1 Outline

Pseudo-relatives (PRs) are finite constructions found in many Romance languages (1) that look superficially like relative clauses, but describe events giving rise to direct perception reports.

(1) a. Ho visto Gianni /l’uomo che correva.
   I have seen G. /the man that run.IMPF
   ‘I saw G. /the man running.’

b. Vedo Gianni /l’uomo che corre.
   I see G. /the man that run.PRES.
   ‘I see G. /the man running.’

The PR typically requires that the matrix and embedded tense match and indeed this was thought to be obligatory (Radford 1975 a.o.). IMPF = imperfective = past imperfective (Schwarze 1974, Radford 1975, Guasti 1988, Kayne 1975, etc.)

(2) Tutti vedero Gianni che correva/*corre.
    All see.PAST G. that run.IMPF/run.PRES.
    ‘Everyone saw seen G. running.’

Here we are concerned with an apparent case of mismatch: present under perfect (3), that also deliver a direct perception interpretation (see Casalicchio 2013 p.31 for other cases of mismatch).

(3) Tutti hanno visto Gianni che correva/corre.
    All have seen G. that run.IMPF/run.PRES.
    ‘Everyone saw seen G. running.’

Today’s Talk:
- T-match PRs deliver direct perception (as opposed to indirect perception, as finite clauses typically do) because they are referential descriptions of events
  - We will capture the intuition that the mismatch cases somehow involve a generic/habitual, but nonetheless may serve as objects of episodic direct perception
  - Various differences in scope and interpretation are accounted for
  - DP-account explains Cross-linguistic availability of kind-denoting PRs.
2 PR Basics

PRs: DP subjects, followed by C introducing finite clauses with a subject gap: [DPs C[TP e ...]]

(4) a. Maria ha visto Gianni che correva.
   M. has seen G. that run.past.impf
   ‘M. saw G. running.’

b. *Mary saw John that was running. (English)


PRs are constituents that denote events/situations, not individuals

(5) Ciò che ho visto è Maria che piangeva.
   That which I have seen is Maria that cry.impf
   ‘What I saw was Maria crying’ (after Radford 1977: 160(98))

Sidenote: In some languages, PRs have another non-constituent parse (Cinque 1992).
This talk is about the constituent parse:

Constituent PR (this talk) VP adjunct PR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>PR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>visto</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>C’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gianni</td>
<td>che correva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visto</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gianni</td>
<td>che correva</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRs are DPs: Like DPs, PRs can complement prepositions, unlike finite CPs/infinitives:

(6) a. La vista [pp di [PR Carlo che balla il tango]] è da non perdere.
   The sight of Carlo that dance.pres the tango is to not miss
   ‘The sight of Carlo dancing the tango is not to be missed’ (Cinque 1992: (35b))

b. La storia (*di) che Gianni ha sconfitto il drago non è vera
   The story of that G. has defies the dragon not is true.
   ‘The story that G. defies the dragon is not true.’

c. *La vista di Carlo ballare ...
   The sight of C. dance.inf...
   ‘The sight of C. dancing’

PRs can coordinate with other DPs that denote individual events

(7) Ciò che non vorrei mai vedere è [PR Gianni che balla] e [DPl’evento di
   That which neg I.would.want never to.see is G. that dances and the’event of
   cui mi parlavi ].
   which to.me you.spoke.
   ‘What I would never want to see is G. dancing and the event you told me about.’
Semantic evidence for D analysis

PRs do not denote propositions: they are not available under propositional attitude verbs. Standard finite CPs are possible in all these cases:

(8) Gianni ha sostenuto/intuito/dedotto che Maria correva / *Maria che correva.
    Gianni has claimed/guessed/deduced that M. ran / M. that ran.
    ‘Gianni claimed/guessed/deduced that M. ran / M. running.’

