

Mismatching Pseudo-Relatives describe event kinds

Nino Grillo (Universität Stuttgart) & Keir Moulton (Simon Fraser University)

Pseudo-relatives (PRs) are finite constructions found in many Romance languages (1) that look superficially like relative clauses, but are naturally translated as English gerundive constructions.

- (1) a. Ho visto **Gianni /l'uomo che correva**. b. Vedo **Gianni /l'uomo che corre**
I.have seen G. /the'man that run.IMPf I.see G. /the'man that run.PRES
'I saw G. /the man running.' 'I see G. /the man running.'

The PRs in (1) match in tense with their matrix clauses, a fact commonly thought to be required of PRs (Radford 1977, Guasti 1988, Cinque 1995). There are, however, often-overlooked cases of tense mismatch (Casalicchio 2013, p.31). Here we are concerned with the previously unreported case of present under past illustrated in (2), that also deliver a direct perception interpretation.

- (2) Ho visto Gianni che corre, e tante altre cose simili.
I.have seen G. that run.PRES, and many others things similar.
'I have seen G. running, and many other such things.'

We argue that there is a semantic difference between Tense-matching PRs (TM-PRs) and Tense-mismatched PRs (TMM-PRs), in that the former deliver an event-token interpretation whereas the latter deliver an event-kind interpretation (Carlson 1977, Barwise & Perry 1983, McNally 1992, Gehrke 2014). The exciting, broader implication is that kind interpretations are not limited to lexical items, or small projections thereof, but can arise from fully inflected clauses.

Background PRs are constituents that refer to events and naturally serve as complements in direct perception. This is shown by (3), where *Ciò que* 'that which' is inanimate; so the PR does not denote *Maria* in (3) but the event/situation described by the entire embedded clause. As (3) shows, both TM-PRs and TMM-PRs are event-denoting constituents.

- (3) **Ciò che₁ / *Chi₂** ho visto è **Maria₂ che piangeva₁ / Maria che piange**
That which /Who I.have seen is Maria that cry-IMPf / Maria that cry.PRES
'What /(*Who) I saw was Maria crying'

Grillo and Moulton (2014) argue that PRs are referential descriptions of events. Their evidence includes the fact that PRs exhibit, in contrast to infinitives, scope-less behaviour with respect to higher operators (negation, conditionals). We show, however, that their analysis applies only to TM-PRs. TMM-PRs do not behave like TM-PRs in these respects or others. We propose that TMM-PRs describe event-kinds (see Gehrke 2014). This accounts for a number of previously unnoticed properties of TMM-PRs (ban on spatial/temporal modifiers, no uniqueness, sloppy identity under VP-ellipsis obligatory, narrow scope/distributive under quantified expressions).

Ban on Spatial/Temporal modifiers. Spatial and Temporal modifiers are banned with TMM-PRs. As with other types of event kinds, these can only be interpreted as creating event sub-kinds. This however is not possible when a specific date is mentioned (e.g. *last Thursday* in (4))

- (4) Tutti abbiamo visto Maria che ballava / *che balla al parco giovedì scorso.
All we.have seen M. that dance.IMPf / that dance.PRES at.the park Thursday last.
'We all saw M. dancing at the park last Thursday'.

Sloppy reading in ellipsis TMM-PRs allow for sloppy reading under ellipsis but TM-PRs do not. This yields the facts in (5), in which the same event of dancing (at same beach) is seen by all of us and the director with TM-PR, but different events /different beaches are allowed with TMM-PR.

- (5) Tutti abbiamo visto Maria che ballava /balla in spiaggia, anche il direttore.
 All we.have seen M. that dance.IMPF /dance.PRES on beach, also the director.
 ‘We all saw M. dancing on the beach, even the director.’ STRICT /SLOPPY

Obligatory narrow scope/distributive reading. Moulton & Grillo (2014) show that TM-PRs under perception verbs, but not infinitives, exhibit wide scope behaviour in a variety of environments (e.g. negation, adjunct islands). TMM-PRs, on the other hand, readily allow narrow scope and distributive readings in the same environments. Notice also that reference to the bears with ‘they were grizzly’ is only allowed in the matching version:

- (6) Tutti abbiamo visto 3 orsi₁ che scappavano /3 orsi₂ che scappano (pro_{1/*2} erano grizzly).
 All we.have seen 3 bears that run.away.IMPF /run.away.PRES (they were grizzly).
 ‘We all saw 3 bears running away (they were grizzly).’ CUMULATIVE /DISTRIBUTIVE

TM(but not TMM)-PRs carry existential entailment under negation, e.g.: *Since Lea never danced...*

- (7) Max non ha mai visto Lea che balla il tango /# L. che ballava il tango.
 M. NEG has never seen L. that dance.PRES the tango / L. that dance.IMPF the tango.
 ‘M. never saw L. dance the tango / dancing the tango.’

Limited capacity to establish a discourse referent Additionally to what shown in (6) for *bears*, while TM-PRs can establish a discourse referent for the event, (8a), TMM-PRs cannot (8b):

- (8) a. Tutti hanno visto M. che ballava₁ /M. che balla₂, pro_{1/*2} è stato uno spettacolo.
 All have seen M. that dance.IMPF /M. that dance.PRES, it is been a sight.
 ‘Everybody saw M. dancing, it was quite a sight.’

Kind Anaphora in Italian As Anderson & Morzycki (to appear) discovered of kind anaphora, Italian kind anaphora ‘*così*’ (9a-c) is only allowed with TMM-PRs (9d):

- (9) a. Un cane così. KIND b. Si comporta così. MANNER c. Alto così. DEGREE
 ‘Such a dog’. ‘He behaves in this way’. ‘This tall’.
 b. Una ragazza che corre /*correva, tutti abbiamo visto una cosa così.
 A girl that run.PRES /run.IMPF, all we.have seen a thing so.
 ‘A girl running, we all saw this kind of thing’.

Our analysis further explains 1. that **Frequency Adjectives** (Gehrke & McNally 2011) are only allowed with TMM-PRs (10a) and 2. why bare plural count nouns in internal argument position of TTM-PRs display properties of Pseudo-Incorporated nouns in **disallowing referential NP** (10b).

- (10) a. Raramente ho visto Maria che balla /*che ballava.
 Rarely I.have seen M. that dance.PRES /that dance.IMPF.
 ‘I rarely saw M. dancing.’
 b. Ho visto Gianni che mangiava / *mangia due caramelle che avevo messo sul tavolo.
 I.have seen G. that eat.IMPF / eat.PRES two candies that I.had put on.the table.
 ‘I saw G. eating two candies that I had put on the table’.

We build on the results of Moulton and Grillo (2014) which shows that TM-PRs are headed by an indefinite determiner. The TMM-PR cases, we contend, are accommodated by a determiner that selects for kind-denoting events. **References:** Anderson & Morzycki. To app. Degrees as kinds. *NLLT*. Cinque 1995. The Pseudo-Relative & Acc-ing construction. Gehrke 2014. Event kinds & abstract objects. Guasti. 1988. La pseudorelative & phénomènes d’accord. *Riv. di Gramm. Gen.* 13. Moulton & Grillo. 2014. Pseudo Relatives: Big but Transparent. *NELS*45.