prepositional C *for* does

¹⁴⁹ I ignore the functional projection ZP here just for ease of exposition.

generally assign Case to the subject of the infinitival clause that it may introduce. The puzzling contrast, then, is that between the example in (15) and the one in (16).

- (15) It is impossible for *him* to go.
- (16) *They took for *him* a fool.

A related issue is that, in those contexts in which *for* introduces an infinitival clause, this prepositional C cannot license the trace that the subject of the infinitival clause leaves behind when this subject moves to a higher position in the structure. An example is given in (17).

(17) **Who*_i would you prefer
$$[_{CP} t_i [_{C'} \text{ for } [_{IP} t_i \text{ to leave first ?]]}]$$

Again the prepositional C *for* would surprisingly behave in a different way in the constructions under discussion if their analysis were as depicted in (7). As shown in (18), the C *for* would license the trace here, as opposed to what occurs in the sentence in (17).

(18) Who_i did they take $\begin{bmatrix} CP & t_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C' & for \begin{bmatrix} IP & t_i \end{bmatrix} = t_i a fool?$

6.1.1.2 The Movement of the Subject Creates a Mixed [A, A', A] Chain

In the analysis in (7), the movement of the DP-subject from the embedded position where it is basegenerated to the matrix clause would create a mixed (sandwiched) [A, A', A] chain. This is so because that DP would move from Spec, XP, an argumental position (A), to Spec, CP, a nonargumental position (A'), and, finally, to a position within the matrix clause, say Spec, AgroP in examples like the one in (19) and Spec, IP in sentences like the one in (20), again an argumental position (A). (19) a. They took *him* for a fool.

b.

 $[AgroP[A-position] him_i [Agro' [VP they took [CP[A-bar position] t_i [C' for [SCI[A-position] t_i a fool]]]]]]$

- (20) a. *He* passes for a soldier.
 - b.

[IP[A-position] $he_i [I' [VP passes [CP[A-bar position] t_i [C' for [SCI[A-position] t_i a soldier]]]]]]$

Obviously, we would expect this operation to yield an ungrammatical sentence, contrary to the facts.

6.1.1.3 The Subject Cannot Check Case at Logical Form

As has been already mentioned, in languages like Spanish the subject of a sentence can check Case either overtly or covertly, that is, at Syntax or at LF (see section 5.2.2.3.2 in chapter 5). As a result, the subject can show up in the sentence in Spec, IP or, presumably, in the position where it is base-generated, namely in Spec, VP. An example is given in (21).¹⁵⁰

(21) Ayer (Juan) corrió (Juan.)yesterday Juan ran.he Juan`Juan ran yesterday.'

Now a nontrivial question that arises from the analysis in (7) is why the DP that is basegenerated in a position following the particle *por* `for' in the construction in (22) cannot ever

¹⁵⁰ Recall that finite verbs move in Spanish from the head of the VP-projection to the head of IP at Syntax.

remain in that position in such languages and check nominative Case at LF. The impossibility of this option is demonstrated by the ungrammaticality of (23).

- (22) Pocos estudiantes pasaron por jugadores de baloncesto.
 few students passed.they for players of basketball
 `Few students passed for basketball players.'
- (23) *Pasaron por *pocos estudiantes* jugadores de baloncesto.

6.1.1.4 Verbs Like to take Do Not Subcategorize for a Full CP

Finally, the standard analysis assumes that verbs like *to take* subcategorize for an ordinary CPprojection. This move is difficult to reconcile with the fact that verbs of this type do not normally subcategorize for CPs containing a full sentence, instead of a SCI:

- (24) a. *They took *that John is a fool*.
 - b. *They took for John to be a fool.

The ungrammaticality of these sentences shows that the ontological category of `proposition', which is typically associated to a CP-projection at Syntax (see section 3.1.1.3.2 in chapter 3), cannot be combined with the meaning that a verb like *to take* has.¹⁵¹

¹⁵¹ The same argument can be also extended to verbs like *to pass* or *to regard*.

6.1.2 A Complex Small Clause-Analysis

The analysis that I would like to propose here for the constructions that appear in italics in the English sentences in (25) and in the Spanish examples in (26) is as depicted in (27).

- (25) a. They took *John for a fool*.
 - b. John passes for a soldier.
 - c. They regard John as smart.
- (26) a. Tomaron *a Juan por tonto*.
 took.they to-_{ACC} Juan for fool
 `They took Juan for a fool.'
 - b. Juan pasa por soldado.
 Juan passes.he for soldier
 `Juan passes for a soldier.'



287


{ tonto / soldado }

In this structure, X heads a SCl, the subject of which is the argumental PRO that appears in Spec, XP. In (25a) and (25b), for instance, the categorial value of X is nominal (N) (*fool* and *soldier*), ¹⁵² whereas in (25c) it is adjectival (A) (*smart*). This SCl is presumably introduced by a functional domain, which in the structure in (27) is represented by the ZP-node (see section 2.2 in chapter 2). On the other hand, the head of the highest extended projection of X is the particle F, that is, *for / as* in English and *por* in Spanish,¹⁵³ whereas the subject of the construction is the lexical DP that is merged with F', namely *John / Juan*.

In the following sections, I show that these constructions are clauses, in the sense that they establish a subject-predicate relationship (section 6.1.2.1), and discuss the internal organization of the elements that make them up (section 6.1.2.2).

¹⁵² Here I ignore the presence of the D a since, as already pointed out above, we still lack evidence regarding the position in which the subject of a SCl is base-generated when the predicate of that SCl is a DP.

¹⁵³ I do not discuss here whether or not F should be treated as a C. Notice that a positive answer would mean having to accept that SCIs *do* have a CP-projection even in languages like English and Spanish (see footnote 8). This is a strong claim that I would like to postpone here until more substancial evidence in favor of or against this position becomes available.

6.1.2.1 The Subject-Predicate Relationship in a Nonverbal Complex Small Clause

As has been already mentioned above, the DP *Juan / John* and the string that follows this DP form a constituent in sentences like those in (28).

(28) a. Tomaron a *Juan por tonto*.`They took Juan for a fool.'

b. I regard John as smart.

An argument that was cited above to demonstrate this was provided by the sentences in (5) and (6). The examples in (6) are repeated here as (29).

(29) a. #Tomaron a Juan.

b. #I regard John.

As has already been mentioned, the fact that the sentences in (28) do not presuppose the meaning of the sentences in (29) leads us to say that the DP *Juan / John* in the examples in (28) is not a semantic object of the verb, but an argument of the embedded construction.

A second argument in favor of this position is that the complex that these two phrases form can be coordinated with a constituent of the same kind. This is illustrated in (30) for Spanish and in (31) for English.

(30) Tomaron a Juan por traidor y a María por infiel.

`They took Juan for a traitor and María for adulterous.'

(31) John regards *professors as strange* and *politicians as creepy*.

On the other hand, there are arguments that show that the string introduced by the particle *por* `for' in (28a) and *as* in (28b) also forms a constituent. For instance, this sequence can be coordinated with similar constituents, (32), and appear in the so-called *not only* ... *but also* constructions, (33).

- (32) a. Tomaron a Juan *por traidor* y *por incompetente*.`They took Juan for a traitor and for an incompetent.'
 - b. They regard John *as crazy* and *as a fool*.
- (33) a. Tomaron a Juan no sólo *por traidor* sino también *por incompetente*.`They took Juan not only for a traitor but also for an incompetent.'
 - b. Mary regards John not only *as a good soldier* but also *as a good student*.

Secondly, this sequence can be also clefted, as the examples in (34) illustrate.

- (34) a. Es *por tonto* por lo que tienen a Juan.`It is as a fool that they regard Juan.'
 - b. It was as a good soldier that Mary regarded John.

And thirdly, this string can be focused:

(35) a. POR TONTO tomaron a Juan.for fool took.they to Juan`FOR A FOOL they took Juan.'

b. AS INTELLIGENT they regard Mary.

Finally, we have arguments that demonstrate that the sequence introduced by these particles behaves like a predicate, rather than like a complement of the lexical DP. For instance, in languages like Spanish this sequence can precede the lexical DP in the sentence. This is shown in (36).

(36) Tomaron *por tonto* a Juan.took.they for fool to-_{ACC} Juan`They took Juan for a fool.'

As can be observed in this example, the sequence *por tonto* `for a fool' appears preposed to the DP *Juan*. This demonstrates that the so-called process of `restructuring' is available in this construction, and this is so because we are dealing here with an example of reduced predication.¹⁵⁴

Secondly, the sequence introduced by the particle is not affected by the pronominalization of the lexical DP that precedes this sequence. Consider the examples in (37) and (38).

(37) a. Tomaron *a Juan por tonto*.took.they to Juan for fool`They took Juan for a fool.'

¹⁵⁴ Recall that restructuring is a linguistic phenomenon that is typically found in Romance, and consists in preposing the predicate of an argumental SCl to its subject (see section 1.2 in chapter 1).

- b. Lo tomaron por tonto.
 him took.they for fool
 `They took him for a fool.'
- (38) a. They regard *Mary as their best friend*.
 - b. They regard *her* as their best friend.