With respect to intensionality, PRs behave like infinitives not standard finite CPs:

(9) Lea ha visto che Gianni piangeva, . . . ma ha pensato ridesse.
    Lea has seen that G. cry.IMPF, . . . but has thought laugh.SUBJ.
    ‘Lea saw that Gianni was crying, but she thought he was laughing.

(10) Lea ha visto Gianni piangere / che piangeva . . . ma ha pensato che ridesse.
    Lea has seen Gianni cry.INF / that cry.IMPF . . . but has thought that laugh.SUBJ.
    ‘Lea saw Gianni cry / crying . . . but she thought he was laughing.’

Diagnosis: Barwise (1981): direct perception verbs describe relations between perceivers and individual situations, whereas indirect perception describes relations between perceiver s and propositions, a set of possible situations (Kratzer 1989).

Referential Properties of PRs Higginbotham (1983) establishes that bare infinitival complements of direct perception are existentially quantified situation descriptions (11a):

(11) a. John saw Mary depart. ⇝ ∃s, s is a departure by Mary
    b. John saw Mary’s departure ⇝ the s, s is a departure by Mary

Infinitives can scopally interact with negation: Neg > ∃

(12) Gianni non ha visto Maria partire.
    G. has neg seen Mary depart.
    ‘John didn’t see Mary depart.’

Unlike infinitives, PRs are referential, carrying an existence commitment under negation.

(13) Dato che Lea non ha mai ballato, Max non ha visto L. ballare / #che ballava.
    Given that L. neg has never danced, M. neg has seen L. dance / L. that danced
    ‘Since L. has never danced, M. has never seen L. dance / dancing the tango.’

Greek PRs contrast with Greek na-clauses in the same way. (Giorgos Spathas, p.c.)

(14) Opote, kanis den ton idhe na xorevi / #pu xoreve sto parti
    therefore nobody not him saw subj dance / that dance.PAST.IMPF at the party
    ‘Therefore, no one saw him dance / dancing at the party.’

Spanish: same contrast between PRs and infinitives (Menéndez-Benito, p.c.):

(15) Juan no vio a Lea bailar / #que bailaba, porque Lea no bailó.
    J. neg saw obj L. dance.INF / that dance.IMPF, because L. neg danced.
    ‘Juan didn’t see Lea dance / dancing, because she didn’t dance.’

Dutch: Existential entailment for PRs, but not for infinitives (Neeleman & van de Koot p.c.):

(16) Context: John never stole anything in his life,
    Daarom zag niemand Jan ooit stelen / Jan die stal.
    Therefore saw no-one J. ever steal / J. that steals.
    ‘Therefore nobody saw J. steal / stealing.’
PRs: No interaction with QPs Infinitives can scope under the universal, giving rise to multiple events reading (17a). PRs in the same context strongly resist a distributive interpretation (17b).

(17) a. Tutti hanno visto Maria ballare. \( \forall > \exists \) multiple events of dancing
   All have seen M. dance.INF
   ‘Every one saw M. dance.’
   b. Tutti hanno visto Maria che ballava. single event of dancing
   All have seen Mary that danceIMP.
   ‘Every one saw M. dancing.’

Similar cumulative/distributive differences are found with numeral inside the PR:

(18) a. Tutti abbiamo visto 3 orsi scappare. DISTRIBUTIVE / CUMULATIVE
   All we have seen 3 bears run.away.INF.
   ‘We all saw 3 bears run away’.
   b. Tutti abbiamo visto 3 orsi che scappavano. CUMULATIVE / *DISTRIBUTIVE
   All we have seen 3 bears that run.away.IMP.
   ‘We all saw 3 bears run/running away’.

Conditionals PRs in if-clauses (19b) presuppose the event exists, not so infinitives (19a).

(19) Se Maria avesse visto Gianni ballare /che ballava si sarebbe arrabbiata.
    If M. hadCOND seen G. dance/that danced si be get.angry.
    ‘If M. had seen G. dance/dancing she would have got angry.’

