Evaluatives and the Structure of CP

Abstract.

This paper analyzes the Comp recursivity in Spanish and its interaction with selection by other heads. After examining the distribution of several words that can appear with que ‘that’, the paper concludes that there is no a priori limit to the number of Comp heads a grammar can project, provided each of them is properly licensed. Licensing properties are formalized as a subtype of agree, which locally matches a syntactic (uninterpretable) feature \{+selC\}, selected C on Comp with a similar feature on the licensing head (a main verb, an adverb, etc.). It is also argued that these licensing operations are subject to minimality effects that depend on the type of feature of the blocking category. The paper examines the prediction that Comp should be available in non clause-initial positions, and explores the clause-internal and DP-internal distribution of Comp, relating them to alignment requirements due to the prosody of focus in Spanish.

Introduction

Recent research has argued for a more articulated notion of CP. Rizzi (1997), for example, suggests the need to split the complementizer phrase into several functional projections; Cinque (1999), on the other hand, proposes a theory that entails a much more fine-grained sentential structure than previously thought. However, these proposals do not address the effects of these expanded CP projections on how clauses are selected by verbs or other heads. Are all the expanded CP projections transparent to selection by heads outside their domain? Is selection still local, if this is the case? Does this proliferation of CP categories still count as a single extended projection (cf. Grimshaw, 2000, 2003)?

In this paper, I will argue that Spanish provides evidence for the view that multiple heads of Comp can be projected within the same sentence, but that each one must be syntactically selected and (an operation of the agree/matching type), and it may optionally satisfy the s-selection requirements of verbs of saying, an operation also formalized as agree.

The study will probe the syntax of several words that associate with Comp: three adverbs (como, which signals a speaker’s lack of commitment to the content of a constituent, bien ‘good’ and ojalá

---
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‘hopefully’), and a verb (\textit{parecer} ‘seem’). The data come mostly from the oral register of Colombian Spanish, although the distribution and meaning partially overlaps Spanish spoken in other areas (for example Mexico and Chile).\footnote{Although the contention that CP should be split into separate categories is not new (cf. Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999, but also Plann 1982 and Suñer 1991, among others), the type of data presented here has not been considered, to the best of my knowledge.} Although the contention that CP should be split into separate categories is not new (cf. Rizzi 1997, Cinque 1999, but also Plann 1982 and Suñer 1991, among others), the type of data presented here has not been considered, to the best of my knowledge.

1. The distribution of \textit{como} in Colombian Spanish

Spanish uses the word \textit{como} in a variety of contexts to establish that the speaker is not willing to commit him/herself to the content of the constituent \textit{como} modifies. For this reason, it has been labelled “attenuation \textit{como}” (cf. Cuervo 1954, Sánchez and Molina 1994, Rees 1971, Montes 1981, Gaínza 1972, Camacho 1999). In (1a) below, the speaker may not be completely sure whether they know something, hence s/he uses \textit{como}. Likewise, in (1b), the speaker suggests that whatever was learnt was close enough to a song, but for some reason or other, it differs in a noticeable way from a song. In many cases, the meaning of \textit{como} closely resembles that of \textit{kind of} in colloquial English, so I will use this expression as a translation, wherever appropriate.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Como que no saben nada.
\item b. Aprendimos como una canción.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{itemize}
\item (1a) ‘It seems they don’t know anything.’
\item (1b) ‘We learned kind of a song’
\end{itemize}

\textit{Como} can associate with several kinds of constituents. The basic generalization regarding its distribution is that it associates with VP-internal indefinites and CP material. (2) illustrates the first part of the generalization (association with VP-internal material), under the assumption that \textit{unas personas} in (2a) is in VP, whereas \textit{unas personas llegaron} in (2b) is in IP. The contrast between (2a) and (3) shows that the constituent modified by \textit{como} must be indefinite (cf. Camacho 1999, 2003 for a complete analysis).

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. \textit{unas personas} llegaron.
\item b. \textit{ unas personas llegaron}.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{itemize}
\item (2a) ‘Some people arrive.’
\item (2b) ‘Some people arrived.’
\end{itemize}

\footnote{No specific dialectal claims are made, since the number of speakers poled is very small and their selection has not been done in any statistically meaningful way. However, the data and analysis represent coherent grammars of individual speakers. Thus, the use of terms like “Spanish” should be qualified in this way.}
4

(2)  a. Llegaron como unas personas.
    arrived kind of some people
    ‘Some kind of people arrived.’
  b. *Como unas personas llegaron.
    kind of some people arrived

(3)  *Llegaron como las personas.
    arrived kind of the people

As suggested above, como can also associate with CP, as in (1a), where como has scope over the whole clause. However, the sequence como que need not be clause initial, it can also appear clause-internally, as (4) shows. I will call this use “clause-internal como que” to distinguish it from clause-initial como que illustrated in (1a).

Any constituent can appear to the left of clause-internal como que: a subject (cf. (5)), the main verb (cf. (6a-b)), a verb and a direct object (cf. (6c)), or even a whole VP, leaving an adjunct as a remnant (cf. (6d)). It is even possible to have a clitic left-dislocated constituent, as in (6e).2

(4)  Marta como que salió.
    ‘Marta seems to have gone out.’

(5)  Los primos como que vinieron ayer.
    ‘It seems the cousins came yesterday.’

(6)  a. Trajeron como que un vino.
    brought kind of that a wine
    ‘They brought kind of some kind.’

---

2 The distribution of como que is very reminiscent of a similar focus marker used in Colombia and the Caribbean (cf. Toribio, 1992, Bosque, 1999, among others), illustrated in (i). In this construction, the copular verb is used to focus a constituent in the sentence. The main difference between como que and the copular focus marker is that the latter cannot focus verbs, whereas the former can (cf. (ii) vs. (4)). See Camacho, 2003 for a comparison of both structures.

i. Trajeron fue una bebida.
   ‘It was a drink they brought’

ii. *Pedro fue vino.
    Pedro was came
b. Llegó como que un amigo.  
arrived kind of that a friend  
‘What seems like a friend arrived.’ 

c. Le regalaron un chocolate como que a Marta.  
CL gave a chocolate kind of that to Marta  
‘They gave chocolate, it seems, to Marta.’ 

d. Le regalaron un chocolate a Marta como que  
CL gave a chocolate to Marta kind of that  
aver. yesterday  
‘They gave chocolate to Marta, it seems it was yesterday.’ 

e. El chocolate como que se lo regalaron a  
the chocolate kind of that CL CL gave to  
Marta ayer.  
Marta yesterday  
‘It seems it was the chocolate they gave to Marta yesterday.’ 

When it is clause-internal, *como que* tends to modify the last constituent in the sentence, as in the examples above, an issue that will become relevant below.

The meaning of *como que* is evaluative: the speaker is not fully committed to a given constituent’s content. The reasons for this lack of commitment may include lack of direct evidence (and in this case, *como que* would be an evidentiality marker), but they also extend to other instances where the speaker has direct evidence of the events, as seen in (7), provided by an anonymous reviewer (from http://www.lagmanweb.com/pages/old/12-11_16-11.htm). In this sentence, the speaker does not question the source of evidence, but rather expresses some hesitation about whether s/he is going to do the abdominal exercises or not.