The sentences in (37b) and (38b) show that the pronoun *lo* 'him' and *her* can only represent the DPs *Juan* and *Mary* that are found in the sentences in (37a) and (38a), respectively. Now this fact proves that the sequence introduced by *por* 'for' and *as* does not form part of a complex DP headed by the N *Juan* or *Mary*. Were this the case, the pronominalization should obligatorily affect the whole complex.

And thirdly, the sentences in (39) show that the DP *Juan* in (39a) and *Mary* in (39b) can be moved from its position leaving the string introduced by the particle behind.

- (39) a. *Juan* fue tomado por tonto.Juan was.he taken for fool`Juan was taken for a fool.'
 - b. Mary was regarded as intelligent.

Again, this possibility indicates that here we are not dealing with a complex DP, but with a construction that involves a predication.

Now all the facts presented so far are perfectly captured by the structure depicted in (27). In this analysis, it is claimed that the constituent introduced by FP is a clause, more specifically a CSC1. The subject of this CSC1 is the argument that is base-generated in Spec, FP; the CSC1-head is F; and the predicate of the construction is the constituent introduced by this F.

6.1.2.2 Internal Organization

In this section, I explain the organization of the elements that constitute this type of construction according to the CSCI-structure in (27), and discuss some facts that straightforwardly derive from this structural organization.

6.1.2.2.1 PRO

The CSCI-structure in (27) tells us that an argumental PRO is directly merged with X'. The result of this operation is a lexical XP-shell in which X' assigns a theta-role to the null argument PRO. In the examples in (40), for instance, the categorial value of X is A.

- (40) a. Tomaron a Juan por PRO *inteligente*.
 took.they to Juan for intelligent
 `They took Juan for intelligent.'
 - b. They regard Mary as PRO smart.

Nonetheless, we also have similar constructions (that will not be discussed in this work) in which the categorial value of X is V. Some examples are provided in (41).

(41) a. John passes as PRO being a soldier.

b. I regard John as PRO *having too much property*.

The sentences in (41) are important since they stand as an argument in favor of the idea that there *is* a subject between the particle and the embedded (verbal) predicate. Now this subject cannot be the lexical DP *John*. Otherwise all the problems attributed to the standard analysis in section 6.1.1 above would arise once again here.

At some point of the derivation, PRO and the head of the lexical XP-shell, namely X, will have to license their predication relationship. Presumably, this licensing is satisfied within a functional projection ZP by means of a Spec-Head agreement relationship between PRO and X. As represented in (27), this functional projection ZP would be found in a position higher than the lexical XP-shell but, importantly, lower than F. Examples like the ones cited in (42) in Spanish indicate that there is "space" between the lexical XP-shell and F. In other words, they show that F is not a sort of prefix attached to the predicate X'. The example in (42a) is taken from J. Eslava Galán, *En busca del unicornio*, 1987, Spain; (42b) from ABC *electrónico* 8888, 1997, Spain; and (42c) from A. Azuela, *La casa de las mil vírgenes*, 1983, Mexico.

- (42) a. [...] aquellas pocas cosas que ellos tenían por *muy* necesarias [...] those few things that they had for very necessary
 `... those few things that they held as being very necessary.'
 - b. El presidente del Gobierno se daría por *muy* contento si [...]

294

the president of the Government himself give.would.he for very happy if `The president of the Government would be very happy if...'

c. como pasa casi siempre, se hizo pasar por *muy* revolucionario [...] as happens almost always himself made.he pass for very revolutionary
`... as it usually happens, he made himself pass for a very revolutionary...'

In these examples, the intensifier *muy* 'muy' shows up between the particle *por* `for' and the A *necesarias* `necessary' in (42a), *contento* `happy' in (42b), and *revolucionario* `revolutionary' in (42c).

As a result of the Spec-Head configuration between PRO and X within the functional projection ZP, PRO will trigger the gender and number agreement on X if the categorial value of that X is A. The Spanish sentence in (43) illustrates this effect.

(43) Tomaron a tus hermanasi por PROi { *tonto / *tonta / took.they to your sisters-FEM-PL for fool-MASC-SG fool-FEM-SG
*tontos / tontas. }
fool-MASC-PL fool-FEM-PL

In this example, it can be observed that X, which here is the A *tontas* `fools', must obligatorily agree in gender (feminine) and number (plural) with the subject PRO, which, as we will see shortly below, is controlled by the lexical DP that is base-generated in Spec, FP, namely *tus hermanas* `your sisters' in (43). The relationship that we find between PRO and X in the internal predication of a nonverbal CSCl, then, would be just like the relationship between PRO and X in constructions of the following kind:

(44) [Por PRO_i { *tonto / *tonta / *tontos / tontas, }]
for fool-MASC-SG fool-FEM-SG fool-MASC-PL fool-FEM-PL
tus hermanas_i perdieron todo lo que habían ganado.
your sisters-FEM-PL lost.they all what that had.they won
`Your sisters lost everything they had won because of their foolishness.'

In this construction the subject PRO also triggers the gender (feminine) and number (plural) agreement on the predicate *tontas* 'fools'. But differently from the construction that we are examining in this chapter, here this PRO is controlled by an argument of the matrix clause, that is, the lexical subject *tus hermanas* 'your sisters'.¹⁵⁵

As far as Case is concerned, it seems reasonable to suppose that the mechanism that serves to license the PRO that typically appears functioning as the subject of an adjunct SCl, as in (45), or the PRO that is found in sentences like those in (46) also licenses the PRO that is contained in the internal predication of the CSCls in (47).¹⁵⁶

- (i) Por PRO tontas, Juan perdió todo lo que había ganado.
 - for fool-_{FEM}-PL Juan lost.he all what that had.he won

'Juan lost everything he had won because of their foolishness.'

As one can observe, here PRO must refer to a feminine plural N, which does not appear in the sentence.

¹⁵⁶ It is important to remark at this point that the predicate of the SCl, namely X', will not need Case even if it is nominal. The reason is simple: this phrase is not an argument, but a predicate that expresses a property that holds of its subject.

¹⁵⁵ In examples of this type, the reference of PRO can also be contextually established. That is, a sentence like that in (i) is also grammatical.

(45) I found the glass_i [*PRO*_i empty.]

(46) [Por *PRO*_i tonto,] Juan_i perdió todo lo que había ganado.
for fool Juan lost.he all what that had.he won
`Juan lost everything he had won because of his foolishness.'

- (47) a. Tomaron a $[Juan_i \text{ por } PRO_i \text{ tonto.}]$
 - b. They took [John_i for *PRO*_i a fool.]

So, in all three constructions, PRO presumably checks some kind of null Case by default.

The analysis in (27), on the other hand, predicts that PRO is the argument that must bind the anaphor that may appear in the complement position of the CSCl-internal predication. Consider the example in (48).

(48) María_j tomó a [_{CSC1} Juan_i [por [_{SC1 (DP)} PRO_i un apasionado María took.she to-_{ACC} Juan for a fanatic {*de sí mismo_i / *de sí misma_j*.}]]]
of himself of herself
`María took Juan for a fanatic {of himself / *of herself.}'

In this sentence, we can see that the anaphor cannot be bound by the subject of the matrix clause. According to the CSCl-analysis in (27), the lexical DP *Juan* would not be a candidate to bind the anaphor either, because this argument would not bind the anaphor locally, that is, within the domain of the internal predication of the CSCl. Thus the only candidate that would be able to do so would be the subject of the SCl, namely PRO.

The sentences in (49) and (50) show that this PRO cannot be replaced by a phonologically realized pronoun.

- (49) *Tomaron a Juan_i por \acute{el}_i (fuera) tonto. took.they to Juan for he were.he fool
- (50) a. *They took John_i for $\{him_i / he_i\}$ (were) a fool.
 - b. *They regard John_i as he_i (were) smart.

This is another property that characterizes both the subject of the internal predication of a nonverbal CSCl and the subject of the internal predication of a verbal CSCl, as we have already seen in the previous chapters.

Summarizing, the CSCl stucture in (27) sustains that the particle *for / as* in English and *por* `for' in Spanish introduces a predicative relationship. The domain that these particles precede in these constructions, then, would clearly differ from the domain introduced by a P in ordinary SCls, (51), whereas it would resemble the domain introduced by a copula, (52).

- (51) a. Juan_i está [$_{SC1(PP)}$ t_i [$_{P'}$ en [$_{NP}$ casa.]]] b. John_i is [$_{SC1(PP)}$ t_i [$_{P'}$ at [$_{NP}$ home.]]]
- (52) Tus hermanas_i son [_{SC1(AP)} t_i [_{A'} tontas.]]
 your sisters are fools
 `Your sisters are fools.'

On the one hand, the P *en* `in' that appears in the Spanish sentence in (51a) and the P *at* that shows up in its English counterpart in (51b) select an NP, which here is headed by the N *casa* and *home*, respectively. Now the basic difference between this projection (NP) and the projection headed by X in a nonverbal CSCl (XP) lies in that, in the former case, the projection does not contain any (null) subject. The reason for this is simple: in these constructions *casa* and *home* are not predicated of any subject. For instance, these Ns cannot be predicated of a PRO controlled by the DP *Juan* or *John*. We know this because the sentences in (53) are ungrammatical.

