On Left-Dislocation and Topicalization in Spanish*  

Introduction

In this article I will study some of the formal syntactic properties of left-dislocated configurations in Spanish. Left-dislocated sentences have an NP set off by commas at the beginning of a clause—TOP position—and a pronoun (or NP) which is anaphorically related to the phrase in TOP position.

(1) Al partido carlista, dicen que no lo legalizaron para las elecciones.  
   the party carlist say (3-p) that not it legalized (3-p) for the elections  
   'The Carlist party, they say that they did not legalize it for the elections.'

In section 1, I will propose that examples such as those in (1) have the underlying structure represented schematically in (2).

(2) $[\text{TOP} \ldots] [\text{COMP} \ldots] [\ldots \left\{ \text{PRONOUN} \right\} \ldots]$

In section 2, I will show that the syntactic properties of left-dislocated structures can constitute a diagnostic test to classify configurations which have lost the surface structure characteristics exemplified in (1), as a consequence of the application of a transformational rule unrelated to Left-Dislocation. In particular, I will argue (section 2.1) that sentences such as (3) are not the result of Subject Raising (or NP Preposing), even though parecer ‘seem’ is an item that allows such movement. (3) is a left-dislocation with the independent deletion of the nonemphatic subject pronoun in the embedded sentence:

(3) El niño parece que está protestando siempre.  
   the child seems that is complaining always  
   'It seems that the child is always complaining.'

* The research for this article was completed under Leave Fellowship W760438 and Research Grant 410-77-0417-R1 from the former Canada Council in 1977. I wish to thank several anonymous readers for their comments, and in particular the reader who provided me with the analysis discussed in fn. 9, together with many other useful suggestions that are not reflected in the article.

1 Examples are provided with a word-by-word gloss, and an English literal translation. 1, 2, 3 stand for first, second, and third person; s for singular; p for plural.
In section 2.2, I will argue that sentences of the type of (4) are not the result of Topicalization, but are examples of left-dislocated structures that have undergone Subject-Pronoun Deletion as well.

(4) Los estudiantes, acepto la sugerencia de María de que no tienen interés por mi asignatura.

'The students, I accept Mary's suggestion that they have no interest in my course.'

The left-dislocation analysis for (3) and (4) has interesting consequences in connection with certain conditions on rules. If (3) were the result of a raising process, the rule would violate the Propositional Island Condition (Chomsky (1977)), because the constituent el niño would have been extracted out of a tensed clause, as seen in (5).

(5) [Δ parece s[que el niño está protestando siempre]]

In sentences such as (6a), a Raising analysis provides a case of a rule that violates the Propositional Island Condition for the reasons given in connection with (3), the Specified Subject Condition because the process would have extracted the NP el niño across the lexical subject María, and the Subjacency Condition because the extraction would have applied across two cycles, as indicated in (6b):

(6) a. El niño, parece que María dice que está protestando siempre.

The child seems that Mary says that is complaining always

'The child, it seems that Mary says that he is always complaining.'

b. [Δ parece s[que María dice s[que el niño está protestando siempre]]]

Under the hypothesis that these sentences are left-dislocated structures that involve the deletion of the pronoun, these problems do not arise.

If (4) were the result of Topicalization, it would provide a case in which a movement rule that leaves a gap (a "chopping rule"; see Ross (1967)) violates the Complex NP Constraint, given that the constituent los estudiantes would have been extracted out of a complex NP, as indicated in (7). If Topicalization involves movement into COMP position (as in Chomsky (1977)), (7) would indicate that the rule does not observe Subjacency.

(7) [acepto NP[la sugerencia de María s[de que los estudiantes no tienen interés por mi asignatura]]]

Under a left-dislocation analysis with Subject-Pronoun Deletion, there is no violation of these conditions, since there is no movement. In section 3, I will sketch an analysis
of Topicalization as a movement-into-COMP rule. This transformation cannot be identified with Wh Movement, even though it observes Subjacency.

I will consider sentences that have a TOP-phrase in initial position, and another phrase—the one which has an anaphoric relation with the TOP one—which is moved by Topicalization, i.e. topicalized phrases within left-dislocated structures:

(8) Dinero, dicen que María cree que mucho, sí que tiene.
    money say (3-p) that Mary believes that much yes that has
    'Money, they say that Mary believes that {he, she} does have a lot.'

