"Adding projections and making connections":
Deconstructing the embedded CP through a study of DAT. *[gustar / encantar] (eso/lo de) que*

Sophie Harrington – *University of Toronto*

When it comes to clausal embedding, numerous questions remain unanswered. Of these questions, perhaps the most intriguing is why mood alternation occurs in finite complements in Romance languages – in particular, Spanish. Much work has been done on subjunctive complements and their various restrictions relating to: (1a) subject obviation, whereby the matrix and embedded subject cannot co-refer; (2a) sequence of tense, given that the tense of subjunctive clauses appears almost "parasitic" on that of the matrix (Gallego 2015); and (3) Neg-raising, where the licensing of embedded NPIs and constituents suggests that matrix negation originates in the complement and is somehow able to traverse the clause boundary. By contrast, the indicative clauses in (1b) and (2b4) show no such restrictions in relation to subject co-reference and sequence of tense, moreover like Neg-raising 3.

Given the examples (1-3), prior scholarship has analysed embedded subjunctive clauses as closely tied to their superordinate matrix, and truly dependent. Indicative complements, on the other hand, appear matrix-like. This is linked to the notion that embedded indicative clauses have been observed to behave like nominals, and are predicated on a null DP (4), which may be inferred by the grammaticality of inserting the constituent (*lo / eso*) *de que* (5). Harrington (HLS 2018) recently provided robust quantitative evidence in support of this null DP analysis by demonstrating an association between the inclusion of *de* prior to the complementiser and the appearance of indicative in the embedded clause in 10351 written web tokens of *no [dudar] que*. Nevertheless, in general, quantitative research backing up these claims is lacking – an omission that the current investigation will seek to remedy by examining the mood of the complement and the non-standard insertion of *eso de* and *lo de* prior to the complementiser with the two psychological predicates *gustar* ('to like') and *encantar* ('to love'). The hypothesis is that, when *(eso / lo) de* is present, the frequency of indicative complements should be higher, despite both predicates traditionally only being associated with subjunctive in the embedded clause. This would add weight to the existence of a null DP, which facilitates an appositive interpretation whereby the indicative complement is both syntactically and semantically independent to the matrix, rather than subordinate to it.

Method and Results: An automated corpus search was carried out using the Corpus del Español's (Davies 2018, 2016) Web/Dialects and NOW corpora on the strings DAT. *[gustar] (eso de / lo de) que* and DAT. *[encantar] (eso de / lo de) que* to see whether there exists an association between the presence of *(eso / lo) de* and the mood of the complement. The results bore out the hypothesis in that, despite the assumption that *gustar* and *encantar* invariably select for a subjunctive complement, the matrices with *(eso / lo) de* had a markedly higher incidence of unexpected indicative complements (Table 1), with a chi-square statistic of 246.87 and a p-value of less than .001 (significant at p < .05).

Table 1: Mood of the complement of *[gustar/encantar] que* according to presence of *(eso / lo) de*

	IND	SBJV	TOTALS
DAT. *[gustar / encantar] que*	246 (6%)	3599 (94%)	3845
DAT. *[gustar / encantar] (eso de / lo de) que*	88 (34%)	171 (66%)	259
	334	3770	4104

Discussion: The results in Table 1 support the existence of a possible null DP on which indicative complements are predicated, by showing that when an explicit DP is present in the form of *(eso/lo) de*, indicative complements are more likely to appear. This finding also has implications for the ongoing debate as to the fine structure of the embedded CP. The exact nature of this

projection is still under investigation, with further analysis being needed to determine whether the contrast between indicative and subjunctive embedding is better captured in terms of extra layers of structure, or features of the CP. It is possible that the indicative structure resembles that presented in Demonte and Fernández Soriano's (2005) work on *dequeísmo* – the non-standard insertion of *de* prior to the complementiser. In their analysis, *de* is not a Case-marker nor a lexical item, but rather heads its own projection, taking a CP headed by *que* as its complement and, of particular relevance to the study presented here, a null pronoun akin to *lo / eso* as its Spec. Alternatively, this fuller CP layer could be reconciled with the defective C analysis (Gallego 2009; Gallego & Uriagereka 2007), whereby the indicative CP, unlike its subjunctive counterpart, is headed by a fully specified C which presumably confers matrix-like independence and nominal-like opacity.