- (53) a. *Juan es casa.
 - b. #John is home.¹⁵⁷

Conversely, according to the analysis that is defended in this work, the projection headed by X in a nonverbal CSCl does contain a subject. This subject is a PRO and is base-generated in Spec, XP. This straightforwardly accounts for the fact that the internal predication, namely X', can be combined independently with a lexical subject in a copulative sentence. Compare (51) and (53) with (54)-(55).¹⁵⁸

- (i) a. Tomaron a Juan por *mi*.
 took.they to Juan for me
 `They took Juan for me.'
 - b. Tomaron a Juan por *ti*.
 took.they to Juan for you
 `They took Juan for you.'

¹⁵⁷ This sentence is acceptable in one interpretation in English because the word *home* can also convey the meaning of *at home* or *to one's home*. The relevant reading in (53b), however, is that in which the properties of *home* are attributed to *John*.

¹⁵⁸ Consider the Spanish examples in (i).

- (54) a. María tomó a Juan por *(un) estúpido*.
 María took.she to Juan for a stupid
 `María took Juan for stupid.'
 - b. They regard John as *their best friend*.
- (55) a. Juan es *(un) estúpido*.

`Juan is stupid.'

b. John is *their best friend*.

Contrary to what is claimed in the text, the oblique forms *mi* `me' and *ti* `you' cannot be predicated of *Juan* in a copulative sentence:

- (ii) a. *Juan es mí.
 - (cf. ^{OK}John is me.)
 - b. *Juan es ti.

What I would like to suggest here is that the oblique forms *mi* `me' and *ti* `you' in the sentences in (i) are default forms that are used here to indicate the property of `no-subject' of the pronoun in this structural context. As it is claimed in Fernández Leborans 1999b, a default Case "anula o neutraliza la condición de sujeto gramatical de los pronombres personales que, por ser expresiones propiamente referenciales, son categorías idóneas para la función de sujeto lógico, y, por tanto, gramatical" (p. 2414). Therefore, the oblique forms *mi* `me' and *ti* `you' in (i) would indicate that these personal pronouns are not subjects. Notice that in Spanish the pronoun that appears in a postcopular position carries nominative Case and, importantly, triggers the agreement on the copula, in contrast to languages such as English. This is illustrated in (iii).

(iii) La causa de todo esto $\{eres / *es\}$ tú.

the cause of all this are / is you-NOM

`The cause of all this is you.'

In this sentence, the copula must obligatorily agree with the personal pronoun $t\dot{u}$ 'you' because $t\dot{u}$ 'you' is the referential expression here.

6.1.2.2.2 The Lexical DP

Differently from the standard approach, I claim that the particle that appears in these constructions is not the head of an ordinary CP-constituent, but the head of a CSCl (cf. subsection 6.1.1.4 above). In other words, I claim that F is the head of the highest extended projection of X, and, hence, the head of the projection that hosts the subject of the construction. As represented in (27), the subject of the construction is the DP that is base-generated in Spec, FP. Like the lexical subject of any other type of argumental (C)SCl, this DP will check structural Case outside its clausal domain. In the examples in (56), the Case checked is the accusative assigned by the matrix verb, whereas in (57) and (58) it is the nominative Case that is assigned by the matrix IP-head.

- (56) a. Lo tienen por tonto.him have.they for fool`They regard him as a fool.'
 - b. They regard him as smart.
- (57) a. (*Él*) es tenido por un don nadie.he is had for a don nobody`He is regarded as a no-one.'
 - b. He was regarded as smart.
- (58) a. $(\acute{E}l)$ pasa por soldado.
 - b. *He* passes for a soldier.

As already pointed out above, examples of this kind demonstrate that the lexical subject of the embedded construction can move from the position where it is base-generated to an argumental position of the matrix sentence. Now the analysis of these constructions in terms of a CSC1 correctly predicts the legitimacy of this operation. This is so since, in the examples in (57) and (58), for instance, the lexical subject would move from Spec, FP, an A-position, to the subject position of the matrix sentence, again an A-position. This movement, then, would create a well-formed [A, A] chain. Compare the derivation in (59b) with the derivations in (19) and (20) that were discarded in subsection 6.1.1.2 above. (20) is repeated here as (60).

- (59) a. *He* passes for a soldier.
 - b.

 $[IP [A-position] he_i [I' [VP passes [FP [A-position] t_i [F' for [SCI PRO a soldier]]]]]]$

- (60) a. *He* passes for a soldier.
 - b.

[IP[A-position] $he_i [I' [VP passes [CP[A-bar position] t_i [C' for [SCI[A-position] t_i a soldier]]]]]]$

As the sentences in (61) show, the subject of this type of CSCl can also be an anaphor bound by the subject of the matrix sentence in those contexts in which this CSCl functions as the object of a verb.

- (61) a. John_i took *himself*_i for intelligent.
 - b. Juan_i se tomó (a sí mismo_i) por inteligente.

Again this fact is expected, bearing in mind that this kind of relationship between the matrix subject and the subject of the embedded clause can be also established when the subordinate clause is an ordinary SCI. This is illustrated in (62).

- (62) a. John_i considers *himself*_i intelligent.
 - b. Juan_i se considera (a sí mismo_i) inteligente.

Now, as in the examples of verbal CSCl investigated in the previous chapters, the subject of a nonverbal CSCl must also corefer obligatorily with the grammatical subject of the internal predication. This means that, in this construction, the lexical DP that is base-generated in Spec, FP must necessarily control the null subject PRO that is base-generated in Spec, XP. This relationship is represented in (63).

- (63) a. Mary took $Peter_i$ for PRO_i a fool.
 - b. María tomó a *Pedro*_i por *PRO*_i tonto.

As expected, the construction is ruled out if this control relationship is not satisfied. This is what the ungrammaticality of the examples in (64) in English and (65) in Spanish tells us.

- (64) a. **Mary*_i took the children for *PRO*_i a fool.
 - b. **Mary*_i regard the children as PRO_i their best friend.
- (65) #*María*_i tomó a los niños por *PRO*_i tonta.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁹ See footnote 1.

The control relationship that is established between the lexical and the null subject in a nonverbal CSCl, then, parallels the control relationship that is set up between the lexical subject of the matrix sentence and the null subject of the embedded SCl in constructions like the ones in (66) (cf. (63)).

(66) a. $Peter_i$ doesn't want PRO_i to be a fool.

b. *Pedro*_i no quiere *PRO*_i ser tonto.

The only difference between the control relationship in a nonverbal CSCl, (63), and the control relationship in the constructions in (66) lies in that only in the former structure is the control relationship established within the same extended projection, that is, within the extended projection initiated by X (*fool* in (63a) and *tonto* `fool' in (63b)). This is so since, according to the analysis proposed here, the particle *for / por* forms part of the extended projection of this lexical head. In contrast, the controller in the constructions in (66), namely *Peter / Pedro*, is situated in the extended projection headed by the verb *want / quiere*, that is, an extended projection that does not include the null subject PRO.

Finally, the CSCI-structure in (27) helps us understand why in languages like Spanish the subject of the CSCI, that is, the lexical DP, can appear at Syntax either in the subject position of the matrix clause if the construction combines with a raising verb, (67a), or immediately preceding the particle, (67b), but never between the particle and the internal predicate, (67c).

- (67) a. *Pocos estudiantes* pasaron por jugadores de baloncesto.
 few students passed.they for players of basketball
 `Few students passed for basketball players.'
 - b. Pasaron pocos estudiantes por jugadores de baloncesto.
 - c. *Pasaron por pocos estudiantes jugadores de baloncesto.

The answer that the CSCI-structure offers us is that this lexical subject cannot appear between the particle and the SCI-predicate because this argument is base-generated in a position structurally higher than the particle, namely in Spec, FP. In (67a), for instance, the CSCI-subject *pocos estudiantes* `few students' shows up in the subject position of the matrix clause, which is the position where that DP overtly moves from Spec, FP. In this position, the DP checks the EPP-feature of the matrix IP and nominative Case. In the example in (67b), on the other hand, the subject of the CSCI presumably remains in the position where it is base-generated, namely in Spec, FP. In this example, the EPP-feature of the matrix IP is checked by a null expletive subject pro_{expl}, whereas nominative Case would be checked off covertly by the CSCI-subject. And, finally, the ungrammatical sentence in (67c) simply indicates that the CSCI-subject cannot be lowered to a position following the CSCI-head (cf. subsection 6.1.1.3 above).

As expected, the facts that we see in (67) can also be observed in the other instances of CSCl that have been explored in the previous chapters. For example, the contrast between the two Catalan sentences in (68) shows that, in the PR, the CSCl-subject can only appear in a position preceding the C *que* `that'. According to the CSCl-analysis that I have defended here for this construction, this is so because this argument is base-generated in Spec, CP (see chapter 3).

- (68) a. Hi ha *en Joan* que estudia.there has.he the Joan that studies.he`Here is Joan studying.'
 - b. *Hi ha que en Joan estudia.

