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Abstract
Previous work on Relative Clause attachment has overlooked a crucial grammatical distinction across both the languages and structures tested: the selective availability of Pseudo Relatives. We reconsider the literature in light of this observation and argue that, all else being equal, local attachment is found with genuine Relative Clauses and that non-local attachment emerges when their surface identical imposters, Pseudo Relatives, are available. Hence, apparent cross-linguistic variation in parsing preferences is reducible to grammatical factors. The results from two novel experiments in Italian are presented in support of these conclusions.
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1. Introduction

In this paper we identify a confounding factor in the literature on Relative Clause (RC) attachment preferences originating with the findings of Cuetos & Mitchell (1988): the asymmetric availability of Pseudo Relative Small Clauses (PRs).

Analyzing previous attachment preference results both crosslinguistically and crossstructurally, we observe the following: everything else being equal (controlling prosody and referentiality etc.) languages / structures generating Low Attachment preferences contain genuine Relative Clauses (RCs). While those demonstrating High Attachment preferences have a string identical, but structurally and interpretatively distinct, representation from the RC, the PR. PRs and RCs, despite being string identical, are very distinct at the structural and interpretive level (1).

(1) a. Vi al [dp [np hijo del medico] [cp que corría]]. RC, HA
   b. Vi al [dp hijo [del [medico [cp que corría]]]]. RC, LA

   Saw.I the son of the doctor that run.impf.
   ‘I saw the son of the doctor that was running.’
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c. Vi al [sc [DP hijo del médico] [CP que EC₁'n₂ corría]]. PR, obligatory HA
Saw, I the son of the doctor that run.impf.
‘I saw the son of the doctor running.’

RCs are NP-modifiers and denote properties of entities, PRs are either complement or adjuncts of VPs and denote events / situations. In the context of complex NPs, the most local NP is not grammatically available for attachment in the case of a PR interpretation, High Attachment is mandatory. Critically PRs, are not crosslinguistically available: they exist in Spanish (French, Italian, Dutch among others) but not in English (Romanian, Basque, Chinese, among others). Thus, in Spanish there are certain contexts (clarified below) where a Relative Clause is open to at least one additional interpretation/structural parse that is unavailable in English. Furthermore, within a language (ie, Spanish), PRs are not available in all syntactic and semantic environments, as they are selected by only a relatively small set of predicates and subject to a number of syntactic and semantic constraints.

We propose an account, the PR-first Hypothesis, for some of the variability in the attachment preference data based on the structural and interpretive distinction between PRs and RCs. We then present the results of two novel studies on attachment preferences in Italian that manipulated PR availability. The results of both experiments strongly support the predictions of the PR-first Hypothesis: everything else being equal, a Low Attachment preference is observed in all conditions in which RC is the only available reading, while significantly more High Attachment preferences are observed when PRs are a grammatical option.

The conclusion we will draw is that locality is a universal principle governing the human language parser and the apparent exceptions can be reduced to the variation in PR- availability across languages and structures. This does not mean to say that locality does not interact with other principles when it comes to RC attachment. As, e.g. Gilboy et al. (1995) show convincingly, Referentiality plays a major role in deciding RC attachment; the same is true of prosody. Importantly these interactions between principles of locality and referentiality/prosody (among others) generate the same outcome in all languages studied. What we set out to explain here is the residual asymmetry in attachment across both languages and structures that is still left unexplained by previous approaches. We claim that when PR-availability is considered, much of this variation can receive a principled explanation that does not require postulating language specific parsing mechanisms.

The structure of the paper is the following: section 1.1 introduces the relevant literature on variation in RC attachment across languages, structures and individual processing capacity. The ambiguity between Pseudo Relative Small Clauses (PR) and RCs is introduced in section 2. After having presented some core properties distinguishing PRs from genuine RCs (section 2.1), we will propose that the parser is more likely to resolve this ambiguity in favor of Pseudo Relatives over Relative Clauses, as the former are simpler on both structural and interpretive grounds 3.1. Sections 3.2 and 3.3 discuss the application of this distinction to previously observed attachment preference asymmetries across languages and structures respectively. Section 4 presents the results of two novel experiments on attachment preferences in Italian in which we manipulated PR availability. Section 5 sums up the findings and concludes with a research agenda to further investigate the role of PRs in attachment.

1.1. Asymmetries in Attachment Preferences

Principles of locality have been shown to regulate both structure building and filler-gap processes in language processing (Right Association Kimball 1973; Late Closure Frazier 1978; Min-

(2) details a typical case of ambiguity in which such principles have been shown to apply:

(2) John said that Bill arrived yesterday

a. John [vp said [cp that [ip Bill [vp arrived yesterday]]]]

b. John [vp said [cp that [ip Bill [vp arrived]] yester][day]

Principles of Locality, correctly predict (2-a), i.e. with the temporal modifier yesterday attaching to the most local potential host, to be the preferred interpretation.

Yet, this picture is not exempt from problems: Cuetos & Mitchell (1988) tested both English and Spanish speakers for their attachment preferences when RCs were embedded within complex NPs (3). They found that while English speakers had a preference for Low Attachment (LA), i.e. appear to obey locality principles akin to Late Closure (3-a), Spanish speakers preferred High Attachment (HA), apparently disobeying locality (3-b).

(3) a. Someone shot the maid1 of the actress2 that2 was2 standing on the balcony

b. Alguien disparó contra la criada1 de la actriz2 que1 estaba1 en el balcón

These findings are at odds with the otherwise uniform Local Attachment preferences found for other structures within that same language (Phillips & Gibson, 1997) This has led researchers to question the universality of locality principles in processing and, as a consequence, of the very existence of universal principles of parsing, grounded on syntactic structures or otherwise. This, in turn, posed important theoretical problems for language acquisition.

The second issue is in many respects far more critical than the first: How to account for cross-linguistic variation in parsing preferences. While variation across structure can have a principled explanation, cross-linguistic variation in parsing preferences is much harder to capture under a principled account. For these reasons, the last two decades generated a large body of work aimed at explaining these problematic findings for parsing. These studies confirmed that speakers of additional languages differ in their RC attachment preference in complex DP environments(NP1 P NP2 RC). Like English (Cuetos & Mitchell, 1988; Mitchell & Cuetos, 1991; Gilboy et al., 1995; Fernández, 1999, 2003; Frazier & Clifton, 1996, among others), a Low Attachment (LA) preference is found in e.g. Romanian (Ehrlich et al., 1999), Basque (Gutierrez-Ziardegi et al., 2004), and Chinese (Shen, 2006), while a preference for High Attachment (HA), as in Spanish, was reported in e.g. Dutch (Brysbaert & Mitchell, 1996; Mitchell & Brysbaert, 1998; Mitchell et al., 2000), French (Mitchell et al., 1990; Frenck-Mestre & Pynte, 2000b; Zagar et al., 1997), Italian (De Vincenzi & Joh, 1993, 1995), Russian (Sekerina, 1997, 2004; Fedorova & Yanovich, 2004, 2006b,a; Dragoy, 2007) and Greek (Papadopoulou & Clahsen, 2003), among others.

To complicate things further, variation in attachment preference within the same language has also been reported. Brazilian Portuguese was initially classified as an LA language by

---

2While it is a matter of debate whether these, and other, principles of syntactic parsing apply in isolation from, and prior to, other factors involved in deciding the meaning of a sentence, e.g. context, plausibility, lexical idiosyncrasy (see e.g. Altmann et al. 1998 on the effects of contexts in late closure), there is substantial consensus that principles of locality play a major role in human language parsing.

3As Fodor (1998a, p. 285) puts it: The whole explanatory project [. . . based on the hypothesis that the processing mechanism is fully innate and applies differently to different languages only to the extent that their grammars differ . . . ] is in peril because of the discovery that Late Closure is not universal.
(Miyamoto, 1999), but Maia & Maia (2001); Ribeiro (1998, 2005) have shown a consistent preference for HA among its speakers. A similar situation arises with German. While some studies have found HA preference in this language Hemforth et al. (1996, 1998, 2000), LA preference was found by others (Murray et al., 2000; Augurzky, 2005). How much of this variation is accountable by dialectal variation and/or induced by differences in experimental design and material (see Fernández 2003 and below for discussion of this matter) is an open question.

Table 1 and 2 (adapted from Augurzky (2005)) summarize these results by LA and HA languages respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LA Languages</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Abdelghany &amp; Fodor (1999); Quinn et al. (2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Gutierrez-Ziardegi et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Bulgarian</td>
<td>Sekerina et al. (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Shen (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*German</td>
<td>Augurzky (2005); Murray et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>Ehrlich et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Portuguese</td>
<td>Miyamoto (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>Ehrlich et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Ehrlich et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Summary of studies reporting LA for the languages indicated. Note: “*” precedes contrasting results.

A hint to the solution of this puzzle is provided by the finding that in certain well-defined syntactic structures the cross-linguistic asymmetry in attachment disappears. The first such observation is due to De Vincenzi & Job (1993, 1995), who showed that RC HA preference in Italian disappears in the contexts of thematic prepositions (4):

(4) **TYPE** of P  
    a. Qualcuno ha sparato alla governante con l’attrice che stava seduta in balcone.  
    Someone shot the maid with the actress that was sitting on the balcony.

Similar findings were reported for other languages, including Spanish (Cuetos et al., 1996), English (Frazier & Clifton, 1996; Traxler et al., 1998), French (Frenck-Mestre & Pynte, 2000b; Zagar et al., 1997) and Greek (Papadopoulou & Clahsen, 2003).

Similarly, Hemforth et al. (unpublished), show that Spanish speakers, just like English speakers, demonstrate LA preference with complex NPs in subject position (6):

(5) **SUBJECTS**  
    a. La criada de la actriz que estaba en el balcón es rubia.  
    ‘The maid of the actress who was on the balcony is blonde.’

Fernández (2003) discusses the case of Spanish RCs introduced by the relative pronoun “el cual” (who) vs. the more common complementizer “que” (that). While, as seen above, HA is generally
Table 2: Summary of studies reporting HA for the languages indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HA Languages</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>Mitchell et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bulgarian</td>
<td>Sekerina et al. (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>Lovrić (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Brysbaert &amp; Mitchell (1996); Mitchell &amp; Brysbaert (1998), Mitchell et al. (2000); Desmet et al. (2002b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Mitchell et al. (1990); Frenck-Mestre &amp; Pynte (2000b), Zagar et al. (1997); Colonna et al. (2000), Colonna &amp; Pynte (2001a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Fraga et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*German</td>
<td>Hemforth et al. (1996, 1998), Hemforth et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Cuetos &amp; Mitchell (1988); Carreiras &amp; Clifton (1993), Carreiras &amp; Clifton (1999); Cuetos et al. (1996), Gibson et al. (1999); Igoa et al. (1998), Gilboy et al. (1995); Mitchell et al. (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

observed with the latter, a sharp preference for LA appears to be induced by the former:

(6) RELATIVE PRONOUNS

Vi al hijo1 del medico2 el cual2 estaba en el balcón.  
I saw the son of the doctor who2 was on the balcony.

A third notable environment in which the asymmetry between English and Spanish disappears is in the presence of 3 possible attachment sites. Gibson et al. (1996) observed a U-shaped attachment preference in both languages in these contexts (7), with highest preference for the most local NP3, followed by the least local NP1 and lastly by intermediate NP2. Gibson et al. (1996) tested sentence fragments (isolated nominals), which might have been interpreted as subjects of a forthcoming matrix verb.

(7) NOMINALS

Gibson et al. (1996)

a. La lámpara1 cerca de la pintura2 de la casa3 que fue 1 > 2 dañada en la inundación.
   The lamp1 near the painting2 of the house3 that was1 > 2 damaged by the flood.

Gibson et al. (1999) obtained similar results with full sentences containing the complex NPs in object position in Spanish. They conducted two experiments using the same materials modified to include either 2 or 3 NPs. In the two-NP condition the usual HA preference emerged, while in the three-NP condition they observed the U-shaped preference identified in Gibson et al. (1996). Similar findings were reported for Japanese and Brazilian Portuguese (Miyamoto et al., 1999; Miyamoto, 1999), while a different U-shaped pattern (NP1>NP3>NP2) was found by Wijnen (1998); Wijnen et al. (1999) for Dutch, and by Dragoy (2007) for Russian.

Gilboy et al. (1995) demonstrated that Referentiality and the type of associative relation be-
tween the two NPs (e.g. functional: assistant of the inspector vs. substance: sweater of cotton) plays a central role in deciding attachment preferences in a similar way across both English and Spanish; see section 1.2 for discussion.

Prosodic Effects. Following Fodor; Fodor’s (1998a; 1998b; 2002b) proposal that readers project a prosodic contour while reading, that can influence syntactic parsing, many researchers demonstrated that a length manipulation, of either the RC and / or the NPs, strongly affects attachment preferences. An effect of length was obtained consistently across languages: a stronger preference for HA is found with longer RCs than with short ones. These effects make perfect sense if the parser follows prosodic principles and tries to balance the length of different prosodic phrases in the clause. Reading a long RC is easier, if a prosodic boundary is placed at its onset. This boundary in turn influences the syntactic parsing, making LA less likely to arise. The resulting prosodic phrases provide a good balance, with the long complex NP balanced by a long RC. A short RC, on the other hand, can more easily continue the previous prosodic phrase, as the absence of a break pushes the parser to attach low (see Fernández, 2003; Augurzky, 2005, for discussion).

