

THE PSEUDO-RELATIVES AND OTHER CORRESPONDENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE ROMANCE LANGUAGES*

JAN CASALICCHIO

1. Introduction

In this paper, I want to present the research project for my PhD-thesis, based on the results of my MA-thesis (Casalicchio 2009), where I analysed the different syntactic constructions with perception verbs in Gardnese, a variety of Dolomitic Ladin spoken in Northern Italy. The Ladin group is divided in four (or five) main dialects, and is traditionally thought to constitute an independent language together with Romansh (spoken in Switzerland) and Friulian (North-Eastern Italy), although other scholars consider them as Northern Italian dialects¹. The valleys where Ladin is spoken are Gardena, Badia, Fassa and Fodom (It. Livinallongo)².

In Romance languages, the main constructions used with perception verbs are the bare infinitive (henceforth BI, example 1), the gerundive clause (GC, ex. 2) and the Pseudo-relative clause (PR, ex. 3)³:

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| (1) | a. Vedo i bambini <i>giocare</i> | (It.) |
| | b. Je vois les enfants <i>jouer</i> . | (Fr.) |
| | I see the children play (BI)
'I see the children play.' | |
| (2) | a. Vedo i bambini <i>giocando</i> . | (only Old It.) |
| | b. Je vois les enfants <i>jouant</i> . | (Fr.) |
| | I see the children playing (GP)
'I see the children playing.' | |
| (3) | a. Vedo i bambini <i>che giocano</i> . | (It.) |
| | b. Je vois les enfants <i>qui jouent</i> . | (Fr.) |
| | I see the children that play (PR)
'I see the children playing.' | |

In the Ladin area, the perceptive constructions differ substantially from variety to variety: while all of them allow the PR (4), the Northern varieties use also a GC (5), Fassa a BI (6) and Fodom a prepositional infinitive introduced by the preposition *a* (henceforth, PI, cf. ex. 7). Note that each of the constructions in (5) – (7) is excluded or very marginal in the other varieties:

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| (4) | a. Vëije i mutons <i>che jughea</i> . | (Gardnese - PR) |
| | b. Veighe i tosac <i>che i sogä</i> . | (Fodom - PR) |
| | I-see the children that (they) play
'I see the children playing.' | |
| (5) | Vëije i mutons <i>jugan</i> . | (Gardnese - GC) |
| | I-see the children playing
'I see the children play/playing.' | |
| (6) | Veide i bec <i>jier</i> . | (Fassa - BI) |
| | I-see the children play
'I see the children play.' | |

* I want to thank Andrea Padovan for commenting an earlier version of this paper. Furthermore, I am indebted to Emanuele Burei, Nicola Duberti, Marija Runic and all my informants for providing and discussing the data.

The handout of my seminar held in Padua (written in Italian), which discusses this topic more thoroughly, can be downloaded at the site http://www.maldura.unipd.it/ddlcs/dottorati/archivioseminari/seminario_28ott_casalicchio.pdf [22/2/2012].

¹ On the so called "Ladin question", vd. among others Goebel (1998 and 2000), who conceives Ladin (together with Romansh and Friulian) as an independent language, and Pellegrini (1991) and Vanelli (2004), who consider it as a subgroup of the Northern Italian dialects.

² At syntactic level, the Ladin varieties can be subdivided in a more conservative Northern group (Badia and Gardena), which show also a greater German influence, and a more innovative Southern group (Fassa and Fodom), which are subject to Italian influence (where the innovations come from). I do not consider here the variety of Cortina d'Ampezzo, which is excluded by several linguistic studies from the Ladin group.

³ In the translations, I usually follow the example of most scholars, which translate the Romance bare infinitive with a bare infinitive, and the pseudo-relative or gerundive clause with the English *-ing* form. Nevertheless, in some cases I try to translate the examples more freely, since I have the impression that there is no exact correspondence between the Romance and the English forms.

- (7) Veighe i tosa*c a so*ghé. (Fodom – PI)
 I-see the children to play
 ‘I see the children play/playing.’

On the following pages, I present a preliminary study of these four different constructions, analysing mainly their uses in two major Romance languages, namely Italian and Spanish. This description will constitute the basis for my PhD-thesis, on which I will take into account the analysis of these constructions in the Ladin varieties. In this article I will show that:

- there is a systematic correspondence between the uses of the GC and the PR;
- the distribution of the PI covers just a part of the uses of the PR/GC, and so does its structure;
- The BI displays a distribution completely different from the other structures and therefore requires a different analysis.

The paper is organised in this way: sections 2-4 will describe respectively the PRs in Italian, the GCs in Spanish and the PIs in Italian, Portuguese and in a Northern Italian dialect. The data presented there will constitute the backbone of the structural analysis that will be discussed in §5. Section 6 describes the BI and its complete different syntactic behaviour, while the Ladin situation will be briefly sketched in §7. The last section hosts the conclusions.

