

On COMP-t Effects in Spanish: A New Argument for Rescue by PF Deletion

Julio Villa-García, *University of Connecticut*

Overview. In this paper I present new Spanish facts which are highly reminiscent of the English *that-t* phenomenon, and argue that they provide novel support for a system where an aspect of locality is PF-based, namely the rescue-by-PF-deletion analysis of the mitigating effect of ellipsis on island violations (Boeckx & Lasnik 2006; Bošković 2011; Fox & Lasnik 2003; Hornstein *et al.* 2003; Lasnik 2001; Merchant 1999 *et seq.*; Park 2005; among many others).

Novel observation. As shown in (1), left-dislocated phrases in spoken Iberian Spanish may be sandwiched between overt complementizers in embedded clauses (cf. “recomplementation”) (Campos 1992; Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2009; Fontana 1993; López 2009; Uriagereka 1988, 1995; a.o.). It is well known that Romance null-subject languages like Spanish are insensitive to the COMP-t effect (cf. 2a). Nevertheless, it has so far gone unnoticed that in double-complementizer configurations in Spanish (cf. 1), movement across the secondary complementizer induces a locality problem (cf. 3a), which vanishes in the absence of the secondary complementizer (cf. 3b) (see also (4a) for dislocated phrases moved to the CP across secondary *que*). Cases like (3a) stand in glaring contrast to single-complementizer constructions, where the complementizer does not block extraction of the moving element (cf. 2a).

Major claims. I argue that **i)** movement across secondary *que* yields a locality-of-movement violation (be it long-distance extraction, as in (3a), or movement of the dislocate to the CP, as in (4a)); **ii)** PF-deletion of secondary *que* removes the locality violation caused by movement across it; and **iii)** left-dislocated phrases can be merged in, or moved to the CP domain/left periphery.

Analysis and predictions. Ross (1969) observed that ellipsis mitigates the effect of island violations (cf. 5), which gave rise to the repair-by-PF-deletion analysis of the amelioration of locality violations under ellipsis. Within this line of research, Bošković (2011) shows that if Ross’s ellipsis operation is extended to the deletion of copies and offending elements, recalcitrant problems such as the notorious English *that-t* effect (cf. 6a) can be handled uniformly. Following the majority of the literature on COMP-t effects, Bošković attributes the contrast between (6a) and (6b) to locality of movement, noting that the complementizer is crucially implicated in the violation. I argue that in Spanish, the trouble-maker is the secondary complementizer *que*, as illustrated by the contrast between (3a) and (3b) (see also the ungrammatical reading of (4a)). Unlike in English, where only local \bar{A} -subject extraction is problematic (cf. 6a), in Spanish all movements across secondary *que* are illicit. In the paper I provide an account of the difference, the basic idea being that in Spanish only elements that are very close to secondary *que* prior to crossing it are affected by it, which in English only holds for local subjects. The (simplified) derivations of the sentences in (3) and (4) are provided in (7) and (8), respectively. Drawing on Bošković (2011), I propose that when a moving phrase crosses secondary *que*, the offending complementizer is *-marked *à la* Chomsky (1972), as in (7a,b) and (8a,b). If *que** survives into PF, a locality violation occurs (cf. 7a/8a), since the presence of * in the final PF representation triggers a violation (cf. i). Yet, if deletion of *que** occurs in PF (cf. ii) (see Chomsky & Lasnik 1977), the violation is circumvented (cf. 7b/8b), which explains why movement is possible if secondary *que* is absent, as in (3b) and (4b). It should be noted that unlike the higher *que*, whose deletion is highly restricted in Iberian Spanish (cf. 2b) (Torrego 1983, a.o.), secondary *que*, which is optional, can be deleted in PF, as in Chomsky & Lasnik’s analysis of optional *that* in English, whereby *that* has been deleted when it does not surface. Regarding (iii), I argue that in recomplementation cases (cf. 1), the dislocated phrase is merged in between *ques* in the left periphery (cf. 8c), which is an option independently available for Spanish dislocation (Martín-González 2002, a.o.). Hence, no locality problem arises in (8c),