The infinitive allows the continuation: “but fortunately G. never danced and never will.” The PR does not, i.e. the existence of a dancing event is presupposed.

Analysis
PRs give rise to direct perception because they denote individual situations (not propositions). The clause-taking D\( _C \) is responsible for PRs being referential descriptions of situations:

\[
\text{DP \ argument}
\]
\[
\text{DC \ 0 \ THE}
\]
\[
\text{DP}_S \quad \text{CP \ predicate of situations}
\]
\[
\text{C' \ predicate of situations & individuals}
\]
\[
\text{Maria \ che \ Op_1,2 \ C \ PRO_1 \ s_2 \ ballava}
\]

C binds a situation argument and the subject position, creating a two place predicate (like a control of both the situation argument in T and the subject, Ippolito 1999).

Summary:
• PRs: referential descriptions of events
• Infinitives: property of events
4 T-mismatch PRs denote Kinds

In general, the tense of the PR must ‘match’ the matrix:

(21) a. Gianni vide Maria che ballava.
    G. saw.PERF M. that dance.IMPF.
    ‘G. saw M. dancing.’

b. *Gianni vide Maria che balla.
    G. saw.PERF M. that dance.PRES.
    ‘G. saw M. dancing.’

However, when the matrix clause is Present Perfect, **Mismatch** is possible, allowing present PRs.¹

In that case, only generic spatial/temporal modifiers are allowed (giving rise to subkinds).

(22) Gianni ha visto Maria che balla (al parco/ *Giovedì scorso).
    G. has seen M. that dances (at the park/ Thursday last.
    ‘G. has seen Mary dancing (at the park/ last Thursday’.

(22) and (22b) both report a past direct perception of one event of Mary dancing but (22) additionally implies a habitual interpretation of the the embedded clause.

**But this is no ordinary embedded habitual:** These PRs are also DPs:

(23) Ciò che ho visto sono [DP le danze Turche] e [DP Lea che balla].
    What that I have seen are [ dances Turkish] and [ L. that dances].
    ‘What I have seen is this Turkish dances and Lea dancing.’

And most importantly, these PRs take scope under negation unlike the match cases.

(24) Max non ha mai visto Lea che balla il tango. ¬∃x∃y¬
    M. NEG has never seen L. that dance.PRES the tango.
    ‘M. never saw L. dance the tango / dancing the tango.’

**How can a habitual sentence serve as the object of direct perception?**

• The events involved should be too many (Ferreira 2005) or the situations too big (Kratzer 1989) to serve as the object of a (singular) direct perception event.

**Enter Kinds and Experiential Perfect**

We believe the contrast between (22) and (21b) is related to the following contrast with ordinary definite DPs: the object in (25a) is more easily interpreted as kind-denoting under present-perfect than passato remoto (25b), where it gets a token interpretation.

(25) a. Gianni ha visto **la foca**. b. Gianni vide **la foca**
    G. has seen.EXP.PERF the seal. G. saw.SP the seal.
    ‘G. is a guy who has seen seals’ (=TYPE) ‘G. saw the seal’ (=TOKEN)

Experiential Perfect (EXP.PERF) promotes kind readings for DP objects; Simple Past (SP) only allows a token interpretation (see Carlson 1977:446 (122)).

Similarly, the present perfect is crucial for allowing a kind PR. The reason is due to a more general fact about experiential perfects (Comrie 1976); they allow kind-denoting definite DPs to be objects of token-taken verbs (22). Simple past (21b) resists this.

¹Note that this is **not a universal perfect**, so the possibility of a Present-tense PR isn’t something to due with the event time reaching into the present.
Matrix Tense/Aspect | PR interpretation | Def. NP interpretation
--- | --- | ---
SP | Episodic PR | Token
EXP. PERFECT | Habitual/kind PR | Kind or Token (PRES) or Episodic PR (IMPF)

Preview of proposal:
- T-mismatch PRs denote Kinds
  - habituals describe plural events (Ferreira 2005)
  - Chierchia’s nom ∩ operator combines with this to deliver an event kind
- token-taking verbs (see) involve Derived Kind Predication (Carlson 1977, Chierchia 1998)
- this derives contrasting scope properties of T-match & T-mismatch PRs under see.