Similarly, the European Portuguese examples in (69) demonstrate that, in the PIC, the CSClsubject can be moved to the subject position of the matrix sentence, (69a), or remain in the position where it is based-generated, that is, Spec, PP, (69b). But, importantly, the CSCl-subject cannot appear in a position immediately following the head of the CSCl, namely the P a, (69c).

- (69) a. Alguns meninos estão a ler o livro.
 some children were they at read the book
 `Some children were reading the book.'
 - b. Estão alguns meninos a ler o livro.
 - c. *Estão a alguns meninos ler o livro.

The examples in (67)-(69), then, show us that the subject of a CSCl cannot appear between the CSCl-head and the predicate of the internal predication in nonverbal CSCls or in verbal CSCls.

6.2 The Semi-Lexical Status of the Head

The goal of this section is to present and discuss the idea that the particle that links the subject of the construction and the SCI in a nonverbal CSCI is a semi-lexical head.¹⁶⁰ In section 6.2.1 we will see that this particle functions as the highest *functional* head of the internal predication, just like the C *que* in the PR, the P *a* in the PIC, and the suffix *-ing* in the GC. But, in contrast to these three elements, we will see in section 6.2.2 that this particle also demonstrates a behavior closer to that of a *lexical* head. Here I attribute the semi-lexical status of the particle that heads a nonverbal CSCI to two facts. First, to the fact that this particle behaves like a modal head and, secondly, to the fact that only this particle contributes to the semantics of the matrix verb. These are the two main facts that

¹⁶⁰ For the idea that there are categories that behave like both lexical and functional heads when they appear in certain structural contexts, see Corver and Riemsdijk 2000.

distinguish the head of the nonverbal CSCls that are explored in this chapter from the head of the verbal CSCls previously examined.

6.2.1 The Functional Status of the Particle in a Nonverbal Complex Small Clause

In the previous chapters, we saw that the highest head of the extended projection of V in the verbal CSCls investigated in this work functions as an *aspectual* marker that modifies the event provided by the internal predication. It was argued that it does so by selecting a temporal set out of the plural temporal domain that this internal predication displays. This can be schematically represented as in (70).



As represented in the structure in (27), the particle that appears in the constructions under examination stands as the highest head of the extended projection of the lexical head X.¹⁶¹ In this section, I would like to suggest that this highest head functions in a nonverbal CSCl as a *modal* marker that modifies the state of affairs provided by the internal predication. As defined in chapter 2, here I understand the term `state of affairs' as a static situation that holds throughout some stretch of time. The relationship that the CSCl-head would establish with the state of affairs that it introduces, then, could be depicted as shown in (71).

¹⁶¹ Notice that this notion is already captured by the standard analysis (section 6.1.1), which states that this particle is a prepositional C.



In contrast to (70), this representation intends to capture the idea that the meaning of the modal marker (*for / por*, *as*) modifies the whole situation that it introduces, instead of only an internal part of this situation, as occurs in a verbal CSCl.¹⁶² Now my claim is that the construction that results from merging a lexical DP with the constituent headed by a modal marker, that is, F' in the

- (i) He vist *en Joan que creuava el carrer*, però de cop ha aparegut have.I seen the Juan that crossed.he the street but suddenty has.it appeared un camió i l' ha atropellat.
 - a truck and him has.it run.over.it

'I saw Joan crossing the street, but suddenly a truck appeared and ran over him.'

- (ii) *He vist *en Joan com creuava el carrer*, però de cop ha aparegut have.I seen the Juan as crossed.he the street but suddenly has.it appeared un camió i l' ha atropellat.
 - a truck and him has.it run.over.it

It was claimed there that this contrast is in accordance with the idea that only the aspectual C *que* provides the construction with a progressive interpretation, and that the C *com* only expresses actuality or true existence of the event that it introduces. Now notice that this grammatical contrast is also captured by the representations that we have in (70) and (71) in the text. That is, only the aspectual C *que* 'that' makes reference to a stage of the event that it introduces (see (70)), hence the grammaticality of the example in (i). On the other hand, the C *com* `as' affects the whole event (see (71)), hence the deviance of the example in (ii).

¹⁶² In the appendix to chapter 4, we saw that in a language like Catalan the PR can be headed by either the C *que* `that' or the C *com* `as'. We also saw that this construction has a different meaning when it is headed by one or the other. For instance, the following contrast was noted:

structure in (27), expresses a situation in which the individual that the lexical DP refers to is taken as a participant of a "possible" state of affairs. In order to illustrate this idea, let me comment very briefly on the semantic interpretation of a nonverbal CSCl headed by the particle *for*. An example is provided in (72a). According to the CSCl-analysis, the embedded construction in (72a) would be analyzed as represented in (72b).

(72) a. The committee took *you for intelligent*.

b. The committee took $[_{CSC1(FP)} you_i [_{F'} for [_{SC1} PRO_i intelligent.]]]$

In the structure in (72b), one can observe that PRO and the A *intelligent* form a SCI. This SCI describes a situation or, more specifically, a state of affairs, namely a static situation that holds throughout some stretch of time. On the other hand, the head of the highest extended projection of the SCI-head is *for*. This particle projects an FP-projection, which contains the subject of the CSCI in its specifier.

Now my claim is that, as a modal head, the particle *for* here indicates that the state of affairs that it introduces, namely [PRO intelligent], is a presumed situation. That is, a situation that holds in a possible world, say W2.¹⁶³ The syntactic configuration of a nonverbal CSCl (see (72b)), then, allows this presumed state of affairs to be predicated of the individual that the CSCl-subject refers to. In the example in (72b), this individual happens to be *you*. Thus, according to this configuration, the speaker who utters the sentence in (72) says something like `the committee attributed something to *you*, and this something was a presumed state of affairs in which *you were intelligent*'. The

¹⁶³ The presumptive nature that a clause has when it is introduced by the particle *for* is already mentioned in Jespersen 1927:

[&]quot;It should be noted that in nearly all sentences the combination of *for* and an infinitive denotes some vague possibility or something imagined." (taken from Gee 1975: 301).

The only difference is that in (72) for combines with a SCl, instead of an infinitive, or infinitival clause.

presumptive state of affairs that the speaker has attributed to *you* by constructing this type of nonverbal CSCl, or to put it differently, the presumption that the SCl [PRO intelligent] conveys in (72), explains why a sentence like `Don't you think I am intelligent?' sounds appropriate as a response to the statement in (72). What we are doing by uttering this question is challenging the presupposition that the speaker has constructed.

Now the meaning of the CSCl-construction in (72) clearly contrasts with the meaning of a regular SCl. Consider the example in (73).

(73) The committee considered [sci you intelligent.]

In contrast to the sentence in (72), here the speaker who utters this sentence is simply saying that `the committee attributed something to *you*, and this something was the property of being *intelligent*'. So the basic contrast with regard to the CSCl in (72) is that (73) does not convey a presumptive state of affairs. This immediately explains why the question `Don't you think I am intelligent?' sounds inappropriate as a response to the statement in (73).¹⁶⁴

The idea that the particle that heads a nonverbal CSCl is a functional element, namely the head of the highest extended projection associated with the lexical head X, also helps us to understand a nontrivial syntactic fact. I am referring to the fact that the particle *for* in English cannot assign Case to the subject of the internal predication in a nonverbal CSCl, (74), in contrast to what occurs when *for* introduces an infinitival clause, (75).

¹⁶⁴ Of course, the opinion that the sentence in (73) expresses may not be shared by the speaker who utters this sentence. This is shown by the fact that the example in (i) does not express a contradiction.

⁽i) The committee considered you intelligent, but you aren't.

The relevant point here is that, as opposed to the example in (72), in (73) the speaker does not construct a presumed situation that leads the hearer to infer that the speaker questions the truth value of the embedded clause in the actual world, W1.

- (74) *They took John for *him* a fool.
- (75) It is impossible for *him* to go.

In order to show that this contrast can be attributed to the functional status of the particle *for* in both cases, let me first present a general hypothesis that has recently been defended in the literature. This will allow us to draw the relevant parallelisms. To begin with, consider the familiar scopal ambiguity that is observed in a sentence like that in (76).

(76) John left [after Sheila said he should leave.]

This sentence has two interpretations. It can mean that 'John left after the time of Sheila's saying that he should leave' or that 'John left after the time which Sheila said he should leave at'. In Larson 1988b, it is proposed that this ambiguity stems from the two different positions in which the temporal operator (TO) can be base-generated in this type of construction. On the one hand, that TO can appear modifying the clause headed by the verb *to say*, in which case the former interpretation is obtained. On the other hand, it may appear modifying the clause headed by the verb *to leave*, yielding the latter interpretation. It is claimed, furthermore, that in both readings the TO would end up moving from the position where it is base-generated to the specifier of the embedded CP. This is schematically represented in (77).

