

THE OBJECT GAP-PSEUDORELATIVE GENERALIZATION

Nuria Aldama García
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM)

ABSTRACT. Previous literature contains two different points of view regarding the subject-object asymmetry related to the DP head of pseudorelatives (PRs). Some authors claim that the DP head can only be interpreted as the subject of the embedded predicate (subject-gap PRs). Other authors point towards the possibility of finding other constituents (e.g. direct object) in head position (object-gap PR), too. In this paper I claim that there are certain languages that only allow the DP head to be the subject of the embedded predicate, that is, they only allow subject-gap PRs, whereas other languages allow both subject-gap and object-gap PRs. Thus, the aim of this paper is to present the object-gap PR generalization to account for the cross-linguistic availability of subject-gap and object-gap PRs: the availability of object-gap PRs is subject to object clitic doubling. The structure of this paper goes as follows. Section 1 introduces PRs. Section 2 presents data about subject-gap and object-gap PRs. Section 3 gives some remarks on object clitic doubling. Section 4 presents the object-gap PR generalization. Conclusions and further research issues are presented in section 5.

Key words. subject-gap pseudorelatives; object-gap pseudorelatives; object clitic doubling; syntax.

RESUMEN. La literatura recoge dos puntos de vista con respecto a la asimetría sujeto-objeto relacionada con el SD que encabeza las construcciones pseudorelativas (PRs). Para algunos autores dicho SD solo puede ser interpretado como el sujeto del predicado subordinado (PRs de sujeto). Otros autores señalan que es posible encontrar otros constituyentes (el objeto directo) en posición de cabeza (PRs de objeto). Este trabajo sostiene que hay lenguas que solo admiten PRs de sujeto, mientras que otras admiten PRs de sujeto y PRs de objeto. Esta variabilidad se explica mediante la generalización de PRs de objeto que aquí propongo cuya idea principal es que la posibilidad de encontrar PRs de objeto en una lengua está sujeta a la disponibilidad de doblado de clítico de objeto en esa lengua. Las secciones 1 y 2 presentan las construcciones PRs y la distribución de PRs de sujeto y PRs de objeto respectivamente. La sección 3 trata sobre el doblado de clítico de objeto. En la sección 4 se presenta la generalización de PRs de objeto. La sección 5 incluye las conclusiones y cuestiones relacionadas con futuras investigaciones.

Palabras clave. pseudorelativas de sujeto, pseudorelativas de objeto, doblado de clítico de objeto, sintaxis.

1. Introduction

Pseudo-relatives (PRs)¹ are constructions formed by a DP (the head) plus an embedded clause headed by the complementizer *que* ‘that’ (1). Traditionally, the DP head is interpreted as the subject of the embedded predicate.

¹ This is a part of the research work I did in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master in Linguistics I took at the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), 2016. Its supervisor was professor Javier Ormazabal to whom I am thankful for his dedication and advice.

- (1) a. (SUBJ) + V + [PR DP + que + V TENSED]
 b. Ana vió a Juan que corría.
Ana see-PST.3SG DOM² Juan that run-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘María saw Juan running’

PRs have been studied from very different angles since the late 19th century (Casalicchio 2013; Graffi 2017 and references therein). Researchers on semantics, syntax and discourse have been studying PRs for decades (Granville-Hatcher 1944; Schwarze 1974; Radford 1975; Súnier 1978; Graffi 1980, 2017; Guasti 1988; Campos 1994; Cinque 1995; Brito 1995; Rafel 1999; Scarano 2002; Casalicchio 2013, 2014, 2016; Koopman & Sportiche 2014; Rodríguez-Espiñeira 2014; Angelopoulos 2015; Moulton & Grillo 2015a, 2015b; Grillo & Moulton 2016 among others). PRs have been studied from a psycholinguistic perspective, too (Grillo & Costa 2014; Grillo et al 2015a; Grillo et al 2015b). PRs are present in a great variety of languages such as: Spanish (2a), Catalan (2b), Italian (2c), Romanian (2d), Portuguese (2e), French (2f), Galician (2g), Greek (2h), Japanese (2i) or Dutch (at least in some varieties) as opposed to languages like English, Basque or Chinese (Grillo & Costa 2014: 157).