2. The Italian Pseudo-relative clause

PRs have been studied since the 1970s by several scholars, who proposed different approaches to analyse their structure. One main question is represented by the relationship between PR and ordinary relative clauses. A fundamental contribution to this topic is represented by Radford (1975), who observed that they differ from each other in various respects, so that PRs cannot be considered a subgroup of ordinary relative clauses:

1. The antecedent of the PR may be a proper name, and can be cliticized:

- (8) a. Vedo Anna che esce dal cinema.
 I-see A. that goes-out from-the cinema
 ‘I see Anna going out of the cinema.’
 b. La vedo che esce dal cinema.
 Her.CL I-see that goes-out from-the cinema
 ‘I see her going out of the cinema.’

2. The antecedent can correspond only to the subject of a PR (with few exceptions):

- (9) *Ho visto Anna che Luca abbracciava.
 I-have seen A. that L.(SUBJ) hugged

3. The PR can be introduced only by the complementizer *che* (‘that’), instead of by relative pronouns (like It. *quale*):

- (10) Vedo Luigi che / *il quale va al mercato.
 I-see L. that / the which goes to-the market
 ‘I see Luigi going to the market.’

4. The tense of the embedded verb is not autonomous, but depends strictly on the perception verb, since there must be simultaneity between the two events:

- (11) Vedo Maria che va / *andrà / *andava a scuola.
 I-see M. that goes / will-go / went to school
 ‘I see Maria going to school.’

5. Stative and modal verbs are usually not permitted in the PR:

- (12) *Vedo Gina che ha gli occhi verdi.
 I-see G. that has the eyes green

6. Differently from the attributive relative clauses (AR), there is no pause between the antecedent and the complementizer:

- (13) a. Vedo il professore che scrive alla lavagna.
 I-see the teacher that writes at-the board
 (PR: ‘I see the teacher writing on the board.’)
 b. Vedo il professore, che scrive alla lavagna.
 I-see the teacher that writes at-the board
 (AR: ‘I see the teacher, who writes on the board.’)

Furthermore, PRs can occur only in some specific contexts; the most important one is represented by the perceptive construction introduced by ‘generic’ perception verbs like *to see* and *to hear* (see examples above), or by more specific ones like *to catch* and *to find* (14). The PR is used *inter alia* also with the preposition *con* (‘with’) to form an absolute construction (15), as a predicative complement of the subject or of the object (16), in the locative construction (formed by the verb *to be* and a complement of place, ex. (17)), in the presentative

construction introduced by *c'è / ci sono* ('there is / are', (18)). Finally, it can form the object of a verb together with its antecedent⁴ (19) and be used in 'root' (reduced) clauses, to mark an unbelievable thing (20)⁵:

- (14) Ho sorpreso Maria che frugava nella tua borsetta.
I-have surprised M. that fumbled in-the your handbag
'I caught Maria fumbling in your handbag.'
- (15) Con Gianni che urla continuamente, non riesco a sentire la televisione.
With G. that cries continuously, not I-can to hear the television
'Since Gianni keeps crying, I cannot hear the television.'
- (16) a. Gianni lasciò la stanza che piangeva.
G. left the room that he-cried
'Gianni left the room crying.'
b. Mangiò la pizza che stava ancora fumando.
He-ate the pizza that was still smoking
'He ate the pizza while it was still smoking.'
- (17) Luca è in biblioteca che studia.
Luca is in library that studies
'Luca is in the library and studies.'
- (18) C'è un signore che ti aspetta in salotto.
There-is a man that you awaits in dining-room
'There is a man waiting for you in the dining room.'
- (19) Non sopporto Gianni e Mario che fumano in casa.
Not I-stand G. and M. that smoke in home
'I cannot stand Gianni and Mario when they smoke at home.'
- (20) Aldo che picchia sua moglie? Non ci credo!
Aldo that beats his wife? Not to-it I-believe
'Aldo beating his wife? I cannot believe it!'

3. The Spanish Gerundive Clause

As we have seen in the introduction, the GC is used in Northern Ladin perceptive constructions. This use is shared by most Romance languages like Spanish, Rumanian or Sardinian:

- (21) Vi a Juan tocando la guitarra. (Spanish)
I-saw to J. playing the guitar
'I saw Juan playing the guitar.'

In Spanish, GCs can alternate with BIs. However, there are some differences between these two complements at a syntactic and semantic level:

1. In GCs, the focus lies on the antecedent, while in BIs the event is perceived as a whole;
2. In GCs only the antecedent has to be directly perceived, whereas in BIs the whole event is perceived *en bloc*;
3. The antecedent of GCs must always be expressed; the semantic subject of BIs can be missing.