Differences between Offline and Online results. Online results, in HA languages like Italian (see De Vincenzi & Job, 1993, 1995), have shown that reaction times at the critical region in the RC are shorter when disambiguating information (ie, number) matches lower NP than when it matches the higher NP. These results, apparently conflicting with those offline, are generally interpreted as showing an initial LA preference followed by a later reanalysis for HA. Similar results have been obtained in other languages (see e.g. Fernández 2003 for Spanish, Baccino et al. 2000 for French and Italian; Frenck-Mestre & Pynte (2000a,b); Pynte et al. (2003) for French; Kamide & Mitchell (1997); Miymoto (2005) in Japanese and Lourenço-Gomes et al. (2011) in Portuguese). However, as Andrea Santi p.c. pointed out, this is only one possible interpretation of the timing results. One, equally valid interpretation of (at least some of) the data is that longer RTs for High Disambiguation are due to intervention effects, triggered by the similarity of internal structure of the target High-NP and the intervening Low-NP. This explanation would treat the timing effects as a common case of attraction phenomena (Bock & Miller 1991; Franck et al. 2006, 2007, 2010, for a review and a discussion of the effects of attraction in comprehension see Wager et al. 2009). Attraction effects occur also in the absence of ambiguity and crucially this explanation does not require stipulating commitment to a parse followed by reanalysis. Preliminary empirical support for this interpretation, which we are currently investigating, can be found in Lourenço-Gomes et al. (2011). A similar claim is made in Miyamoto (2005), cited in Maia et al. (2006). See (8) for an illustration of this point through Number manipulation. A full paradigm involves crossing both local and non-local configurations (i.e. LA and HA) with the number specification.

(8)  
a. **NON-LOCAL SING-PL-SING**  Someone shot the maid.SING of the actresses.PL that was.SING on the balcony  
b. **NON-LOCAL PL-SING-PL**  Someone shot the maids.PL of the actresses.SING that were.PL on the balcony  
c. **LOCAL PL-SING-SING**  Someone shot the maids.PL of the actress.SING that was.SING on the balcony  
d. **LOCAL SING-PL-PL**  Someone shot the maid.SING of the actresses.PL that were.PL on the balcony
On the basis of the attraction literature we can predict the non-local agreement configuration in (8-a) and (8-b) to be harder to process than the local configuration in (8-c,d). On the basis of the same literature, we expect (8-a) to be harder than (8-b). The results in Lourenço-Gomes et al. (2011), who tested the full paradigm above, support this prediction. Grillo et al. (2013b), who also manipulated PR availability, obtained similar results.

A thorough review of the online attachment literature is necessary to fully assess both the extent of the parallelism between early-attachment preference and attraction, i.e. to what extent is the former reducible to the latter, and the effects of PR-availability on online results. This asymmetry requires further investigation, but this is complicated by the difficulty of accessing the original stimuli along with the great extent of variation in the type (e.g. semantic vs. grammatical gender, number, plausibility) and position of disambiguation (early vs. late in the sentence) used across studies.

Individual variation. Finally, an interaction of reading span with attachment preferences was consistently observed in both children Felser et al. (2003) and adults (Mendelssohn & Pearlmutter, 1999; Swets et al., 2007; Omaki, 2005). Somewhat surprisingly, these studies reported a preference for HA in participants with low reading span and a preference for LA in participants with high reading span.4

1.2. Previous accounts

Several accounts have been proposed to explain this complex pattern of variation. These accounts (and other studies that tested their predictions) have made it clear that several factors are ultimately involved in determining attachment preferences, including: lexical, prosodic, and frequency/recency of exposure to prior attachment resolution. The findings presented here in no way deny the relevance of these factors in the resolution of RC-attachment nor stand in opposition to them. Critically, however, none of them have considered the potential role of PR-availability in RC-attachment. For excellent critical reviews of this literature see Fernández (2003) and Augurzky (2005).

The Tuning Hypothesis. Mitchell & Cuetos (1991); Mitchell et al. (1995); Cuetos et al. (1996) reduces variation across both languages and individuals to different statistical distributions of (and/or individual exposure to) HA and LA. The literature provides conflicting results on this. See Cuetos et al. (1996) for supporting data from corpus analyses of English and Spanish and Mitchell & Brysbaert (1998) for problematic results from Dutch (see also Desmet et al. 2002a; Desmet & Gibson 2003; Gibson & Schütze 1999 for further discussion).

One essential question for this hypothesis is whether a form is less frequent because it is inherently more complex or less favored by the parser, limiting its explanatory power. More importantly, for the present discussion, is that none of the corpus studies on attachment took into account Pseudo Relatives, whereby attachment is obligatorily high.

4Fraga et al. (2012) reported offline effects of the emotional charge associated with nouns on RC attachment. Emotionally (both positive / pleasant, orgasm and negative / unpleasant killer) charged nouns appear to act as attractors for RC attachment.
Construal. (Gilboy et al., 1995; Frazier & Clifton, 1996). Structural parsing principles, i.e. Minimal Attachment and Late Closure (Frazier, 1978; Frazier & Fodor, 1978; Frazier, 1987), apply only to primary (e.g. verb-argument) relations, while non-primary relations (e.g. modification by a RC) are construed (within the current thematic processing domain) in accordance to a variety of non-structural (pragmatic and discourse representation) principles. Restriction of construal to current thematic domains explains LA preference in the presence of the thematic preposition with (De Vincenzi & Job, 1993, 1995; Gilboy et al., 1995). Pragmatic principles explain effects of Referentiality on RC-attachment, for example. Restrictive modifiers, including restrictive RCs, preferentially seek referential hosts, the presence of a definite Determiner being one of the diagnostics for referentiality. English, but not Spanish, allows genitive, which force HA, in addition to prepositional complex NPs. Because of the Grecean maxim of clarity (Grice, 1975), English, but not Spanish, speakers should resort to the prepositional option to express LA.

Experimental results presented in Gilboy et al. (1995) strongly support the effects of both Thematic Domain and Referentiality on attachment (but see section 3.3.1 for a PR-based account of Thematic Domain effects). As it is often recognized, however, studies with other languages that allow for an alternative genitive form do not support this account, including Greek (Papadopoulou & Clahsen, 2003), Dutch and Afrikaans (Mitchell et al., 2000) and Croatian (Lovrić, 2003), each of which has been classified as an HA language. It is of interest to point out that Pseudo Relatives are allowed in each of these problematic languages, which can independently explain why HA is found. Recognition of PRs, therefore, calls for a re-evaluation of this data, and verification of the various principles advocated by the Construal approach in the context of unambiguous RCs.

Predicate Proximity. To account for variation, and the U-shaped attachment preference in 3-NP sites, Gibson et al. (1996) and Gibson & Schütze (1999) propose that principles of locality (i.e. Recency) interact with the parametrized principle of Predicate Proximity, which is weak in English but strong in Spanish. We discuss this account, and the relevant data, in section 3.3.2.

Anaphoric Binding. German RCs are necessarily introduced by relative pronouns. In English, on the other hand, RCs can also be introduced by complementizers (that) or even null elements. Hemforth et al. (1996, 1998, 2000) propose that since pronominals tend to refer to salient discourse antecedents, we can expect a strong effect of saliency in the interpretation of RCs in German. This would favor attachment to NP1, associated with the matrix clause, and thus more salient than NP2, which predicts HA preference in this language. It also predicts an asymmetry between RC and PP attachment, the latter has been shown to be universally low.

It has been argued (e.g. Fernández 2003) that problems for this account arise when more languages are considered, and in particular when the behavior of HA languages in presence of an optional relative pronoun is taken into account. Fernández (2003), p. 31, discusses how replacing the complementizer que with the relative pronoun el cual in Spanish produces a sharp change in attachment preference from High to Low, against the predictions of Anaphoric Binding. Interestingly there seems to be a generalized ban on PRs in languages with obligatory relative pronouns (German, Russian and Bulgarian). In section 3.2 we will discuss this further and suggest that the Anaphoric Binding approach might indeed provide the best explanation for the RC attachment behavior in this set of languages.
Implicit Prosody. As mentioned above, several experiments have demonstrated an effect of prosody in RC-attachment, as predicted by the Implicit Prosody Hypothesis (IPH, Fodor, 1998a,b, 2002). The idea being that a default prosodic contour is projected while reading and various factors affecting this prosodic representation are able to influence the syntactic choices of the parser. Intonational boundaries are more likely to precede longer RCs than shorter RCs, because speakers (and listeners/readers) prefer projecting independent intonational phrases for long RCs, than short stand-alone RCs. The presence of a phrase boundary, in turn, creates a HA bias for these RCs.

The IPH was also claimed to be able to account for the cross-linguistic variation in attachment. Variation across languages might be explained as the by-product of variation in prosodic phrasing imposed by the different grammars of those languages. Speakers of different languages behave differently because their grammar projects different prosodic contours over similar stimuli (see Jun 2003 for evidence in favor of this account). A proper assessment of the IPH in light of the present findings is beyond the scope of this paper, but see section 3.4 for a discussion of potential interactions between PR-availability and prosody.

Despite their success in explaining often-subtle contrasts (between e.g. long and short RCs, or the role of Referentiality in attachment), there is substantial agreement that no account proposed so far offers a satisfactory explanation for the full pattern of variation discussed above. This might in part reflect that none of these accounts recognized the contribution of PR-availability to this complex pattern. The PR confound, moreover, is ubiquitous in the data supporting/falsifying these accounts, which calls for reappraisals with this variable in mind; an endeavor far beyond the scope of this enterprise; however, might be that, with PR-availability controlled for, some of these problems disappear demonstrating their epiphenomenal nature. The first necessary step in this direction is the investigation of PRs in relation to attachment and processing. In the next section we introduce the PR/RC distinction and successively we will attempt to reorganize previous findings in light of this distinction. While a great deal of work is still necessary to properly assess the effects of PR-availability in attachment preferences, we will show that a much more organic picture emerges once this simple cross-linguistic difference is taken into account.

2. Not all Complementizers are created equal

A standard assumption in the RC attachment literature is that the syntactic structures under consideration, both across languages and syntactic environment, are equivalent in all relevant respects. Instances of Relative Clauses embedded within a complex DP\(^6\) (9) (a) and (9) (b) are treated as equivalent and both two way ambiguous. Assuming identity, at the grammatical level, puts the burden of explaining the existing attachment preference variation on the parser, generating the problems mentioned above for a theory of universals in parsing.

\[(9)\]
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. I saw the son of the doctor that was running} \\
\text{b. Vi al hijo del medico que corría}
\end{array}
\]

\(^6\)Obviously we are abstracting away from both the difference between Complementizers and Relative Pronouns (Hemforth et al., 1996, 1998, 2000), and the role of Referentiality and type of relation between the NPs analyzed in Gilboy et al. (1995).
Thankfully, the assumption of identity is wrong. English *that* and Spanish (or Italian / French / Dutch) *que* / *che* / *qui* / *die* are not syntactically identical. Complementizers, like Prepositions, demonstrate a domain extreme and often subtle variation across languages (with respect to e.g. subjacency effects, *that*-trace effects etc.) and a careful analysis of their combinatorial properties shows that even superficially similar and homophonous Cs like the Italian, French and Spanish *che* / *que* reveal important differences in their structural distribution.

These distinctions become particularly relevant in the context of complex DPs. These distinctions become particularly relevant in the context of complex DPs. In the case at hand, the English (9-a) is two-ways ambiguous in that the RC introduced by *that* can be attached to either NP1 and NP2, its Spanish “counterpart”, as shown in (10), is three-ways ambiguous. As in the English sentence, *que* can introduce a RC attaching either to NP1 or NP2, but additionally it can also introduce a Pseudo Relative Small Clause, which attaches to the VP and, thereby obligatorily takes NP1 as its subject.

(10) a. Vi al [DP [NP1 hijo del medico] [CP que corría]]. RC, HA
b. Vi al [DP hijo [del [medico [CP que corría]]]]. RC, LA
c. Vi al [SC [DP hijo del medico2] [CP que EC1/2 corría]]. PR, obligatory HA

‘I saw the son of the doctor running.’

Pseudo Relatives are a particular type of clausal complement that, despite their name, have little to nothing in common with Relative Clauses but roughly correspond to English *Acc*-ing constructions, as the gloss to (10-c) indicates. The following section discusses these claims in some details.

2.1. Pseudo Relatives

Pseudo Relatives and Relative Clauses are string identical, are distinguished along structural and semantic properties. In this section we will illustrate these differences and show, following Cinque (1992), that PRs share crucial structural and semantic properties with English Small Clauses of the *Acc*-ing type (e.g. *I saw John running*). The PR and RC parse of the same string are illustrated in (11-a,b) respectively.

(11) RC: Ho visto [DP il [NP ragazzo [CP che correva]]] I saw [DP the [NP boy [CP that ran]]]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V' \\
\text{visto} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{il} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{ragazzo} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{che} \text{ correva} \end{array}
\]

PRs are available in a number of languages including Dutch, French, Serbo-Croatian and Greek, but the discussion in this section is based on Italian. See Appendix C for a short discussion of PRs in other languages.
In (12-a) the main verb takes a DP as its complement and the RC modifies that DP; at the interpretive level this maps onto the perception of an entity / individual having certain additional restrictions specified in the RC. In comparison in (12-b), the matrix verb takes the whole PR Small Clause as its complement, and the DP is the subject of that clause; at the interpretive level this maps onto the perception of an event. Several syntactic tests demonstrate this fundamental difference between PRs and RCs. For reasons of space, we will illustrate only a few of them here, selecting those that best set the stage for Experiment 1 and 2 (below), and refer the interested reader to the cited literature for more evidence.

i. PRs appear freely with proper names (13-a), contrary to RCs (13-b).8

(13)

a. Ho visto Gianni che correva
He visto a [Pr Juan que corría]
J’ai vu [Pr Jean qui courait]
**I saw John that ran.
‘I saw Gianni running.’

b. Ho visto Gianni, che correva.

ii. Relative pronouns are banned from PRs, but obviously not from RCs:

(14) *Ho visto Gianni il quale correva.
Have.I seen Gianni the which run.IMPF.
‘I saw Gianni who was running.’

iii. Just like other types of Small Clauses (see ungrammatical translation), PRs are only available with embedded subjects and cannot be construed with embedded objects (15-a), this restriction obviously doesn’t apply to RCs (15-b).9

(15)

a. *Luigi ha visto [Pr Gianni; che Maria baciava EC].
Luigi saw Gianni that Maria kissed EC.
*Luigi saw John Mary kissing EC.’

