

Review by Anonymous

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation? [max 250 words]*

Yes, the paper discusses new empirical data about Pseudo-relative clauses ('PRs'). In particular, the illustration of similar effects in PRs, control clauses and imperatives is interesting and new.

However, the analysis proposed by the authors is sketchy (as they admit in the conclusions), and only the *pars destruens* is developed. I understand that obviation effects are difficult to capture theoretically, but I think that a position about the structure of PRs should be taken: is it the same, or a similar one, as in Casalicchio & Herbeck (2022; henceforth, 'C&H')? Or is it radically different?

Without a proper analysis, it is impossible to state 1) if the correlation between the ungrammaticality of passive PRs and other phenomena in the paper (obviation, use of passive 'se') is due to structural reasons or just a case; 2) what structural property is responsible for the grammaticality of object PRs (26) and of split antecedents in PRs (29).

Note that without proper analysis of PRs the parallel with control clauses risks to raise more problems than it solves, because we need to compare the structures of these two constructions (which diverge in various, crucial points): due to the space limits of this box, I discuss this in box 3.

In principle, I would recommend major revisions; since *Isogloss* does not allow this option, I go for minor revisions, but I really recommend the authors that they make the suggested changes, because I think they are necessary to improve their paper.

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]*

Yes, in general the data are presented properly.

I have some remarks about the examples (30-32), though.

First, I think that the difference between passive 'se' and impersonal 'se' should be discussed in more detail, because this divergence is puzzling, especially if one considers Pujalte & Saab's (2012) (which the authors briefly mention, p. 12).

Second, I would reconsider the interpretation and choice of some examples in (30-32):

- As far as the reflexive 'se' is concerned (30a, 31b, 32b), it is important to make sure that the ungrammaticality is not due to independent reasons, i.e. semantics or aspect. Concerning (32b), I do not think that a fictional reading should receive a different structure than a non-fictional one (nor that it is true indirect perception), the problem with these sentences is just that it is almost impossible to imagine a context in which Juan sees himself in the act of doing something; and if you imagine him e.g. in front of a mirror, there are probably aspectual reasons to prefer an infinitive or gerund. Even in Italian, where passives of PRs are completely

grammatical, a sentence like (30a) would be completely out. Therefore, I'm not sure these examples neatly suggest a correlation between reflexive 'se' and passives.

- About passive 'se', first of all I recommend that the authors use 'ver' and not 'escuchar', because (31c) is odd: while I certainly *see* somebody while she/he is the patient of an event, I won't usually *hear* her/him: (31c) does not imply that the lawyers are speaking while they are insulted (they might stay quiet, and so I don't hear them directly), and that might be the reason for its ungrammaticality).

In addition, I think that it is crucial to make clear whether the ungrammaticality of the examples with passive 'se' is really due to co-reference, or if indefinites (at least non-specific indefinites) are ruled out altogether in PRs. I don't know if Spanish allows passive 'se' with definites (if it does, in (30b, 31c, 32c) I would use "los abogados", or "Juan y Julia" etc.); otherwise, the authors could show that indefiniteness is fine in PRs by proposing an example like "Oí abogados que protestaban en el juzgado." (I am not a native speaker of Spanish, so I don't know if this sentence is grammatical).

Finally, examples (43-45) should be reconsidered (see below, box 7).

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]*

The fact that no structure of PRs is given makes it difficult to answer this question. What is sure is that the *pars destruens* is worked out in much more detail than the *pars construens*, thus the authors should focus on the latter in the revised version.

The absence of a structure for PRs is the main issue of this paper. The structure of perception constructions is a long-standing question, in any Romance language. Since Kayne (1975), many linguists have discussed PRs, infinitives, gerunds, complement clauses in French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese etc. Simplifying the whole discussion, the main challenge is to propose a structure that accounts for all the properties displayed by these perception constructions. Since the task seemed impossible in some languages/constructions, Cinque (1992) was the first (for Romance) to propose a threefold structure.