In languages like Spanish, GCs are not limited to perceptive verbs, but can occur in every predicative context. Now, if we try to list them, we realize that they correspond exactly to those that allow the use of a PR. Cf. the examples (22) - (25) with (14) - (20):

- (22) Encontraron a mi abuelo fumando en pipa.
They-found to my grandfather smoking in pipe
'They caught my grandfather smoking the pipe.'
- (23) Con los precios subiendo de este modo, la inflación será grande.
With the prices growing of this manner, the inflation will-be big
'Since the prices are growing so much, the inflation will be big.'
- (24) Enrique está en la biblioteca estudiando.
E. is in the library studying
'Enrique is in the library and studies.'

⁴ For the sake of simplicity, I keep the definition 'antecedent' to refer to the logical subject of PRs, GCs and PIs, although it is usually used only when referred to ordinary relative clauses; but this does not mean that I hypothesize a similar structure for all these constructions.

⁵ Most of the examples are taken from Cinque (1992), where the definitions given above also come from. In his article it is possible to find a complete list of the contexts permitting a PR.

For this reason, the antecedent both of the PI and of the PR cannot be missing (another correspondence to the GC): it is the antecedent that is perceived while involved in a certain action or event. On the other hand, both the BI and the completive clause do not need their subject to be expressed, since the perception regards a whole event or action.

A second similarity between the PI and the PR regards its distribution; if we consider Standard Italian, there are some contexts that are shared by the two constructions. The most frequent ones are the perception contexts introduced by verbs like *to catch*, *to find* (example (30), cf. (14)), the ‘absolute *con*’ construction ((31), cf. (15)), the locative complement ((32), cf. (17))¹³ and the predicative complement of the object ((33), cf. (16)):

- (30) Ho sorpreso Maria a frugare nella tua borsetta.
I-have surprised M. to fumble in-the your handbag
‘I have caught Maria fumbling in your handbag.’
- (31) Con Gianni a urlare continuamente, non riesco a sentire la televisione.
With G. to cry continuously, not I-can to hear the television
‘Since Gianni keeps crying, I cannot hear the television.’
- (32) Luca è in biblioteca a studiare.
Luca is in library to study
‘Luca is in the library and studies.’
- (33) Sua nonna lo immaginava già a dirigere l’orchestra.
His grandmother him.CL imagined already to conduct the orchestra
‘His grandmother already imagined him conducting the orchestra.’

However, another subgroup of the PR-contexts cannot host a PI, e.g. in the sentences that correspond to the examples (16), (19) and (20), where it corresponds to the predicative complement of the subject, to the direct object of a verb together with the antecedent and to a ‘root’ clause:

- (34) *Gianni lasciò la stanza a piangere.
G. left the room to cry
- (35) *Non sopporto Gianni e Mario a fumare in casa.
Not I-stand G. and M. to smoke in home
- (36) *Aldo a picchiare sua moglie? Non ci credo.
A. to beat his wife? Not to-it I-believe

We will discuss this partial correspondence in § 5.

A third argument in favour of a compared analysis of PRs and PIs is provided by the cross-linguistic variation. In fact, the PI is used also in another Romance language, namely Portuguese. In Raposo (1989), there are several examples of the uses of the PI that correspond exactly to the Italian PR¹⁴. Moreover, the author himself claims that the PR is „a finite version of the PIC [= Prepositional Infinitive Construction]” (Raposo 1989: 304 fn. 32). In (37), both constructions are possible:

- (37) a. Vi o Jorge que comia a maçã. (European Portuguese)
I-saw the J. that ate an apple
- b. Vi o Jorge a comer a maçã.
I-saw the J. to eat an apple
‘I saw Jorge eating an apple.’

4.2. A comparison between Prepositional Infinitives and Gerundial Clauses

In the previous sections we have seen that there is a correlation both between PRs and GCs, and between PRs and PIs. Thus, it would be desirable to collect evidence for an interrelation between PIs and GCs, too. In this case it is more difficult to find some links, but even here we can make some useful considerations.

¹³ The examples (30) - (32) have the same general meaning as the correspondent PRs in (14), (15) and (17), but there are some slight semantic differences: the sentence (32), for example, embeds also a secondary meaning of scope (‘for studying’), which is totally absent from (17), where the PR is used.

¹⁴ On the basis of Raposo (1989), Guasti (1992) claimed that there is a parallelism between PR and (Portuguese) PI. Actually, the diffusion of the Portuguese PI is more widespread than in most Italian dialects, since it appears to be possible in any context which permits the Italian PR. I do not propose a syntactic analysis for the Portuguese data here and will reconsider them in my future research.

First of all, there exists a clear correspondence between the adverbial gerundive clauses and the PI in most Romance languages. Generally speaking, in Northern Italian dialects the gerund is almost always replaced by the PI. Here I quote examples of this alternation in Italian and in *Noneso*, a dialect spoken in the province of Trento and close to Ladin¹⁵:

- (38) A ben guardare / Guardando bene, si nota la differenza.
To well look / Looking well, one notes the difference
'If you check it out well, you can see the difference.'
- (39) A mañár e a béver, en paśá en beł dopodiznár. (ALD-II, map 516, measuring point 49)
To eat and to drink we-have spent a nice afternoon
'We spent a nice afternoon, eating and drinking.'