---

8With the irrelevant (for the present purposes) exception in which they behave like nouns (e.g. I am talking about the Mary who came from Alabama), proper names cannot be modified with restrictive RCs. These exceptional cases often require an overt determiner. Whilst appositive RCs can also be headed by proper names, they require a prosodic break between the head and the RC, often indicated with a comma in writing (13-b). No such break is required in PRs. Obviously PRs can also appear with other NPs (e.g. the boy), we will however use proper names in many of the following examples to signal the presence of a PR.

9There are very few exceptions to this generalization (e.g. l’ho visto che lo inseguivano / I saw him that they were chasing him), see Casalicchio 2013 for discussion.
iv. Tense is anaphoric in PRs. Its interpretation is bound by the Tense of the matrix clause. This restriction obviously doesn’t hold for RCs:

\[ (16) \text{Ho visto il ragazzo} / *\text{Gianni che correrà.} \]
Have.I seen the boy / *Gianni that run.fut ‘I saw the boy /*Gianni that will run.’

v. Restrictions to both inner and outer aspect hold for PRs. PRs require imperfective, but not perfective, aspect (17-a), as they denote ongoing events. They are further restricted to stage level properties and cannot denote individual level properties (17-b). Neither of these restrictions applies to RCs.

\[ (17) \]
\[ a. \text{Ho visto Gianni che correva} / *\text{che è corso a casa.} \]
‘I saw Gianni running / that had run home.’
\[ b. \text{Ho visto Gianni che aveva gli occhi rossi} / *\text{aveva gli occhi blu.} \]
I saw Gianni that had the eyes red / had the eyes blue.
‘I saw Gianni with red eyes / with blue eyes.’ (Casalicchio, 2013, p.117, ex.160)

vi. While RCs modify NPs, and as such can appear in any environment in which NPs can appear, PRs are selected by a subset of predicates and therefore appear in a much more restricted set of contexts.

\[ (18) \text{Ho incontrato} / *\text{Vivevo con Gianni che correva.} \]
‘I met / *lived with Gianni running.’

Having established that PRs are not RCs, we will follow Cinque (1992) in claiming that PRs are structurally equivalent to English Small Clauses of the eventive (progressive) type. This is supported by the observation that PRs can occur in all contexts in which eventive SCs can. A few cases are illustrated in (19).

\[ (19) \]
\[ a. \text{COMPLEMENT SMALL CLAUSES} \]
\[ \text{Non sopporto Gianni e Mario [vestiti così / che fumano in casa mia]} \]
‘I can’t stand Gianni and Mario dressed like that / smoking in my house.’
\[ b. \text{ADJUNCT SCs PREDICATED OF A SUBJECT} \]
\[ \text{Gianni lasciò la stanza [ubriaco / che era ancora sotto l’effetto dell’alcohol]} \]
Gianni left the room drunk / still under the effects of alcohol.’

---

10In PRs, but not in RCs, the matrix event and the embedded event are interpreted as unfolding within the same temporal window. This possibly also explains the aspectual restriction and the requirement for these type of SCs to appear in the progressive form in many languages (including English, Brazilian Portuguese, Spanish and Sardinian) as progressive provides the required imperfectivity. \textit{Strict identity of Tense} is not necessary. Present Tense, for example, is required when the matrix verb bears future T (\textit{Domani vedrò Gianni che corre / Tomorrow I will see John that runs}).

11PR-verbs include e.g. meet, catch, find, dream, imagine, discover, imitate, draw, surprise, among others. PRs, and Acc-ing SCs, also appear in a variety of other contexts, including presentational and so called \textit{absolute with} constructions. See Cinque (1992) for a more comprehensive list.
c. **Adjunct SCs Predicated of an Object**

Mangiò la pizza [calda / che stava ancora fumando]

‘He ate the pizza hot / that it was still smoking.’

Additionally, PRs and SCs can be freely coordinated (20-a,b), while neither of them can be coordinated with RCs (which is further evidence against a RC analysis of PRs) or other types of clausal complements (20-c,d).

(20)  
a. SC & PR:  

‘I saw G. depressed and P. that was trying to cheer him up.’

b. SC & PR:  
Ho visto [Gianni [depresso] e [che piangeva]].

‘I saw G. depressed and that was crying.’

c. *RC & PR/SC:  
*Ho visto [Gianni, [che vive con Maria], e [depresso / che piangeva]].

‘I saw G., who lives with M. and depressed / that was crying.’

d. *PR/SC & finite CP:  
*Ho visto [Gianni [che piangeva / depresso] e [che P. cercava di risollevarlo]].

‘I saw G. crying / depressed and that P. tried to cheer him up.’

Semantically, both PRs and eventive SCs involve *direct perception* (21-a), i.e. they don’t allow the content of the embedded clause to be inferred. This sets them apart from normal finite clauses in similar contexts (21-b).

(21)  
a. *Dalle medaglie vedo Gianni che corre.

‘From the medals I see Gianni running.’

b. Dalle medaglie vedo che Gianni correva.

‘From the medals, I see / deduce that Gianni is a runner.’

(22) and (23) illustrate the semantic distinction between PRs and RCs, while DPs modified by RCs denote individuals / entities, PRs denote events.

(22) **Pseudo Relative / Small Clauses complements**

Gianni ha visto [pr la ragazza che correva] / John saw [sc the girl running].

∃s ∃s’ [see(s) & agent(s)(John) & theme(s’)(s) & run(s’) & agent(s’)(the girl)]

There is an event of seeing and the agent of that event is John and the theme of the event is an event of running and the agent of running is the girl.

(23) **Relative Clauses**

Gianni ha visto [dp la [np ragazza [cp che correval]]] / John saw [dp the [np girl [that was running]].

∃s [see(s) & agent(s)(John) theme(unique girl that ran)(s)]

There is an event of seeing and the agent of that event is John and the theme of the event is the unique girl that ran.

The PR-complement interpretation (22) reports the perception of an event, i.e. the theme of *see* is an eventuality: theme(s’)(s), s = an eventuality (of the running type). The RC interpretation in (23), on the other hand, reports the perception of an entity, i.e. the theme of *see* is an ordinary individual: theme(x)(s), x = an individual (the girl).
This semantic difference is well illustrated by the pronominalization contrast in (24-a,b):

(24) a. Chi ho visto è il ragazzo/*Gianni che correva.  
    ‘Who I saw is the boy / Gianni that ran.’

b. Ciò che ho visto è il ragazzo/Gianni che correva.  
    ‘What I saw is the boy / Gianni running.’

(24-a) is ungrammatical as a PR because events can only be referred to with inanimate pronominals. The animate wh-pronoun chi / who in (24-a) is free to refer to il ragazzo / the boy, an animate entity modified by the RC that ran. Using the proper name ‘Gianni’ renders the sentence ungrammatical, since this prevents the RC interpretation.

The exact opposite pattern emerges when the inanimate ciò / what is used in (24-b): here the pronoun refers to the whole clause “Gianni che correva”, which forces it to be interpreted as a PR. As the glosses to (25-b) indicate, this is not a quirk due to the presence of a proper name: even with NPs that would otherwise accept a RC (the boy) a SC reading is the only available option. This test also shows that PRs in the context of perception verbs can form a single constituent. The latter contrast does not apply to all types of PRs (25), which forms the basis of the tripartite distinction proposed by Declerck (1981) for SCs and Cinque (1992) for PRs.

(25) Chi / *Ciò che ho incontrato è Gianni che correva.  
    Who / *What I met is Gianni running.

Since reference with inanimate ciò is not allowed with verbs like ‘meet’ shows (i) that the argument of the matrix verb is the DP ‘Gianni’ and not the whole event as above. We therefore assume like Cinque that PRs come in 3 different varieties: PR arguments of V (26-a), PR adjunct within NP (26-b) and PR adjunct of VP (26-c) (original examples from Cinque 1992, ex. 38 p. 9).

(26) a. Small Clause complement:  
    Ho [v′ visto [sc Mario [che correva a tutta velocità]]]  
    I saw Mario that was running at full speed

b. Small Clause adjunct within NP:  
    Ho [v′ visto [np [np Mario] [sc PRO [che correva a tutta velocità]]]]

c. Small Clause adjunct within VP:  
    Ho [vp [v′ visto Mario [sc PRO che correva a tutta velocità]]]

Each of these structures is supported by a number of syntactic tests and corresponds to a slightly different semantic interpretation. Importantly, the PR complement analysis in (26-a) is not available with all PR taking verbs, which, however, allow for at least one of the adjunct interpretations. The two types of structural relations are depicted in the trees in (27) and (28).

---

[12] For reasons of space, we refer the reader to Declerck’s and Cinque’s original papers for discussion of the syntactic tests at the basis of these distinctions, which include the possibility for the PR-head to cliticize (l’ho incontrato che correva / him I met that ran vs. *non lo sopporto che correva / not him can stand that ran) and passivize (Gianni è stato colto che rubava / John was caught stealing vs. *Gianni non è amato che fuma / G. is not loved that smokes).
The parse as *PR-adjunct within NP* is interpreted as a temporal modification on the NP itself: (27) does not mean that I cannot stand Gianni, it roughly means *I can’t stand Gianni when he is smoking*, or *I can’t stand the situation in which Gianni is smoking*. This is similar to other types of adverbial NP-modifiers (e.g.: *Non sopporto Gianni vestito da boy scout / I can’t stand J. dressed as boy scout*), which mean ‘I can’t stand (to see) G. when he is dressed as a boy scout’. The restriction, therefore, is not among a set of different people called Gianni, but among different instantiations of the same person.

Similarly, the parse as *PR-adjunct within VP* derives an interpretation in which, as in complement PRs, the embedded event has to unfold within the same temporal window of the matrix event. For example: *Ho incontrato la ragazza che correva / I met the girl running* requires the meeting event and the running event to overlap in time, i.e.: *I met the girl while she was running*.

In summary, there is ample evidence, both syntactically and semantically, that PRs and RCs are distinct. PRs typically refer to events and are selected by a restricted set of predicates. The relation between the ‘head’ and the embedded clause in PRs is akin to the relation between a subject and a predicate in eventive Small Clauses. Finally, PRs come in 3 varieties (complement of V, adjunct of NP, adjunct of VP), which can all appear in the context of perceptual verbs, while other verbs (e.g. ‘meet, surprise’) can only select adjunct PRs.

Table 3 summarizes the various tests in support of this account:

3. PRs and ‘attachment’

In the preceding section we have established that the grammar of some languages (e.g. Italian and Spanish) but not others (e.g. English) a Relative Clause and Pseudo Relative interpretation. We have also claimed that when PR / SC are projected in the environment of complex NPs, as in (30), the familiar attachment ambiguity disappears and the only possible subject for the embedded verb is DP1 (i.e., the PR reading is selected).

(29) **PR reading: DP1 only accessible subject**

*Ho [V’ visto [SC [DP1 la figlia1 [PP del [DP2 postino2]] [CP che pro1v2 correva]]].

‘I saw [SC the daughter1 of the postman2 running0v2].’*
This is more clearly visible when a PR reading is forced. As shown in (24), it is possible to force a RC or PR reading of the *che* string by making overt reference to it as an animate individual, as in (30-a), or an (inanimate) event (30-b,c) respectively.

(30)

a. Chi ho visto è la figlia del postino che corre da solo.  
   ‘Who I saw is the daughter of the postman that runs by himself / herself.’  
   RC/*PR

b. Ciò che ho visto è [la figlia del postino che correva da sola/*da solo].  
   ‘What I saw is the daughter of the postman running by herself / *by himself.’  
   PR/*RC

c. [La figlia del postino che corre (da sola/*da solo)] è un evento eccezionale.  
   ‘The daughter of the postman running (by herself/*by himself) is an exceptional event.’  
   PR/*RC

As both the Italian examples and the English translations show, contrary to when the RC reading is forced, DP2 is not an accessible subject when a PR/SC reading is forced. DP2 cannot be interpreted as the subject of the embedded verb, and moreover an optional gender marked, modifier (by himself / herself) that agrees only with DP2 (and not DP1) within the embedded
clause (30-b,c) renders the sentence ungrammatical. This shows it is interpretively restricted to
the higher DP1 and gives the “illusion” of High Attachment. Actually, no preference is at stake
here: DP1 is the only available subject for the embedded verb, i.e. the only grammatical option.
Since “High Attachment” is forced in the environment of PRs; eliminating a PR reading is essen-
tial to avoid confounds when testing RC attachment preferences in complex DP environment. In
the remainder of this section we claim that the following generalization holds: once a PR reading
is prevented (and everything else being equal, i.e. when factors such as prosody and referentiality
are controlled for) a Low Attachment preference emerges both across languages and syntactic
structures.

3.1. Variable Syntax, Uniform Parsing

In this section we propose that the residual variation in RC-attachment, i.e. the variation
observed when factors such as prosody or referentiality are properly matched, can be reduced to
the selective availability of PRs. The theoretical advantage of this is obvious: the universality
of locality principles can be reintroduced. Support for this claim and the specific generaliza-
tions in (31) can obviously only come from empirical work. In what follows, after presenting a
formalization of this idea, we will provide its rationale and then present the empirical arguments
in their support. We propose that everything else being equal, once the distinction between RCs
and PRs is taken into account, the following generalizations hold:

(31) A. Low Attachment preference is observed, across languages and structures, with
genuine restrictive RCs, i.e. when PRs are not available.

B. High Attachment preference is observed in languages and structures which allow
for a PR / SC reading (in contexts in which PRs are allowed by the grammar of
each particular language).

The generalization in (31-A) formalizes the prediction of a universal locality principle, be it
Late Closure, Recency, Merge Right or otherwise. Locality is a natural principle of economy of
computation, whose universality and appeal are so strong that when apparent counterexamples to
this universal principle are found, as in the RC-attachment literature at hand, a massive amount
of work is rightly dedicated to explain their origins. We should underline that the universality
of a principle doesn’t imply that that principle will always win over other factors such as e.g. refer-
entiality. As we have seen above, several factors ultimately contribute to attachment selection and many of them can apparently override locality (see e.g. Altmann et al.
1998 on the effects of context on Late Closure). The factors external to syntax that potentially
affect attachment are compatible with locality applying universally within syntax. The biggest
concern arising from the residual cross-linguistic variation in the RC attachment literature is that
it questioned the universality of locality, not that it showed that other factors could take priority
over it.