- (77) a. John left [PP [P' after [CP Op_i [C' \emptyset [IP Sheila said [CP he should leave] t_i]]]]]
 - b. John left $[PP \ [P' \ after [CP \ Op_i \ [C' \oslash [IP \ Sheila said [CP \ he should leave t_i]]]]]$

More recently, Dubinsky and Williams (1995) have convincingly shown that in English temporal Ps (*after*, *before*, *while*, etc.) recategorize as Cs. In other words, they demonstrate that in

this language temporal Ps occupy the head of a CP-projection, instead of the head of a PPprojection situated immediately above a CP containing a null C (cf. (77)).¹⁶⁵ According to their proposal, then, the structures in (77) should be modified in the following way:¹⁶⁶

(78) a. John left [CP Opi [C' after [IP Sheila said [CP he should leave] ti]]]
b. John left [CP Opi [C' after [IP Sheila said [CP he should leave ti]]]]

Dubinsky and Williams take advantage of the idea that there is a TO in Spec, CP in this type of construction to account for the contrast between (79) and (80).

- (79) John left [CP Op_i [C' after [IP {*me / PRO} telling him to t_i]]]
- (80) It is impossible [$_{CP}$ [$_{C'}$ for [$_{IP}$ {me / *PRO} to leave.]]]

As one can observe, a null subject PRO must follow the prepositional C in the example in (79), whereas in (80) the embedded subject must be a phonologically realized pronoun. Following Manzini's 1992 work, they arrive at the conclusion that a prepositional C can assign Case to the subject of the clause that it introduces only if that prepositional C does not have to establish a Spec-

- (i) Después de que Juan llegara.
 - after of that Juan arrived `After Juan arrived.'
- (ii) Na dat Jan arriveerde.

¹⁶⁵ For example, they observe that the C *that* cannot follow the P *after* in Modern English, (i), as opposed to Old

English, (ii). These examples are from Dubinsky and Williams. The example in (ii) is from the fifth century (1464).

⁽i) They came *after* (**that*) they read their Bibles.

⁽ii) It is solde rythe well *aftyr that* the wole was.

¹⁶⁶ This modification would not apply to those languages that admit the C *that* following a temporal P, like Spanish, (i), and Dutch, (ii).

Head agreement relationship with an element in Spec, CP. For a sentence like (79), this means that the temporal prepositional C *after* cannot assign Case to the subject of the embedded clause because this C must set up a Spec-Head agreement relationship with the TO occupying the specifier of its projection, that is, Spec, CP. This accounts for the fact that the subject of this clause can only be a PRO, since there is no element in the clause that can assign structural Case to this argument. Conversely, the nontemporal prepositional C *for* in the example in (80) can assign structural Case to the subject of the embedded clause because there is no element with. Hence, that subject has to be a phonologically realized pronoun.

Now compare the sentence in (79) with the construction in (81) as analyzed here.

(81) They took [$_{FP}$ John [$_{F'}$ for [$_{SCl}$ {*him / PRO} a fool.]]]

At this point, the answer to the ungrammaticality of *They took for him a fool* or *They took John for him a fool* becomes crystal-clear: in this construction, the head of the highest extended projection of the N, namely *for*, cannot assign Case to the subject to its right because this head must establish a Spec-Head agreement relationship with the subject that is base-generated in its specifier. In this sense, the particle *for* in (81) behaves just like the prepositional *C after* that appears in the sentence in (79) (cf. subsection 6.1.1.1 above).

Interestingly enough, the contrast between (81) and (82) tells us that this property only holds of prepositional Cs, or more generally of *functional* Ps,¹⁶⁷ that host an element in its specifier.

(82) This book_i is $[PP t_i [P' \text{ for } [DP me.]]]$

¹⁶⁷ These would include the aspectual P a in the PIC in European Portuguese, which does not assign Case to the subject of the embedded clause either.

In the sentence in (82), the DP *the book* is the subject of the SCl, whereas the *lexical* P *for* is the head of this SCl. This means that the DP *the book* and the P *for* must eventually establish a Spec-Head agreement relationship, as usual. Nonetheless, this agreement relationship does not prevent the lexical P *for* from assigning Case to its complement.¹⁶⁸ Compare (79)/(81) with (82).

6.2.2 The Lexical Status of the Particle in a Nonverbal Complex Small Clause

In the previous section, we have seen that the head of a CSCI behaves like a functional head or, in other words, like a modal marker that introduces a clause. Let us see now the other side of the coin, that is, the lexical properties of this head.169

The lexical nature of the head of a nonverbal CSCl is shown by both syntactic and semantic facts. From a syntactic viewpoint, for example, these particles may be left stranded in those languages where a P can be left stranded, as in English. This is shown in (83).

- (83) a. Who do you take me *for*?
 - b. What do you regard him as?

From a semantic perspective, for instance, these particles implement the semantic specification of the matrix verb. Consider the following sentences:

- (84) a. They took John *(for) a fool.
 - b. John passes *(for) a fool.
 - c. I regard John *(as) my best friend.

¹⁶⁸ In this sense, the lexical P in (82) would behave just like a transitive verb.

¹⁶⁹ The double nature of these particles is perfectly in tune with the ambiguous properties that modal verbs usually have. That is, they may behave like either full verbs or mere auxiliaries.

- (85) a. Tomaron *a Juan* *(*por*) tonto.
 - b. Juan pasa *(por) tonto.

As one can observe, these examples are grammatical only if the modal particle appears. Otherwise they are ruled out. Now this fact leads us to say that in these constructions the particle has a lexical specification, and that this lexical specification must contribute to the ultimate semantic value of the matrix verb. From a technical point of view, this lexical contribution of the particle to the matrix verb may be achieved at LF by means of a "semantic checking" between the modal particle, namely the CSCI-head, and the matrix verb.¹⁷⁰

A second semantic argument that shows that the head of a nonverbal CSCl also behaves like a lexical category is provided by the fact that light verbs combine with this type of construction. Some examples in Spanish are cited in (86).

¹⁷⁰ Although the semantic value of the combination *take-for* is very similar to the semantic specification of a simple verb like *to consider*, there are arguments that show that these two verbal forms are not interchangeable. For example, the SCI-predicate that the particle *for* introduces can be a proper noun (see footnote 4), (i). As (ii) shows, this possibility is not available when the SCI is selected by the verb *consider*.

- (i) They took John for Richard.
- (ii)*They considered John Richard.

- (iii) *Lo tomaron por {de muy mal gusto / de mala educación.}
 - it took.they for of very bad taste / of bad manner
- (iv) Lo considero {de muy mal gusto / de mala educación.}

it consider.I of very bad taste / of bad manner

And, secondly, there are prepositional predicates that cannot appear in the SCl introduced by the particle *for*, (iii), whereas these prepositional predicates are admitted by the SCl subcategorized for by the verb *consider*, (iv).

^{&#}x27;I consider it {bad taste / bad manners.}'

- (86) a. *Dieron* a Juan *por* {muerto / desaparecido / inútil.}
 gave.they to Juan for dead disappeared useless
 `Juan was taken for {dead / missing / useless.}'
 - b. *Tienen* a Juan *por* {un buen chico / mentiroso / estúpido.}
 have.they to Juan for a good boy liar stupid
 `Juan is regarded as {a good boy / a liar / a stupid.}'

The light verbs that appear in these sentences are *dar* `to give' in (86a) and *tener* `to have' in (86b). This possibility can also be attributed to the lexical properties of the CSCI-head, which in these cases would implement the semantics of the matrix verb.

And thirdly, the lexical nature of the head of a nonverbal CSCl is supported by the versions of the construction that can be found when the head is the particle *as*. Consider the examples in (87).

- (87) a. I regard John as my best friend.
 - b. I regard John as if he were my best friend.

The embedded constructions that we have in these two sentences look like a CSCl headed by the modal particle *as*. But, as the reader might have already noticed, the crucial difference between these two examples is found in that the particle *as* introduces a SCl in (87a), just like in the examples explored so far in this chapter, and a complete clause in (87b).¹⁷¹

Now the embedded construction in (87b) is interesting to us for various reasons. First of all, it clearly shows that the situation described by the predicative relationship introduced by the particle *as* is a presumptive situation. This is indicated here by the subordinating conjunction *if* that

¹⁷¹ By the term `complete clause', I mean a full sentence, namely a domain headed by the lexical head V, that possesses its own temporal specification (see section 1.2 in chapter 1).

precedes the embedded finite clause.¹⁷² Secondly, it explicitly shows that a participant in this clause is the individual that the lexical DP preceding the particle *as* refers to. As one can observe, in (87b) the pronoun *he* and the lexical DP *John* refer to the same individual. And thirdly, the embedded construction in (87b) illustrates the *lexical* nature of the particle *as* in this example. That is, here the particle *as* introduces a complete clause the highest functional projection of which is the subordinating conjunction *if*. This suggests that in (87b) the particle *as* initiates its own extended projection. This is schematically represented in (88).¹⁷³

(88) I regard [EP2 John as [EP1 if he were my best friend.]]

The properties that the particle *as* has in this type of sentence, then, would be similar to the properties that the particle *like* has in examples like the one in (nonstandard) English in (89).

(89) You look *like* you've just seen a ghost.

In conclusion, the arguments that have been provided in this section indicate that the head of a nonverbal CSCl behaves like what here I have call a `semi-lexical' head. That is, it does not behave like a pure functional head nor like a pure lexical head. On the one hand, we have seen that it

- (i) *They took John for *if he were intelligent*.
- (ii) *Tomaron a Juan por si (él) fuera inteligente.