(7) Oye que me voy ya pero antes … como que  
listen that CL go already but before … kind of that  
me voy a hacer un par de series de abdominales  
CL going to do a couple of series of abdominals  
de esos de arriba.  
of those of up there  
‘Listen, I am leaving now, but before I am kind of going to do a  
couple of series of abdominal exercises up there.’

Evaluative content is loosely related to evidentiality, although as I suggested above, narrowly-defined evidential meaning is only one of
the subtypes of meaning como can convey. Let us assume that evaluative meaning is classified according to one’s best possible grounds for making an assertion, following Faller (2002). In her study of Quechua evidentials, she argues that the direct evidence marker -mi entails best possible grounds (bpg) for making an assertion. I believe this notion of evidentiality matches the meaning of como, which can be defined as “lacking bpg to make an assertion”. In some cases, lack of bpg follows from absence of direct evidence, in others, from lack of commitment to the denotation of the constituent modified by como. In order not to confuse narrow definitions of evidentiality with the notion derived from bpg, I will continue to label como as evaluative.

In general, the different positions of como que correlate with different scopal properties: when it is clause-initial, as in (8a), the source or the content of the proposition may be in doubt; when it is clause-internal, as in (8b), the content of the constituent it attaches to (un amigo ‘a friend’) is in doubt: the speaker may have heard someone arriving and was expecting a friend, or may have heard the voice of someone who sounds like a household friend, or it could be that the speaker is not clear on the exact status of the person who arrived, and the closest thing that comes to mind is “friend”.

(8) a. Como que llegó un amigo.
    kind of that arrived a friend
    ‘It seems that a friend arrived.’

b. Llegó como que un amigo.
    arrived kind of que a friend
    ‘Someone that seems like a friend arrived.’

The verb parece ‘seems’ has a very similar distribution to como. Like como, parece requires que in clause-initial position (cf. (9)), but que is optional clause-internally. Additionally, the meaning of parecer also involves lack of bpg. I will return below to other similarities between parecer and como.

(9) a. Parece que los tomates se pudrieron.
    seems that the tomatoes CL rotted
    ‘It seems the tomatoes rotted.’

b. *Parece los tomates se pudrieron.
    seems the tomatoes CL rotted

3 The intonational pattern is different in (10a) and (10b). Nevertheless, the contrast between (9)-(10) still holds.
Given the differences in distribution and meaning between both types of evaluatives + que, the question is whether one can be derived from the other or not, in other words, whether there is a single projection and different transformations that derive alternative word orders, or whether each instance of the evaluative can be generated in different positions in the clause. I am particularly interested in the distribution of these evaluatives when they appear with que, so in this paper I will not analyze other instances of bare como or parece, except to argue below that they are not in free distribution with the corresponding one with que. For a full analysis of bare como, see Camacho 1999, 2003.

2. The Analysis of clause-initial evaluatives

The analysis of evaluatives associated with Comp raises the following questions: are the clause-initial and clause-internal variants of the same position related by movement? Or are they located in different positions? Deriving both instances from a common underlying source would explain the obvious fact that they all have que in common, and that que is typically a complementizer in Spanish. On the other hand, postulating separate sources for each position overcomes the problem of having a number of transformations for which there may be no independent evidence. However, this second option forces us to claim either that que is not a complementizer in instances where it is not clause-initial, or else that complementizers in Spanish may have a wider distribution than one might expect. After reviewing the different alternatives, I will conclude that some instances of clause-internal Comp-related evaluatives are derived from underlying clause-initial cases by a prosodically motivated movement, but that others must be generated in positions not typically associated with Comp, for example DP-internally. However, even in those cases, I will argue that que is in Comp.

First, let me argue against the analysis that would claim that que in como que is not Comp. This amounts to the claim that como-que is a
compound that may have historically been associated with Comp but no longer is.\(^4\)

2.1. Against the Compound Analysis of *como que*

If *como-que* were a compound, the main justification for relating *que* to Comp would disappear: it may have been historically related to Comp, but in the present-day Spanish dialects that have it, it is simply some kind of compound adverbial that can modify certain constituents. The main objection to this analysis is that the distribution of *como que* is completely compositional. Both *como/parece* and *que* can appear separately, and, in such cases, the syntactic and/or semantic contribution of the missing part is absent. Consider, for example, the contrast in (11). Descriptively, *como* and *parece* cannot appear at the beginning of a clause without *que*.\(^5\)

(11) a. Como que se pudieron los tomates.
   kind of that CL rotted the tomatoes
   ‘It seems the tomatoes rotted.’
   b. *Como se pudieron los tomates.
      kind of CL rotted the tomatoes

(12) a. Parece que se pudieron los tomates.
   seems that CL rotted the tomatoes
   ‘It seems the tomatoes rotted.’
   b. *Parece se pudieron los tomates.
      seems CL rotted the tomatoes

Clause-internally, *como que* and *como* seem to have a similar distribution, as shown in (13). However, in this case, only (13a) can have the wide scope reading (the same as the reading in (11a)).

(13) a. Se pudieron como que los tomates.
   CL rotted kind of that the tomatoes
   ‘It seems the tomatoes rotted.’
   b. Se pudieron como los tomates.
   CL rotted kind of the tomatoes
   ‘It was kind of the tomatoes that rotted.’

---

\(^4\) The possibility of considering *como que* as a compound has been independently suggested by Roger Schwarzchild and an anonymous reviewer.

\(^5\) The relevant generalization is, I believe, that *como* cannot modify IP, as I have suggested, but that entails treating *que* in (11a) as a head of CP.
A third difference between the distribution of *como* and *como que* relates to the type of constituent it associates with. I observed above (cf. (2) and (3)) that *como* can only modify VP-internal indefinite DPs. This is not the case with *como que*, which can associate with any kind of constituent, in particular with preverbal subjects (cf. (15) vs. (2b)).

(15) Como que Marta regaló el cuadro.
kind of that Marta gave the painting

‘It was apparently Marta who gave the painting.’

In addition to the preceding examples, it can be shown that the *que* in *como que* is related to Comp. Like its bare counterpart, it can introduce an embedded complement clause, as illustrated in (16). Without *que*, such configuration is ungrammatical (cf. (17)).

(16) a. Dice que viene mañana.
says that comes tomorrow

‘S/he says that s/he is coming tomorrow.’

b. Dice como que viene mañana.
says kind of that comes tomorrow

‘S/he says something like s/he is coming tomorrow.’

(17) a. *Dice viene mañana.
says comes tomorrow

b. *Dice como viene mañana.
says kind of comes tomorrow

The very fact that *como que* and *parece que* have a parallel distribution casts doubt on the compound analysis, which would have to claim that in the case of *parece que* there is also compounding, even though

---

6 This difference, or the one illustrated in (16) do not extend to *parece*. The latter difference is discussed after example (37).