Secondly, Raposo (1989) has focussed on a class of functional verbs like *to continue*, *to stop*, which take a gerundial complement in Spanish, a PI in Portuguese (and Italian), citing the following examples:

- (40) a. Los niños continúan trabajando. (Spanish)
The boys continue working
- b. Os rapazes continuam a trabalhar. (Portuguese)
The boys continue to work
'The boys keep working.'

As regards the predicative complements, there seems to be a cross-linguistic complementary distribution between these two constructions: the languages that allow a GC (like Spanish) usually exclude the PI, and vice versa, like in the Gallo-Italic dialects. But some varieties do not enter this pattern, since they can use both constructions in some of the contexts listed in (14) - (20) with a free alternation. This is the case of Portuguese (examples (41)) and of Romansh (42)¹⁶:

- (41) a. Está um homem a esperar-te ao pé da porta. (Portuguese)
esperando-te
There-is a man to wait / awaiting-you at-the front of-the door.
'There is a man waiting for you in front of the door.'
- (42) a. Gina es in baselgia a discuorrer cul prer. (Romansh)
discurrind
G. is in church to speak / speaking with-the priest
'Gina is in the church and speaks with the priest.'

Thus, considering the threefold evidence, the proposal for a correlation even between GCs and PIs seems to be well grounded. In the next section I will propose that this correlation is grounded on structural factors.

5. A first approach to a syntactic interpretation

We have already seen in § 2 that the PR does not correspond to an ordinary relative clause. On the basis of this statement, in the last decades different syntactic tests have been proposed to determine its precise structure, where the PRs behaved in an incoherent way. Thus, there have been various analyses.

First of all, as pointed out in Cinque (1992), we note that the PRs are possible in all and only the contexts where it is possible to have a predicative complement (in terms of the traditional grammar); in the generative framework, this kind of complements is called 'Small Clauses' (SC). In the SC the higher functional projections are missing or inactivated: a typical example is constituted by the complements of sentences like *I painted the wall blue* or *I consider John to be intelligent*. As a matter of fact, we can reformulate all sentences in (14) - (20) using an AP ('Adjectival Phrase'), e.g.:

- (43) Con Gianni malato, non possiamo uscire di casa. (Cf. (15))
With G. ill, not we-can go-out of home
'Since Gianni is ill, we cannot leave home.'
- (44) Mangiò la pizza calda. (Cf. (16))
He-ate the pizza hot.
'He ate the pizza hot.'

¹⁵ Note that there is not a total correspondence between the adverbial GC and the PI, because there are many factors (the clause's position in relation to the matrix clause, aspectual values, etc.) which can exclude one construction or the other.

¹⁶ Again, I am not considering here other variables (like aspectual values) that could favour the choice of one construction or the other.

The main syntactic tests proposed by different authors give ambiguous results. First of all, in some tests the sequence ‘antecedent + PR’ seems to be a single constituent ((45) - (46)), while in others these two elements can be split ((47) - (48))¹⁷:

- (45) E’ [Maria che inseguiva una capra] che abbiamo visto. (Cleft sentence)
 It-is [M. that chases a goat] that we-have seen
 ‘It is Maria chasing a goat what we have seen.’
- (46) Ho visto una cosa molto strana: [Maria che inseguiva una capra]. (Equi deletion)
 I-have seen a thing very strange: [M. that chased a goat]
 ‘I saw a very strange thing: Maria chasing a goat.’
- (47) L_i’ho vista t_i [che inseguiva una capra]. (Pronominalization)
 Her.CL I-have seen t [that chased a goat]
 ‘I saw her chasing a goat.’
- (48) Maria_i è stata vista t_i [che inseguiva una capra]. (DP movement)
 M. is been seen t [that chased a goat]
 ‘Maria was seen chasing a goat.’

There is also another problem: when the sequence ‘antecedent + PR’ behaves like a unique constituent, it sometimes resembles a CP (‘Complementizer Phrase’, i.e. a full-fledged clause), because it can be referred to by neutral forms like *il che* or *ciò* (both meaning ‘what’, example (49)), and by the neuter pronoun *lo* (‘it’, (50)). But the PR and its antecedent can also be coordinated with DPs (51) and behave like an island (52)¹⁸; in this respect, they seem not to be a CP, but a complex noun (DP):

- (49) Ho visto [Maria che inseguiva una capra], il che mi ha sorpreso.
 I-have seen [M. that chased a goat], the what me has surprised
 ‘I saw Maria chasing a goat, what surprised me.’
- (50) Ho visto [Maria che inseguiva una capra], e anche Gina l’ha visto.
 I-have seen [M. that chased a goat], and also G. it has seen
 ‘I saw Maria chasing a goat, and Gina also saw it.’
- (51) Ho visto una capra e [Maria che la inseguiva].
 I-have seen a goat and [M. that her chased]
 ‘I saw a goat and Maria chasing it.’
- (52) *Quale capra_i hai visto [Maria che inseguiva t_i]?
 Which goat you-have seen [Maria that chased t]

