PARAMETERS OF DEÍSMO IN ECM STRUCTURES: EVIDENCE FROM ROMANCE

Keywords: ECM, Perception and Causative Structures, deísmo, Passivization, Romance Languages.

1. CLAIM: We argue that so-called "de(que)ísmo" follows from the nominal nature of the CP layer, an option we attribute to the argument-taking strategies that transitive verbs deploy: subordination (hypotaxis) or insubordination (parataxis) (Torrego & Uriagereka 1992, Epstein, Kitahara, Seely 2016, Etxepare 2016, among others). We claim that subordination involves the direct merger of V and a CP, whereas insubordination requires for V to take a nominal projection (or pronoun), which is then indirectly (paratactially) related to a CP. We derive a series of parametric facts involving the presence of P / D in the CP layer in both Romance and English from this distinction.

2. THE BASIC DATA: ECM structures involving causative and perception verbs can be preceded by the preposition "de" in certain varieties of Spanish (e.g., Castilla-La Mancha Spanish, but also Andalusian and other Southern European varieties; cf. Camus 2013, Peinado 2017), as in (1)-(2):

(1) Hice   a   mis amigas [**de** traer   el libro]   (2) Vi [**de** cantar a Marta] (Cas.La-Mancha Spanish)
    made ACC my friends   of bring-inf the book   saw of sing-inf ACC Marta
    'I made my friends bring the book'   'I saw Marta sing'

A similar behaviour is displayed in certain American varieties of Spanish (Ecuador and Perú) with some causative verbs (cf. Montalbetti 1999). Crucially, here the preposition "de" emerges if an otherwise *bona fide* IO is passivized, an option restricted to ECM contexts, like that in (3). Therefore, IOs cannot be passivized in a mono-clausal structure, so *María fue prohibida el libro* (Eng. 'María was prohibited the book') is ruled out.

(3) María fue   prohibida $t_{María}$ [**de** leer   el   libro]   (Peruvian / Ecuadorian Spanish)
    María was prohibited   of read-INF the book
    'María was prohibited to read the book'

Plausibly, the presence of "de" in (3) is related to the English data in (5), where passivization of the ECM subject requires the appearance of "to" as well (cf. Zagona 1988, Lightfoot 1991, Hornstein et al. 2006, Richards 2010, among others). Like in the Peruvian / Ecuadorian case, this element is barred in active cases (see (4)):

(4) John heard/made [her (***to**) hit Fred]   (5) She was heard/made [t_{She} ***(to)** hit Fred]

Although the parallelism between (1)-(2)-(3) and (4)-(5) is blatant, it is unclear how to account for the relevant facts (and their parametric nuances) in a unitary fashion.

3. FURTHER FACTS: Other things being equal, "deísmo "should be related to another puzzle of Spanish: "dequeísmo" (cf. Goméz Torrego 1999). In both cases, "de" introduces a clause with no obvious semantic contribution of its own (*pace* Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2004) and such clauses behave like NPs (distributionally), as Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2004) and Peinado (2017) show in (6) and (7):

(6) [**De** que todas esas niñas se vayan a enfermar] es mucho más difícil   (Dequeísta Spanish)
      of that all   those girls SE go-3sg to get-ill   be much   more difficult
    'It is much more difficult that those girls get ill'

(7) Lo   primero que no permito   a mis hijos es [**de** llegar tarde]   (Deísta Spanish)
    the first   that not allow-1sg to mi sons is of arrive-INF late
    'The first thing I don't allow my sons is to arrive late'

Peinado (2017) further points out (rightly) that deísta dialects are not necessarily dequeísta. However, this does not mean that the ultimate motivation behind the presence of both "*des*" is not the same. We would like to assume so and provide an explanation for the facts that is related to another intriguing asymmetry, namely the fact that English, which features Case-Resistance effects (*sensu* Stowell 1981), as can be seen in (8), allow Ps to introduce embedded interrogative clauses (cf. Stowell 1981, Richards 2010, Plann 1982), as (9) reveals:

(8) *Mary talked [PP **about** [CP that I went to Paris]]   (9) Mary talked [PP **about** [CP where I went t_{where}]]

As observed in Richards (2010), (8) is also rescued if a nominal layer is added between P and the CP:

(10) Mary talked [PP about [NP the fact [CP that Sue went to Paris last summer]]]

Interestingly enough, embedded interrogatives also behave like nominals: this is what (11) reveals, with "of" being required when the CP is a complement of a nominal:

(11) The problem *(of) {[CP how they behave] / [NP their behaviour]}

4. PROPOSAL. In order to account for the facts above, we argue that clauses preceded by P are not CPs. We have to clarify what this means and what strategies languages resort to in order to yield the relevant outcome. To cover all the cases, we need a two-layered parameter: the first one should tease apart Romance and English, the second one should assess (1/2) vs. (3) in Spanish.