- (2) a. He visto a Juan que corría.
Have-PRS.AUX.ISG see-PTCP DOM Juan that run-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Juan running’
 [Rafel 1999: 166]

- b. He vist en Joan que corria.
Have-PRS.AUX.ISG see-PTCP - Joan that run-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Joan running’
 [Rafel 1999: 166]

- c. Ho visto Gianni che correva.
Have-PRS.AUX.ISG see-PTCP Gianni that run-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Joan running’
 [adapted from Cinque 1992: 1]

- d. L-am văzut pe Ion că fugea.
Him-have.I seen DOM Ion that run- PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Ion running’
 [Alboiu et al. 2013: 279]

- e. Vejo Joao que chora.
See-PRS.ISG Joao that cry-PRS.3SG
 ‘I saw Joao running’
 [Brito 1995: 40]

- f. J’ai vu Jean qui courait.
I.Have-PRS.AUX.ISG see-PTCP Jean that run-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Jean running’
 [adapted from Guasti 1988: 35]

² Differential Object Marking.

g. Eu vin a Xoán que corria.
I see-PST.3SG DOM Xoán that run-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Jean running’

[Rafel 1999: 166]

h. Idha ton Yani pu etreche
See-PST.1SG the Yani that run-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Yani running’

[Angelopoulos 2015: 1]

i. Watashi-ha hashitte-iru Huan-wo mi-ta
I-SUBJ.TOP run-DUR John-ACC see-PST
 ‘I saw Huan running’

[Ueda. Personal communication]

2. Subject-gap and Object-gap PRs.

The literature concerning PRs points towards a subject-object asymmetry, that is, the DP preceding the complementizer *que* must be interpreted as subject of the embedded predicate. This is what I call from now on a subject-gap PR (3) (Graffi 1980, 2017; Guasti 1988; Cinque 1995; Brito 1995; Rafel 1999; Casalicchio 2013, 2016; Koopman & Sportiche 2014; Rodriguez-Espiñeira 2014; Moulton & Grillo 2015a, 2015b, Grillo & Moulton 2016). In other words, if the DP head is interpreted as the direct object (henceforth DO) of the embedded predicate as in (3-6b), then the construction becomes ungrammatical.

- (3) a. Ho visto Luigi che salutava Maria.
Have-AUX.PRS.1SG see-PTCP Luigi that greet-PST.IPFV.3SG Maria
 ‘I saw Luigi greeting Maria’
 b. *Ho visto Luigi che María salutava
Have-AUX.PRS.1SG see-PTCP Luigi that María greet-PST.IPFV.3SG
~~Luigi~~
Luigi
 ‘I saw Luigi that Mary greeted’

[Casalicchio 2014: 2]

- (4) a. He visto a Juan que saludaba
Have-AUX.PRS.1SG see-PTCP DOM Juan that greet-PST.IPFV.3SG
 a María.
DOM María
 ‘I saw Juan greeting María’
 b. *He visto a Juan_i que
Have-AUX.PRS.1SG see-PTCP DOM Juan that
 saludaba María ~~Juan_i~~
greet-PST.IPFV.3SG María Juan
 ‘I saw Juan that Mary greeted him’

[Adapted from Rafel 1999: 168]

- (5) a. J'ai vu Jean qui embrassait Marie.
I.have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP Jean that kiss-PST.IPFV.3SG Marie
 'I saw Jean kissing Marie'

[Koopman & Sportiche 2014: 57]

- b. *J'ai vu Jean_i que Marie embrassait t_i
I.have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP Jean_i that Marie kiss-PST.IPFV.3SG t_i
 'I saw Jean that Marie kissed him'

[Guasti 1988: 36]

- (6) a. Vejo a teu filho que está a chorar.
See-PRS.ISG the your son_i that be-COP.PRS.3PL to cry-INF
 'I see your son crying'

- b. * Vejo o teu filho_i que os meninos
see-PRS.ISG the your son_i that the kids
 estão a magoãr t_i
be-COP.PRS.3PL to hurt-INF t_i
 'I see your son getting hurt by the kids'

[Brito 1995: 29]

However, there is a clear contrast between (4) and (7): whenever a DO clitic coindexed with the head of the PR is present, the structure is grammatical (7a). This is what I call from now on object-gap PR³. If the DO clitic is removed, as in (4b, 7b) the structure is again ungrammatical.

- (7) a. He visto a María_i que la_i
Have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP DOM María that her-ACC
 traían (sus amigos) en coche a la facultad.
bring-PST.IPFV.3PL her friends by car to the faculty
 'I saw María who was brought to the faculty by car'

- b. * He visto a María que
Have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP DOM María that
 traían (sus amigos) en coche a la facultad.
bring-PST.IPFV.3PL her friends by car to the faculty
 'I saw María who was brought to the faculty by car'

Angelopoulos (2015) independently observes that DO-gap PRs are available in Greek. Greek DO-gap PRs are subject to the same condition as Spanish DO-gap PRs: the presence of the DO clitic coindexed with the head of the PR is mandatory.