Most scholars have proposed a unitary account for this almost schizophrenic behaviour, but none of them has been able to explain all these facts. Thus, Cinque (1992) claimed that the PR can enter in three different structures, depending on the contexts¹⁹. These structures can be represented – in a very simplified manner – along those lines²⁰:

- (53) a. Ho visto Maria_{SC}[*ec* che inseguiva una capra].
 b. Ho visto_{SC/CP}[Maria [che *ec* inseguiva una capra]].
 c. Ho visto_{SC/DP}[Maria [*ec* che inseguiva una capra]].

While the PR with perception verbs fits all of the three structures, the other contexts permit just one of them. To give just a few examples, the PR never forms a single constituent with its antecedent with verbs like *to catch*; therefore, the antecedent can be moved leftwards. On the contrary, the tests indicate that the PR forms a unique constituent together with its antecedent with verbs like *to stand*, and that this constituent corresponds to a complex noun:

- (54) a. L’ho sorpresa [che inseguiva una capra].

¹⁷ Most of the tests cited here were first proposed in Burzio (1986), who applied them to the Italian PRs and BIs. The four tests (45) - (48) are some of the canonical tests that are used to split a sentence into constituents (marked by the square brackets). The letter *t* in (47) and (48) shows the original position of the element that has been moved leftwards, i.e. the clitic pronoun in the third and the DP (‘Demonstrative Phrase’) *Maria* in the fourth example.

¹⁸ A constituent is called ‘island’ when it is not possible to extract anything out of it. In the example (52) *Quale capra* (‘which goat’) has been extracted out of the PR (the starting point is indicated by *t*).

¹⁹ This hypothesis is a readaptation of Declerck (1981), who put forward a similar theory for the English *-ing* forms with perception verbs.

²⁰ Cf. Cinque (1992), where these structures receive a much more detailed analysis. The structures I propose here are just a starting point and will be refined during my research. In particular, I do not discuss here the nature of the empty categories (indicated in the structures by *ec*). In the analysis of Cinque (1992), the *ec* of the structures (53) was a PRO, that of the structure (53) a pro.

- Her.CL I-have surprised [that chased a goat]
 ‘I caught her chasing a goat.’
- b. *Ho sorpreso una capra e [Maria che la inseguiva].
 I-have surprised a goat and [M. that her.CL chased]
- (55) a. *Non li sopporto [che fumano in casa].
 Not them.CL I-stand [that smoke in home]
- b. Ci sono due cose che non sopporto: i treni e DP[Gianni che fuma in casa].
 There are two things that not I-stand: the trains and [G. that smokes in home]
 ‘There are two things that I cannot stand: the trains and Gianni when he smokes at home.’

Now, let’s turn to the other two constructions. Differently from the PR, less attention has been devoted to predicative GCs, especially in theoretic linguistics. The PI has been analysed only in a handful of papers, first of all by Raposo (1989) for Portuguese. However, the ‘Gallo-Italic PI’ has never been the topic of any theoretic work.

Consider first the GC: We have seen that in Spanish it can be used in every context where Italian uses a PR²¹, with the same function. Moreover, the syntactic tests (45) - (52) regarding the PR give the same results also for the GC²²:

- (56) Es [Juan hablando con María] que vimos. (Cleft sentence)
 It-is [J. speaking with M.] that we-saw
 ‘It is Juan speaking with María what we saw.’
- (57) Vi una cosa muy curiosa: [María siguiendo una cabra]. (Equi-deletion)
 I-saw a thing very curious: [M. chasing a goat]
 ‘I saw a very strange thing: María chasing a goat.’
- (58) Lo vi [hablando con María]. (Pronominalization)
 Him.CL I-saw [speaking with M.]
 ‘I saw him speaking with María.’
- (59) María fue vista [hablando con Juan]. (DP-movement)
 M. was seen [speaking with Juan]
 ‘María was seen speaking with Juan.’
- (60) Vi [a María hablando con Juan], lo que me sorprendió (resumption with *lo que*, ‘what/that’)
 I-saw [to M. speaking with Juan], the what me surprised
 ‘I saw María speaking with Juan, what surprised me.’
- (61) Vi [a María hablando con Juan], y Julia también lo vio. (resumption with a neuter clitic)
 I-saw [to M. speaking with J.] and J. also it.CL saw
 ‘I saw María speaking with Juan, and Julia also saw it.’
- (62) Vi una cabra y [un perro siguiendola]. (coordination with another DP)
 I-saw a goat and [a dog chasing-her]
 ‘I saw a goat and a dog who was chasing her.’