As for (31-B), the first thing to be recognized is that when PRs are available, the parser is
not dealing with an issue of RC-attachment any longer. First it will have to decide whether
to project the relevant string as an RC or a PR. This type of choice is not regulated by Late

13With “universality” we intend a principle that applies in the same way in every language under comparable conditions,
abstracting away from the independent issue of how locality interacts with other components of the language system.
See below for more on this point.
Closure types of principles, but by principles of the Minimal Attachment type. While both principles can be seen as two instantiations of a universal principle of locality, favoring closer, most accessible, targets (differently operationalizing distance: structural complexity, structural distance, recency, frequency), they are clearly involved in different processes. The Late Closure type relates more directly to Recency effects applying within the string just parsed, i.e. attach α to the most recent element capable of carrying a particular relation α; the Minimal Attachment type relates to the relative ease of projecting a given string as a constituent of type A or B, i.e. when deciding between two, or more, alternative parses for a constituent, choose the simplest option. We propose the following:

(32) PR-first Hypothesis: When PRs are available, everything else being equal, they will be preferred over RCs.

This preference arises because PRs are both structurally and pragmatically (in terms of presupposition):

- From a structural perspective, Small Clauses are by definition smaller, and arguably less complex, than full Relative Clauses. The structural constraints imposed on PRs, but not on RCs, in terms of Tense, Aspect, type of argument etc. analyzed in the preceding section, point to the presence of a richer and more articulated functional domain in the latter than the former.

- From a Reference Theory perspective (Crain & Steedman, 1985; Altmann & Steedman, 1988), the RC analysis requires building a context which contains more referents than the SC analysis. The felicitous utterance of a sentence like: Ho visto il ragazzo che correva / I saw the boy running, as a RC presupposes a context containing a set of boys. The PR interpretation, on the other hand, only requires to introduce an event of running as the theme of see, and this event has a boy as its agent, i.e. only one boy is presupposed in the PR context.

Importantly, because of their tripartite nature (on which see Declerck 1981; Cinque 1992 and the discussion in section 2.1 above), PRs become an option for the parser at multiple points: i. at the offset of the verb, as a complement SC; ii. at the offset of the NP, as a PR adjunct within VP or NP. Consider the options of the parser at these two points:

i. In the presence of a PR taking verb the parser needs to choose between an NP continuation or a SC continuation. Much literature in psycholinguistics has shown a strong tendency

---

14Minimal Attachment: Attach incoming material into the phrase-marker being constructed using the fewest nodes consistent with the well-formedness rules of the language.

15We initially concentrated on the structural angle, thanks are due to Richard Breheny for pointing out that PRs are also interpretively simpler than RCs.

16The two types of principles can obviously coexist and interact and it is reasonable to suppose that, as in other such cases, contextual effects might override structural principles of parsimony. The important question, as usual, is whether this influence can be found at all stages of processing or only at a later stage. This is obviously an empirical questions that we reserve to address in future work. The only data using context in RC attachment, that we are aware of, comes from Desmet et al. (2002b) who manipulated the preceding context in Dutch and did not find it to interfere with attachment preferences (the usual generalized HA preference emerged), at least not at the earliest stages of parsing. This results, however, like all the others considered so far, did not take into account possible effects of PR availability, and therefore do not allow strong conclusions to be drawn.
for the parser to posit nominal complements over clausal complements (cf. the well-know
garden-path effects with: the students knew the answer was in the back of the book, Ferreira &
Clifton (1986); Traxler et al. (1998); Pickering et al. (2000)). It should be noted that
this literature has dealt with a relatively small set of verbs that allow clausal complements,
and to our knowledge it has never dealt with the type of verbs we are presently discussing,
nor with the choice between NP and SC complements. It is an empirical question (to be
addressed in future work) whether this preference also extends to the present environment.

If this preference also extends to SCs, we might expect the parser to prefer a NP comple-
ment parse:

\[
\text{Ho } [\text{VP } [V' \text{ visto } \ldots ] \quad [\text{NP il ragazzo}] \quad \text{[SC [NP il ragazzo] \ldots ]}]
\]

Importantly, at this stage there’s no difference between PR languages and non-PR lan-
guages like English, i.e. the English parser will also have to decide whether to parse NP as
the direct object of see or as the subject of a Small Clause. If the parser considers multiple
options in parallel, this might explain the relatively high number of HA preferences in LA
languages like English (around 40%).

ii. Assuming a preference for NP complements over clausal complements, a cross-linguistic
difference arises when the parser hits the complementizer: in languages allowing PRs, it
will be presented with a choice between an RC and a PR, as there is still the possibility to
interpret the che-clause as a PR adjunct. Importantly, there are good reasons to postulate
that a PR/SC parse is less complex, both structurally and interpretively, than the RC parse.

\[
\text{Ho } [\text{VP } [V' \text{ visto } \text{[NP il ragazzo \ldots ]} \quad [\text{SC che correva}] \quad [\text{CP che correva}]]}
\]

Whether the best way to capture Minimal Attachment is in terms of number of nodes, relative
accessibility of the contextual representation associated with each alternative, or as a function of
frequency/predictability of each parse, or even as a combination of these factors, is beyond the

\[17\]It should also be kept in mind that many PR-taking verbs also allow a number of other clausal complements, which
raises the question (not addressed in this paper) of whether the parser deals with these multiple possibilities. For a detailed
discussion of clausal complementation see Moulton (2009). Here is a list of different types of clausal complements
introduced by perceptual verbs (from Moulton, 2009, ex.1, p.2): i. John saw Fred leave early, bare infinitive, direct
perception; ii. John saw Fred leaving early, gerundive, direct perception; iii. John saw Fred owning a house, gerundive,
imaginative; iv. John saw Fred to be a party-pooper, infinitive, belief; v. John saw that Fred left early, finite clause,
factive.
scope of this work, and in many ways irrelevant to the point we arguing for, especially since dif-
ferent approaches would probably converge on this prediction. What is relevant to the present
point is that some principle akin to Minimal Attachment is at stake here. We argue that when
a simpler option is available, restrictive relatives are not the preferred parse in the absence of a
ccontext supporting the relevant presupposition. There is potentially a third reason, based on prin-
ciples such as Relativized Relevance, of why PRs should be preferred to RCs: with the former,
but not the latter, the che-clause is conveying additional information about the event described in
the matrix clause, i.e. the most salient part of the clause in the discourse representation.

The hypothesis in (32) is easily falsifiable since it makes several strong predictions, both
about offline judgments and online measures, a few of which are listed below. All else being
equal (i.e. in the absence of strong biases introduced by prosodic, contextual, lexical and other
factors):

i. High Attachment preferences will emerge whenever PRs are available;

ii. RC-only continuations should be harder to parse than PR-compatible continuations in lo-
cally ambiguous environments, e.g. we expect the globally ambiguous (and PR-compatible)
(33-a) to be easier to parse than the locally ambiguous (and PR-incompatible) (33-b):19

(33) a. Ho visto il ragazzo che correva la maratona
   I saw the boy that ran the marathon
   PR: I saw the boy running the marathon / RC: I saw the boy that ran the marathon
b. Ho visto il ragazzo che correrà la maratona
   RC only: I saw the boy that will run the marathon

iii. In the context of complex NPs, HA disambiguation should be easier to parse for PR-verbs
than RC-only verbs.

iv. High Attachment preferences will also be observed in any context allowing an ambiguity
between a reduced RC and a correlate of PR interpretation, e.g. the Acc-ing construc-
tion in English (I saw the son of the doctor (that was) running), Prepositional Infinitive
Constructions in Portuguese (PIC; Raposo 1989: Vi o filho do medico a correr).20

That a SC reading is preferred in Acc-ing constructions in English, is visible also from the
following garden-path effect:

(34) I saw the daughter of the woman dancing tomorrow at the gala.21

18See e.g. Hale (forthcoming) for an implementation of these ideas in an automatic parser.
19An anonymous Cognition reviewer asked whether we also expect locally unambiguous RCs to be relatively harder
than unambiguous PRs. Although we presently don’t have data to support this, this is indeed a prediction of the present
approach. We plan to address this issue in future work.
20On PIC see Fernandes (2012); Grillo et al. (2012) and Grillo et al. (2013a) on Acc-ing constructions.
21An anonymous reviewer, while agreeing with us that this sentence is intuitively hard to process, suggested that this
difficulty might be simply due to the Tense mismatch between the matrix and the embedded (saw/tomorrow) and, if this
is true, the same complexity should emerge when the same mismatch is present in unambiguous RCs (i). This is certainly
a possibility which needs to be empirically tested.

i. The person who I saw was the daughter of the woman dancing tomorrow at the gala.
The local ambiguity between an SC and a reduced RC reading, seems to be resolved in favor of the former: introducing a temporal mismatch between the dancing event (tomorrow) and the matrix event saw (past) forces reanalysis of the embedded clause as an RC (temporal mismatch is not allowed with SCs and PRs):

(35) I saw the daughter of the woman (that will be) dancing tomorrow at the gala.
(36) I saw the ballerina dancing kiss the man
(37) Ho visto la ragazza che ballava baciare un uomo

In the remainder of this paper, we show that (at least some of) these predictions are corroborated by both previous findings and novel experimental results. Variation across languages is discussed first in 3.2, followed by variation across structures 3.3. Finally, two novel experiments on attachment preference in Italian are presented in section 4. The results from the experiments, which manipulate PR availability, strengthen the generalizations in (31).

3.2. Explaining variation across languages

Since the pioneer study of Cuetos & Mitchell (1988), a great number of studies have investigated RC attachment across several languages. The pattern found, or better, the lack of a pattern has puzzled psycholinguists for more than twenty years. English speakers appear to behave like Romanian and Basque speakers (among others) in showing a preference for LA, while Dutch speakers match Italian, Greek and Japanese in their preference for HA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>PRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (?)</td>
<td>High/Low</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian (?)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian (?)</td>
<td>High/Low</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian (?)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish (?)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Attachment Preferences and PR availability

Importantly, it should be pointed out that (all, to our knowledge) previous work on RC attachment used subject RCs, which, as mentioned above, are the only type compatible with a PR
reading. More in depth investigation is certainly needed to settle this issue, still it seems hard to reduce the strength of the above correspondence to random factors. Pending further research on Russian, Swedish and Norwegian a reanalysis of the mixed results in Bulgarian and German, we take the generalization in (31) to be strongly supported by the empirical results. It is worth noticing that RCs are obligatorily introduced by a relative pronoun in Bulgarian, Russian and German. Additionally, all three languages have writing systems that force the use of a comma in between the NP and the relative pronoun. Importantly, the presence of a comma has been shown to have a strong influence on reading, particularly in disambiguating ambiguous structures (Hill & Murray, 1998). Commas have also been shown to elicit a Clousure Positive Shift component in ERP, a component associated with the processing of prosodic boundaries (Steinhauer et al., 1999; Steinhauer & Friederici, 2001; Steinhauer, 2003). The presence of commas, by triggering a prosodic boundary between N2 and the relative pronoun, might have an influence on attachment, crucially in the direction of HA. More generally, HA in these languages might receive an independent explanation under the Anaphoric Binding approach. Recognizing the central role of PR-availability, in fact, does not exclude the relevance of other factors in deciding RC-attachment.

A few notes, and a general recommendation, are in order when dealing with sets of data of this magnitude and heterogeneity (for methods, analyses etc.), since we often do not have the possibility to assess all characteristics of the studies that produced them. This is particularly important in the present context in which a novel, previously unnoticed, factor is introduced into the equation and was not taken into account when these studies were designed/conducted. This means that such data should be handled with care both to support and to falsify a theory. In the remainder of this section we briefly discuss some of the potential issues that arise when considering such a large dataset in the absence of all information about the methods employed.

First of all, remember that several factors can determine the availability of PR: not only the semantic properties of the matrix verb (does the matrix V subcategorize for PRs?), but also the temporal and aspectual properties of the matrix and embedded verb. Remember further that different kinds of PRs exist (i.e. argument/adjunct) and different types of verbs differ in their ability to combine with them (e.g. perceptual verbs can take both argument and adjunct PRs, whereas verbs of the incontrare / meet kind only take adjunct PRs; see section 2.1 and Cinque 1992 for discussion). For this reason to obtain a complete picture we need to proceed to a more detailed study of previous results, one that takes into account the fine structural and semantic properties of the stimuli used.

The problematic data from Swedish and Norwegian, as well as the unproblematic ones from Romanian, come all from Ehrlich et al. (1999), a study which is often cited in the RC-attachment literature, but which has never been published in paper format (only a CUNY abstract is available online). This makes it obviously very hard to recover even the most basic (and in this context most important) information: whether PR-verbs were used and how many of them were used.

Secondly, as mentioned above, contrasting results are often found in the literature. Experimental work on attachment in German, for example, has given mixed results: HA preference was found by Hemforth et al. (1996, 1998, 2000) and LA by Murray et al. (2000); Augurzky (2005). Conflicting data at times comes even from the same sources. Sekerina et al. (2003) discuss 2 experiments on attachment in Bulgarian that yielded opposite results: High Attachment preference

22(See Augurzky 2005, p. 99 for results in German which do not seem to support this argument).
was obtained in the first experiment and Low Attachment in the second. Bulgarian being a nonPR language, we would predict LA preference, everything else being equal. Importantly for the present point, while in the first experiment the stimuli were presented in an out-of-the-blue setting, the stimuli of the second experiment were introduced by strong Relative Clause context.

In the second experiment the sentence stimuli were preceded by two sentences (38-a,b) and a visual cue. The latter consisted of two sets of objects (e.g. two sets of triangles and triangle tips) distinguishable by some specific property (e.g. color). The complex DPs were contained in a question (38-c), which prompted the participant to single out a specific member from the two sets of triangles. This type of context functions as a perfect introduction for a RC reading. More importantly, the sentences used in this second experiment do not allow for PRs for independent reasons (i.e. there is no verb capable of selecting a PR).