7 Things are slightly more complicated, since *como que* can co-appear with bare *que*, see below.
parece and como belong to two different lexical categories (verb and adverb respectively).

All of these contrasts argue against treating como que as a compound, rather it seems that como/parece and que are distinct syntactic atoms. The default assumption is that que is in Comp, and I have argued that there is distributional evidence to argue in favor of that hypothesis.\(^8\)

If these arguments are right and clause-initial and clause-internal como, parece que both involve Comp, now the question is do they both involve a unique projection for each word order? The answer must be no, given examples such as (18). This example would be appropriate in the following context: I am in my room with the door closed, I hear people coming into the house, and there is a big party. I know each guest must have brought a drink, I also know that Juan was a guest, but I don’t know who brought what. In this context, the first como que casts doubt on the whole proposition, the second one casts doubt on what it was that Juan brought. If there is a unique underlying position for every instance of como que, then it should not be possible to have multiple cases in one sentence, contrary to what (18) shows.

(18) a. ¿Como que Juan trajo como que ron.
   kind of that Juan brought kind of that rhum
   ‘It seems that Juan brought, I believe, rhum.’

b. ¿Parece que Juan trajo parece que ron.
   seems that Juan brought seems that rhum
   ‘It seems that Juan brought, it seems it was, rhum.’

If there are two underlying positions for the evaluative + que, one clause-internal, one clause-initial, how can they both involve Comp? Under standard assumptions, Comp is a fixed position in the left periphery, and even when it is recursive, recursion involves a projection that is also part of CP, not inside VP, as the clause-internal instances I have presented seem to be. In the following sections, I will argue that que can in fact appear recursively within CP, but it also can appear in different parts of a sentence, provided there some lexical category licenses it.

\(^8\) The compound analysis may be more promising for a similar item in this same dialect, dizque (from Old Spanish diz ‘say’ and que). With dizque, que is always obligatory:

i. Dizque/*diz vino.
   apparently came
   ‘Apparently s/he came.’
2.2. Que-recursion

The idea that Spanish may have different positions for Comp in Spanish is not new. The facts are well-known, dating back to the 19th century grammarian Bello (1972) (see also Demonte 1977, Rivero 1980, Hurtado 1981, Plann 1982, Suíer 1991, Lahiri 2002): que can precede a Wh-word when embedded under certain types of verbs (cf. (19)), those that can independently take direct quotes (cf. (20)-(21)).

(19) a. Me preguntó que cuándo venías.
   ‘S/he asked me when you were coming.’
   cl  asked  that  when  came
b. Repitió que qué quieres.
   repeated  that  what  want
   ‘He asked again what you want.’

(20) a. Juan preguntó: “¿quién vino?”
   Juan asked:  who  came
   ‘John asked: “who came?”’
   b. Juan preguntó que quién vino
      Juan asked  that  who  came
      ‘Juan asked who came.’

(21) a. *Juan confesó: “¿quién vino?”
      Juan confessed:  who  came
b. *Juan confesó que quién vino.
      Juan confessed  that  who  came

The type of evidence for different Comp-positions I will propose is slightly different from the one illustrated above: it involves embedded declaratives, not questions. Consider first the possibility of heading an embedded declarative clause, already shown in (16)-(17), repeated below as (22a-b): como que in (22b) can head an embedded clause. By contrast, other adverbs associated to Comp, such as ojalá ‘hopefully’ and bien ‘good’ cannot head an embedded clause, as shown in (22c-d).

(22) a. Dice que viene mañana.
   says  that  comes  tomorrow
   ‘S/he says that s/he is coming tomorrow.’

b. Dice como que viene mañana.
   says  kind of  that  comes  tomorrow
   ‘S/he says something like s/he is coming tomorrow.’
If we now turn our attention to (23), we can see that at least two instances of *que* can appear in a sentence in Spanish.

(23) a. *Me dice ojalá que venga.
   CL says hopefully that comes.SUBJ
   ‘s/he says that hopefully s/he will come.’

b. *Me dice bien que venga.
   CL says that good that comes.SUBJ
   ‘S/he says that it’s good that s/he comes.’

c. *Dice que como que viene mañana.
   says que kind of that comes tomorrow
   ‘S/he says something like s/he is coming tomorrow.’

These examples suggest that one can have multiple Comps in Spanish, even headed as by the same head *que*. All of them can be seen as part of the extended verbal projection (in the sense of Grimshaw 2000, 2003). However, *que* cannot just be freely inserted in any position, it must be licensed by some category, as the ungrammaticality of root instances show (cf. (24a) and also below).

(24) a. *Que está lloviendo.
    that is raining

b. Está lloviendo.
   is raining
   ‘It is raining.’

c. Dicen que está lloviendo.
   say that is raining
   ‘They say it is raining.’

The idea to be pursued is that the availability and distribution of each instance of *que* is related to the availability of a syntactic licensor that selects for *que*. I take the structural configuration for selection to be C-command (X selects for Y if X c-commands Y), but subject to minimality effects: an intervening category of the relevant type can block selection of a category by a c-commanding head. Selection can be seen as a subtype of the agree operation, by which features of two syntactic
objects match and delete. For que, I will propose a syntactic feature that must be deleted, let me call it selected $C\lbrack \{+selC\} \rbrack$. In (24a) above, $\{+selC\}$ is not deleted, hence the sequence is ungrammatical. In (24b), the feature is not present, and in (24c), it is matched and deleted by *dicen*.

Is $\{+selC\}$ just case? In this view, que, as head of CP, would have to be case marked, contra (Stowell, 1981), who argues that clauses do not get case in English. Treating as case would greatly simplify the theory, since an already attested syntactic mechanism would be responsible for the distribution of Comp. First, the evidence seems to suggest that clauses do receive case in Spanish, as shown by the contrast in (25): the obligatory presence of the preposition can be taken as an indication of case marking.

(25) a. El hecho de que Pedro salga es bueno.
    the fact of that Pedro goes-out is good
    ‘The fact that Pedro goes out is good.’

    the fact that Pedro goes-out is good

However, adverbs can license que, and they are usually not taken to assign case. Thus, a nominal complement to an adverb cannot appear without a case-assigning proposition, as seen in (26). Likewise, when the complement is a CP, the preposition is required, as shown in (27).

(26) a. Independientemente de tu opinión, creo que no está bien.
    independently of your opinion, think that not is good
    ‘Independently of your opinion, I think that it is not good.’

b. *Independientemente tu opinión, creo que no está bien.
    independently your opinion, think that not is good

(27) a. Independientemente de que venga.
    independently of that comes.SUBJ
    ‘Independently of the fact that s/he comes’

b. *Independientemente que venga.
    independently that comes.SUBJ

One could argue that some adverbs assign case while others do not, just as some verbs (transitive verbs) assign accusative case but others
do not. However, such an assumption would run into empirical problems in examples like (22b), because there would be two case assigners: the adverb and the verb, and only one case receiver (*que*). If the case feature on *que* is deleted by the closest matching feature (that of *como*), then the feature of *decir* would remain unchecked. For this reason, I will assume that the relationship between *como*, *parece* and *que* involves a different feature.