In the paper under review, the authors highlight the resemblance between perception and object-control verbs. This proposal is not completely new (see e.g. a criticism to this approach in European Portuguese by Raposo 1989), but the comparison between perception and control verbs raises two issues that should be addressed in the paper:

1. object-control verbs and perception verbs radically differ when they have an embedded non-finite clause: the former can be passivized without apparent restrictions ("Kenan fue forzado a casarse con Arzu", example from the internet), while the latter can be passivized only when the infinitive is unaccusative (cfr. p.6, fn. 3);

2. If PRs are similar to control clauses, we might expect the antecedent and the PR to be two different constituents (as has been proposed as one of the three structures of Italian PRs, Cinque 1992, Casalicchio 2013, 2016; and for Spanish gerunds it has been proposed by Di Tullio 1998). But there are constituenthood tests that clearly show that the antecedent and the PR

behave as a single constituent (e.g. pseudoclefts: “Lo que vi fue el barco que atracaba en el puerto.”, accepted by native speakers I consulted).

Another remark I have is about the counterarguments to C&H, which are mainly the possibility of objects PRs and split antecedents. However, there could be other reasons for the grammaticality of these data: 1. object PRs could have a different structure than subject PRs. They could be CPs in which the antecedent has moved to an embedded Spec,CP position, without moving further (in line with Guasti’s 1992 analysis); or they could be structures in which the antecedent and the PR form two different constituents, with the PR being an adjunct controlled by the antecedent (a structure I mentioned above, when I referred to the threefold structure of Italian PRs). 2. The latter analysis (= PR as adjunct) would also account for split antecedents (29).

In sum, a possible analysis that should be considered (and in case discarded, if the authors think the data do not lead us in that direction) is that PRs might have more than one structure in Spanish, as they do in Italian.

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.*

Some of the literature that I have cited in this review should be used by the authors. In any case, I provide here the full references of all the works that I have cited here:

Casalicchio, Jan. 2016. '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. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 23-42.

Guasti, Maria Teresa. 1992. 'Pseudorelatives and Prepositional Infinitives. A Unified Account.' *Geneva Generative Papers* 1: 53-65.

Kayne, Richard S. 1975. *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Raposo, Eduardo (1989). 'Prepositional Infinitival Constructions in European Portuguese' in: O. Jaeggli, K.J. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 277-305.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi (2004). 'Locality and left periphery', in A. Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structure, Vol. 3*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 223-251.

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]*

NO

If you accept the paper with minor revisions, please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

I invite the authors to make the revisions mentioned in the previous parts of the review. I make a short summary of them here (but please refer to the full review for all of them):

- give a structure (at least a preliminary one) for PRs;
- revise and change accordingly the examples in (30-32), and discuss them in more detail;
- address the issue of the similarities and differences between perception verbs and control verbs

In addition to what I have mentioned in the boxes above, I would also ask the authors to integrate the following:

- The discussion of the data in (16-19) about the possibility of corefering the antecedent of a PR with the embedded direct or indirect object (16a-b) should at least mention the possibility that Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990) could be involved in this ban, especially in Rizzi's more recent formulations (e.g., Rizzi 2004). Especially the contrast between (18) and (19) looks at first sight suspicious as a case of RM.
- the discussion of obviation in imperatives is very short and sketchy, and it is not clear what contribution they give to the author's point. I would elaborate on this, or delete this part (in case, they can be maintained in a footnote).
- Concerning examples (43-45), I don't think that the selection of 'que' vs. 'si/wh' is an instance of mood restriction: mood and illocutionary force should be kept distinct, since they belong to different domains.
- Concerning example (47), I trust the authors that complement CPs of perception verbs show the same obviation effects as PRs, but I would choose an example where the embedded verb is in a tense that favours a direct perception reading (e.g. imperfective or an estar+gerund periphrasis)
- correct the typos that I have highlighted in the attached paper.