(38) a. Eto edin rozov triašnik i edin žalš triašnik.
   This one pink triangle and one yellow triangle
b. Vâxovete im sa različno ocveteni.
   The tips them are differently colored
c. Kakâv cvjat e vâxrât na triašnikâ, v kojto e narisuvan čadâr?
   What color is the tip of the triangle in which is drawn umbrella
   What color is the tip of the triangle that has an umbrella in the middle?

Experiment 1 required reading the stimuli, which might have influenced the prosodic phrasing because of the presence of a comma separating NP2 and the relative pronouns. The stimuli of experiment 2, however, were presented auditorily, which eliminates the possibility that the comma might have played a role. In sum, we predict that when a RC context is used, as in experiment 2, a Low Attachment preference should be observed, while the results of experiment 1 still need to be further investigated.

Thirdly, while PRs are widely attested in a variety of environments in certain languages, e.g. in Italian, their availability in other languages (e.g. Portuguese) is subject to great variation, both regional, generational and often what appears to be purely individual. This variation obviously needs to be taken into account, but obviously this has never been done. Even in those cases in which we do have access to the sentence stimuli used in the experiments, we still do not know what kind of fillers were used. This is particularly important in the light of possible syntactic priming effects: a filler containing a Small Clause immediately preceding a sentence stimulus, for example, might well prime the subject for a PR reading. A final note on non-PR languages and SC contexts: as discussed in section 3.1, in the presence of PR-type verbs even the parser of a non-PR language like English might temporarily consider an SC continuation. It might thus be reasonable to hypothesize that in the presence of SC introducing verbs (such as perceptual verbs) a higher tendency for HA might be observed also in non-PR languages such as English. Given its serial nature, when the parser encounters an SC introducing predicate, it will have to choose between an SC and NP parse of the following material. Early commitment to an SC reading might have effects later on in the parse even when the RC is introduced and ultimately influence attachment preferences. This might explain the relatively weak effect of Late Closure in English.

23Note that this type of setting is very different from, and much more restrictive than, the one used in Desmet et al. (2002b). While the context in Desmet et al. still allows for a PR reading (it only introduces a set of alternatives for either NP1 or NP2), the present context simply rules out a PR reading completely.
and other LA languages (around 60% LA). Preliminary results from an undergoing study on the role of SC-taking verbs in RC attachment in English appear to support this claim (Grillo et al., 2014).

In sum, in order to strengthen these results, in-depth comparative work must be conducted, taking into account the various factors involved in the availability of PRs. Yet, while we cannot take this generalization at face value, it is hard not to be struck by the strength of the prediction and the variety of languages it correctly applies to (Basque, Chinese, Dutch, English, European Portuguese, French, Galician, Greek, Italian, Korean, Japanese, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish). Once again, advocating for the importance of PR-availability does not imply claiming that other factors will not play a role in RC-attachment, especially when the PR option is not available.

3.3. Explaining variation across syntactic structures

As mentioned above, several authors have shown that the characteristic asymmetry in attachment preferences disappears in certain specific syntactic environments. Speakers of languages commonly classified as HA, such as Spanish, display a Low Attachment preference in environments such as those listed below:

\[(39)\] **UNAMBIGUOUS RELATIVE PRONOUNS**

(Fernández, 2003, p.31)

Vi al hijo del médico el cual estaba en el balcón
I saw the son of the doctor who was on the balcony

\[(40)\] **SUBJECTS**

(Hemforth et al., unpublished)

a. La criada de la actriz que estaba en el balcón es rubia
   a. The maid of the actress that was sitting on the balcony is blonde

b. The maid of the actress [RC/SC sitting on the balcony] is blonde

\[(41)\] **TYPE OF P**

(De Vincenzi & Job, 1993, 1995)

a. Qualcuno ha sparato alla governante con l’attrice che stava seduta in balcone
   b. Someone shot the maid with the actress that was sitting on the balcony

b. The maid of the actress [RC/SC sitting on the balcony] is blonde

\[(42)\] **NOMINALS**

(Gibson et al., 1996)

a. la lámpara cerca de la pintura de la casa que fue dañada en la inundación
   a. The lamp near the painting of the house that was damaged by the flood

b. The lamp near the painting of the house [RC/SC damaged by the flood]

Crucially, what all these contexts have in common is their inability to introduce events, which makes PRs unavailable. Given these premises, and following the account proposed in (31), we correctly predict a generalized LA preference in these environments.

The English sentences in (40)[c], (42)[c] and (41)[c], serve as a good illustration of the general ban of PRs in the context of subjects, nominals and thematic prepositions. These sentences, in fact, can only be interpreted as reduced RCs and not as Small Clauses. The lack of PR readings in (39) is due to the presence of the relative pronoun, which, as discussed in example (14) above, can only introduce genuine RCs. As for subjects, we should point out that it is not all subjects that prevent PRs, the example in (30)[a], reported in (43) is an example of felicitous (even obligatory) PR in subject position.
The daughter of the postman running by herself/b*by himself is an exceptional event.

In this case, however, the PR interpretation is authorized (and enforced) by making reference back to the whole subject as an event. The ungrammaticality of the RC reading in these contexts can be diagnosed easily also in English, the overt presence of the restrictive marker *that was* makes the sentence ungrammatical:

The maid of the actress (*that was) dancing the polka is an event you shouldn’t miss.

When explicit reference to an event, or other such licensing elements are not present, as in e.g. (40), the PR interpretation is not available. Importantly, the experimental works cited above did not make use of these special contexts.

The case of thematic prepositions (43) and that of nominals (44) not only involve more subtle distinctions to be made, but have also played a central role in previous accounts of variation in RC attachment (e.g. Construal and Predicate Proximity) and for these reasons require a more detailed discussion, and are addressed in sections (3.3.1) and (3.3.2) respectively.

3.3.1. Type of Preposition

We have claimed that the preposition ‘with’ excludes a PR reading of the sentence in (41). To be exact, a type of PR is in fact licensed in this environment, i.e. the so-called absolute-with constructions (45).

Con Gianni che ha la febbre non possiamo partire.
With G. that has the fever not can we leave.
‘With G. sick, we can’t leave.

Absolute-with constructions modify the situation presented in the matrix clause as illustrated in (47) and, more crucially, exclude HA in the context of complex NPs under discussion (47).24

Hanno sparato alla governante [
PR con l’attrice che stava seduta in balcone].
Have they has shot the maid with the actress that was sitting on the balcony.
PR reading: ‘While the actress was sitting on the balcony, they shot the maid.’

Hanno sparato al colonnello [
PR con l’attrice che stava [seduta/*seduto] in balcone]
Have they shot the colonel with the actress that was [seated/fem/*masc.] on the balcony.
‘While the maid was sitting on the balcony, they shot the colonel.’

The obligatory LA resulting from an absolute-with constructions strengthen our general argument: LA is predicted with this type of Ps and this prediction is based on the availability of PRs.

Restrictive and comitative *with*. 25 An anonymous reviewer pointed out that, contrary to our claim, Small Clauses taking the highest NP as subject are available in sentences like (48-a) despite the presence of the preposition *with*. This is also true of PRs (48-b).

---

24 We thank Jan Casalicchio (p.c. 2013) for this important observation.
25 We are grateful to Giorgos Spathas for detailed comments and suggestions on this section.
The maid with the blonde hair dancing the polka is an event you shouldn’t miss.

La governante con i capelli biondi che balla la polka è uno spettacolo imperdibile.

Notice first of all that both sentences stand in clear contrast with the minimally different (49-c,d), which contain two animate Nouns (like the sentences used in the experiment under discussion).

What is at stake here is the difference between Restrictive (which can be replaced by a RC) (50) and non-Restrictive (comitative) (51) uses of with, which can be paraphrased with “together with/in company with”.

The examples in (48) both involve a clear case of restrictive preposition, both NPs can be paraphrased with: the actress who has blonde hair. Restrictive-with, but not the non-Restrictive, is easily available with properties (e.g. being blonde), as is generally the case for restrictive modifiers, can be used in subject position, and in complement position of stative verbs, such as “be married to”, which obligatorily select NP complements (50).

Comitative with, which emerges more clearly when using two animate nouns (and is forced when proper names are used), is not available with NPs denoting properties (50), in the environment of subjects (51-b) and as complement of a stative predicate (51-c):

The inability of comitative-with to appear in subject position (51-b) generalizes to being subjects of a PR, explaining the absence of a PR reading of the relevant sentences.

Since comitative with is not allowed in subject position, we can conclude that SCs and PRs are allowed only when Restrictive with is used in a complex NP, this explains the grammaticality of (48). As shown by the oddness/ungrammaticality of (49) and (53), Restrictive with does not seem to be the favored interpretation when two animate NPs are present:

The combination of the restrictive/comitative distinction and the apparent preference for comitative with animate Nouns explain the LA preference in the environment of with (besides the
already noted forced LA in the presence of absolute with constructions). All the experiments under discussion used complex NPs containing two animate Nouns, thus reasonably favoring a comitative reading of with, as in (53). As comitative with cannot be the subject of a PR/SC, the relevant sentences can only be interpreted as RCs and LA is predicted.

3.3.2. No need for parametrization of Relativized Relevance in Three-NP sites

As discussed above (see ex. (7)/(54)), a common U-shaped pattern in RC-attachment was reported for Spanish and English in the context of 3 possible attachment sites, both in a “subject position” of sentence fragments (Gibson et al., 1996), and in object position (54-b) (Gibson et al., 1999).

(54) a. La lámpara cerca de la pintura de la casa que fue dañada en la inundación.
   b. The lamp near the painting of the house that was damaged by the flood.
   c. El astronómo predijo el cambio de la órbita del planeta que se observó desde el satélite.
   d. The astronomer predicted the change of the orbit of the planet that was observed from the satellite.

Gibson and colleagues propose that principles of locality (i.e. Recency) interact with the parametrized principle of Predicate Proximity, which is weak in English but strong in Spanish. Similarly to its precursor (Relativized Relevance, Frazier 1990) Predicate Proximity recognizes the central role played by predicates in structuring sentences: “the core predicate structure […] is ranked more highly for attachment by the parser” (Gibson et al. 1996:41). NPs that stand in an predicate-argument relation with the matrix predicate are preferred in cases in which multiple attachment sites are available. The parametrization of this principle is claimed to follow from the relative degree of freedom in word order in a given language, in languages with relatively free word order (like Spanish, French and German) the predicate plays a more central role in parsing than in languages with relatively fixed word order like English.

The strength of Predicate Proximity in Spanish would explain the HA preference in 2-NP sites in this language, while its relative weakness in English would account for the observed LA preference. The increased distance between the predicate and the RC, would in turn account for the identical non-monotonic preference in the two languages, i.e. increasing the distance lowers the strength of Predicate Proximity over Recency.

We propose a slightly different account for the two findings. Let’s first discuss the results of Gibson et al. (1996) (54-a,b), remember that sentence fragments, i.e. complex nominals that could have been taken to be the subjects of a potential forthcoming predicate, were used in this experiment. The primary, and universal, LA preference found in these contexts is explained when considering that (offline) PRs cannot possibly be introduced in this context as no PR-taking predicate (either Verbal or Nominal) is present. In the absence of a PR option, the embedded clauses can only be interpreted as RCs, whose attachment will be heavily influenced by Locality principles.

We argue that the secondary preference for NP1 depends on the prominence of NP1 within the complex NP. In this ‘sentence fragment’ context, NP1 qualifies as the head of the whole complex NP and thus as the head of the subject of a potential forthcoming predicate. The structural prominence of NP1, which ensures e.g. that it will trigger agreement on a forthcoming predicate, and the role it plays in attracting attachment, is well captured by principles such as Relativized Relevance or Predicate Proximity. Importantly, however, there’s no need to parametrize the
strength of this type of principle, as the variation across languages (or lack thereof) is already explained by the unavailability of PRs in this environment.28

A similar account can be extended to the findings in Gibson et al. (1999) (54-c,d), adding the natural conjecture that as a consequence of decay of syntactic representations, the likelihood of projecting a PR decreases when the distance between the PR-taking predicate and the that-clause is increased, remember that PRs are not obligatory in these contexts. As the likelihood of a PR parse diminishes, that of a RC parse increases, which puts Locality in charge again and explains the primary LA preference. The secondary preference for NP1. As above, the application of Relativized Relevance / Predicate Proximity accounts for the secondary preference for N1 attachment. Importantly, once again, this account does not require a parametrization of this principle. The difference between these results and the results in Dutch (Wijnen, 1998; Wijnen et al., 1999), in which the U-shaped pattern still favors HA (NP1 > NP3 > NP2) might be due to a difference in the number of PR-verbs used in the two experiments, however, more empirical work is required to provide a full account for these differences.

Summing up, once the availability of PRs is taken into account, previous (often conflicting or confusing) results from the experimental literature on RC attachment are amenable to a uniform explanation: as predicted, High Attachment is observed in a given language only in contexts that allow for a PR reading, whereas in all genuine RC contexts, unless factors such as prosody or referentiality are involved, a Low Attachment preference prevails. The patterns discussed in this section do not simply follow from position (subject vs. object) or category (N vs. V). What drives attachment preferences is the availability of PRs, i.e. the presence of a context capable to introduce events. Importantly, the different effects are derived from the grammatical (un)availability of PRs and do not require postulating the potentially problematic parametrization of parsing principles.

3.4. A note on PRs and prosody

In section 1.2 we briefly discussed the Implicit Prosody Hypothesis (Fodor, 1998a,b, 2002). Now that we have introduced PRs and discussed the confounding role they might have played in the preceding literature on RC attachment, we can ask to what extent, if any, PR-availability might be responsible for the observed differences in prosodic phrasing across languages (Jun, 2003). A full answer to this question is beyond the scope of the present paper, and we will limit ourselves to point out that, besides having a different syntax / semantics, PRs are also associated with different prosodic representations. Notice that claiming that PRs might be involved in determining default prosodic phrasing across languages does not in any way constitute a threat for the IPH, in fact we believe quite the contrary to be true, as the IPH itself has little to say about those default preferences.