4.1 Evidence for kind-like behaviour of Mismatch PRs

Event-kind/situation type treatment of PRs under sopportare
Many kind-taking predicates also take present PRs (sopportare-class PRs, common)

(26) a. Non sopporto Gianni che fuma in casa mia.
    NEG stand G. that smokes in house mine.
    ‘I can’t stand G. smoking in my house.’

b. Non sopporto questo tipo di situazione.
    NEG stand this type of situation.
    ‘I can’t stand this type of situation.’

(27) Maria che balla è piuttosto comune.
    M. that dances is rather common.
    ‘Mary dancing is rather common.’

(28) Maria che balla è ovunque.
    M. that dances is everywhere.
    ‘Mary dancing is everywhere.’
    ∼ different instances of the kind ‘Mary dancing’ are in all relevant places (e.g. on every TV channel there’s a different event of Mary dancing)

4.2 T-mismatch under perception, in detail

When a T-mismatch PR meets a verb like see, which takes individual event tokens (not kinds, and certainly not habitual/generic propositions!), it nonetheless passes diagnostics for kind-hood. (While at the same time asserting perception of an instance of the kind.)

Ban on Spatial/Temporal modifiers. Spatial and Temporal modifiers are banned with Pres-PRs. As with other types of event kinds, these can only be interpreted as creating event sub-kinds. This however is not possible when a specific date is mentioned (e.g. last Thursday in (29))

(29) a. Ho visto Maria che ballava al parco giovedì scorso.
    I have seen M. that dance.IMPf at.the park Thursday last.
    ‘I all saw M. dancing at the park last Thursday’.

b. *Ho visto Maria che balla al parco giovedì scorso.
    I have seen M. that dance.PRES at.the park Thursday last.
    ‘I saw M. dancing at the park last Thursday’.
Limited capacity to establish a discourse referent While Past-PRs can establish a discourse referent for the event, (30a), Pres-PRs cannot (30b):

(30) a. Tutti abbiamo visto M. che ballava₁, *pro₁ è stato uno spettacolo.
    All we have seen M. that dance.impf, it is been a sight.
    ‘We all saw M. dancing, it was quite a sight.’

b. Tutti abbiamo visto Maria che ballava₁, *pro₁ è stato uno spettacolo.
    All we have seen M. that dance.pres, *pro is been a sight.
    ‘We all saw M. dancing, it was quite a sight.’

Similarly, reference to the bears with ‘they were grizzly’ is only allowed in the matching version:

(31) a. Tutti abbiamo visto 3 orsi₁ che scappavano (pro₁ erano grizzly).
    All we have seen 3 bears that run.away.impf (they were grizzly).
    ‘We all saw 3 bears running away (they were grizzly)’.

b. Tutti abbiamo visto 3 orsi₁ che scappano (*pro₁ erano grizzly).
    All we have seen 3 bears that run.away.pres (they were grizzly).
    ‘We all saw 3 bears run away (some time or other) (they were grizzly)’.

Bare plural /weak definites inside
Our account also explains why bare plural count nouns in internal argument position of Pres-PRs, but not Past-PRs, display properties of Pseudo-Incorporated nouns in disallowing referential NP (32b). (32c) only allows event-subkind or weak interpretations of definites.

(32) a. Ho visto Gianni che mangiava due caramelle che avevo messo sul tavolo.
    I have seen G. that eat.impf two candies that I had put on the table.
    ‘I saw G. eating two candies that I had put on the table’.

b. *Ho visto Gianni che mangia due caramelle che avevo messo sul tavolo.
    I have seen G. that eat.pres two candies that I had put on the table.
    ‘I saw G. eating two candies that I had put on the table’.

c. Ho visto Gianni che mangia caramelle /la foca.
    I have seen G. that eat.pres candies /the seal.
    ‘I saw G. eating candies /the seal’.  