For all these reasons, I propose to extend the same structural analysis given for PRs also to GCs, which is exemplified by (63) - cf. (53):

- (63) a. Vi a Juan _{SC}[*ec* tocando la guitarra].
 b. Vi _{SC/CP}[a Juan [*ec* tocando la guitarra].
 c. Vi _{SC/DP}[a Juan [*ec* tocando la guitarra].

Now, consider the PI in Italian. In the examples above ((30) - (36)) we have seen that it can be used in the following contexts:

- as a predicative complement of the object with verbs like ‘to surprise’, ‘to catch’;
- in absolute constructions (usually introduced by the preposition *con*);
- in locative contexts.
- as a predicative complement of the object of non-perception verbs.

On the other hand, it is ungrammatical in these constructions:

- where the whole ‘antecedent+PI’ is the complement of a verb;
- as a predicative complement of the subject of non-perception verbs.

²¹ The inverse is not always true, since the Spanish GCs can have not only a predicative function, but also an adjectival and an adverbial one. Note that the PR exists also in Spanish, but it is more restricted than in Italian.

²² The only test where the GC differs from the PR is the island character, as the former, but not the latter, permits extraction: *¿Con qué chica viste a Juan hablando?* (‘With which girl did you see Juan speaking?’), but this property seems to be due to independent reasons.

This partial correspondence between the PI and the PR seems to rest on deeper syntactic differences. Thus, the PI is compatible with almost every context where the antecedent and the PI form two different constituents²³. On the other hand, it seems ungrammatical where it should form a single constituent with the antecedent. Now, if we use the same tests we have proposed for the PR also to the PI, our suppositions are confirmed²⁴:

- (64) *U l'è [Giuanén a parlé con María] che l'oma vist (Pseudo-cleft)
It is [Giuanén to speak with M.] that we-have seen
'It is Giuanen speaking with Maria what we saw.'
- (65) ??E l'hō vist ena cosa ben strana: [María a 'ndé apress a na cráva] (Equi deletion)
I have seen a thing very strange: [M. to go after to a goat].
'I saw a very strange thing: Maria chasing a goat.'
- (66) E lo; sent t_i [a soné 'l piáno] da dj' ore. (Pronominalization)
I him.CL hear t [to play the piano] since some hours
'I have heard him playing the piano for hours.'
- (67) Maria_i a l'è stacia vista t_i [a pulidè le scare]. (DP-movement)
Maria SUBJ.CL is been seen t [to clean the stairways]

Therefore, the only structure available seems to be the following one²⁵:

- (68) E l'hō vist Maria SC/CP[*ec* a 'ndé apress a na cráva] (Viola, province of Cuneo)

In conclusion, Cinque's presumption of a threefold structure for the PR (Cinque 1992), although not up to date with the new research lines, still constitutes the best starting point for my research. On the one hand, his analysis corroborates our theory about a complete structural correspondence between the PR and the GC, and explains the partial correspondence between the PR and the PI. On the other hand, the fact that the PI fits exactly in one of the three structures proposed in Cinque (1992) seems to confirm at least a structural bipartition of the PRs, depending on the relationship between the antecedent and the PR.

Thus, Cinque's analysis of the PRs can be extended to the GCs and (partially) to the PIs.

6. The Bare Infinitive: a completely different construction

We have already seen in the previous sections that the BI construction used with perception verbs displays different semantic properties from the predicative complements. In fact, it describes an event that is perceived as a whole by the subject of the perception verb, while the other three constructions, although they are not totally synonymous, all stress the direct object of the matrix verb, which is perceived while involved in an action or event.

Nevertheless, the difference between BIs and the other constructions turns out to be more far-reaching: while the latter ones can be used as predicative complements not only with perception verbs, but also in a series of other contexts, the BI is excluded from each of them. Cf. the following examples with the sentences exemplified in (14) - (20)²⁶:

- (69) *Ho sorpreso Maria frugare nella tua borsetta.
I-have surprised M. fumble.INF in-the your handbag
- (70) *Luca è in biblioteca studiare.
L. is in library study.INF
- (71) *Non sopporto Gianni e Mario fumare in casa.
Not I-stand G. and M. smoke.INF in home

²³ The only exception is constituted by the use of the PR as a predicative complement to the subject (16), but this fact seems due to independent reasons: in these cases the PI would receive a final meaning that is incompatible with the semantics of the PRs.

²⁴ The examples (64) - (66) come from Viola, the example (67) from Montaldo Mondovi, two geographically close dialects from the province of Cuneo (Piedmont). It is particularly difficult to find examples with passivization, because the Romance varieties usually prefer other strategies, first of all the use of a generic third person plural.

²⁵ The only exception to this interpretation is constituted by the 'absolute *con*' construction, which allows the PI, although it is analysed by Cinque (1992) in terms of a unique constituent. The situation seems to be quite complex (e.g., there are two different *con*-construction, one before and one after the matrix clause, which seem to have a different structure. Anyway, I will analyse this construction in a future paper.