We’ll first point out that a specific intonational phrasing is required by PRs, which is different in crucial ways from that of RCs. PRs are compatible with the presence of a prosodic bound-
ary placed in between NP2 and the *che-clause*, as in (55-a); and incompatible with a boundary following NP1.

(55)  
a. **PR compatible break**  
Ho visto la figlia del postino // che correva da sola / *da solo.
   I saw the daughter of the postman that ran by herself.
   I saw the daughter of the postman // running by herself.  
   SC / RC

b. **PR incompatible break**  
Ho visto la figlia // del postino che correva da solo / *da sola.
   I saw the daughter of the postman that ran by himself / herself.
   I saw the daughter // of the postman running by himself / herself.  
   RC / *SC

The phrasing of English SCs seems to pattern in a similar way, as both the glosses to (55) above and the examples in (56) show:

(56)  
a. **SC compatible break**  
John saw the daughter of the postman // working by herself / **himself.**

b. **SC incompatible break**  
John saw the daughter // of the postman (that is) working by himself / **herself.**

Some reappraisal of the effects of RC length in attachment might also be desirable, as by manipulating the RC we might involuntarily manipulate PR availability:

(57)  
a. **Short RC, PR available**  
Ho visto il ragazzo che correva.
   I saw the boy that ran.
   I saw the boy running.

b. **Short RC, PR unavailable**  
Ho visto il ragazzo che ami.
   I saw the boy that you love.

c. **Long RC, PR available**  
Ho visto il ragazzo che correva la maratona domenica scorsa.
   I saw the boy that ran.imperf. the marathon last sunday.

d. **Long RC, PR unavailable**  
Ho visto il ragazzo che ha corso la maratona domenica scorsa.
   I saw the boy that has run.perf. the marathon last sunday.

Here we will simply point out that extra care should be taken with length manipulation, as this can also involve manipulation of e.g. **inner aspect** of the embedded verb, compare the PR-compatible process *run* in (57-a) with the PR-incompatible state *love* in (57-b); or **outer aspect** of the embedded verb, compare the PR-compatible imperfective *correva* with the PR-incompatible perfective form *ha corso* in (57-c,d). Inner and outer aspect are just two of the possible factors that are involved in deciding PR-availability, and are in turn influenced by a number of other factors (e.g. *Ho visto il ragazzo che correva ogni giorno / I saw:PERF the boy that ran.imperf every day, contains an imperfective, but the modifier *every day*, forces an habitual reading which rules out a PR interpretation because of its incompatibility with the perfective of the matrix verb).

Summarizing, PR-availability might be partially responsible to explain cross-linguistic differences in default phrasing in complex NPs plus RC / PR strings. PR-availability might also contribute in shaping changes in attachment preferences generated by RCs of different length,
and should be controlled for when investigating this type of effect. Once again, advocating a role for PRs simply amounts to saying that these structures are real and cannot be ignored when investigating attachment and prosody, it does not imply negating the clear role played by prosody in parsing.

Having discussed some of the potential implications of the role of PR-availability in the previous literature, we now turn to the discussion of two novel experiments in which this availability was the direct object of manipulation.

4. New experimental evidence

In the remainder of this section we present the results of two novel experiments in Italian in which we used different grammatical constraints (among those presented in section 2.1) to selectively manipulate PR availability. Based on the PR-first hypothesis in (32) we predict to observe LA preference in unambiguously RC contexts, and HA preference in contexts ambiguous between a PR and RC parse.

Most previous experiment on RC-attachment introduced the complex NPs using a variety of verbs, mixing PR-taking verbs (e.g. see) with verbs that can only select for NPs (e.g. know). This might explain why a relatively low percentage (around 60%) of HA preference in generally observed also in PR-languages. To support this claim we conducted a first experiment using sentences containing a mixed set of verbs (5 PR-taking and 15 nonPR-taking) which introduced a complex NP modified by a che clause. To allow additional comparisons, we also manipulated the syntactic structure in which the verb + complex NP + RC appeared, using PR compatible and PR incompatible environments. In a second experiment, we directly compared attachment preferences in sentences containing PR or nonPR verbs, keeping syntactic structure identical across conditions. The results of both experiments strongly support the PR-first hypothesis.

4.1. Experiment 1

The first experiment aims

As discussed above, PRs can only be constructed with subjects of the embedded clause and in the presence of a verb or noun selecting for a events. (32) predicts LA preference to arise in all the conditions in which RC was the only available parse (condition B, C, D below), and a significantly higher HA preference to arise when both PR and RC are allowed (condition A).

Method and Participants  (N=31) Italian native speakers participated in an offline questionnaire on attachment preferences in complex DPs. All the participants gave their informed consent before taking part in the study and were naive as to the goals of the experiment.

Materials and Design  20 sets of target sentences were constructed with 4 versions for each sentence in a 2x2 design crossing Position (right branching [RB] vs. center embedding [CE]) and ExtractionSite (subject vs. object). 4 lists of 20 target and 80 filler sentences were created using a latin-square design. The fillers didn’t contain either RCs or SCs/PRs. Target and filler sentences were pseudo randomized so that subjects would never see a target sentence immediately following another target sentence. Meaning was kept constant using passives in the A and C condition. An example of the sentence stimuli and questions is reported in (58). Position of extraction is indicated with <>. 30
Stimuli

a. PR / RC CONDITION: RB-SUBJECT
Il barista ha guardato l’amico del cliente che veniva sorpreso dai colleghi.
The barman has watched the friend of the client that came surprised by the colleagues.
‘The barman watched the friend of the client (that was) being surprised by his colleagues.’

b. RC ONLY CONDITION: RB-OBJECT
Il barista ha guardato l’amico del cliente che i colleghi avevano sorpreso.
The barman has watched the friend of the client that the colleagues had surprised.
‘the barman watched the friend of the client that his colleagues had surprised.’

c. RC ONLY CONDITION: CE-SUBJECT
L’amico del cliente che veniva sorpreso dai colleghi è molto buono.
The friend of the client that became surprised by the colleagues is very nice.
‘the friend of the client that was surprised by his colleagues is very nice’.

d. RC ONLY CONDITION: CE-OBJECT
L’amico del cliente che i colleghi avevano sorpreso è molto buono.
The friend of the client that the colleagues had surprised is very nice.
‘the friend of the client that his colleagues had surprised is very nice’.

→ chi era sorpreso? A. amico B. cliente
(who was surprised? A. friend B. client)

To obtain as close a match as possible between this study and previous studies on attachment, we used a mix of verb types in the matrix clause, namely: 5 verbs that allow PRs complements (watch, observe, see, listen, hear), 3 verbs that can take PR adjuncts (admire, hate, intercept) and 12 verbs that don’t allow PRs (e.g. run over). 16 of these verbs were previously used in De Vincenzi & Job (1995). Thematic assignment in the embedded clauses was kept constant across conditions using passive voice in the A and C condition.29 As indicated in (58), the only condition allowing for a PR reading of the embedded clause is condition A. This is also the condition that most closely resembles previous studies on RC-attachment, the main difference being the use of passives in the present experiment. RC reading was forced in all other conditions: extraction of the object prevents a PR reading in condition B, while embedding within a subject in the absence of any predicate selecting for an event disallows the PR reading in condition C and D. The target sentences were interspersed among 80, unambiguous, unrelated fillers. No SCs or RCs were used in the fillers.

The sentences were organized in a Latin-square design so that each subject only saw one version of each sentence. To ensure proper attention was paid to the task, a comprehension question followed each sentence. We counterbalanced questions and answers of both stimuli and fillers. For the stimuli, we made sure that NP1 was presented first in 50% of the answers. For the fillers, we ensured that only 50% of the answers to the fillers were true. The study was conducted using a PC running the Linger software developed by Doug Rodhe (http://tedlab.mit.edu/dr/Linger) or it was presented to the subjects on an Excel spreadsheet.

Results and Analysis

One subject was excluded from the analysis because of answering only 46.5% of the unambiguous filler item questions correctly. Table 5 reports the percentages of High Attachment per condition.

Data were fit with mixed effects logistic regression using the lmer() function of the lme4

29 Thanks to Colin Phillips for suggesting to use passives.
Table 5: Percentage of High Attachment Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Summary of Attachment Preferences Experiment 1

package (Bates et al., 2011) of the R analysis program (R core development team). In the main model position and extractionsite were fit as fixed factors, and subject and items as random factors. Random slopes were fit for both fixed effects and their interaction. The analysis showed a significant effect of position (coefficient = 0.9915, SE = 0.4321, z-score = 2.300, p < .01). A significant interaction position*extractionsite was also observed (coefficient = 1.5059, SE = 0.6083, z-score = 2.476, p < .01). An additional analysis, looking at effects of extraction for the two positions separately, showed a significant effect of extraction site in the RB condition only (coefficient = 0.9672, SE = 0.4023, z-score = 2.404, p < .01), with significantly more HA preferences for subject extraction than object extraction. Finally, analyzing effects of position for the two extraction sites separately revealed an effect of position for subject extraction only (coefficient = 1.7751, SE = 0.5954, z-score = 2.982, p < .001), with significantly more HA preferences for RB than CE.

Taken together these results show that, as predicted, the number of High Attachment decisions was significantly higher for subject extraction than for object extraction in the RB condition only, i.e. condition A.
4.2. Discussion

The results fully support our predictions. A Low Attachment preference was found in all conditions in which an unambiguous RCs reading had been forced: using object extraction in the RB environment in condition B, and both subject and object extraction in CE, in condition C and D. High Attachment preference was observed only when PRs were available i.e. limited to subject extraction in RB cases (condition A). The absence of a statistically significant difference between condition C and D shows that the asymmetry between condition A and B boils down to the availability of PRs. Notice that these results have been obtained despite the extremely conservative use of PR-complement taking verbs. We deliberately chose to limit the use of these verbs to better demonstrate the possible influence of PR availability in previous studies even in the presence of a restricted number (8) of PR-taking verbs, i.e. 40% of the stimuli. Importantly, HA preference for the PR-taking verbs taken separately goes up to 71.1% (i.e. an increment in average HA of 14.5%) in condition A, but it remains unchanged in condition B (46.9%). Conversely, when the eight PR-taking verbs are excluded from the analysis, HA preference for condition A goes down to 40% and to 34.7% in condition B, which indicates an effect of verb type even with such restricted numbers. A complete list of the item, together with average HA per item / condition, is reported in Appendix A.

An anonymous reviewer pointed out that these results might be offered an alternative explanation in terms of the higher memory load imposed on conditions B, C and D by object extraction and center embedding respectively. It is well established that object extraction is harder to parse than subject extraction (on extraction see King & Just, 1991; Gibson, 1998; Gordon et al., 2001, among many others). The literature on the relative complexity of Center Embedding and Right Branching is more divided (see Gibson et al. 2005 for a review of the literature and a claim that RB is in fact harder than CE and Santi et al. 2011a,b for a critical review of the results in Gibson et al. and for additional data asserting the higher complexity of CE).

As the same reviewer suggests “working memory demands are minimized in Condition A, while the three other conditions where low attachment is found each have at least one extra burden on working memory”. The reviewer further suggests to strengthen our position avoiding structural manipulation, i.e. by manipulating the matrix verb, which is what we do in the next experiment.

4.3. Experiment II: Manipulating the matrix verb

As discussed in section 2.1, PRs behave much like other types of clausal complements in being selected only by a restricted class of verbs. Among these, perceptual (e.g. see, hear, feel

---

30As mentioned above, it is not always possible to have access to the sentence stimuli used in published work, and even less information (generally none) can be found about fillers. However, a quick look at the literature shows that a similar (or higher) percentage of PR-verbs was generally used: PR-taking verbs were used in 9 / 24 of the sentence stimuli (i.e. 37.5%) in Cuetos & Mitchell (1988); 8 / 20 (40%) in Brysbaert & Mitchell (1996); 6 / 16 (37.5%) in Carreiras & Clifton (1999); up to 13/24, i.e. more than 50% in Zagar et al. (1997). All these experiments revealed a HA preference in languages allowing PRs. Carreiras & Clifton (1993) used two sets of stimuli, the first set was used for experiments 1-4, this is the same set used by Carreiras & Clifton (1999), i.e. 37.5% of the sentences allow a PR interpretation. A second set of sentences was used for experiment 5. This contains at least 6 PR-verbs over 24 (5, photograph; 15, draw; 16, bump into; 19 photograph; 21 meet; 12, see), i.e. 25% of the stimuli.

31Two studies addressed the interaction of memory span and attachment preferences:Felser et al. (2003) with children, and Swets et al. (2007) with adults. Both reported a preference for local attachment in subjects with high working memory span. While these results do not directly inform us on the interaction of object RCs and higher memory load with attachment preferences, they might in fact predict this interaction to go in the opposite direction we observed, which would explain the relatively high percentage of HA in the Object RC condition and ultimately strengthen our results.
etc.) or quasi-perceptual (e.g. photograph, film, record), are the ones that most readily allow for PRs across languages.

To further test the role of PR availability in attachment, and avoid possible structural confounds in an additional experiment we tested the effects of PR availability on RC attachment preference by manipulating the type of verb in the matrix clause. We used sentences containing strings ambiguous between a RC and PR interpretation, which displayed perceptual or quasi-perceptual verbs, and identical sentences in which the same string could not only be interpreted as a RC because of the stative nature of the matrix verb. If our account holds, we expect LA to arise in the unambiguous RC condition and HA in the ambiguous PR / RC condition.

**Method and participants**  (N=30) Italian native speakers participated in an offline questionnaire on attachment preferences in complex DPs. All participants gave their informed consent before taking part in the study and were naive as to the goals of the experiment.