This basic agreement mechanism is still not enough to account for the distribution seen above. First, not every category can license *que*. Adjectives clearly do not license it unless a preposition is present (cf. (28)). In the case of nouns, the presence of the preposition seems to be optional (cf. (29)). The version with the preposition (29a) is considered the standard form, but the one without the preposition is very widespread, and the distribution of each variant is not well understood.9

(28) a. Estoy contento de que vengas.
   am happy of that come.SUBJ
   ‘I am happy that you come.’
   b. *Estoy contento que vengas.
      am happy that come.SUBJ

(29) a. El hecho de que suba la bolsa no indica que la economía esté mejor.
   the fact (of) that goes-up the stock-market not indicates that the economy is.SUBJ better
   ‘The fact that the stock market goes up does not mean that the economy is better.’

   b. El hecho que suba la bolsa no indica que la economía esté mejor.
      the fact that goes-up the stock-market not indicates that the economy is.SUBJ better
      ‘The fact that the stock market goes up does not mean that the economy is better.’

As the examples above show, prepositions can license Comp. In addition to those examples, (30) shows cases with other prepositions:

(30) a. Compramos una piscina para que las niñas jueguen.
    bought a pool for that the girls play.SUBJ

9 The only accounts of why the preposition is optional in (291) involve evidentiality (Schwenter 1999, Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2001).
'We bought a pool so that the girls can play.'

b. Me molesta la insistencia en que todo tiene que ser correcto.

that be correct

'The insistence on everything having to be correct bothers me.'

One additional problem for the account is that *como*, but not *ojalá*, *bien*, is transparent to selection by an outside verb, as already mentioned (cf. (22b) vs. (22c-d)). This cannot be due to an undeleted {+selC} feature, because in each case there is a category to match and delete the feature: in (22c), *ojalá* ‘hopefully’, in (22d) *bien* ‘good’.

To confirm that these adverbs can license *que*, we have examples of root *que* licensed by them, as seen in (31). In each of those cases, the {+selC} feature on *que* is deleted by *ojalá* and *bien* respectively.

(31) a. Ojalá que no llueva.

   hopefully that not rain.SBJ

   ‘I hope it doesn’t rain.’

b. Bien que no llueva.

   good that not rain.SBJ

   ‘It’s good that it doesn’t rain.’

Thus, the ungrammaticality of (22c-d) cannot be due to lack of licensing. Rather, I believe this distribution follows from a different feature, one related to the semantic content of the category headed by *que*, which usually denotes a proposition.\(^{10}\) It seems clear that a verb like *decir* also s-selects for a proposition. Thus, the semantic requirement of *decir* is matched by the denotation of *que*. We can extend the mechanism proposed above for syntactic licensing to formalize these cases: semantic selection involves a matching relationship between a head and another category under c-command. However, since *que* satisfies the selectional requirements of *decir* but can appear in other frames independent of that type of verb, I will propose the following distinction: *que* has a {propositional} feature that is interpretable, hence it needs not be deleted, but *decir* has an optional uninterpretable

\(^{10}\) Lahiri 2002 argues that the class of verbs that allows for *que* + Wh-word takes an utterance as a complement, regardless of its semantic type. This idea is based on Plann’s (1982) observation that those verbs allow for for an embedded quotation. This refinement does not affect the reasoning below.
{propositional} feature that must be deleted. The uninterpretable feature of decir activates the interpretable feature of que, and deletes. The interpretable feature remains.\textsuperscript{11}

As in the case of syntactic licensing, an intervening category with a feature of the relevant type will block the mechanism just described, which we could call s-agreement. For example, consider a sentence like (32). In it, the s-selectional requirements of preguntar ‘ask’ (a question-taking verb) are satisfied across que, which certainly does not denote a question.\textsuperscript{12}

In the current analysis, the s-agreement relationship between preguntar and quién is activated and the +wh feature on the verb is deleted. This operation is possible despite the fact that there is an intervening head que which could block it. The reason it does not block it is that there que does not have a feature of the relevant type to do so.

(32) Marta preguntó que quién viene.
Marta asked that who came
‘Marta asked who is coming.’

These assumptions can account for the grammaticality of (22b), where decir and que are separated by como by claiming that the adverb is transparent to the agreement relationship between decir and que. In the case of (23c), the distant que can still satisfy the selectional requirements of decir because the intervening material is not specified for a feature that can block that relationship. In the case of (23a-b), the selectional requirements of decir are satisfied by the closest que, suggesting that que in this case is some kind of resumptive Comp. Within the logic of the current analysis, the ungrammaticality of examples like (22c-d) can be traced to a feature on ojalá, bien that blocks the s-selection between the verb decir ‘say’ and que. Thus, it must be the case that ojalá, bien have a semantic feature that blocks that s-selection relation, and there is some evidence that this is indeed the case.

Ojalá, bien are modal adverbs that mark irrealis: the truth value of the proposition they introduce cannot be determined in the speaker’s

\textsuperscript{11} The optionality of {propositional} on decir accounts for the fact that the verb can appear with non-propositional NP-complements: dijo tu nombre ‘S/he said your name.’ In such cases, decir cannot have the uninterpretable {propositional} feature.

\textsuperscript{12} In Lahiri’s (2002) analysis, preguntar selects for an utterance when it appears with que. The verb does not care for the actual semantic type of the embedded clause. This forces him to claim that preguntar is ambiguous: it takes a wh-question when it appears with que, and it takes an utterance when it appears with que. The way I view things, the selectional restrictions of preguntar are the same at one level (it selects for a wh-question), but it also may optionally select for an utterance.
current circumstances, since they express a wish or comment on something that will happen in the future. By contrast, the proposition associated with *como* denotes realis modality: it has a truth value in the speaker’s current circumstances. As a consequence, both *ojalá* and *bien* require subjunctive mood on the verb, as shown in (33).

(33) a. Ojalá que venga.
   hopefully that comes.SUBJ
   ‘Hopefully s/he will come.’

b. *Ojalá que viene.
   hopefully that comes.IND

c. Bien que venga.
   good that comes.SUBJ
   ‘It’s good that s/he comes.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d. *Bien que viene.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good that comes.IND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whatever the correct formalization of the realis/irrealis distinction, one can argue that the semantic content of the category headed by *ojalá, bien* blocks the s-selection relation between the verb and *que*. Notice that this claim does not amount to saying that *decir* cannot take irrealis clauses, it can, but only if the category selecting for irrealis content cannot surface between the main verb and Comp, as already shown in (22c-d)–(23a-b).

The underlying idea in the analysis presented is that *que* can enter into two types of matching relations: one to delete it {+selC} feature, one to delete the matrix verb’s {propositional} feature. I have suggested that adverbs like *ojalá, bien* may block the second type of matching relation. The following set of data can also be explained as a blocking effect. Recall the observation that Spanish can have a Comp followed by a Wh-question (cf. (19) above, repeated below).