Kind Anaphora in Italian and Pres-PRs As Anderson & Morzycki (to appear) discovered of kind anaphora, Italian kind anaphora ‘così’ (33a-c) is only allowed with Pres-PRs (34):

(33) a. KIND  
    Un cane così.
    ‘Such a dog’.

b. MANNER  
    Si comporta così.
    ‘He behaves such’.

c. DEGREE  
    Alto così.
    ‘Such tall’.

(34) a. Una ragazza che corre, tutti abbiamo visto una cosa così.
    A girl that runs, all we have seen a thing so.
    ‘A girl running, we all saw something like this’.

b. *Una ragazza che correva, tutti abbiamo visto una cosa così.
    A girl that run.impf, all we have seen a thing so.
    ‘A girl running, we all saw this kind of thing’.
4.3 Kinds and PRs

Chierchia’s nom operator $\cap$ produces kind-denoting individuals (type $e$) from properties of pluralities.

(35) For any property $P$ and world $w$,
$$\cap P = \lambda w \ i_P w,$$
if:
- $\lambda w \ i_P w$ is in the domain of Kinds $K$;
- $P$ is plural;
- undefined otherwise. (after Chierchia 1998, 16)

(36) Dogs are widespread.
a. dogs = property describing a plurality of dogs
b. $\cap$ dogs = the dog kind
c. widespread($\cap$dogs) = 1 if dog-kind is widespread

Now for Kind PRs:

(37) $[DP D_{kind} [CP \text{ Maria che balla } ]]$ è piuttosto comune.
    M. that dances is rather common.
    ‘Mary dancing is rather common.’

T-mismatch/Kind PRs contain habituals, and these describe a plurality of events (Ferreira 2005).\(^2\)

(38) $[CP \text{ Maria che balla }]$ = set of plural events of Maria dancing

$\cap P$ returns a name of a kind (type $s$) from properties of pluralities of events.
Assume: $[D_{kind}] = \lambda P. \cap P$

(39) $[DP D_{kind} [CP \text{ Maria che balla } ]] = \cap (\text{Maria che balla}) = \text{the kind associated with an event of Maria dancing}$

(40) comune($\cap (\text{Maria che balla})) = \text{The kind that is Maria dancing is common}$

4.4 PRs and DKP

When token-taking verbs meet kind-denoting elements (as in (41)), verbs must shift by DKP (42):

(41) [pointing at a picture of a lion in a zoology book] I saw that in the zoo
    (Chierchia 1997, ex. 18).

(42) Derived Kind Predication (DKP):
If $P$ applies to object and $k$ denotes a Kind, then
$$P(k) = \exists x [\cup k(x) & P(x)]$$
$$\cup k = \text{the property describing instantiations of } k$$

Recall the contrast: Pres-PR under Perfect showing that it has kind characteristics (no spatial temporal modifiers):

\(^2\)Ferreira contends that (bare) habituals are headed by definite (plural) determiner. That option seems not to be available to PR complements (if it were, we would expect the sentences above to involve perception of a plurality of events, which they do not). One might also ask why not let verbs that combine with habitual PR just take a property of a plurality of events. We are not sure this captures the meanings, but this requires further work.
(43)  a. Ho visto Maria che balla.
    I have seen M. that dance.pres.
    ‘I saw M. dancing’.

    b. *Ho visto Maria che balla al parco giovedì scorso.
    I have seen M. that dance.pres at the park Thursday last.
    ‘I saw M. dancing at the park last Thursday’.