**Materials and Design**  24 minimal pairs of target sentences were constructed, keeping everything but the matrix verb constant. Condition A contained a PR taking predicate (e.g. see, hear, film, photograph among others), while Condition B contained stative predicates (e.g. lives with, works with, is married to) which only allow for NP complements, and therefore RC interpretation of the embedded clause. Two lists were created, with 24 target and 80 fillers. As in the previous experiment, the fillers did not contain either RCs or SCs / PRs. (59) depicts an example of the sentence stimuli used.

(59) **Stimuli Experiment II**

a. **PR / RC condition:** PR-verbs
   Gianni ha visto il figlio del medico che correva.
   G. saw the son of the doctor running.

b. **RC only condition:** Stative verbs
   Gianni vive con il figlio del medico che correva.
   G. lives with the son of the doctor running.

Each subject only saw one version of each sentence. To ensure proper attention was paid to the task, a comprehension question followed each sentence. The questions and answers to both targets and fillers were counterbalanced so that NP1 was presented first in 50% of the answers, 50% of the answer to the fillers were true. The study was conducted using Google Questionnaire.

**Results and Analysis**  All subjects performed at ceiling on the filler items. Table 6 reports the percentages of High Attachment preference per condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eventive Stative</th>
<th>78.6% 24.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 6: Percentage of High Attachment Preferences

Data were fit with mixed effects logistic regression using the lmer() function of the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2011) of the R analysis program (R core development team). In the main model verb-type was fit as fixed factor, and subject and items as random factors. Intercept and random slopes were fit for the fixed effect. The analysis showed a highly significant effect of
Figure 2: Summary of Attachment Preference Experiment 2

verb-type (coefficient = -3.95604, SE = 0.51992, z-score = -7.609, p < .0001), with significantly more HA preferences for event-taking (Condition A) than entity-taking (Condition B) verbs. As predicted, LA was observed with stative predicates, which can only take nominal complements and with which the embedded clause can only be interpreted as a RC. A very strong HA preference emerged with perceptual predicates, which can take both nominal complements and clausal complements of the PR type.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have shown that the literature on RC attachment preferences in complex DPs has ignored a grammatical distinction between the string identical RCs and PRs. We have argued that this distinction potentially confounds previous results in this area of research and claimed that much cross-linguistic differences in parsing preferences can be reduced to the asymmetric availability of PRs. Support for this claim was discussed, from both previously published and original results.

Looking back at the previous literature we see that, all else being equal, once a PR reading is excluded, i.e. once genuine RCs only are considered, LA preference is observed. This was shown to explain not only variation across languages, but also variation across syntactic structures within the same languages (e.g. type of Preposition / Relative Pronoun, position of the complex NP etc.).

Our experiments on RC-attachment in Italian further confirm this prediction: in the first experiment we have shown that ambiguity is resolved differently when the same sequence, NP1 of NP2 + RC, is embedded in different positions, and crucially LA preference arises in all cases in
which a PR reading was excluded through grammatical means (i.e. object extraction, position of embedding), HA preference, on the other hand, is found when PRs are available (subject extraction in Right Branching context). Importantly, the first experiment was designed to replicate previous studies, i.e. only a small subset of the stimuli contained verbs that can select for a PR. The size of the effect is also representative of those earlier studies (the observed 56% HA over all verb types goes up to 68.8% when only PR compatible verbs are considered), which shows that even a small number of PR-verbs can strongly influence the final result. The second experiment directly tackles the role of the matrix verb in determining attachment preferences: we constructed minimal pairs of sentences containing either PR-verbs as matrix predicates or stative verbs that can only select for NP complements (and therefore in which the embedded clause can only be parsed as a Relative Clause). The results are strongly in line with our prediction (78.6% HA in the PR vs. 24.2% HA in the RC-only condition), supporting the claim that a strong LA preference is to be expected in the absence of PR ambiguity. To complete the picture we should add that identical stimuli were used in an experiment in English by Grillo et al. (2014). As predicted, the results found here were not replicated in that experiment, i.e. a generalized LA preference was found in English across both conditions.

To interpret these results, and more generally the residual variation across languages and syntactic structures, we have proposed that when both PRs and RCs are available (in the absence of additional factors such as prosody, plausibility etc.) the parser prefers PRs over RCs because the former are simpler both at the structural (i.e. PRs are Small Clauses, while RCs are full clauses) and interpretive level (PRs require simpler presuppositions at the contextual level). This account also allowed us to dispense with parametrization of principles such as Relativized Relevance (Frazier, 1990) / Predicate Proximity (Gibson et al., 1996, 1999).

Notable exceptions to this generalization, which require further investigation, include a set of languages (German, Bulgarian, Russian) which have been classified as HA, albeit with contrasting results in the literature. We have noted that these languages share three important characteristics: i. they all disallow PRs; ii. they all require obligatory relative pronoun to introduce RCs (which reasonably explains lack of PRs in these languages), and iii. they all instantiate writing systems that require a comma between the second NP and the RC. These characteristics might reduce the observed HA preference to these factors under the Anaphoric Binding (obligatory relative pronoun) and the Implicit Prosody (obligatory comma) approaches.

We conclude that PR availability plays a major role in shaping attachment preference and we hypothesize that the observed residual differences across languages are determined by this factor. This does not amount to saying that PR availability is the only factor involved in deciding attachment preferences, as the effects on attachment of e.g. Referentiality or Prosody have been repeatedly demonstrated (Gilboy et al., 1995; J.D., 2002a), but that the origin of many otherwise obscure asymmetries in attachment reported in the literature can be traced back to this factor. We have shown that speakers of those languages that allow for PRs in the relevant contexts prefer High Attachment, while speakers of languages that disallow PRs in those same contexts prefer Low Attachment. Moreover, within the same language, we saw that whenever PRs are not available, a Low Attachment preferences are observed universally.

Obviously much more work needs to be carried on to fully support these claims and properly assess the interaction of the various factors that ultimately contribute to RC-attachment in the absence of PR-availability. Similarly, at the theoretical level, a great effort is needed to describe the availability of PRs across syntactic environments and languages (keeping in mind that PR availability in a given structure is not the same across different languages, e.g. Italian vs. Spanish nominals) and thus make precise falsifiable predictions about RC-attachment. Future work will
need to address several questions left open at present: how and when does the parser decide between PRs and RCs? Does the typical preference for Nominal over Clausal complements (based mostly on a relatively small subset of verbs allowing clausal complements) also extend to Small Clauses? i.e. could the parser already prefer a SC parse in the presence of PR-complement type verbs before reaching the embedded complementizer? If a PR preference is confirmed online, is it possible to modulate it through context manipulation? If so, would the context play a role at the very initial stage of parsing or only at a later point, i.e. is the preference structurally or context driven?

Other questions include the role of plausible differences among PR-complement and PR-adjunct taking verbs, the prosody of PRs and more generally SCs, and finally the relation between PR preference and memory span. We are currently running experiments to test many of these questions and to extend the empirical basis of the claim to cover more languages and syntactic environments. Results on Spanish, Portuguese (Grillo et al., 2012), English, French (Grillo & Spathas, 2014) and Greek (Grillo et al., 2013b) further support these claims. Results from timed questionnaires and self-paced reading also suggests an online preference for PRs / SCs over RCs in both European Portuguese and English (Grillo et al., 2013a). Finally, Costa et al. (2013) addressed the question of acquisition of PRs and found evidence for early knowledge of the obligatory HA in these structures and in Prepositional Infinitive Constructions in European Portuguese.

On these bases we have argued that once PRs are taken into the equation, the Universality of Parsing principles of locality can be stated once again. The question of whether these principles act independently from or in harmony with other factors (lexical, semantics, plausibility, prosody, context, frequency) is completely independent from this claim. What we meant to address is the residual variation that appeared to be present after these factors were taken into account; this residual variation created a huge theoretical problem that might be manageable now that the role of PR ambiguity in attachment is fully recognized.
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Appendix A. Items Experiment 1

Note: Mean HA preference is indicated for each item. (*) marks items containing clear instances of PR taking verbs.

1. a. il dottore ha chiamato il figlio del signore che veniva attaccato dai poliziotti
   b. il dottore ha chiamato il figlio del signore che i poliziotti avevano attaccato
   c. il figlio del signore che veniva attaccato dai poliziotti ha superato la prova
   d. il figlio del signore che i poliziotti stavano attaccando ha superato la prova
2. a. il barista ha guardato l’amico del cliente che veniva sorpreso dai colleghi  
   b. il barista ha guardato l’amico del cliente che i colleghi avevano sorpreso  
   c. l’amico del cliente che veniva sorpreso dai colleghi è molto buono  
   d. l’amico del cliente che i colleghi avevano sorpreso è molto buono

   * 44.4  
   25  
   75  
   66.6

3. a. l’avvocato ha diffidato il padre del ragazzo che veniva tradito dai compagni  
   b. l’avvocato ha diffidato il padre del ragazzo che i compagni avevano tradito  
   c. il padre del ragazzo che veniva tradito dai compagni è molto amareggiato  
   d. il padre del ragazzo che i compagni avevano tradito è molto amareggiato

   0  
   22  
   0  
   37.5

4. a. l’avvocato ha difeso il padre del ragazzo che veniva tradito dai rivoltosi  
   b. l’avvocato ha difeso il padre del ragazzo che i rivoltosi avevano tradito  
   c. il padre del ragazzo che veniva tradito dai rivoltosi è molto diligente  
   d. l’amico del senatore che i rivoltosi avevano colpito è molto diligente

   50  
   33  
   55.5  
   50

5. a. il duca ha aiutato il figlio del sarto che veniva aggredito dai ladri  
   b. il duca ha aiutato il figlio del sarto che i ladri avevano aggredito  
   c. il figlio del sarto che veniva aggredito dai ladri è ancora intristito  
   d. il figlio del sarto che i ladri avevano aggredito è ancora intristito

   50  
   50  
   44.4  
   33.3

6. a. il visitatore ha riconosciuto il collega del dirigente che veniva zittito dai moderatori  
   b. il visitatore ha riconosciuto il collega del dirigente che i moderatori avevano zittito  
   c. il collega del dirigente che veniva zittito dai moderatori è poco cortese  
   d. il collega del dirigente che i moderatori avevano zittito è poco cortese

   22.2  
   25  
   62.5  
   62.5

7. a. il direttore ha conosciuto il segretario del supervisore che veniva promosso dai colleghi  
   b. il direttore ha conosciuto il segretario del supervisore che i colleghi avevano promosso  
   c. il segretario del supervisore che veniva promosso dai colleghi è molto influente  
   d. il segretario del supervisore che i colleghi avevano promosso è molto influente

   88.8  
   33.3  
   0  
   62.5

8. a. il marchese ha osservato la nipote della ballerina che veniva protetta dalle amiche  
   b. il marchese ha osservato la nipote della ballerina che le amiche avevano protetto  
   c. la nipote della ballerina che veniva protetta dalle amiche è davvero affascinante  
   d. la nipote della ballerina che le amiche avevano protetto è davvero affascinante

   * 87.5  
   100  
   29.4  
   25

9. a. il tecnico ha ammirato il sosia del calciatore che veniva esaltato dai tifosi  
   b. il tecnico ha ammirato il sosia del calciatore che i tifosi avevano esaltato  
   c. il sosia del calciatore che veniva esaltato dai tifosi è proprio bravo  
   d. il sosia del calciatore che i tifosi avevano esaltato è proprio bravo

   * 75  
   62.5  
   22.2  
   22.2

10. a. la cameriera ha visto l’amico del poliziottò che veniva insultato dai teppisti  
    b. la cameriera ha visto l’amico del poliziottò che i teppisti avevano insultato  
    c. l’amico del poliziottò che veniva insultato dai teppisti è stato ricompensato  
    d. l’amico del poliziottò che i teppisti avevano insultato è stato ricompensato

    * 100  
    0  
    37.5  
    44.4

11. a. lo studente ha odiato il nipote del preside che veniva premiato dai giurati  
    b. lo studente ha odiato il nipote del preside che i giurati avevano premiato  
    c. il nipote del preside che veniva premiato dai giurati è stato avvertito  
    d. il nipote del preside che i giurati avevano premiato è stato avvertito

    * 100  
    100  
    0  
    62.5

12. a. la psicolabile ha sparato al maestro del pianista che veniva applaudito dai musicisti  
    b. la psicolabile ha sparato al maestro del pianista che i musicisti avevano applaudito  
    c. il maestro del pianista che veniva applaudito dai musicisti è molto orgoglioso  
    d. il maestro del pianista che i musicisti avevano applaudito è molto orgoglioso

    50  
    33.3  
    11.1  
    0

13. a. la signora ha aiutato il garzone del cuoco che veniva chiamato dai clienti  
    b. la signora ha aiutato il garzone del cuoco che i clienti avevano chiamato  
    c. il garzone del cuoco che veniva chiamato dai clienti è stato licenziato  
    d. il garzone del cuoco che i clienti avevano chiamato è stato licenziato