²⁶ Actually, there is just one context which permits the BI, i.e. the 'root' sentences like in (20). I do not consider it here, since such kinds of clauses often behave in a particular manner. Moreover, this only fact alone does not prove a connection between this construction and those analysed in the previous sections.

On this basis, it seems reasonable to postulate a radical (i.e. structural) difference between the BI and the other constructions, since it does not fit in the same contexts nor passes the same syntactic tests²⁷.

7. Going back to the Ladin varieties

In the previous sections we have seen an analysis valid for Spanish GCs and Italian PIs, based on a theory about the PRs. Turning back to the Ladin varieties, we note that there are some significant differences between the Gardenese and the Spanish GC on the one hand, and between the Italian and the Fodom PI on the other hand. In fact, both Ladin constructions are not subject to the following restrictions that hold for Spanish and Italian:

a. There are no restrictions about the *Aktionsart* of the verbs, since also statives and achievements are admitted:

- (72) a. La jënt se fajoa marueia a udëi [...] moncs varii, viërces udan inò²⁸. (Gard.)
 The people CL.REFL made wonder to see cripples recovered, blinds seeing again
 ‘The people was surprised at seeing [...] cripples recovered, blind people see again.’
 b. L Marco l à sentù l balon a se sclopé. (Fodom)
 The M. he.CL has heard the ball to CL.REFL burst
 ‘Marco heard the balloon burst.’

b. The antecedent of the GC or PI can be missing (like in Old Italian):

- (73) a. Ie aude pluan. (Gard.)
 I hear raining
 ‘I hear it raining.’
 b. L Luca l senta a pluove. (Fodom)
 The L. he.CL hears to rain
 ‘Luca hears it raining.’

c. The construction can optionally enter a monoclausal structure. In the other Romance languages, this is possible only with the BI²⁹:

- (74) a. Chësc Latin che la jënt de nosc luesc audiva rujenan dai mpieghei romans...³⁰ (Gard.)
 This Latin that the people of our places heard speaking by-the employees Roman...
 ‘This Latin that the people of our places heard spoken by the Roman employees...’
 b. L Luca l lo sent a cianté. (Fodom)
 The L. he.CL it hears to sing
 ‘Luca hears him sing.’

On this basis, it is not possible to adopt the same analysis as for the Spanish GC and Italian PI, because the differences between these structures and the Ladin ones are too deep. However, the Ladin constructions show significant correspondences with the Romance BI: they can enter (one type of) monoclausal structures, are indifferent to the *Aktionsart* of the embedded verbs, and cannot be used in any of the other contexts listed in (14) - (20), exactly like the BIs. So, one of the main topics of my thesis will be to compare these Ladin constructions with the Italian BI, to search for possible correspondences and differences, and to propose an account for these constructions.

Regarding the origins of this structural shift, I propose that the GC formerly had a predicative function, the same that can be found in Spanish. The core difference between the two languages is given by the presence or absence of the BI: in Spanish it is possible to use this construction as well, creating a syntactic and semantic alternation between BIs and GCs. Since Gardenese lacks the BI in these contexts, the GC has widened its

²⁷ The structure of the BIs with perception verbs has been even more studied than the PR; the accounts can be divided into two groups: those who analyse the ‘antecedent’ and the BI as two separate constituents (like our analysis of PRs and GCs), and those who propose a single constituent structure. Although I do not intend to discuss this complex topic here, I prefer the latter analysis, since it accounts for the structural differences between this construction and the predicative ones.

²⁸ Example taken from a New Testament’s version for children, contained in an online data-base (<http://corpuslad.ladintal.it/> [19.2.2012]).

²⁹ To be more precise, Kayne (1975) distinguishes two types of monoclausal sentences in French, the *faire-inf* (the subject of the infinitive is expressed by a dative complement) and the *faire-par* (the subject is missing or expressed by an agentive complement). For these Ladin constructions, only the *faire-par* is available, while the *faire-inf* remains possible with causative verbs (which take a BI).

³⁰ This example comes from a schoolbook contained in the online data-base cited in fn. 28.

functions, encompassing also those that are typical of the Romance BI, thus becoming the unmarked construction and losing its predicative semantics.

8. Conclusions

In this article, I have shown that there exists a neat correlation between PRs and predicative GCs in synchrony, and that the two constructions can receive a unitary account. The third construction under analysis, the PI, is linked both to the PR and to the GC. However, the correspondence is partial, since the PI has just one of the three structures proposed for the other two constructions³¹. This fact constitutes evidence for a two- or threefold structure. On the contrary, the BI has no common elements with the other constructions.

These considerations hold for the two main languages that I have considered in this paper, Italian and Spanish. The next steps in my research will be the collection and evaluation of more data coming from the Northern Italian area, first of all from the Ladin valleys. At first glance, it is already evident that the Gardenese and Fodom constructions do not correspond exactly to the Spanish and Italian ones; further research will show to what extent it resembles the BI, even by means of syntactic tests.