(44)  \[
\text{see}([DP \cap [CP Maria che balla ]]) (I) = \\
\text{see}([\cap [DP \cap [CP Maria che balla ]]) (x) (I) = \\
\exists s [s \text{ is a (token) event of dancing by Maria } & \text{ see(s)(I)}]
\]

The reason that (43b) is out is because the modifiers attach to a habitual sentence — the token is only derived by DKP. (It’s bad like #Mary dances last Thursday is bad.)

4.5 Predictions of DKP borne out wrt scope

DKP builds an existential quantifier “into the verb”. This will have the same effect in terms of scope as that given for infinitives (see above), i.e. that they will take (low) scope wrt to higher scope bearing elements. This prediction is borne out.³

Obligatory narrow scope/distributive reading.
Recall Moulton & Grillo (2014) show that Past-PRs under perception verbs, but not infinitives, exhibit wide scope behaviour in a variety of environments (e.g. negation). Pres-PRs, on the other hand, readily allow narrow scope and distributive readings in the same environments.

Negation
Past-PRs carry existential entailment under negation, e.g.: Since Lea never danced...

(45)  #Max non ha mai visto Lea che ballava il tango.
      M. neg has never seen L. that dance.impf the tango.
      ‘M. never saw L. dancing the tango.’

Existential entailment seems to disappear with Pres-PRs:

(46)  Max non ha mai visto Lea che balla il tango.
      M. neg has never seen L. that dance.pres the tango.
      ‘M. never saw L. dance the tango / dancing the tango.’

Conditionals
Similarly, the existential entailment observed with Past-PRs under Conditionals disappears with Pres-PRs:

(47)  Se Maria avesse visto Gianni che balla si sarebbe arrabbiata
      If M. hadCOND seen G. that dance.pres si be get.angry.
      ‘If M. had seen G. dancing she would have got angry.’
      “But G. never danced and never will.”

Other Quantifiers
Past-PRs are preferentially interpreted denoting single events under distributive operators (even in adjunct islands), Pres-PRs only allow a multiple events reading in such environments.

³See Appendix for a more exhaustive list of examples.
(48) a. Ogni prof. ha gioito quando ha visto Max che barava all’esame. Every prof. has rejoiced when he saw M. that cheat.IMPF at.the’exam.
‘Every professor rejoiced when he saw M. cheating at the exam.’ single event
b. Ogni prof. ha gioito quando ha visto Max che bara all’esame. Every prof. has rejoiced when he saw M. that cheat.PRES at.the’exam.
‘Every professor rejoiced when he saw M. cheating at the exam.’ Multiple Cheatings obligatory: every professor exulted when he saw a different realization of this type of event.

(49) a. Tutti abbiamo visto 3 orsi che scappavano. All we.have seen 3 bears that run.away.IMPF.
‘We all saw 3 bears running away’.
One event with same bears
b. Tutti abbiamo visto 3 orsi che scappano. All we.have seen 3 bears that run.away.PRES.
‘We all saw 3 bears run away (some time or other)’. multiple events with different bears

Once more, Remote Past in the matrix clause not only bars present tense in the embedded clause, but also completely exclude a multiple event reading:

(50) Tutti vedemmo 3 orsi, che scappavano. All we.see. remote pst M. that dance.IMPF on beach, also the director.
‘We all saw M. dancing on the beach, even the director.’ Strict /?Sloppy

4.6 Sloppy reading in ellipsis

Pres-PRs allow for sloppy reading under ellipsis but Past-PRs do not. This yields the facts in (51), in which the same event of dancing (at same beach) is seen by all of us and the director with Past-PR, but different events /different beaches are allowed with Pres-PR.