¹⁷² More specifically, in (87a) the semi-lexical head *as* is a modal particle that indicates that the predication that it introduces is a presumptive situation. In (87b), on the other hand, the lexical head *as*, which here behaves like an adverb, would indicate an equivalence, whereas the conjunction *if*, which functions as a C, would indicate the presumptive nature of the finite predication that it introduces.

¹⁷³ This option is not possible when the particle is *for / por*, in English, (i), or in Spanish, (ii).

This would indicate that the particle *for / por* cannot be used as a pure lexical head, according to the position that we have adopted here. The different behavior of *as* and *for / por* in this context deserves a careful examination on its own, so here I leave this point as a simple observation.

behaves like a functional head in the sense that it is a category that, semantically, provides the predication that it introduces with modal information and, structurally, stands as the highest extended projection of the lexical head X. On the other hand, it behaves like a lexical head in the sense that it contributes to the semantics of the matrix verb. ¹⁷⁴ Note, incidentally, that this position regarding the particles *for / por* and *as* goes against previous proposals that have been cited in the literature.

6.3 Summary

In this chapter, we have examined the syntactic and semantic properties of a type of construction that I have called the nonverbal CSCl.

We have seen that the properties of this type of construction also agree with the general properties that are established by the CSCI-model in chapter 2. We have seen that the subject of the construction is base-generated in the specifier of the highest extended projection of the lexical head of the clause. From this position, this subject controls the null grammatical subject PRO that is found within the internal predication, yielding a domain of internal control.

In contrast to the constructions analyzed in the previous chapters, however, the lexical head of this type of construction is nonverbal, hence the name `nonverbal CSCls'. This property is important for our purposes in this work since it proves the scope and productivity of the CSCl-structure that is defended here. We have also seen that the head of this type of CSCl has a modal meaning, and that this head possesses properties that situate this category close to both functional and lexical categories, hence the name `semi-lexical' head.

¹⁷⁴ In Bowers 1993, for instance, it is claimed that *as* is simply "a direct lexical realization of Pr" (p. 597), that is, the head of the Predicate Phrase (PrP) that introduces *any* type of SCI. Similarly, in Haegeman 1994, it is held that *as* is a lexical realization of agreement (Agr).

On the other hand, the idea that *as* is not a lexical realization of the head of an AgrP in a nonverbal CSCl coincides with the idea against treating the C *que* as a lexical realization of the head of an AgrCP in the PR, *contra* Guasti 1992.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

"Yo no puedo cambiar las circunstancias, pero puedo ser dueño de mis actitudes." (Sri Anirvan) In this dissertation I have defended the idea that there exists a syntactic configuration that allows a *situation* to be predicated of an *individual* or *object*. I have called this syntactic configuration *Complex Small Clause*-structure (CSCI), and the constructions that respond to this structure *Complex Small Clauses*.

The main syntactic characteristic that identifies a CSCl is found in that the subject of the construction is base-generated in the specifier of the highest *functional* projection FP associated with the lexical element X that heads the construction. One immediate consequence of this is that the extended domain of the lexical head X ends up containing two subjects: the subject that is base-generated within the lexical XP-shell, more specifically the argument that is base-generated within the lexical XP-shell that functions as the subject of the X'-projection (or I'); and the "extra" subject that is base-generated in the specifier of the highest functional projection of X, more specifically the argument that is base-generated in that position and functions as the subject of the F'-projection. I have called the predicative domain that is established between the first subject and the X'-projection (or I'), the *internal predication* of the CSCl, and the predicative domain that is set up between the second, or extra, subject to be legitimized in a CSCl-configuration, it must corefer with the *grammatical subject* of the internal predication. This means that a CSCl constitutes a domain of internal control.

As pointed out above, this syntactic configuration allows a situation to be predicated of an individual or object. In the examples of CSCl that have been examined in this work, we have seen that the situation can be either an *event* or a *state of affairs*. On the other hand, we have also seen that the semantic properties of the head that allows the connection of the situation with the individual or object in a CSCl are *aspectual* in the verbal CSCls investigated here, and *modal* in the nonverbal CSCls.

The CSCI-model that I have defended in this dissertation carries nontrivial consequences for the theory of grammar. These consequences are both specific and general. Some of them are the following:

(i) First of all, the CSCI-model has proven to be a useful tool to describe, explain, and predict the semantic and syntactic behavior of a set of constructions in Romance and Germanic (mainly English). Apart from this, the CSCI-structure has allowed us to see the common conceptual idiosyncrasies that lie behind this set of constructions.

(ii) This model tells us that, in principle, Romance and Germanic languages do not have ordinary *verbal* SCls in the sense that it has often been defended by the proponents of the Small Clause-Theory. That is, in the sense that the subject of the verbal SCl is an argument that is base-generated within the lexical XP-shell. We have seen that the structure of a verbal SCl is simply different.

(iii) The CSCI-model allows us to distinguish clearly the structure of a verbal (C)SCI from the structure of a regular proposition.

(iv) As has already been mentioned, the CSCI-model that has been presented in this work captures the properties of the constructions that have been investigated here in a straightforward way. Nonetheless, this model may also stand as a model of reference for the study of different, but undoubtedly, related constructions. For example, the Irish construction that was cited in chapter 2; the constructions that were presented in the appendix to chapter 3; and the constructions that were pointed out in section 6.2.2 in chapter 6.

321

(v) The CSCI-model demonstrates that a subject can be directly merged with a functional, or semilexical, category, contrary to what has been claimed by the Small Clause-Theory since its origins in the early eighties.

(vi) This model adds a third semantic pattern to the theory of grammar. That is, it adds the relationship [$\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{s}$] (where \mathbf{x} means `individual' or `object' and \mathbf{s} `situation'). Therefore, it implements the semantic organization already described by a sentence, i.e., [$\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{e}$], and a Small Clause (SCl), i.e., [$\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{p}$] (where \mathbf{e} means `event' and \mathbf{p} `property').

The CSCI-model that is defended in this dissertation is presented as a universal semantic and syntactic configuration. This means that this CSCI-model is expected to be a useful structure in order to account for the behavior of other constructions from the languages that have been considered here as well as constructions from languages that have not been taken into account in this work. If this is the case, then these other tokens of the CSCI-structure should improve the profile of the CSCI-model that has been constructed in this dissertation.

References

- Abney, Steven Paul. 1987. The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Adams, Marianne. 1987. From Old French to the theory of pro-drop. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 1-33.
- Albertocchi, Giovanni and Irene Zannier. 1990. Riflessioni contrastive sul gerundio. In *Las lenguas extranjeras en la Europa del Acta única*. Barcelona: Institut de Ciències de l'Educació, UAB: 137-144.
- Alcina, Juan and José Mª Blecua. 1975. Gramática española. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Bach, Emmon. 1979. Control in Montague Grammar. In Linguistic Inquiry 10: 515-531.
- Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical functional change*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Baltin, Mark. 1995. Floating quantifiers, PRO, and predication. In Linguistic Inquiry 26: 199-248.
- Barwise, Jon. 1981. Scenes and other situations. In The Journal of Philosophy 78: 369-397.
- Barwise, Jon and John Perry. 1981. Situations and attitudes. In *The Journal of Philosophy* 78: 668-691.
- Barwise, Jon and John Perry. 1983. Situations and attitudes. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Baugh, Albert and Thomas Cable. 1993. A history of the English language. London: Routledge.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1966. Problèmes de linguistique générale. Paris: Gallimard.
- Berstein, Judith. 1993. *Topics in the syntax of nominal structure across Romance*. Doctoral dissertation, CUNY.
- Bosque, Ignacio. 1990a. Las categorías gramaticales. Madrid: Síntesis.
- Bosque, Ignacio. 1990b. Tiempo y aspecto en español. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Bosque, Ignacio and Violeta Demonte. 1999. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Bowers, John. 1993. The syntax of predication. In Linguistic Inquiry 24: 591-656.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1972. Theory of complementation in English. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1978. A realistic transformational grammar. In *Linguistic Theory and Psychological Reality*, M. Halle, J. Bresnan and G. Miller (eds.). Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1982. Control and complementation. In Linguistic Inquiry 13: 343-434.
- Brucart, Josep M. 1987. *La elisión sintáctica en español*. Bellaterra: Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Brucart, Josep M. 1993. Sobre la estructura de SCOMP en español. In *Estudis de sintaxi*, pp. 59-102. Lleida: El fil d'Ariadna.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1981. Intransitive verbs and Italian auxiliaries. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. Italian syntax. Dordrecht: Reidel.

- Calabrese, Andrea. 1992. The lack of infinitival clauses in Salentino: A synchronic analysis. In *Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics*, C. Laeufer and T. Morgan (eds.), pp. 267-294.
 Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Campos, Héctor. 1995. Seudo-elevación y seudo-relativas en español. In *Gramática del español*, V.
 Demonte (ed.), pp. 201-236. México: Centro de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios, El Colegio de México.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Maria Teresa Guasti. 1995. Syntax and semantics. Small Clauses. London: Academic Press.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1996. Reference to kinds. Ms., Università degli Studi di Milano.

- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1997. Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of `Semantic Parameter'. Ms., Università degli Studi di Milano.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Fall lectures. University of California at Irvine.
- Chomsky, Noam 1955/75. *The logical structure of linguistic theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. Syntactic structures. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In *English Transformational Grammar*, R. Jacobs and P. Rosenbaum (eds.), pp. 184-221. Waltham: Ginn.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On *wh*-movement. In *Formal syntax*, P. Culicover, T. Wasow and A. Akmajian (eds.), pp. 71-132. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1980. On binding. In Linguistic Inquiry 11: 1-46.
- 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, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986a. Barriers. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986b. Knowledge of language. New York: Praeger.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1991. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In *Principles and Parameters in comparative grammar*, R. Freidin (ed.), pp. 417-454. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from building 20*,K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.), pp. 1-52. Cambridge Mass.: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1998. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. Ms., MIT.

- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. 1977. Filters and control. In Linguistic Inquiry 8: 425-504.
- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The theory of Principles and Parameters. In *Syntax: An international handbook of contemporary research*, J. Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld and T. Vennemann (eds.), pp. 506-569. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Chung, Sandra and James McCloskey. 1987. Government, barriers, and small clauses in Modern Irish. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 173-237.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. Types of A'-dependencies. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1992. The Pseudo-Relative and the acc-ing constructions after verbs of perception. In *University of Venice WPL* CLI-92.I.2. Centro Linguistico Interfacoltà, Università degli studi di Venezia.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1993a. A null theory of phrase and compound stress. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 239-297.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1993b. On the evidence for partial N-movement in Romance NP. Ms., University of Venice.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- Contreras, Heles. 1976. *A theory of word order with special reference to Spanish*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Contreras, Heles. 1987. Small Clauses in Spanish and English. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5: 225-244.
- Corver, Norbert and Henk van Riemsdijk. 2000. Semi-lexical categories. What's between function words and content words? Berlin New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Costa, João. 1996. Scrambling in European Portuguese. In *Proceedings of SCIL 8, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.*
- Declerck, Renaat. 1982. The Triple Origin of Participial Perception Verb Complements. In *Linguistic Analysis* 10: 1-26.

- de Miguel, Elena. 1990. *El aspecto en la sintaxis del español: perfectividad e impersonalidad.* Madrid: Colección de Estudios.
- Demonte, Violeta and Pascual José Masullo. 1999. La predicación: Los complementos predicativos. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, I. Bosque and V. Demonte (eds.), pp. 2461-2523. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- den Dikken, Marcel. 1995. Copulas. Ms., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/HIL.
- Déprez, Vivianne. 1990. On the typology of syntactic positions and the nature of chains. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Does, Jaap van der. 1991. A generalized quantifier logic for naked infinitives. In *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14: 241-294.
- Dowty, David. 1978. Governed transformations as lexical rules in a Montague Grammar. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 393-426.
- Duarte, Inês. 1992. Complementos infinitivos preposicionados e outras construções temporalmente defectivas em português europeu. Ms., Universidade de Lisboa.
- Dubinsky, Stanley and Kemp Williams. 1995. Recategorization of prepositions as complementizers: The case of temporal prepositions in English. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 125-136.
- Eguren, Luis. 1988. *La frase nominal en español: la hipótesis de la frase determinante*. Doctoral dissertation, Universidad de Valladolid.
- Emonds, Joseph. 1985. A unified theory of syntactic categories. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1987. Anchoring conditions for tense. In Linguistic Inquiry 18: 633-658.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1996. Tense and modality. In *The handbook of contemporary semantic theory*, S. Lappin (ed.), pp. 345-358. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Engdahl, Elizabeth. 1985. Parasitic gaps, resumptive pronouns, and subject extractions. In *Linguistics* 23: 3-44.
- Fabra, Pompeu. 1923. *Gramàtica catalana*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Associació Protectora de l'Ensenyança Catalana, Editorial Pedagógica.
- Fernández Leborans, María Jesús. 1999a. El nombre propio. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, I. Bosque and V. Demonte (eds.), pp. 77-128. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Fernández Leborans, María Jesús. 1999b. La predicación: Las oraciones copulativas. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, I. Bosque and V. Demonte (eds.), pp. 2357-2460. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Fukui, Naoki and Margaret Speas. 1986. Specifiers and projection. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 8: 128-172.

- Gee, James Paul. 1975. *Perception, intentionality, and naked infinitives: A Study in Linguistics and Philosophy*. Doctoral dissertation, Standford University.
- Gee, James Paul. 1977. Comments on the paper by Akmajian. In *Formal syntax*, P. Culicover, A. Akmajian and T. Wasow (eds.), pp. 461-493. New York: Academic Press.
- Giorgi, Alessandra and Fabio Pianesi. 1993. For a syntax of tense. Ms. University of Catania / Povo.
- Graffi, Giorgio. 1980. Su alcune costruzioni 'Pseudorelative'. In *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 5: 117-139.
- Grévisse, Maurice. 1988. Le bon usage. Paris: Duculot.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. Argument structure. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1991. Extended projection. Ms., Brandeis University.

- Grimshaw, Jane. and Armin Mester 1988. Light verbs and θ-Marking. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 2: 205-232.
- Gross, Maurice. 1968. Grammaire transformationnelle du français. Syntaxe du verbe. Paris: Larousse.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1988. La pseudorelative et les phenomenes d'accord. In *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 13: 35-58.
- Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1992. *Causative and perception verbs*. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Genève.
- Guéron, Jacqueline and Teun Hoekstra. 1995. The temporal interpretation of predication. In Syntax and semantics. Small Clauses, A. Cardinaletti and M.T. Guasti (eds.), pp. 77-107. London: Academic Press.
- Gutiérrez Ordóñez, Salvador. 1986. Variaciones sobre la atribución. León: Universidad de León.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1994. Introduction to Government and Binding Theory. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hale, Kenneth and Samuel Jay Keyser 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In *The view from building 20*, Hale K., and S. Keyser (eds.), pp. 53-109. The MIT Press.
- Hantson, André. 1989. The complementizer `as'. In *Sentential complementation and the lexicon*, D. Jaspers (ed.), pp. 207-219. Dordrecht, Foris.
- Heim, Irene and Angelika Kratzer. 1996. Semantics in Generative Grammar. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hernanz, Maria Lluïsa. 1982. *El infinitivo en español*. Bellaterra: Sèrie Lingüística, Publicacions del Departament de Filologia Hispànica, UAB.

- Hernanz, Maria Lluïsa. 1988. En torno a la sintaxis y a la semántica de los complementos predicativos en español. In *Estudis de sintaxi*, C. Sánchez and A. Suñer (eds.), pp. 7-29. Girona: Publicacions de l'Estudi General de Girona.
- Hernanz, Maria Lluïsa and Gemma Rigau. 1984. Auxiliaritat i reestructuració. In *Els Marges* 31: 29-51.
- Hernanz, Maria Lluïsa and Avel·lina Suñer. 1999. La predicación: La predicación no copulativa.
 Las construcciones absolutas. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, I. Bosque and V. Demonte (eds.), pp. 2525-2560. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Heycock, Caroline. 1991. *Layers of predication: The non-lexical structure of the clause*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia.
- Higginbotham, James. 1983. The logic of perceptual reports: An extensional alternative to situation semantics. In *The Journal of Philosophy* 80: 100-127.
- Higginbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. In Linguistic Inquiry 16: 547-593.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1990. As Time goes by. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert and David Lightfoot 1987. Predication and PRO. In Language 63: 23-52.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1991. Complex predicates in control. In *Control and grammar*, R. K. Larson,S. Iatridou, U. Lahiri and J. Higginbotham (eds.). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1993. Reconstruction and the structure of VP: Some theoretical consequences. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 103-138.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. X-bar syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. Semantic structures. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1924. The philosophy of grammar. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1927. A modern English grammar, 7 vols. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Johnson, Kyle 1988. Clausal gerunds, the ECP, and government. In Linguistic Inquiry 19: 583-609.
- Kayne, Richard. 1981. On certain differences between French and English. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 349-371.
- Kayne, Richard. 1984. Connectedness and binary branching. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kayne, Richard. 1993. Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection. In *Studia Linguistica* 47: 3-31.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. The antisymmetry of syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1985. Small but clausal. In Chicago Linguistic Society 21: 210-220.
- Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1986. *Subject in Japanese and English*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Koopman, Hilda. 1984. The syntax of verbs. Dordrecht: Foris.

Koopman, Hilda and Dominique Sportiche. 1988. Subjects. Ms., UCLA.

Koopman, Hilda and Dominique Sportiche. 1991. The position of subjects. In Lingua 85: 211-258.