(34) a. Me preguntó que cuándo venías.
   CL asked that when came
   ‘S/he asked me when you were coming.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. *Me preguntó cuándo que venías.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL asked when que came</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The puzzling fact about those examples is that the order must be *que* + Wh-word, as shown in (34b). Given that the verb *preguntar* ‘ask’ selects for a question, one might expect the reverse order to be
possible, if not preferred.\textsuperscript{13} Given the grammaticality of (34a), it can be argued that \textit{que} and \textit{cuándo} are in different projections, since specifiers in Spanish are to the left and \textit{cuándo} is usually assumed to be in a specifier. Hence (34b) cannot be ruled out as a doubly-filled-Comp filter violation. From the current point of view, it could be argued that the projection headed by \textit{cuándo} in (34b) blocks licensing of \textit{que}, in other words, \{+selC\} is unmatched.

Finally, let me turn to two remaining issues: first, to an apparent counterexample to the analysis proposed, then to a puzzling divergence between \textit{como} and \textit{parecer}. Recall that root \textit{que} is ungrammatical in out-of-the-blue statements (cf. (24a)). However, for certain speakers, a root \textit{que} such as the one illustrated in (35a) is grammatical in the context where there has been a previous utterance. So, for example, if I have just had a phone conversation with someone, and s/he tells me that s/he is coming, then I can use (35a) to transmit that information to a third party. The sentence would be unacceptable if there is no contextual information regarding that preceding conversation. In this sense, (35a) has a similar meaning to (35b), which does not require such a context to be acceptable.

\begin{enumerate}
\item [(35)] a. Que viene.
   \hspace{1cm} that comes
   \hspace{1cm} ‘(Someone is saying) that s/he is coming.’
\item b. Dice que viene.
   \hspace{1cm} says that come
   \hspace{1cm} ‘S/he is saying that s/he is coming.’
\end{enumerate}

Within the analysis presented above, root \textit{que} should be ungrammatical, because its \{+selC\} feature cannot be deleted. To account for cases such as (35a), we can postulate a contextually recovered null verb of saying, which licenses root \textit{que}. Thus, the representation of (35a) would be similar to that of (35b), but the verb is null, and its content is contextually recovered. Consistent with this analysis, in the context described above in which (35a) is acceptable, it would not be possible to drop \textit{que}, as in (36b). The null verb of saying would presumably have an unmatched feature (like its overt counterpart \textit{decir} ‘say’).

\begin{enumerate}
\item [(36)] a. Context: I have just had a phone conversation with someone, and s/he tells me that s/he is knows the answer to the latest TV quiz question. I then tell someone:
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{13} Suñer’s (1991) analysis leads her to argue that in these cases there is agreement between the lower Wh-Comp and the higher Comp, so that selection by the verb is local. In the current analysis, this is no longer necessary.
b. Sabe la respuesta del concurso de TV.
   knows the answer of-the contest of TV
   ‘S/he knows the answer to the TV contest.’

Another interesting point relates to the already mentioned parallelism in distribution between parecer and como (see (9)-(10) above). This parallelism breaks down in one respect: parecer is not transparent to selection by an outside verb, as shown in (37), whereas como is, as shown already in (22b).

(37) a. *Dicen parece que se pudieron los tomates.
   say seems that CL rotted the tomatoes
   b. Dicen que parece que se pudieron los tomates.
   say that seems that CL rotted the tomatoes
   ‘They say that it seems the tomatoes rotted.’

Note that the problem is not that parece is a finite form, since the infinitival counterpart of (37a) is still ungrammatical, unlike other embedded complements:

(38) a. *Dicen parecer que se pudieron los tomates
   say to-seem that CL rotted the tomatoes
   b. Dicen creer que se pudieron los tomates
   say to-believe that CL rotted the tomatoes
   They say they believe the tomatoes rotted.

One possible explanation for the contrast in (37) would be to trace it back to the diverging categories of como and parecer: the former is an adverb, the latter is a verb. In this line of analysis, decir does not c-select for a verb, but rather for Comp.\footnote{This explanation runs counter to Grimshaw’s (2001, 2003) assumption that all projections above V are categorially identical to V.}

To summarize this section, I have argued that que can be freely merged into a structure as long as its \{+selC\} feature is matched by a licensing category. I have also argued that in addition to this syntactic requirement, que satisfies the s-selectional requirements of verbs that take propositional content. Both operations are subject to the same principles: matching and locality (determined by minimality constraints). In the both cases, I have argued that certain features may block matching (the semantic features of case ojalá and bien, and a Wh-feature in the case of syntactic licensing).
The analysis predicts that Comp should be freely available in instances where the \{+selC\} feature is licensed. I will now argue that cases of clause-internal *que* show precisely that. I will also relate such instances to the focus properties of the constituent associated with it, suggesting that in addition to fulfilling the syntactic requirement of \{+selC\} deletion, perhaps there must be another interface requirement, in this case focus.

3. Clause-internal evaluatives

I suggested in section 1 that evaluatives + *que* can appear clause-internally, an unusual position for Comp. The analysis proposed above predicts that this should be possible so long as the \{+selC\} is licensed by another category. In this section, I will argue that the position of clause-internal instances of *como que* can be derived from the fact that the constituent it associates with is marked as focused, in a sense to be made precise below. Given an analysis of focus that takes into account sentential prosody, we can derive the correct outcomes for a class of clause-internal *como que*.

There are at least two types of clause-internal evaluatives + *que*, one that modifies clausal constituents (i.e. subjects, direct and indirect objects, prepositional arguments, etc.), as illustrated in (39a) one that modifies DP-internal constituents, as illustrated in (39b) (provided by an anonymous reviewer, from http://www.freelists.org/archives/5y10/03-2002/fullthread6.html). The distribution of *parece que* is parallel.

(39) a. Saludaron como que a unos amigos.
   greeted kind of that to some friends
   ‘They greeted kind of some friends.’

   b. Claramente debe haber un origen ... que te dé
   clearly must have an origin ... that CL give
   esa como que ventaja sobre los demás,
   that kind of that advantage over the others
   ‘Clearly there must be an origin ... that will give you a
   kind of advantage over the others’

I will argue that in both instances *como* associates with focus, but in each case, this association has different syntactic consequences. For the clausal-level constituent in (39a), the prosodic requirements of focus will rearrange clausal constituents to make it claus-final. In the case of the DP-internal constituent, focus will not trigger a clausal-level
rearrangement, but at most a DP-internal alignment. In either case, I will argue that *que* is in Comp.

3.1. **Clausal-level Constituents Associated with *como que***

I will adopting Zubizarreta’s (1998) definition of focus (cf. also Chomsky 1971, 1976, Jackendoff 1972). According to her, focus is the “non-presupposed part of a sentence. The presupposed part of a sentence is what the speaker and hearer assume to be the case (i.e. the shared assumptions) at the point at which the sentence is uttered in a discourse (Zubizarreta 1998:1).” This definition of focus is comparable to É. Kiss’ (1998) informational (or presentational) focus, as opposed to identificational or contrastive focus.