(51) a. Tutti abbiamo visto Maria che ballava in spiaggia, anche il direttore. All we.have seen M. that dance.IMPF on beach, also the director.
‘We all saw M. dancing on the beach, even the director.’ Strict /?Sloppy
b. Tutti abbiamo visto Maria che balla in spiaggia, anche il direttore. All we.have seen M. that dances on the beach, also the director.
‘We all saw M. dancing on the beach, even the director.’ Sloppy /*Strict

Notice the similar behaviour (in this and previous tests) of Pres-PRs and other kind-denoting expressions, e.g. Weak Definites (Carlson & Sussman 2005; Aguilar Guevara 2014 and reference cited therein):

(52) Lola went to the hospital and Alice did too (Lola and Alice could have gone to a different hospital)

When past participle is replaced by perfect, the strict/sloppy ambiguity of (52a) disappears and only the strict reading survives:

(53) Tutti vedemmo Maria che ballava in spiaggia, anche il direttore. All we.see.REMOTE.PST M. that dance.IMPF on beach, also the director.
‘We all saw M. dancing on the beach, even the director.’ Strict /*Sloppy
5 Cross-linguistic Variation

We make an interesting cross-linguistic prediction. Contrary to Italian (54a), French, Spanish and Greek allow TM-PRs but not TMM-PRs.

(54) a. Ho visto Maria che balla il tango.
    b. J’ai vu M. qui dançait /*danse le tango.
    c. He visto a Maria que bailaba /*baila el tango.
    d. Evlepa ti Maria pu xoreve tango /*pu xorevei tango.
      I see.past.impf the M. that danced.past.impf tango /that dances.pres tango.
      ‘I saw Mary dancing tango.’

Strikingly, none of these languages allow definite, kind-denoting DPs in PR-licensing environments (e.g. under see), resorting to bare or partitive NPs instead:

(55) a. Ho visto la foca (=token/type)
    b. J’ai vu le phoque (=token/*type) vs. des phoque(s) (=type)
    c. He visto la foca (=token/*type) vs. focas (=type)
    d. Exo dhi tin fokia (=token/*type)/ fokias (=type)

The same pattern is also observed in absolute with constructions. Italian and Spanish contrast very clearly in allowing/disallowing definite DPs to denote kinds in this environment:

(56) a. Con la febbre non si può/dovrebbe uscire.
    b. Con (*la) fiebre, no se puede/debería de salir.
      With the fever neg si can/should to go.out.
      ‘With fever you can’t/shouldn’t go out.’

A parallel (selective) restriction on PRs is observed also in this case:

(57) a. Con Gianni che sta male, non si può/dovrebbe uscire.
    b. Con Juan (*que está) enfermo, no se puede/debería de salir.
      With J. (that is) sick, neg si can/should to go.out.
      ‘With J. sick you can’t/shouldn’t go out.’

Definites can also denote kinds in these languages, but not in these environments (see Espinal & McNally 2010 for verb-type restrictions on kind denoting expressions).

→ If PRs are always headed by determiners, then an explanation for the asymmetry can be readily offered: kind-referring PRs are only allowed in languages that allow a kind interpretation of definite DPs in PR-environments.
6 Conclusion

Habituals can be used in direct perception complements, via $D_{kind}$

- Ds select clauses and return the expected descriptions of situations (expected on Kratzer 1989, 2007 etc.)
- The range of Ds is constrained by Aspect (episodic/habitual) in a manner expected by Ferreira 2005.
- Role of D and verbal inflection can be separated (cf. Ferreira 2005) as both exist in PRs.
- The DP analysis might provide an account for cross-linguistic variation in availability of PR-kinds.
- Languages vary in allowing kind reading of definite DPs under perceptual verbs. This might call for micro-parametrization of Nominal Mapping Parameter (Chierchia 1998)
- All else being equal, only languages allowing kind reading of definite DPs under perceptual verbs should allow Kind-PRs

Acknowledgments
This research was partially funded through the DFG – Leibniz Prize AL 554/8-1 to Artemis Alexiadou.
References


Gehrke, Berit. in press. Adjectival participles, event kind modification and pseudo-incorporation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.


_Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory: Selected Papers from Going Romance 2013_.


Moulton, Keir and Nino Grillo. 2014. Pseudo Relatives: Big but Transparent. _45 North Eastern Linguistic Society_, MIT.


