On the Islandhood of Double Complementizers in Spanish

Julio Villa-García, *University of Connecticut*

Overview. I present novel Spanish facts highly reminiscent of the English *that*-t phenomenon, and argue that they support the rescue-by-PF-deletion analysis of the mitigating effect of ellipsis on island violations (Boeckx & Lasnik 2006; Bošković 2011; Hornstein *et al.* 2003; Lasnik 2001, Merchant 1999 *et seq.*; a.o.).

Novel observation. As shown in (1), 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; *inter alia*). 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 (cf. 3a) induces a locality problem, which vanishes in the absence of the secondary complementizer (cf. 3b) (see also (4a) for adjunct extraction and (5a) for dislocated phrases moved to the CP across secondary *que*). These cases stand in glaring contrast to single-complementizer constructions (cf. 2a), where the complementizer does not block extraction of the moving element.

Major claims. We argue that **i)** movement across secondary *que* yields a locality-of-movement violation (be it long-distance extraction, as in (3a)/(4a), or movement of the dislocate to the CP, as in (5a)); **ii)** PF-deletion of secondary *que* removes the locality violation caused by movement across it; and **iii)** left-dislocated phrases can be base-generated (i.e. 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. 6), 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 *that*-t effect (cf. 7a) can be handled uniformly. Following the majority of the literature on COMP-t effects, Bošković attributes the contrast between (7a) and (7b) to locality of movement, noting that the complementizer is crucially implicated in the violation. We argue that in Spanish, the trouble-maker is the secondary complementizer *que*, as illustrated by the contrast between (3a) and (3b). Unlike in English, where only local A'-subject extraction is problematic (cf. 7a), in Spanish all movements across secondary *que* are illicit. In the paper we 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 (cf. 8b), which in English only holds for local subjects (cf. 8a). For expository reasons, we focus on the sentences in (3) and (5), whose (simplified) derivations are provided in (9) and (10), respectively. Drawing on Bošković (2011), we propose that when a moving phrase crosses secondary *que,* the offending complementizer is *-marked *à la* Chomsky (1972), as in (9a,b) and (10a,b). If *que** survives into PF, a locality violation occurs (cf. 9a/10a), since the presence of * in the final PF representation triggers a violation (cf. i). Yet, if deletion of *que** (cf. ii) is effected in PF (see Chomsky & Lasnik 1977), the violation is circumvented (cf. 9b/10b), which explains why movement is possible if secondary *que* is absent, as in (3b), (4b), and (5b). Note 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 (1977) analysis of optional *that* in English, whereby *that* has been deleted when it does not surface. Regarding (iii), we propose that in recomplementation cases (cf. 1), the dislocated phrase is merged in between *que*s in the left periphery (cf. 10c), which is an option independently available for Spanish dislocation (Martín-González 2002, a.o.). Hence, no locality problem arises in (10c), since there is no movement at all across secondary *que* (i.e. the dislocate is merged in the CP; cf. iii). Thus, dislocates in recomplementation contexts should not exhibit reconstruction effects. This prediction is correct, as indicated by the unavailability of the bound variable interpretation in (5a) (cf. 10c). Conversely, when secondary *que* is absent, reconstruction is possible (cf. 5a). In this case, movement of the dislocate to the CP results in *-marking of secondary *que*, which is then deleted in PF (cf. 10b). In the current system, (3b), (4b), (5b), and (7b) are treated in the same way as Ross's original examples (cf. 6b; i/ii). Moreover, this analysis does not require positing a different syntax for the ungrammatical sentences with secondary *que* (3a) and their grammatical counterparts without secondary *que* (3b). Further, the present account allows for a unification of the analysis of the seemingly unrelated facts presented in (3)/(4) and (5). 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. 11). This prediction is borne out by the Spanish data in (12), which further substantiates the analysis proposed in this paper.

(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. *Cuándo me dijiste que a Eva **que** le iban a operar?*   (✓ matrix construal of *cuándo*; * embedded)
   when cl. said that Eve that cl. were to operate

   b. *Cuándo me dijiste que a Eva la iban a operar?*   (✓ matrix or embedded construal of *cuándo*)
   'When did you tell me Eve was going to get surgery?'

(5) a. *Me contaron que su*i/j coche **que** todo el mundoi lo tiene que dejar aquí* (* bound variable interpretation)
   cl. told that his car that all the world cl. has that leave here

   b. *Me contaron que sui/j coche todo el mundoi lo tiene que dejar aquí*   (✓ both interpretations)
   'They told me that everybody has to leave his car here.'

(6) a.**That he will hire someone is possible, but I will not divulge who(m) that he will hire is possible*
   b. *That he will hire someone is possible, but I will not divulge who(m)* ~~that he will hire is possible~~

(7) a.**Who do you think that won?*   b. *Who do you think won?*

(8) a. *English*: [CP **that** [TP Subj-*wh* [T' …]]] (7a)   b. *Spanish*: [CP **que** [XP … [X' **que** [YP *wh-* [TP…]]]]] (3a)
   ⊗   ⊗

(9) 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)

(10) a. *[CP que [XP su coche **que***…todo el mundo…~~su coche~~]]   (=(5a), * survives into PF: PF violation)
   b. [CP que [XP su coche ~~**que***~~ …todo el mundo…~~su coche~~]]   (=(5b), ✓ var. bound in lower copy of *su coche*)
   c. [CP que [XP su coche **que**…todo el mundo…]]   (=(5a), base-gener. dislocate; no bound reading)

(11) a.**They said that a professor was hired, but I don't recall which professor they said that was hired*
   b. *They said that a professor was hired, but I don't recall which professor* ~~they said that was hired~~

(12) 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.'

Selected references

Bošković, Željko (2011). Rescue by PF deletion, traces as (non-)interveners, and the *that*-t effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42.

Campos, Héctor. (1992). Los bearneses que quequean, ¿y nosotros qué?. *Hispanic Linguistics* 4.

Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. (1977). Filters and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11.

Demonte, Violeta, and Olga Fdez.-Soriano. 2009. Force and finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system. *Probus* 21.

Ross, John Robert (1969). Guess who? *Chicago Linguistics Society 5*.