Zubizarreta (again, following Chomsky and Jackendoff), uses question and answer pairs to establish the focus status of a constituent in a sentence. In the answer to a Wh-question, the constituent that substitutes for the Wh-word in the question, can be taken to be the focus of that statement. Thus, in (40b), *an apple* is the focus, because it substitutes for *what* in the corresponding question.

\[(40)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } \text{What did the worm eat?} \\
\text{b. } \text{The worm ate \textbf{the apple}}
\end{align*}
\]

Consider the following question-answer pairs with *como que* in (41)-(42). The answer to a question like (41a) must involve focus on the whole clause, i.e. wide focus. As seen in (41b-e), only clause-initial *como que* is a possible answer to that question. On the other hand, the answer to (42a) requires narrow scope focus on the indirect object, and only (42b) and (42d) are possible.\(^{15}\)

\[(41)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } \text{¿Qué pasó?} \\
\text{what happened} \\
\text{‘What happened?’} \\
\text{b. } \text{Como que los tíos le regalaron un chocolate} \\
\text{kind of that the uncles \textbf{cl} gave \textbf{a chocolate}} \\
\text{a Marta.} \\
\text{to Marta} \\
\text{‘It seems the uncles gave chocolate to Marta.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{15}\) I have eliminated the subject from the questions and answers in (42) because it seems much less natural to answer with it than with a pro. Since focus on the subject is not at stake in these questions, it should not make a difference with respect to the possibilities of focus on the indirect object.
c. #Los tíos como que le regalaron un chocolate the uncles kind of that CL gave a chocolate a Marta.
to Marta
‘The uncles, it seems gave chocolate to Marta.’
d. #Los tíos le regalaron como que un chocolate the uncles CL gave kind of that a chocolate a Marta.
to Marta
‘The uncles gave, it seems, chocolate to Marta.’
e. #Los tíos le regalaron un chocolate como que the uncles CL gave a chocolate kind of that a Marta.
to Marta
‘The uncles gave, it seems, chocolate to Marta.’

(42) a. ¿A quién le regalaron un chocolate?
to who CL gave a chocolate
‘Who did they give a chocolate to?’
b. Como que le regalaron un chocolate a Marta.
kind of that CL gave a chocolate to Marta
‘It seems they gave chocolate to Marta’
c. #Le regalaron como que un chocolate a Marta.
CL gave kind of that a chocolate to Marta
‘They gave, it seems, chocolate to Marta.’
d. Le regalaron un chocolate como que a Marta.
CL gave a chocolate kind of that to Marta
‘They gave chocolate , it seems, to Marta.’

The fact that (42b) is a possible answer to (42a) is somewhat unexpected if como always associates with focus. One possible explanation is that clause-initial como que can associate long distance with a focus constituent (as words like solo ‘only’ or even do). Hence, in (42a), focus is on the indirect object, but como que associates with it even though it is clause-initial. On the other hand, the contrast between (42c-d) shows that clause-internally, como que can only associate with the constituent marked with focus.

A second indication that como que is associated with focus is that it has a similar distribution to solo ‘only’, which also associates with focus. For example, when they have clausal scope, both solo ‘only’ and
como que are incompatible with time adverbial clauses, because those clauses induce a presupposition (cf. Saeed 1997) as illustrated in (43a), which presupposes (43b):

(43) a. Juana comió después de que Pedro salió.
    Juana ate after of that Pedro left
    ‘Juana ate after Pedro left.’

b. Pedro left.

(44) illustrates that neither solo ‘only’ nor como que can appear with the adverbial clause if they have clausal scope.16 (45), on the other hand, shows that both solo and como que are possible when the clause is not embedded, for example in a context where there is a lot of noise, and someone asks ‘what happened’?

(44) a. *Juana comió después de que solo Pedro salió.
    Juana ate after of that only Pedro left
    ‘(It’s) only that Pedro left.’

b. *Juana comió después de que como que Pedro salió.
    Juana ate after of that kind of that Pedro left

(45) a. Solo que Pedro salió.
    only that Pedro left
    ‘(It’s) only that Pedro left.’

16 If solo and como modify only a single constituent (as opposed to the whole clause) in the environment of (44), the result is grammatical (cf. (i)). This does not mean they do not signal focus, rather that the whole clause need no longer be non-presupposed.

i. Marta tomó la decisión después de que oyó solo el consejo de su mamá.
   Marta took the decision after of that heard only the advise of her mom.
   Marta made a decision after she heard only her mom’s advise.’

17 In order for solo to have clausal scope in (45a), que is obligatory, otherwise, solo can only take scope over the subject (cf. (i)). In the case of como, absence of que leads to ungrammaticality, not to scope over the subject (cf. (ii)):

i. #{Solo Pedro} vino.
   only Pedro came
   ‘Only Pedro came’, not ‘It’s only that Pedro came.’

ii. *Como Pedro vino.
    kind of Pedro came
b. Como que Pedro salió.
   kind of that Pedro left
   ‘It seems Pedro left.’

I should clarify that I am not making the claim that solo and como (que) have exactly the same syntactic distribution, but rather that they both associate with focus, hence they are incompatible with presuppositional contexts such as temporal adverbial clauses.18

A third parallelism between the constituent associated with como que and focus relates to word order and prominence. Zubizarreta (1998) has argued that focused constituents in Spanish must be aligned with the constituent lowest in the c-command hierarchy, which for all relevant purposes is the last constituent in the clause. This alignment follows from the application of the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR) (cf. Chomsky and Halle 1968), a rule which assigns prominence to a given constituent at the clausal level. In Spanish, this rule takes into account the c-command domain and assigns prominence to the lowest constituent in that hierarchy (cf. Zubizarreta 1998).

The focus alignment constraint has the consequence that if a constituent marked for focus is not last in the c-command domain, everything below it must move to a position higher in the syntactic hierarchy in order to leave the focused constituent last. Thus, if the subject in a sentence is marked as focused, it must be postverbal in order to be the lowest constituent in the c-command domain. This sentence-last position is derived by movement of the rest of the sentence to the left of the subject, yielding and apparently V(OS) structure, in an operation that Zubizarreta calls P(rosodic)-movement.

If it is true that the last position in the c-command domain is the default focus position in Spanish, then my earlier observation that como que appears with the last constituent in the clause also suggests that it associates with focus, further illustrated in the following examples, a sample from a list suggested by an anonymous reviewer:19, 20

18 Not all presuppositional contexts are incompatible with focus, for example complements of factive verbs are presuppositional but allow focus. See Zubizarreta (1998:159fn 3) and references therein for discussion.
20 In example (46c), it might seem not to be clause-final, since como que is associated with por arte de magia ‘all of the sudden’, but in this case, that constituent is intonationally left-dislocated. Since the NSR operates on intonational domains, the phrase como que por arte de magia would not be included in the NSR computation for the clause, because it is in a separate domain from the rest of the clause.
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(46) a. Una clase media que decidió salir como que del closet.
   ‘A middle class that decided to kind of come out of the closet’

b. hoy estuve muy serio en la escuela jeje solo hablaba lo necesario y pues me llegó a sentir como que triste.
   ‘Today I was very serious at school, ha-ha, I only talked the minimum and I got to feel kind of sad.’

c. Pero cuando estamos colocados en posiciones privilegiadas, como que por arte de magia se nos olvida el fin por el cual luchamos, CL forget the ends for the which fight.
   ‘But when we are in a privileged position, kind of all of the sudden, we forget the end we are fighting for,’

The distribution of parecer ‘seem’ is also parallel to that of como in this respect: parecer is associated with a focused constituent when that constituent is a clausal-level argument (cf. (47)-(48)).