- Kuroda, S. Yuki. 1988. Whether we agree or not: A comparative syntax of English and Japanese. In *Linguisticae Investigationes* 12: 1-47.
- Laka, Itziar and Josep Quer. 1996. Extrapositions stranded in a Small Clause. In *GLOW Newsletter* 36.
- Larson, Richard. 1988a. On the double object construction. In Linguistic Inquiry 19: 335-391.
- Larson, Richard. 1988b. Extraction and multiple selection in PP. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 9*: 119-135.
- Lightfoot, David and Norbert Hornstein eds. 1994. Verb movement. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1990. Evidence for the structure of determiner phrases and N-movement in the syntax and LF. In *GLOW Newsletter* 24.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. Reference and proper names. In Linguistic Inquiry 25: 609-665.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1996. The syntax of N-raising: A minimalist theory. In OTS Working Papers, OTS-WP-TL-96-005, Utrecht University.
- Ludlow, Peter. 1997. Readings in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Lyons, John. 1977. Semantics. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Manzini, Maria Rita. 1983. Restructuring and reanalysis. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Manzini, Maria Rita. 1992. Locality: A theory and some of its empirical consequences. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Marantz, Alec. 1984. On the nature of grammatical relations. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Mateu, Jaume. 1999. Universals of semantic construal for lexical syntactic relations. Report de recerca GGT-99-4, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- McCloskey, James. 1983. A VP in a VSO language?. In *Order, concord and constituency*, G. Gazdar, E. Klein, and G. Pullum (eds.), pp. 9-55. Dordrecht: Foris.
- McCloskey, James. 1986. Inflection and conjunction in Modern Irish. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4: 245-281.
- McCloskey, James. 1990. Resumptive pronouns, A'-binding and levels of representation in Irish. In *The syntax and semantics of modern Celtic languages*, Syntax and Semantics 23. San Diego: Academic Press.
- McCloskey, James and Kenneth Hale. 1984. On the syntax of person-number inflection in Modern Irish. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 487-533.

- McCloskey, James and Peter Sells. 1988. Control and A-chains in Modern Irish. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 143-189.
- McNulty, Elaine Maria. 1988. *The syntax of adjunct predicates*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Moro, Andrea. 1995. Small clauses with predicative nominals. In *Syntax and semantics. Small Clauses*, A. Cardinaletti and M.T. Guasti (eds.), pp. 109-134. London: Academic Press.
- Mouchaweh, Loubana. 1984. En faveur des `small clause'. In Recherches Linguistiques de Vincennes, 12: 92-124.
- Navas Ruiz, Ricardo. 1986. Ser y estar. Es sistema atributivo del español. Salamanca: Publicaciones del Colegio de España.
- Neale, Stephen. 1988. Events and 'logical form'. In Linguistics and Philosophy 11: 303-321.
- Noonan, Michael. 1985. Complementation. In *Language typology and syntactic description*. *complex constructions*, T. Shopen (ed.), pp. 42-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey, Ivan Sag, and Thomas Wasow. 1994. Idioms. In Language 70: 491-538.
- O'Grady, W. 1998. The syntax of idioms. In Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 16: 279-312.
- Ormazabal, Javier. 1995. The syntax of complementation: On the connection between syntactic structure and selection. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Ormazabal, Javier and Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria. 1995. Sobre la construcción de la estructura sintáctica: Sintaxis del tiempo y tipos de complementos clausales. Ms., UCLA / UCI.
- Parsons, Terence. 1990. Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David. 1982. Paths and categories. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. Zero syntax. Experiencers and cascades. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Picallo, Maria Carme. 1985. Opaque domains. Doctoral dissertation, CUNY.
- Picallo, Maria Carme. 1991. Funcions dobles: Tres estudis de sintaxi catalana. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Picallo, Maria Carme. 1999. Rasgos sintácticos y posiciones argumentales en catalán. Report de recerca GGT, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 1992. La sintassi del soggetto nei dialetti italiani settentrionali. Doctoral dissertation, University of Padua.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 265-424.
- Radford, Andrew. 1975. Pseudo-Relatives and the unity of subject raising. In Archivum Linguisticum 6: 32-64.

Rafel, Joan. 1997. Verbal small clauses. Master's Thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

- Rafel, Joan. 2000a. From complementizer to preposition: Evidence from Romance. In *Probus* 12: 139-163.
- Rafel, Joan. 2000b. As for as / for, they are semi-lexical heads. In Semi-lexical categories. What's between function words and content words?, N. Corver and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.). Berlin New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rafel, Joan and Avel·lina Suñer. 1999. Predicados cuantificados en consecutivas discontinuas. Paper presented at the *XXIX Simposio de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística*, Universidad de Extremadura, Cáceres, Spain
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1981. *A construção `união de orações' na gramática do português*. Doctoral dissertation, Universidade de Lisboa.
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1987. Case theory and Infl-to-Comp: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 18: 85-109.
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1989. Prepositional infinitival constructions in European Portuguese. In *The null subject parameter*, O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), pp. 277-305. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Raposo, Eduardo and Juan Uriagereka. 1990. Long-distance Case assignment. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 505-537.
- Real Academia Española. 1989. Esbozo de una nueva gramática de la lengua española. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. Elements of symbolic logic. New York: Macmillan.
- Renzi, Lorenzo. 1988. Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Reuland, Eric. 1983. Governing -ing. In Linguistic Inquiry 14: 101-136.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van. 1998. Categorial feature magnetism: The endocentricity and distribution of projections. In *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2: 1-48.
- Rigau, Gemma. 1992. Propiedades de FLEX en las construcciones temporales de infinitivo: la legitimación del sujeto. Paper presented at the 2nd Colloquium on Generative Grammar, Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain, April.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. Issues in Italian syntax. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null objects in Italian and the theory of pro. In Linguistic Inquiry 16: 467-558.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. Relativized minimality. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1991. Residual verb second and the wh-criterion. Ms., Université de Genève.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1995. The fine structure of the left periphery. Ms. Université de Genève.
- Rogers, Andrew. 1974. *Physical perception verbs in English: A study in lexical relatedness*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Romaine, Susan. 1988. Pidgin and creole languages. London: Longman.

Rosselló, Joanna and Jaume Solà. 1987. Estructura i interpretació d'un tipus de construcció amb el verb *veure* (i altres verbs de percepció). Ms., Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Rothstein, Susan. 1983. Syntactic forms of predication. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

- Rothstein, Susan. 1995. Pleonastics and the interpretation of pronouns. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 499-529.
- Rouveret, Alain and Jean-Roger Vergnaud. 1980. Specifying reference to the subject. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 97-202.
- Sauzet, Patrick. 1989. Topicalization et prolepse en occitan. In *Revue des langues romanes* XCIII: 235-273.
- Schein, Barry. 1995. Small clauses and predication. In *Syntax and Semantics. Small Clauses*, A. Cardinaletti and M.T. Guasti (eds.), pp. 49-76. London: Academic Press.
- Schwarze, Christoph. 1974. Les constructions du type 'Je le vois qui arrive'. In Actes du colloque franco-allemand de grammaire transformationnelle, C. Rohrer and N. Ruwet (eds.), pp. 18-300. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Shlonsky, Ur. 1992. Resumptive pronouns as a last resort. In Linguistic Inquiry 23: 443-468.
- Shlonsky, Ur. 1993. Agreement in Comp. Ms. Université de Genève.
- Siloni, Tali. 1995. On participial relatives and complementizer D: A case study in Hebrew and French. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13: 445-487.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1988. A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 425-449.
- Starke, Michal. 1995. On the format for small clauses. In *Syntax and Semantics: Small clauses*, A. Cardinaletti and M. T. Guasti (eds.), pp. 237-269. London, Academic Press.
- Stowell, Tim. 1981. Origins of phrase structure. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Stowell, Tim. 1983. Subjects across categories. In *The Linguistic Review* 2: 258-312.
- Stowell, Tim. 1991. Small clause restructuring. In *Principles and Parameters of Comparative Grammar*, R. Freidin (ed.), pp. 182-218. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Stowell, Tim. 1993. The syntax of tense. Ms., UCLA.
- Suñer, Avel·lina. 1990. *La predicación secundaria en español*. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona..
- Suñer, Avel·lina. 1996. Modalidad y legitimación del sujeto en la predicación no verbal. Ms. Universitat de Girona.
- Tang, Sze-Wing. 1997. The parametric approach to the resultative construction in Chinese and English. In *UCI Working Papers in Linguistics* 3: 202-226.

- Taraldsen, Tarald. 1996. The *que / qui* alternation meets the wizard of *Id*. Paper presented at the NELS Colloquium, Montreal, Canada, October.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, Myriam. 1994. *On the typology of negative polarity licensing*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, Myriam. 1996. On the structural representation of tense. Class lectures, 1996 Girona International Summer School in Linguistics.
- Vallduví, Enric. 1990. *The informational component*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Valois, Daniel. 1991. The internal syntax of DPs. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.
- Varlokosta, Spyridoula. 1994. Factive complements in modern Greek. In University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics 2: 238-258.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. Linguistics in philosophy. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 1982. Dépendances et niveaux de représentation en syntaxe. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Paris VII.
- Williams, Edwin. 1975. Small clauses in English. In Syntax and semantics, J. Kimball (ed.), vol. 4, pp. 249-273. New York: Academic Press.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. In Linguistic Inquiry 11: 203-238.
- Williams, Edwin. 1983. Against small clauses. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 287-308.
- Zagona, Karen. 1990. Times as temporal argument structure. Paper presented at the *Conference on Time in Language*, MIT, March.
- Zagona, Karen. 1991. Binding theory, temporal arguments and tense construal. Ms., University of Washington.