    100  
    62.5  
    44.4  
    33.3
14. a. la talpa ha avvertito il cugino del ragazzo che veniva spiato dai carabinieri 33.3
   b. la talpa ha avvertito il cugino del ragazzo che i carabinieri avevano spiato 0
   c. il cugino del ragazzo che veniva spiato dai carabinieri merita una lezione 50
   d. il cugino del ragazzo che i carabinieri avevano spiato merita una lezione 33.3
15. a. il responsabile ha nascosto la sorella della segretaria che veniva inseguita dai malviventi 100
   b. il responsabile ha nascosto la sorella della segretaria che i malviventi avevano inseguito 77.7
   c. la sorella della segretaria che veniva inseguita dai malviventi è tanto cara 25
   d. la sorella della segretaria che i malviventi avevano inseguito è tanto cara 37.5
16. a. il responsabile ha nascosto la sorella della segretaria che veniva inseguita dai malviventi 100
   b. il responsabile ha nascosto la sorella della segretaria che i malviventi avevano inseguito 77.7
   c. la sorella della segretaria che veniva inseguita dai malviventi `e tanto cara 25
   d. la sorella della segretaria che i malviventi avevano inseguito `e tanto cara 37.5
17. a. la contessa ha ascoltato l`ospite del marchese che veniva interrotto dai commensali * 62.5
   b. la contessa ha ascoltato l`ospite del marchese che i commensali avevano interrotto 44.4
   c. l`ospite del marchese che veniva interrotto dai commensali è davvero sguaiato 0
   d. l`ospite del marchese che i commensali avevano interrotto è davvero sguaiato 25
18. a. la polizia ha sentito il vicino del dottore che veniva interrogato dalla portiera 11.1
   b. la polizia ha sentito il vicino del dottore che la portiera aveva interrogato 33.3
   c. il vicino del dottore che veniva interrogato dalla portiera `e davvero sguaiato 25
   d. il vicino del dottore che la portiera aveva interrogato `e davvero sguaiato 44.4
19. a. la presidentessa ha salutato il corriere del commerciante che veniva eletto dai rappresentanti 11.1
   b. la presidentessa ha salutato il corriere del commerciante che i rappresentanti avevano eletto 33.3
   c. il corriere del commerciante che veniva eletto dai rappresentanti è stato fortunato 25
   d. il corriere del commerciante che i rappresentanti avevano eletto è stato fortunato 50
20. a. l`investigatore ha intercettato il sostituto del ministro che veniva corrotto dai finanzieri *50
   b. l`investigatore ha intercettato il sostituto del ministro che i finanzieri avevano corrotto 44.4
   c. il sostituto del ministro che veniva corrotto dai finanzieri ha poco potere 0
   d. il sostituto del ministro che i finanzieri avevano corrotto ha poco potere 25

Appendix B. Items Experiment 2

1. a. Gianni ha visto il figlio del medico che correva la maratona 92.8
   b. Gianni vive con il figlio del medico che correva la maratona 25
2. a. Maria ha sentito la nonna della ragazza che gridava 68.7
   b. Maria lavora con la nonna della ragazza che gridava 14.2
3. a. Pietro ha sentito il maestro del ragazzo che cantava 71.4
   b. Pietro si allena con il maestro del ragazzo che cantava 0
4. a. lo scrittore guardava la zia della ragazza che saltava 62.5
   b. lo scrittore ha sposato la zia della ragazza che saltava 7.1
5. a. Silvia ascoltava la figlia del poliziottesco che parlava 92.8
   b. Silvia lavora per la figlia del poliziottesco che parlava 18.7
6. a. Paola osservava l’amico del politico che cucinava 87.5
   b. Paola è fidanzata con l’amico del politico che cucinava 28.5
7. a. Mario ha sorpreso l’assistente dell’attrice che rubava 100
   b. Mario è affezionato all’assistente dell’attrice che rubava 56.2
8. a. l’avvocato ha beccato l’autista del vicino che fumava 100
   b. l’avvocato si esercita con l’autista del vicino che fumava 28.5
Appendix C. Pseudo Relatives across languages

Appendix C.1. Romance Languages

Table C.7 contains a list of languages for which PR-availability was discussed in the literature.

Appendix C.2. Dutch

(60-a,b) illustrate PRs in Dutch:

(60)  

(a) Ik zag Jan die naar huis rende  
    I saw J who to home run-past  
(b) Ik zag Jan naar huis rennen  
    I saw J to home run-inf
Table C.7: PRs across languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Ho visto Gianni che correva</td>
<td>Kayne (1981); Labelle (1996), Côté (1999); Koenig &amp; Lambrecht (1999), Koopman &amp; Sportiche (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>J’ai vu Jean qui courait</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician</td>
<td>Eu vin a Xoán que corría</td>
<td>Rafel (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Portuguese</td>
<td>Eu vejo o João que corre</td>
<td>Barros de Brito (1995); Fernandes (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(61) illustrates the Temporal restriction on PRs in Dutch: Temporal mismatch between future Tense in the embedded clause and past tense on the matrix verb prevents a PR interpretation. The appositive reading is available, but, as usual, it requires special comma intonation (i.e. longer break between Jan and die). We are grateful to Ad Neeleman and Hans van de Koot for providing these judgments.

(61) *Ik zag Jan die naar huis zal rennen
    I saw Jan who to home will run-inf

Appendix C.3. Greek

(62) illustrates PRs in Greek (We are grateful to Giorgos Spathas for providing these judgments:

    saw.PERF.I the John that washed.IMPERF the dog
    I saw John washing the dog.

b. Paratirusa ton Jani pu eplene ton skilo.
    observed.IMPERF.I the John that washed.IMPERF the dog
    I was observing John washing the dog.

(63) illustrates the Temporal restrictions on PRs in Greek. The variant with present might be possible in a situation where it is clear that my observing coincided with John’s washing the dog (i.e. an extended present for wash).

(63) Paratirusa ton Jani pu eplene/*pleni/*tha pleni ton skilo.
    observed.IMPERF.I the John that wash.PAST.IMPERF/ wash.PRES.IMPERF/ will wash. IMPERF the dog I was observing John washing the dog

(64) shows that the same structures are not allowed with Relative pronouns o opios. As usual, there is a marginal, and irrelevant for our purposes, reading in which examples like (64) are ok as Restrictive RCs, i.e. when the context involves more than one John.

(64) *Paratirusa ton Jani o opios eplene ton skilo.
    observed.IMPERF.I the John the.NOM.SG who.NOM.SG washed.IMPERF the dog
    ‘I was observing John washing the dog.’

Appendix C.4. Serbo-Croatian

As (65) shows, Serbo-Croatian freely allows PRs (We are grateful to Boban Arsenijević for providing these data):
Video sam Jovan koji je ljubio devojku. 
seen am Jovan.Acc which is kissed girl I saw Jovan kissing the girl

While (65-a) is ambiguous between a PR and the (marginal and, once again, irrelevant) RC interpretation, RC is the only available interpretation in (66).

(66) Video sam Jovana koji će poljubiti devojku. 
seen am Jovan.Acc which will kiss.Inf girl

(67) shows that PRs are also unavailable with perfective aspect (67-a) and stative predicates (67-b). In both cases the RC reading is of course available.

(67) a. Video sam Jovana koji je ljubio / *poljubio devojku. 
seen am Jovan.Acc which is kissed.Imperf / Perf girl

b. *Video sam Jovana koji je znao put do grada. 
seen am Jovan.Acc which is known way to city

Appendix C.5. Korean and Japanese

On Japanese and Korean see Shimoyama; Kim’s (1999; 2009) discussion of Internally Headed Relative Clauses (IHRC) and in particular, the discussion in Kim (2009) of the parallelism between the latter and Perceptual Constructions, which appear to display the same properties of PRs. (68), is ambiguous between a SC/perceptual construction reading and a restrictive RC reading, is an example of the relevant structures in Japanese.

(68) Watashi-wa [kocchi-ni hashitte-kuru Nao]-o mita. 
I-top here-to run-come Nao-acc saw
I saw Nao running this way.

(69) and (70) illustrate IHRCs and Perceptual Constructions respectively, both are ambiguous between a restrictive and non-restrictive reading. See Kim (2009) for a detailed comparison and discussion of their syntax and semantics.

(69) The IHRC construction: (Kim, 2009, ex. 1, p. 346)
John-un [[totwuk-i tomangka-n]-un kes]-ul cap-ess-ta. 
J.-TOP [[[thief-NOM run.away-IMPRF]-REL KES]-ACC catch-PST-DECL
John caught the thief while he (= the thief) was running away.

(70) The perception construction: (Kim, 2009, ex. 2, p. 346)
John-un [[totwuk-i tomangka-n]-un kes]-ul po-ess-ta. 
J.-TOP [[[thief-NOM run.away-IMPRF]-REL KES]-ACC see-PST-DECL
John saw the event of the thief running away.

Appendix C.6. Basque

Basque does not allow PRs. (We are grateful to Larraitz Zubeldia for providing these data and judgments)

(71) Gitarra jo-tzen ari zen Jon ikus-i d-u-t 
guitar.det.sg play-ipv prog 3sg.abs.pst.comp Jon see-pfv 3sg.abs.prs-have-1sg.erg
I saw John that plays guitar (RC only)

The translation given to (71) by my Basque informant is the following: “of all the Jon I know, I saw the one that plays guitar. The PR meaning can be expressed with the following sentence:

(72) Jon gitarra jotzen ari ze la ikusi-d u-t 
Jon guitar.det.sg play-ipv prog 3sg.abs.pst.comp see-pfv 3sg.abs.prs-have-1sg.erg
I saw that Jon was playing the guitar I saw John playing the guitar / while he was playing the guitar
Appendix C.7. Chinese

Given that DE-modifiers can be freely constructed with proper names (73), one might suppose that they are akin to PRs.

(73) Mouren kaiqiang dasi-le zhanzai yangtaishang-de Xiaoming-de puren.
Someone shoot dead-ed standing on the balcony DE Xiaoming’s servant.
Someone shot the servant of [Xiaoming who was standing on the balcony].

However, a more in-depth analysis based on a thorough comparison between DE-modifiers and post nominal Small Clauses shows that the former cannot be treated as PRs.

i. DE-modifiers are incompatible with an event reading, while genuine SCs can have eventive/propositional contents (also in Chinese).
ii. DE-modifiers allow for temporal mismatch between the event described in the matrix sentence and the event described in the embedded clause, which genuine SCs, also in Chinese do not;
iii. De-modifiers are available with both subjects and objects, while genuine SCs in Chinese can only be construed with subjects.
iv. DE-modifiers are not bound by any aspectual restrictions, while post-nominal SCs are subjected to the same restrictions found in PRs.

As mentioned above, using an inanimate pronominal (or a definite description that clearly refers to an eventuality) to refer to the content of PRs and Scs (of the Acc-ing type) is a good diagnostics to establish its status (74).

(74) a. Ciò che ho visto è Gianni che correva
What I saw is Gianni that was running
b. What I saw is John running

DE-modifiers (75-a,b), contrary to post-nominal SCs in Chinese (75-c), however, cannot be made to co-refer to eventive NPs, which shows that they cannot be interpreted as events.

(75) a. *wo kanjian de shiqing shi zhanzai yangtaishang de Xiaoming.
I saw DE event DE is standing on the balcony DE Xiaoming.
The event I saw is Xiaoming standing on the balcony.
b. *wo kanjian de shiqing shi zai paobu de Xiaoming.
I saw DE event DE is -ing run DE Xiaoming
What I saw is Xiaoming running
c. wo kanjian de shiqing shi Xiaoming zai paobu
I saw DE event Xiaoming is -ing run
The event I saw is Xiaoming running

Conversely, as (76) shows, post-nominal SCs can only refer to eventualities and not to entities. As the glosses show, the same is true of English Acc-ing constructions:

(76) *Wo kanjian de ren shi Xiaoming zai paobu.
I saw DE the person is Xiaoming ing run.
*The person I saw is Xiaoming running.

We are grateful to Shuyin Zhang for her extensive help with grammaticality judgements on the materials presented in this section.
The claim that DE-modifiers are not at all like PRs is further supported by the lack of constraints on their temporal properties. While the event denoted by PRs has to develop within the same temporal interval of the matrix event, a temporal mismatch is perfectly available with DE-modifiers (77).

(77) (zuotian) mouren kanjian-le [(mingtian) yao zhanzai yangtaishang-de] Xiaoming.
    yesterday someone saw [tomorrow] will standing on the balcony-DE Xiaoming
    Yesterday someone saw the Xiaoming who is going to stand on the balcony tomorrow.

Temporal mismatch, however, is not allowed with post-nominal SCs:

(78) *Wo (zuotian) kanjian de shiqing shi Xiaoming (jintian) zai paobu.
    I (yesterday) saw DE event is Xiaoming (today) ing run.
    *The event I saw yesterday is Xiaoming running today.

Contrary to PRs, DE-modifiers can be construed with both subjects and objects of the embedded clause (79-a,b). Post-nominal SCs, on the other hand, behave just like PRs and can only appear with subjects (79-c,d).

(79) a. wo kanjian qinguo ngehai de nge nanhai
    I saw kissed girl DE boy
    I saw the boy that kissed the girl
b. wo kanjian nage nanhai qinguo de ngehai
    I saw boy kissed DE girl
    I saw the girl that the boy kissed.
c. wo kanjian Mary zaiqin Xiaoming
    I saw Mary -ing kiss Xiaoming
    I saw Mary kissing Xiaoming
d. *wo kanjian Mary Xiaoqing zai qin.
    I saw Mary Xiaoqing -ing kiss
    *I saw Mary Xiaoqing kissing.

Finally, aspectual restrictions typically found with PRs are observed with post-nominal SCs (80-c,d) but not DE-modifiers (80-a,b):

(80) a. wo kanjian zai paobu de Xiaoming.
    I saw ing run DE Xiaoming.
    I saw Xiaoming who is running
b. wo kanjian hui yingyu de Xiaoming
    I saw knows English DE Xiaoming
    I saw Xiaoming who knows English
c. wo kanjian Xiaoming zai paobu.
    I saw Xiaoming -ing run
    I saw Xiaoming running.
d. *wo kanjian Xiaoming zai hui yingyu.
    I saw Xiaoming -ing know English
    *I saw Xiaoming knowing English.

(80) shows that while pronominal DE-modifiers can be freely used with both eventive and stative predicates, post-nominal SCs (just like PRs and Acc-ing constructions) are completely unacceptable with stative predicates (e.g. to know English).

Defining the exact properties of DE-modifiers is beyond the scope of this paper, it suffices here to demonstrate that these constructions share a number of essential properties with RCs and are very unlike PRs.
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Appendix C.8. Romanian

Romanian clearly does not allow PRs (Thanks to Anca Sevcenco for providing these judgments): There is no SC reading for (81), only the restrictive relative reading is allowed:

(81) Ion a văzut fata care alerga.
    Ion has seen girl.the who was running
    Ion saw the girl that was running

Romanian seems to behave like English in that to obtain the SC reading, the verb in the subordinate must be changed into a gerunziu / gerundive (non-predicative mood):

(82) Ion a văzut fata alergind.
    Ion has seen girl.the running-GERUNZIU
    Ion saw the girl running.