(47) a. ¿Qué pasó?
   ‘What happened?’

b. Parece que los tíos le regalaron un chocolate a Marta.
   ‘It seems the uncles gave chocolate to Marta.’

c. #Los tíos parece que le regalaron un chocolate a Marta.
   ‘The uncles, it seems gave chocolate to Marta.’
d. #Los tíos le regalaron parece que un chocolate
to Marta.
‘The uncles gave, it seems, chocolate to Marta.’

e. #Los tíos le regalaron un chocolate parece que
to Marta.
‘The uncles gave, it seems, chocolate to Marta.’

(48) a. ¿A quién le regalaron un chocolate?
‘Who did they give a chocolate to?’

b. Parece que le regalaron un chocolate a Marta.
‘It seems they gave chocolate to Marta’

c. #Le regalaron parece que un chocolate a Marta.
‘They gave, it seems, chocolate to Marta.’

d. Le regalaron un chocolate parece que a Marta.
‘They gave chocolate, it seems, to Marta.’

Extending the logic of Zubizarreta’s P-movement, the structure of clause-
internal como que must involve movement of whatever is to the right
of that constituent in the underlying structure. There are two possible
implementations of this idea, depending on one’s general assumptions
about Spanish. One possibility would be to assume that the subject,
verb and object remain inside the VP in that language, hence when a
focused subject is associated with como que, the lower VP that groups
the verb and the object will scramble to a position above como que,
leaving the subject as the only constituent inside IP, as in (49).

(49) a. Trajo salchichas como que Marta.
‘It was kind of Marta who brought sausages.’
One could object that in Spanish the verb must move to $I^0$, although current assumptions about agreement as a long-distance, feature-matching operation that does not require movement (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001) could clear those objections; however, the fact that even negation can be scrambled to a pre-como que position makes it hard to advocate this kind of analysis. This is illustrated in (50). If negation is as high as IP, then the analysis in (49) would predict that (50) should be impossible, since only VP scrambles.

(50) No va a poder traer salchichas como que tu
not go to can bring sausages kind of that your
hermano.
brother

'It is kind of your brother who will not be able to bring sausages.'

This example suggests that scrambling must target a fairly high node in the tree. It also argues that the subject must be located higher than that constituent. The revised derivation would be the following:

(51) a. Trajo salchichas como que Marta.
brought sausages kind of that Marta

'It was kind of Marta who brought sausages.'
The main question this analysis raises is why the subject should be located as high as it is in (51b). Ordóñez and Treviño (1999) have argued that the subject is a clitic left-dislocated element in Spanish, with inflection on the verb as the clitic. If this analysis is correct, there is no reason why the subject should merge in VP in the general case: the clitic will receive the theta role. Hence, the subject may be merged higher than VP, perhaps adjoined to IP, if adjunction is allowed, otherwise in the XP projection postulated in (51).²¹

In the case of a direct object, the derivation would be the one in (52). First, the direct object moves to the specifier of XP, leaving the verb in IP as a remnant, which subsequently moves to EvalP.

²¹ An alternative analysis I will not explore here is that P-movement is not subject to the usual constraints on constituency. Since this movement is not syntactically motivated, and does not affect the c-command properties of the clause (cf. Zubizarreta 1998) it is conceivable that material vacated from the post-focused phrase position need not form a constituent to move.
It should be clear that the reason why I am postulating a transformation to derive instances of clause-internal *como, parece que* that associate with clausal level arguments does not have to do with the belief that all instances of Comp should be clause-initial, but rather because of the fact that these cases are associated with focus and focus in Spanish has certain prosodic properties. Put in other terms, if one wants to derive different word orders from a common underlying structure, and one believes that some of those alternative word orders are due to prosodic requirements on focus alignment, then transformations (or whatever alternative representational framework one adopts) are needed even when *como que* is not present.

One incorrect prediction the analysis seems to make is that clause-internal *como, parece que* should be able to head an embedded clause, just as the clause-initial counterparts (cf. (16b) above). However, this is not the case, as shown in (53), with the structure in (54).
The ungrammaticality of this sentence actually follows from the analysis if one assumes that the material intervening between the matrix verb and *como, parece que* is able to block the selectional relationship between those two items.\textsuperscript{22}

To summarize this section, I have argued that some instances of clause-internal evaluatives + *que* (those associated with clause-level constituents) are generated in clause-initial position, but due to focus-alignment prosodic requirements, a series of movements of the non-focused constituents yield the clause-internal word order. To support this analysis, I have provided the distribution of question-answer pairs with *como, parece*, showing that they associate with focus, and also that they behave like another focus-associated marker *solo*.

\textsuperscript{22} This approach can perhaps be generalized to cases of topicalization in embedded clauses, as illustrated with clitic left-dislocation (and it holds in English as well for topicalization, as pointed out by Jane Grimshaw, p.c.).

i. *Dice a Pedro que lo vieron ayer. 
   says to Pedro that \textsc{cl} saw yesterday

ii. Dice que a Pedro lo vieron ayer. 
   says that to Pedro \textsc{cl} saw yesterday

'S/he says that they saw \textsc{pedro} yesterday'
3.2. DP-internal constituents associated with evaluative + *que*

If the analysis developed so far is correct, the position of clausal-level constituents associated with *como, parece que* is determined by the prosodic constraints on focus. In this section, I will argue that although DP-internal constituents associated with the evaluative + *que* are also focused, the analysis presented in the previous section cannot be extended directly to cases such as (39b) above. This suggests that Comp can appear in many different positions provided its \{selC\} is matched and deleted.

*Como* can modify many types of DP-internal constituents, such as PP complements to NP (cf. (55a)), adjectival complements (cf. (55b)), PP complements to adjectives (cf. (55c)), etc. Directly extending the analysis proposed in (51) to these cases is unmotivated because the associated constituents need not be clause-final, as shown in (55a). The same distribution holds for *parecer* ‘seem’, as shown in (56).

(55) a. Compraron unos pantalones como que de seda.
   *bought some pants kind of that of silk*
   ‘They bought some pants (made of) kind of silk.’

b. Escribió un libro como que melancólico.
   *wrote a book kind of that melancholy*
   ‘S/he wrote a kind of melancholy book.’

c. Vi a Juan feliz como que por la noticia.
   *saw to Juan happy kind of for the news*
   ‘I saw Juan happy kind of about the news.’

(56) a. Compraron unos pantalones parece que de seda.
   *bought some pants seems that of silk*
   ‘They bought some pants, it seems made of silk.’

b. Escribió un libro parece que melancólico.
   *wrote a book seems that melancholy*
   ‘S/he wrote what seems like a melancholy book.’

c. Vi a Juan feliz parece que por la noticia.
   *saw to Juan happy seems that for the news*
   ‘I saw Juan happy, it seems, about the news.