- (8) a. Idha tin María_i pu t_i filuse
See-PST.ISG the María that her-ACC kiss-PST.PROG.3SG
 o Yanis
the Yanis
 'I saw Maria that John was kissing her'

³ These structures were already mentioned in Campos (1994: 201-236), Casalicchio (2014) and Scarano (2002).

- b.* *Idha tin María pu filuse o Yanis.*
See-PST.ISG the María that kiss-PST.PROG.3SG the Yanis
 ‘I saw María that Yanis was kissing her’

[Angelopoulos 2015: 52]

On the other hand, Graffi (1980:133) points out that the insertion of an object clitic coindexed with the DP head would ameliorate the degree of acceptability of the object-gap PR, but still, the construction remains ungrammatical.

- (9) a.**Ho visto Giovanni che il suo*
Have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP Giovanni that his
padre picchiava.
father hit-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Giovanni who was being hit by his father’
 b*?*Ho visto Giovanni_i che il suo*
Have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP Giovanni that his
padre lo_i picchiava.
father him-ACC hit-PST.IPFV.3SG
 ‘I saw Giovanni who was being hit by his father’

[Graffi 1980: 133]

Up to this point, it can be said that there are certain languages e.g. Spanish and Greek, that allow object-gap PRs if an object clitic is inserted within the PR predicate. The absence of the object clitic makes object-gap PRs ungrammatical. Besides, there are other languages such as Italian that do not allow object-gap PRs even in the presence of the object-clitic. Thus, what do Spanish and Greek have in common to favor the availability of object-gap PRs through the insertion of object clitics? And why do languages like Italian block the insertion of the object clitic making object-gap PRs unavailable?

3. Some remarks about Clitic Doubling

According to Anagnostopoulou (2006: 520) clitic doubling is a construction in which a clitic co-occurs with a full DP in argument position forming a discontinuous constituent with it inside the same propositional structure (Kallulli & Tasmowski 2008:1).

- (10) *Le_i di un regalo a mi madre_i.*
Her-DAT give-PST.ISG a present to my mother.
 ‘I gave my mother a gift’

Bošković (2008) provides a list of languages that allow clitic doubling. The list includes the following: Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Greek, Somali, Spanish, French (some dialects), Catalan, Romanian, Hebrew, Arabic, Dutch. However, clitic doubling displays intriguing cross-linguistic variation which has been widely discussed in the literature. In particular, some languages such as Spanish or Romanian have clitic doubling of objects, but others such as French or Italian lack this type of construction (Anagnostopoulou 2006: 520).

- (11) a.*Miguelito le regaló un caramelo a Mafalda.*
Miguelito her-DAT gave a candy to Mafalda

- ‘Miguelito gave Mafalda a piece of candy’
 b.*Jean lui a donné des bonbons
Jean her-DAT have-AUX.PRS.3SG give-PTCP the candies
 à Marie.
 to Marie
 ‘John gave candies to Mary’

[Anagnostopoulou 2006: 520]

4. The Object-gap PR generalization

What do PRs and object clitic doubling have in common? If we look back at the examples (3) - (8), an important similarity between object-gap PRs and object-clitic doubling constructions arises: the same languages (French, Italian and Portuguese) that do not allow object-gap PRs do not allow object clitic doubling constructions, and those languages that allow object clitic doubling (Spanish or Greek) also allow object-gap PRs.

Since the presence/absence of the object clitic coindexed with the head of the PR appears to be the key for the availability of object-gap PRs, then I propose the object-gap PR generalization in (12):

- (12) Those languages where PRs and object clitic doubling are available allow object-gap PRs. Those languages where PRs are available, but lack object clitic doubling do not allow object-gap PRs.

In fact, once (12) is applied to the whole PR picture, it can be observed that PRs are not only restricted to the subject or the DO of the embedded predicate, but they are also available with the indirect object (IO) of the embedded predicate (13).