Examples:

1)   a. *Juan$_i$ quiere   que él$_i$/pro$_i$ vaya
    Juan   want-3SG that he – go-SBJV.3SG
    'Juan wants to go.'   (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2009)
    b. pro$_i$ Te   prometo   que pro$_i$ iré
    –   you promise-1SG that – go-**IND.1SG**
    'I promise you I'll go.'   (Bosque 2012)

2)   a. Platón quiere   que Aristóteles (lea   / *leyera) a   Sócrates]
    Plato   want-PRS that Aristotle   read-PRS.SBJV / -PPSTST.SBJV ACC Socrates
    'Plato wants Aristotle to read Socrates.'   (Torrego & Uriagereka 1993)
    b. A   Juan le   (\parece   / parecía / pque María (viene   / venía   / vino).
    DAT   Juan to-him seem-PRS /-PST   /-PRthat María come-PRS.IND /-PST   PST.IND/-
PRERET.IND
    'It seems / seemed / did seem to Juan that María comes / came / did come.'
(Rivero 1971)

3)   a. (Juan) no$_i$ cree   que (María) t_i sea   inteligente
    (Juan)   not believe-PRS.IND.3SG that (María) - be-PRS.SBJV.3SG intelligent
    'John doesn't think that Mary is intelligent'
(Reider 1990)
    b. No$_i$ le   parecía que t_i (*venía   / viniera)   nunca
    not to-him seemedthat - come-IND come-SBJV never
    '*'It doesn't seem to him/her that he/she ever came.'*   (Rivero 1971)

4)   Platón dice [$_{DP}$ *pro*] [$_{CP}$ que Aristóteles lee   a   Sócrates]
    Plato says   –   that Aristotle   read-PRS.IND ACC Socrates
    'Plato says (that) that Aristotle reads Socrates.'   (Torrego & Uriagereka 1993)

5)   Socrates dijo eso (*en varias ocasiones) de que el filósofo   no sabe   nada.
    Socrates said that   on various occasions of that the philosopher not know-IND nothing
    'Socrates said that (on various occasions) about the philosopher not knowing anything.'
                                  (Torrego & Uriagereka 1993)

References: **Bosque, I.** (2012). Ch 19 Mood: Indicative vs. Subjunctive. *The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics*, *69*, 373. **Davies, M.** (2018, 2016). Corpus del Español. *http://www. corpusdelespanol. org*. **Demonte, V., & Fernández-Soriano, O.** (2009). Force and finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system. *Probus*, *21*(1), 23-49. **Demonte, V., & Fernández Soriano, O.** (2005). Features in comp and syntactic variation: the case of '(de) queísmo' in Spanish. *Lingua, 115*(8), 1063-1082. **Gallego, Á. J.** (2015). Subjunctive dependents in Iberian Romance: A

Reprojection account. *Sintagma: revista de lingüística*, 25-42. **Gallego, Á. J.** (2009). Defective CT in romance. *Probus*, *21*(2), 163-216. **Gallego, Á., & Uriagereka, J.** (2007). Defective C. *Alternatives to Cartography*. **Rivero, M. L.** (1971). Mood and presupposition in Spanish. *Foundations of language*, 305-336. **Reider, M.** (1990). Neg-Transportation, Neg-Trace, and the Choice of Mood in Spanish. *Hispania*, *73*(1), 212-222. **Torrego, E. & J. Uriagereka** (1993). *Indicative dependents*. Unpublished ms, University of Massachusetts and University of Maryland.