PARAMETERS OF DEÍSMO IN ECM STRUCTURES: EVIDENCE FROM ROMANCE

4.1. ROMANCE vs. ENGLISH: In order to capture the main Romance / English asymmetries (which concern the facts in (8)-(9)), we adopt the idea that Romance C has a nominal behaviour that Germanic languages lack (cf. Manzini & Savoia 2003, Baunaz & Lander 2017, and references therein). Technically, this can be implemented in different ways. For concreteness, we assume that C can optinally be introduced by a nominal projection (perhaps indicating the connection with relative clauses; cf. Kayne 2010). Spanish shows this nominal nature in cases where C is introduced by an article in object and subject positions (cf. Leonetti 1999, Serrano 2015). We refer to this as "elqueísmo":

(12) [(**El**) que venga]   me preocupa   (13) Carmen lamenta   [(**el**) que nadie   venga]   (Spanish)
    the that come-3sg me worry-3sg   Carmen regret-3sg   the that nobody come-3sg
    'It worries me that he/she comes'   'Carmen regrets that nobody comes'

We assume that the CP in (12)-(13) is introduced by a KP (Case) layer in these cases (Torrego 2010), which turns the CP into an island of sorts (cf. Torrego & Uriagereka 1992, Etxepare 2016).

    Let us next go back to the observation that wh-movement renders the CP nominal in English. We claim this follows not from the nominal nature of C (an option restricted to Romance), but from the same factor that Ott (2011) uses to derive the projecting status of the wh-pronoun of free relatives: After cyclic Transfer applies, all that is left in the derivation is the wh-element (assuming that both C and the TP are transferred), as in (14b):

(14) a. Mary talked [$_{PP}$ **about** [$_{CP}$ where [C [$_{TP}$ Sue went t$_{where}$ last summer]]]]   [before Transfer]
    b. Mary talked [$_{PP}$ **about** [$_{whereP}$ where ~~[C [$_{TP}$ Sue went t$_{where}$ last summer]]~~]] [after Transfer]

This solution tells us that "about" must be able to select not only nominals, but also adverbial elements (which is what the CP becomes after Transfer), and it is correct: *About tomorrow*, *About after the game*, etc.

4.2. PASSIVIZATION. Consider, to conclude, the fact that "de / to" shows up under passivization (the data in (3), (4) and (5)). We take this to indicate that the A-moved NP has received structural Case (Nominative), which renders the clause Case-less. This is okay if the clause is itself a predicate (to yield, e.g., verbal clusters) or if it fails to act as a *bona fide* Goal that can value a φ-Probe (this is the CP case, we claim; cf. Epstein, Seely & Kitahara 2016). In other cases, the relevant clausal object must find a way to license itself, and this is what the preposition does: It adds a KP layer to license the clause. The strategy, therefore, is not too far from that deployed in antipassives (Contreras 1982, Burzio 1986, Masullo 1990), where some element absorbs structural Case (the clitic SE in (16)) and triggers the insertion of "de" to Case-mark the otherwise DO:

(15) L' Anna confessa els seus pecats   (16) L' Anna es confessa dels seus pecats (Catalan)
    the Anna confess   the her   sins   the Anna SE confess   of-the her   sins
    'Anna confesses her sins'   'Anna confesses her sins'

We therefore take deísta clauses to be KPs, namely TPs that add a nominal layer which does not yield an interpretive impact (just like inserting "el" in (12) and (13) makes no semantic contribution). We take it that the two embedding options correspond to two strategies to take clausal dependents: subordination (CP) or insubordination, where the CP is not a direct dependent of V—instead, a nominal layer (KP) or a pronoun is (Torrego & Uriagereka 1992, Etxepare 2016).

5. SOME PREDICTIONS: One may be tempted to argue that the hypothesized KP allows "de" insertion in Romance, but (surprisingly) it does not: "de(que)ísmo" and "elqueísmo" are not compatible. We take this to indicate that, in both deísmo and dequeísmo, "de" is also the spell-out of the K head (so they are a species of NP). This is consistent with the fact that these clauses have an NP distribution (as seen above), and it further predicts that "de" and "el" should compete for the same position, and this is also borne out: deísta and dequeísta CPs cannot take clauses introduced by "el". This further fits with to observations of RAE-ASALE (2009:43.3m and ff.): Firsts, "el-que" clauses cannot be introduced by other prepositions either (see (17)); two, "el" cannot precede embedded interrogatives (see (18)).

(17) No me   vale [$_{PP}$ con [(*el) que digas eso]]   (18) No sé   (*el) [$_{CP}$ quién ha venido]   (Spanish)
    not to.me serves   with the that say   that   not know the   who has come
    'It is not enough for me if you say that'   'I don't know who has come'

For the punch line, notice that if "deísta" and "dequeísta" clauses are nominal in nature also explain their island status (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2004, Gallego 2010, Camus 2013).

REFERENCES (SELECTED): Camus, B. 2013. "On Deísmo. Another Case of Variation in Spanish Complementation." CatJL 12: 13-39. **Hornstein, N., A. M. Martins and J. Nunes. 2006.** "Infinitival Complements of Perception and Causative Verbs: A Case Study on Agreement and Intervention Effects in English and European Portuguese". In N. Kazanina et al. (eds.), UMDWPL 14: 81-110. College Park, MD: UMWPiL. **Montalbetti, M. 1999.** "Spanish Passivized Datives: The Relevance of Misanalysis". In K. Johnson and I. Roberts (eds.), *Beyond Principles and Parameters*, 133-144. Kluwer: Dordrecht. **Peinado, M.Pilar. 2017.** El Deísmo en Pedro Muñoz. TFG, U.Castilla-La Mancha.