- (13) a. He visto a Paco_i que
Have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP DOM Paco that
 le_i pedían la hora unos
him-DAT ask.for-PST.IPFV.3PL the time some
 chavales a la puerta de la biblioteca.
 guys at the door of the library
 ‘I saw some guys asking Paco the time at the library door’
 b.*He visto a Paco que
Have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP DOM Paco that
 pedían la hora unos chavales
ask.for-PST.IPFV.3PL the time some guys
 a la puerta de la biblioteca.
at the door of the library
 ‘I saw some guys asking Paco the time at the library door’

The contrast between (13a) and (13b) shows that again, if the dative clitic *le* is inserted within the *que*-clause (13a), the construction results grammatical. However, if the dative clitic is not present within the *que*-clause, the construction results ungrammatical. In other words, PRs where the DP head is interpreted as the IO of the embedded predicate are also available (at least in Spanish) and are subject to the mandatory presence of the object clitic.

Table 1. Relation between object-gap PRs and object-clitic doubling.

LANGUAGE	Subject-gap PRs	Object clitic doubling	Object-gap PRs
Romanian	Yes	Yes ⁴	Yes? ⁵
Spanish	Yes	Yes	Yes
Galician	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dutch	Yes	No ⁶	No?
Italian	Yes	No	No
French	Yes	No	No
Serbo-Croatian	Yes	Yes ⁷	Yes?
Japanese	Yes	No	No
Korean	Yes	No	No
Greek	Yes	Yes	Yes
Portuguese	Yes	No	No
Catalan	Yes	Yes	No?

Table 1 is the result of applying (12) to the cross-linguistic PR panorama. The first column in table 1 shows languages where (subject-gap) PRs are available⁸. The third and fourth columns show the correlation between the availability of object clitic doubling and object-gap PRs as explained in (12).

In the case of Spanish, Galician⁹, and Greek, object-gap PRs are available. These languages agree with (12) since all of them have object clitic doubling.

Although clitic doubling is available in Catalan, as well as strong pronoun doubling, clitic left dislocation and right dislocation (Bošković 2008; Tsakali & Anagnostopoulou 2008; Complements duplicats Fitxa 7674/3 2014; Gramàtica de la llengua catalana 2016), Catalan does not seem to agree with (12). However, it is interesting that a mandatory intonation break needs to be present in clitic doubling structures¹⁰ as well as after the head of the PR¹¹. Further research needs to be done to see if there is any connection between these two phenomena.

⁴ See Kallulli & Tasmowski (2008), Hill & Tasmowski (2008) and Alboiu et al. (2013) for more information about Romanian object clitic doubling.

⁵ The question mark points out that further research needs to be done to fully confirm the availability of object-gap PRs because parallel syntactic phenomena out of the scope of this paper interfere.

⁶ The availability and display of object clitic doubling changes depending on the different varieties of Dutch. See van Craenenbroeck & van Koppen (2008) and Koopman & Sportiche (2014).

⁷ See Runic (2014); Bošković (2008, 2016) for a discussion about Serbo-Croatian clitic doubling and argument ellipsis. See Mišeska (2008) for a detailed discussion about the variability of object clitic doubling in standard Serbian and in the South-Eastern Serbian varieties.

⁸ Adapted from Grillo & Costa (2014: 133).

⁹ Galician native speaker from Cambados personal communication (February 12th 2018).

(i) Ho visto Xoán_i que o_i traían en coche.
Have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP Xoán that him-ACC bring-PST.IPFV.3PL by car
 ‘I saw Xoán who was been brought by car’.

¹⁰ (i) Le he fet un regal, a la meva mare.
Her-DAT have-AUX.PRS.ISG make-PTCP a present to the my mother
 ‘I made a gift to my mother’

According to Anagnostopoulou (2006) doubled objects have the same intonation and distribution of arguments while right-dislocated objects have the intonation and distribution of peripheral elements.

¹¹ The pause after the PR head turns the PR into an appositive relative clause.

- (14) ?* He vist en Joan que el portaven
Have-AUX.PRS.ISG see-PTCP - Joan that him-ACC bring-PST.IPFV.3PL
 en ambulància.
by ambulance
 ‘I saw Joan who was being brought in an ambulance’

Italian, French and Portuguese also agree with (12), in the sense that neither of them allows object clitic doubling and thus, object gap PRs are unavailable too.

Korean and Japanese lack clitics¹², and thus, the prediction that follows from (12) is that they lack object-gap PRs. However, further research needs to be done to discard other syntactic strategies that might lead to object-gap PRs.

