

3. PROPOSAL: To explain the data in (3), we will propose that the nominal head in such cases is in a position where main T cannot reach it as a target of Agree triggering the 3rd person singular form of the verb. A suitable explanation is Kayne's (1994) raising analysis of RCs (see also Bianchi 1999, i.a.) in which the nominal antecedent moves to Spec,CP of the embedded clause. The relevant difference between a 'regular' RC, which triggers agreement, and the unagreement data is the locus of the head D in the structure. As we see in (6) for the sentences in (5):

- (5) a. Me **gustan** [las cosas que haces] regular RC
 'I like_{3PL} the things that you do'
 b. Me **gusta** [las cosas que haces] unagreement RC
 'I like_{3SG} the things that you do'
- (6) a. Me T **gustan**_{3PL} [**DP [D las]**] [CP [cosas]_i [C' [C que] [TP haces t_i]]]
 |_____↑
 b. Me T **gusta**_{3SG} [**CP [DP las cosas]_i**] [C' [C que] [TP haces t_i]]
 |_____//____↑

While in (6a) the CP with the moved nominal head in Spec,CP is the complement of D, in (6b) the whole DP (with the determiner) stays in Spec,CP, leaving the whole RC as a CP, inaccessible for Agree from the matrix clause.

4. CONSEQUENCES: A consequence of this analysis is that the IA becomes a CP, which could be equated to the canonical argument illustrated in (2b). The crucial difference is that in the case of regular CP arguments the embedded verb is obligatorily in subjunctive mood, while in the unagreement cases the verb has to be in indicative:

- (7) a. Me gusta [las cosas que {**haces**_{IND} / *hagas_{SUBJ}}] unagreement RC
 b. Me gusta [que {*haces_{IND}/**hagas**_{SUBJ}} las cosas] regular CP argument

This is not a trivial difference, since it has been proved that subjunctive clauses have a closer relationship with the matrix clause as opposed to indicative clauses (Torrego & Uriagereka 1992, Uriagereka 2015, i.a.). This difference explains why only regular CP arguments (in subjunctive) can be fronted: the relationship of the main clause with the unagreement RC is very weak so the clause it is not fully licensed and has to remain in situ:

- (8) a. [Que **hagas** cosas] me gusta
 b. *[Las cosas que **haces**] me gusta

5. CONCLUSIONS: This paper has investigated structures whereby T does not agree with the IA as it would be expected in NOM-DAT psych-verb patterns in Spanish. This happens when the IA has a relative clause as a modifier. Regarding the data, exploring the Syntactic Atlas of Spanish, with access to social networks database, and other corpora available has allowed us to discover that this phenomenon is present in very different varieties of Spanish and that it is possible with a full class of verbs, description that was not included in the reference grammars of Spanish. These data do not only seem to provide further support for a raising analysis of relative clauses but also raises questions about the variation in agreement and the structure of clausal modifiers in Spanish.

REFERENCES: Belletti, A. & L. Rizzi. 1988. Psych Verbs and Theta Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6. 291-352. Bianchi, V. 1999. *Consequences of Antisymmetry. Headed Relative Clauses*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. RAE. CORPES [<http://web.frl.es/CORPES/>]. Gallego, A. 2014. *Atlas Sintáctico del Español*. (ASinEs) [<http://twitter.asines.org>]. Kayne, R. S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press. Martínez, J. A. 1999. La concordancia. In I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 2695-2786. Madrid: Espasa Calpe. Torrego, E. & Uriagereka, J. 1992. Indicative dependents. Ms, UMass Boston/UMD. Uriagereka, J. 2015. Subordinación: indicativos y subjuntivos. In Á.J. Gallego (ed.), *Perspectivas de sintaxis formal*, 265-298. Madrid: Akal.