References

- Anderlan-Obletter, Amalia (1991): *La rujeneda dla oma. Gramatica dl ladin de Gherdëina*. Urtijëi: Istitut pedagogich ladin.
- Burzio, Luigi (1986): *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Casalicchio, Jan (2009): *La convivenza di elementi arcaici e innovazioni nella costruzione percettiva gardenese*. University of Trento: MA-thesis.
- . (2011): L'uso del gerundio con i verbi di percezione gardenesi. In *Ladinia* 35 (321-351).
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1992): The Pseudo-Relative and Acc-ing Constructions after Verbs of Perception. In *University of Venice – Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2 (1-31).
- Declerck, Renaat (1982): The Triple Origin of Participial Perception Verb Complements. In *Linguistic Analysis* 10 (1-26).
- De Roberto, Elisa (2007): Le relative predicative rette da verbo di percezione in italiano antico. In *La lingua italiana. Storia, strutture, testi* 3 (105-127).
- Fernández Lagunilla, Marina (1999): Las construcciones de gerundio. In: Bosque, Ignacio & Demonte, Violeta (eds.). *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Volume II: *Las construcciones sintácticas fundamentales. Relaciones temporales, aspectuales y modales*. Madrid: Espasa (3443-3500).
- Goebel, Hans (1998): Il problema dell'Entità ladina delle Dolomiti in vent'anni di studi e ricerche: storiografia, linguistica, antropologia. In: Valeruz, Nadia & Chiocchetti, Fabio (eds.). *L'entità ladina dolomitica: etnogenesi e identità. Atti del convegno interdisciplinare, Vigo di Fassa 11-14 settembre 1996 (Mondo Ladino XXII, 43-68)*.
- . (2000). Gröden und seine Sprache. Ein wissenschaftshistorischer Rück-, Über- und Ausblick zur „Questione ladina“. In: Comploi, Emma (ed.). *Ad Gredine forestum 999 1999. Cunvëni L nridlamënt de na valeda, 23.9.-25.9. 1999 Urtijëi*. San Martin de Tor: Istitut Ladin “Micurà de Rü” (127-168).
- Guasti, Maria Teresa (1988): La pseudorelative et les phenomenes d'accord. In *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 13 (35-57).
- . (1993): *Causative and Perception verbs. A Comparative Study*. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Gutiérrez Arous, María Luz (2004): *Problemas fundamentales de la gramática del español como 2/L*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1975): *French Syntax. The transformational cycle*, Cambridge/MA: MIT Press.
- Pellegrini, Giovan Battista (1991). *La genesi del retoromanzo (o ladino)*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Radford, Andrew (1975): Pseudo-relatives and the unity of Subject Raising. In *Archivum Linguisticum*, 6 (32-64).
- . (1977): *Italian Syntax. Transformational and Relational Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raposo, Eduardo (1989): Prepositional Infinitival Constructions in European Portuguese. In Jaeggli, Osvaldo & Safir, Kenneth J. *The Null Subject Parameter*, Dordrecht-Boston-London: Kluwer (277-305).
- Rizzi, Luigi (2000): *Comparative Syntax and Language Acquisition*, London/New York: Routledge.

³¹ I am convinced that this correspondence is due to diachronic factors: it is plausible that the GC of Vulgar Latin evolved in some varieties into a PR, in others into a PI. This explains the fact that in Italy the GC can be found only in very conservative varieties, namely in Northern Ladin and in Sardinian (as well as in Swiss Romansh), while the PI is found in the more innovative Gallo-Italic dialects. I will analyse these historical links in the future research.

- Rohlf's, Gerhard (1949): *Historische Grammatik der Italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten*, Bd. II: *Formenlehre und Syntax*. Bern: Francke.
- Sandfeld, Kristian (1936): *Syntaxe du français contemporain. Les propositions subordonnées*. Genève: Droz.
- Škerlj, Stanko (1926): *Syntaxe du participe présent et du gérondif en vieil italien. Avec une introduction sur l'emploi du participe présent et de l'ablatif du gérondif en latin*. Paris : Honoré Champion.
- Skytte, Gunver (1983): *La sintassi dell'infinito in italiano moderno*. Copenaghen: Munksgaards.
- Strudsholm, Erling (1988): *Relative situazionali in italiano moderno. Una reinterpretazione della cosiddetta pseudorelativa sulla base di un approccio combinato, formale e funzionale*. Münster-Hamburg-London: LIT.
- Tekavčić, Pavao (1972): *Grammatica storica dell'italiano*, volume II: *Morfosintassi*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Vanelli, Laura (2004): Osservazioni preliminari sulla questione ladina. In: Benincà, Paolo & Vanelli, Laura. *Studi sul friulano*, Padova: Unipress (5-17).