The cases of Dutch, Romanian and Serbo-Croatian are more complex because clitic doubling is subject to other syntactic factors such as argument ellipsis, article availability (Bošković 2008, 2016; Runic 2014), lack of clitic doubling for fully lexical DPs or the differences between subject/object clitic doubling (van Craenenbroeck & van Koppen 2008: 223-225). Additionally, clitic doubling structures behave differently depending on the varieties of Dutch or Serbo-Croatian (Mišeska 2008: 80-83). Thus, further research needs to be done to check whether the predictions following from (12) for Romanian, Serbo-Croatian (they should allow object-gap PRs), and Dutch (Dutch should not allow object-gap PRs) are fulfilled and if they are not, what grammatical issues interfere.

5. Conclusion and further research.

Previous literature on PRs presents a subject-object asymmetry regarding the syntactic nature of the DP in head position with respect to the embedded predicate. In this squib I present the object-gap PR generalization that relates the availability of object-gap PRs and object clitic doubling, namely, those languages that allow object clitic doubling, allow object-gap PRs, whereas those languages that lack object clitic doubling do not allow object-gap PRs. Further research includes extending and testing the cross-linguistic availability of indirect object-gap PRs or finding an explanation for the cross-linguistic availability of PRs. Besides, it would be important to see whether Japanese and Korean reach object-gap PRs using alternative syntactic strategies, if Catalan intonation breaks are related to object clitic doubling phenomena or if the predictions made by the object-gap PR generalization hold for Romanian, Serbo-Croatian and Dutch.

Nuria Aldama García
 Laboratorio de Lingüística Informática
 Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
 Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
nuria.aldama@estudiante.uam.es

References

- Alboiu, G. & V. Hill. (2013). On Romanian perception verbs and evidential syntax. *RRL* LVIII 3, pp 275–298. Available at http://www.lingv.ro/RRL_3_2013.art02Alboiu.pdf

¹² Moreno Cabrera & Takagi Takanashi personal communication (16/02/2018)).

- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2006). Clitic Doubling, in M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Malden, MA, USA, Blackwell Publishing, pp. 519-581. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996591.ch14>
- Angelopoulos, N. (2015). *Explorations of (Greek) pseudo-relatives*. MA Thesis, Los Angeles, University of California. Available at <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9jv565v7>
- Bošković, Ž. (2008). What will you have, DP or NP?, in E. Elfner & M. Walkow (eds.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 37*, Amherst GLSA, University of Massachusetts, pp 101-114.
- Bošković, Ž. (2016). *On Clitic Doubling and Argument Ellipsis*. University of Connecticut. Available at <http://web.uconn.edu/boskovic/papers/CliticDoublingMay2016WCCFLFormattedFINAL-1.pdf>
- Brito, A. M. (2003). Subordinação adverbial. In M. H. Mira *et al.* (eds.), *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Caminho, pp. 695-728.
- Campos, H. (1994). Seudo-elevación y seudo-relativas en español. In V. Demonte (ed.), *Gramática del español*. México: El Colegio de México, pp. 201-236.
- Casalicchio, J. (2016). The Pseudo-relative construction in Romance. *Linguistic Seminars of the Centre de Lingüística Teòrica of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*, 2016.
- Casalicchio, J. (2014). Pseudo-Relatives and their left-periphery: A unified account. In E. Carrilho *et al.* (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory, Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 28, Lisbon 2014*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 23-42
- Casalicchio, J. (2013). *Pseudorelative, gerundi e infiniti nelle varietà romanze: affinità (solo) superficiali e corrispondenze strutturali*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Cinque, G. (1995) [1992]. The pseudo-relative and acc-ing constructions after verbs of perception. In *Italian Syntax and Universal Grammar*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 244-275
- Graffi, G. (1980). Su alcune costruzioni "pseudorelative", in *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 5, pp. 117-139.
- Graffi, G. (2017). What are 'Pseudo-Relatives'? In R. D'Alessandro, G. Iannàccaro, D. Passino & A. M. Thornton (dirs.), *Di tutti i colori*. Utrecht / Stockholm / Nice / L'Aquila: Utrecht University Repository, pp. 115-132. https://www.ris.uu.nl/ws/files/34667598/Di_tutti_i_colori.pdf
- Institut d'Estudis Catalans (2016). Els pronoms personals i els pronoms febles ho, en i hi: naturalesa i funció. In *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, pp. 667-712.
- Granville-Hatcher, A. (1944). Je le vois sourire; Je le vois qui sourit; Je le vois souriant. *Modern Language Quarterly* 5, pp. 275-301. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00267929-5-3-275>
- Generalitat de Catalunya. (2014). Complements duplicats. Fitxa 7674/3. Available at http://aplicacions.llengua.gencat.cat/llc/AppJava/index.html;jsessionid=6E8881389862980A2E032E94095E5228?action=Principal&method=detall&input_cercar=Ordre+dels+elements&numPagina=1&database=FITXES_PUB&idFont=11965&tipusFont=Fitxes+de+1%27Optimot&idHit=11934&titol=Ordre%20dels%20elements%20en%20la%20frase%20/%20Complements%20despla%27