The question-answer test used earlier to probe for assertion structure can be adapted to DP-internal constituents by using in situ Wh-questions, as shown in (57a), which needs not be echo questions. When
the Wh-word questions the DP-complement *fresa* ‘strawberry’, as in (57), the natural answer is one in which *de fresa* ‘of strawberry’ is clause final, as in (57b). If the subject is postverbal, as in (57c), the answer is not an appropriate one. If the postverbal subject is separated from the main clause and the intonation is falling, then it the answer is appropriate once again (cf. (57d)). This pattern suggests that the focused constituent inside the DP tends to align with the clause-final position in its prosodic domain by pied-piping the whole DP-constituent that contains it, to the extent that it is possible to do so. The same patterns arise with *como que*, as seen in (58).

(57) a. ¿Miguel compró un helado de qué?
   Miguel bought an ice-cream of what
   ‘Miguel bought an ice-cream of what (flavor)?’

b. Miguel compró un helado de fresa.
   Miguel bought an ice-cream of strawberry
   ‘Miguel bought a STRAWBERRY ice-cream.’

c. #Compró un helado de fresa Miguel.
   bought an ice-cream of strawberry Miguel
   ‘MIGUEL bought a strawberry ice-cream.’

d. Compró un helado de fresa, Miguel.
   bought an ice-cream of strawberry Miguel
   ‘It was a strawberry ice-cream Miguel bought.’

(58) a. ¿Miguel compró un helado de qué?
   Miguel bought an ice-cream of what
   ‘Miguel bought an ice-cream of what (flavor)?’

b. Miguel compró un helado como que de fresa.
   Miguel bought an ice-cream kind of that of strawberry
   ‘Miguel bought kind of a STRAWBERRY ice-cream.’

c. #Compró un helado como que de fresa
   bought an ice-cream kind of that of strawberry Miguel.
   Miguel
   ‘MIGUEL bought kind of a strawberry ice-cream.’

d. Compró un helado como que de fresa,
   bought an ice-cream kind of that of strawberry Miguel.
   Miguel
‘It was kind of a strawberry ice-cream Miguel bought.’

If the question sets up an answer with focus on the subject, then an answer like (59b) is not appropriate, because *de fresa* should by focused, but the question and the answer’s word order force focus on the subject.

(59) a. ¿Quién compró un helado?
   who bought an ice-cream
   ‘Who bought an ice-cream?’

   b. #Compró un helado como que de
      bought an ice-cream kind of of strawberry
      fresa  Miguel.
      ‘It was Miguel who bought a kind of strawberry ice-cream.’

If these data are correct, they suggest that the DP containing the focused constituent must be aligned following the prosodic constraints of the NSR. However, the focused constituent itself does not move. In certain cases, alignment of the container DP fails, as shown in (60). In these cases, the default or unmarked word order (i.e. the order that results if the whole clause is focused), is V-O-PP, as shown in (61). The order V-PP-O is somewhat marked, specifically, the last constituent has a right-dislocated intonation.

(60) Compraron unos pantalones como que de seda para
    bought some pants kind of that of silk for
    ella.
    her
    ‘They bought some pants (made of) kind of silk for her.’

(61) a. Compraron unos pantalones de seda para ella.
    bought some pants of silk for her
    ‘They bought some pants (made of) silk for her.’

   b. Compraron para ella unos pantalones como que
      bought for her some pants that of
      de seda.
      silk for her
      ‘They bought for her, some pants (made of) silk.’

Thus, there seem to be contradictory constraints at play: one that gives us the default or unmarked word order (V-O-PP) and one that
triggers DP-internal focus, which in (60) would result in V-PP-O. Since that clause is still compatible with focus on \textit{de seda}, it can be argued that the clausal-level unmarked word order constraint is ranked higher than the focus-alignment constraint (to put it in informal constraint-ranking terms).

Regarding the syntactic structure of DP-internal \textit{como, parece que} it seems clear that those evaluatives are not generated in Comp-position, but rather inside the DP. Given the analysis presented earlier, this should not be surprising, since the \{+selC\} feature of \textit{que} can be deleted by \textit{como, parece}. However, there must be some additional restriction on the distribution of \textit{que} inside the DP, since there are very few other instances in which Comp can be generated in those positions. The suggestion in this respect is that in addition to syntactic licensing, there must be other interface constraints that restrict the possibility of DP-internal Comp. In the case of evaluatives the fact that Comp can be associated with focus is the interface condition that licenses its appearance inside DP.\(^{23}\)

Other examples of DP-internal Comp also involve very precise semantic conditions, as illustrated below. The first class of cases involves noun complement clauses that are selected by a noun such as \textit{hecho} ‘fact’, \textit{idea} ‘idea’, etc., as illustrated in (62). The fact that the embedded verb must be subjunctive suggests that these are indeed selected clauses, since subjunctive mood is typically selected by some lexical head. The second class of examples involves relative clauses (cf. (63)). In this case, the semantics of the relative clause restricts it to modifying only nouns.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(62)] a. La idea (de) que tu hermana venga a estudiar aquí me parece buena.
\hspace{2cm} ‘The idea that your sister comes to study here seems good to me.’
\item[b.] El presidente insiste en la sorprendente idea (de) que Iraq era un peligro inminente.
\hspace{2cm} that Iraq was a danger imminent
\end{itemize}

\(^{23}\)Although at this point it is not clear to me why Comp bears such a close relationship to focus, but presumably the fact that Comp usually denotes propositional content makes it visible when processing discourse-level constraints. Since focus is one of the key elements involved in discourse computation, languages would tend to make it prominently, prosodically or structurally (by associating with the most prominent syntactic node, or perhaps in both ways.
‘The president insists on the surprising idea that Iraq was an imminent danger.’

Los árboles derribaron el poste que habían construido hace poco.

‘The trees brought down the post that had been built a short while ago.’

To summarize this section, I have argued that DP-internal instances of como, parece que are also associated with focus, but that they must be generated DP-internally. Given the analysis presented, this should not be surprising. I have also argued that other interface conditions will restrict the possible instantiation of Comp inside DP, yielding, in effect three different types: selected noun complement clauses, relative clauses (whose semantic denotation restrict them to nominal complement positions) and focus-related Comp.

4. Conclusion

The data presented in this paper confirms the view of grammar as a general computational system with no construction-specific computational mechanisms. In particular, the analysis presented reinforces the idea that Comp can be inserted anywhere in the computation provided that it is properly licensed. In looking at the syntactic distribution of Comp in root and embedded contexts, I propose that selectional restrictions can be subsumed under the general agreement mechanism, a matching operation that deletes formal features. Additionally, I have argued that agreement is subject to intervention effects which determine its locality constraints.

Although the paper does not explore issues of semantic selection in any substantial depth, I have argued that in some cases (selection of embedded clauses by decir-type verbs), there is a syntactic aspect of s-selection. Finally, I have also suggested that interface constraints must also restrict the distribution of DP-internal Comp.
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