since there is no movement at all across secondary *que* (i.e. the dislocate is base-generated in the CP; cf. iii). If this analysis is on the right track, dislocates in recomplementation contexts should not exhibit reconstruction effects. This prediction is correct, as indicated by the unavailability of the bound variable interpretation in (4a) (cf. 8c). Conversely, when secondary *que* is absent, reconstruction of the dislocate is possible (cf. 4b). In this case, movement of the dislocate to the CP across secondary *que* results in *-marking of secondary *que*, which is then deleted in PF (cf. 8b). Under the current system, (3b), (4b), and (6b) are treated in the same way as Ross's original examples (cf. 5b; i/ii). Moreover, this analysis does not require positing a different syntax for the ungrammatical sentences with secondary *que* (cf. 3a) and their grammatical counterparts without secondary *que* (cf. 3b). Further, the present account allows for a unification of the analysis of the seemingly unrelated facts presented in (3) and (4). Lastly, it is important to note that the overall approach pursued in this paper predicts secondary *que* locality violations to be rescued by ellipsis, much like ellipsis remediates *that-t* effect violations in English (Merchant 2001) (cf. 9). This prediction is borne out by the data in (10), which substantiates the analysis proposed here.

-
- (1) a. *Dijo que cuando lleguen (que) me llaman*
 said that when arrive that cl. call
 'S/he told me they'll call me when they arrive.'
 b. *Me dijo que a mi prima (que) la echaron*
 cl. said that my cousin that cl. threw
 'S/he said my cousin was fired.'
- (2) a. *Quién crees que ganó?*
 who believe that won
 'Who do you think won?'
 b. **Quién crees ganó?*
 who believes won
- (3) a. **Quién me dijiste que a tu madre que la iba a llamar?*
 who cl. said that your mother that cl. was to call
 b. *Quién me dijiste que a tu madre la iba a llamar?*
 'Who did you say was going to call your mom?'
- (4) a. *Me contaron que su_{i,j} coche que todo el mundo_i lo tiene que dejar aquí* (* bound variable interpret.)
 cl. told that his car that all the world cl. has that leave here
 b. *Me contaron que su_{i,j} coche todo el mundo_i lo tiene que dejar aquí* (✓ both interpretations)
 'They told me that everybody has to leave his car here.'
- (5) a. **That he will hire someone is possible, but I will not divulge who that he will hire is possible*
 b. *That he will hire someone is possible, but I will not divulge who ~~that he will hire is possible~~*
- (6) a. **Who do you think that won?*
 b. *Who do you think won?*
- (7) a. **Quién...[CP que [XP...que*...quién]]* (= (3a), * survives into PF: PF violation)
 b. *Quién...[CP que [XP...que*...quién]]* (= (3b), *que** deleted in PF: derivation salvaged)
- (8) a. **[CP que [XP su coche que*...todo el mundo...su coche]]* (= (4a), * survives into PF: PF violation)
 b. *[CP que [XP su coche que*...todo el mundo...su coche]]* (= (4b), ✓ var. bound in lower copy of *su coche*)
 c. *[CP que [XP su coche que...todo el mundo...]]* (= (4a), base-gener. dislocate; no bound reading)
- (9) a. **They said that a professor was hired, but I won't reveal which professor they said that was hired*
 b. *They said that a professor was hired, but I won't reveal which professor ~~they said that was hired~~*
- (10) a. **Me dijo Marta que a tu madre que le habían regalado flores, pero no te voy a decir*
 cl. said Martha that to your mother that cl. had given flowers, but not cl. go to say
quién me dijo Marta que a tu madre que le había regalado flores
 who cl. said Martha that to your mother that cl. had given flowers
 b. *Me dijo Marta que a tu madre que le habían regalado flores, pero no te voy a decir quién me*
~~*dijo Marta que a tu madre que le había regalado flores*~~
 'Martha told me that somebody gave your mother flowers, but I won't tell you who.'