- [ats%20i%20duplicacions%20pronominals&numeroResultat=2&tipusCerca=cerca.normes&clickLink=detall](#)
- Grillo, N. & J. Costa. (2014). A novel argument for the universality of parsing principles. *Cognition* 133, pp. 156-187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.05.019>
- Grillo, N. *et al.* (2015). Highs and Lows in English Attachment. *Cognition* 144, pp. 116-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2015.07.018>
- Grillo *et al.* (2017). *There and back again: Pseudo Relatives contribution to parsing and grammar*. Prin Workshop CISCL – Università degli Studi di Siena April 8 2017. Available at <http://www.ciscl.unisi.it/master/belletti/Final%20Prin%20Workshop.Grillo.York.pdf>
- Grillo, N. & K. Moulton. (2016). Event kinds and the pseudo-relative. In B. Prickett and C. Hammerly (eds.), *NELS 46: Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistics Society*. Amherst, MA: GLSA (Graduate Linguistic Student Association), Vol.2. pp. 11-20.
- Guasti, M. T. (1988). La pseudorelative et les phenomenes d'accord. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 13, pp. 35-80.
- Kallulli, D & L. Tasmowski. (2008). Clitic Doubling, Core Syntax and the interfaces, in D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.130.03kal>
- Koopman, H. & D. Sportiche. (2014). The que/qui alternation. New analytical directions. In P. Svenonius (ed.), *Functional structure from top to toe: The cartography of syntactic structures*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 46-96. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199740390.003.0003>
- Mišeska Tomić, O. (2008). Towards grammaticalization of clitic doubling, in D. Kallulli, & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 65-88. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.130.06mis>
- Moulton, K. & N. Grillo. (2015a). Pseudo Relatives: Big and Direct. In T. Bui & D. Özyıldız (eds.), *NELS 45: Proceedings of the Forty-fifth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*. Amherst, MA: GLSA (Graduate Linguistics Student Association), vol. 2, pp. 193-202.
- Moulton, K. & N. Grillo. (2015b). *Sorting out pseudorelatives: Clausal determiners and mediated Agree*. In *Lingbuzz/002684*. 1-27. <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002738>.
- Radford, A. (1975). 'Pseudo-Relatives and the Unity of Subject Raising'. *Archivum Linguisticum* 6, pp. 32-64.
- Rafel, J. (1999). La construcción pseudo-relativa en romance. *Verba. Anuario Galego De Filoloxía* 26, pp. 165-192.
- Rodríguez-Espiñeira, M.J. (2014). Cláusulas flexionadas predicativas con verbos de percepción. In A. Enrique-Arias, M. Gutiérrez, A. Landa, F. Ocampo (eds.), *Perspectives in the Study of Spanish Language Variation. Papers in Honor of Carmen Silva-Corvalán. Anejo 72 de Verba*. Santiago: Universidad de Santiago, pp. 201-236.
- Scarano, A. (2002). *Fraasi relative e pseudo-relative in italiano in Sintassi, semantica e articolazione dell'informazione*. Roma: Bulzoni.

- Schwarze, C. (1974). Les constructions du type "Je le vois qui arrive". In C. Rohrer & N. Ruwet (eds.), *Actes du Colloque Franco-Allemand de Grammaire Transformationnelle*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 18-30.
- Suñer, M. (1978). Perception verb complements in Spanish: same or different? *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 23, pp. 107-127.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008413100008732>
- Suñer, M. (1988). The role of agreement in clitic-doubled constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 391-434.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00133904>
- Tsakali, V. & E. Anagnostopoulou (2008). Rethinking the Clitic Doubling parameter. The inverse correlation between clitic doubling and participle agreement. In D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 321-360.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/la.130.17tsa>
- Van Craenenbroeck, J. & M. van Koppen Doubling. (2008). Pronominal Doubling. In S. Barbiers, O. Koenenman, M. Lekakou & M. van der Ham (eds.), *Dutch Dialects: Big DPs And Coordinations*, Syntax and Semantics volume 6: Microvariation in Syntactic Doubling. Leiden: Brill, pp. 205-249.