The position of dinero in (8) is not the result of a process sensitive to conditions on rules, while the position of mucho is the output of such a process. Dinero is the TOP-phrase within a left-dislocated structure of the type of (2); mucho is the phrase which is moved by Topicalization from COMP to COMP and which is partially deleted under identity conditions with the phrase in TOP position.

1. The Analysis of Left-Dislocation

1.1. Left-Dislocation and Topicalization

I have already given the characteristics of left-dislocated structures in connection with (1): they have a phrase in TOP position, and a pronoun or an NP elsewhere in the string. The TOP-phrase and the pronoun or NP are understood to be anaphorically related.

Left-dislocated structures must be distinguished from topicals, which have an initial NP set off by commas as well, and a gap, which is indicated by __ in (9):

(9) Dinero, dicen que no tiene __.
    money say (3-p) that not have (3-s)
    'Money, they say that {he, she} does not have ___.'

Ross (1967) proposed that topicals and left-dislocated sentences be generated by unbounded transformations. Topicalization had the effect of moving a constituent while leaving a gap in the original place. Its functioning classified it as a "chopping" rule subject to various restrictions, such as the Complex NP Constraint (CNPC). Topicalized structures in Spanish share the characteristics first pointed out by Ross. Movement is not possible out of complex phrases, and, as can be deduced from (10), Topicalization is sensitive to the CNPC specifically, in the sense in which Chomsky views this constraint.

(10) a. Dinero, acepto que pretendan que tienen __.
    money accept (1-s) that pretend (3-p) that have (3-p)
    'Money, I accept that they should pretend that they have ____.'

b. *Dinero, acepto la pretensión de que tienen __.
    money accept (1-s) the pretension of that have (3-p)
    'Money, I accept the pretension that they have ____.'
The difference between (10a) and (10b) is that in the first sentence we find an S-node where the second one has an NP ((11a) and (11b), respectively).²

\begin{align*}
11 & a. \quad [s\{acepto\} [s\{que\} pretendan \underline{s\{que\} tienen dinero\}]] \\
& b. \quad [s\{acepto\} \underline{NP\{la\ pretensión\}} \underline{s\{de\ que\} tienen dinero\}] \\
\end{align*}

According to Ross, Left-Dislocation moves a constituent over a variable and leaves a pronominal copy in the original place. As a copying rule, it is not subject to the constraints applying to chopping rules such as Topicalization. Left-dislocated structures are not subject to Ross’s constraints in Spanish, as seen in (12), for the CNPC.

\begin{align*}
12 & a. \quad El\ dinero,\ acepto\ que\ pretendan\ que\ lo\ tienen\ ya.
& \text{‘The money, I accept that they should pretend that they have it already.’} \\
& b. \quad El\ dinero,\ acepto\ la\ pretensión\ de\ que\ lo\ tienen\ ya.
& \text{‘The money, I accept the pretension that they have it already.’} \\
\end{align*}

Topicalized structures have always been considered the result of a movement transformation (for example, Ross (1967), Lakoff (1969), Neubauer (1970), Postal (1971; 1972), Ross (1973), Hirschbühler (1974; 1975), Emonds (1976), Chomsky (1977), and, for Spanish, Contreras (1976)). Recently, Chomsky (1977) has proposed that Topicalization be identified with Wh Movement in English. Sentences with topicalized phrases are assigned the basic structure of left-dislocated configurations, with a TOP-phrase as in (2). After Wh Placement and Wh Movement in the sentence which follows the TOP position, there is the deletion of the wh-phrase in COMP position. If this analysis is extended to Spanish, the basic structure of (9) (once Wh Placement has applied) should be (13a). ¿Qué represents the wh-phrase. Wh Movement applies iteratively to qué in (13a) to give (13b), before Wh Deletion.

\begin{align*}
13 & a. \quad [s\{TOP\{dinero\}\} \underline{s\{COMP\} dicen\ COMP\ no\ tiene\ qué\}] \\
& b. \quad [s\{TOP\{dinero\}\} \underline{s\{qué\} dicen\ que\ no\ tiene\ t\}] \\
\end{align*}

In (13b), t represents the initial trace left by Wh Movement.

In section 3, I return to Topicalization.

² Not all surface sequences of the type NP – S are complex NPs. For example, several people (among them an anonymous reviewer) have pointed out to me that it is possible to extract from haber-relative clauses, as in Dinero, no hay nadie que tenga ‘Money, there is no one that has’. In a forthcoming monograph, M. Suñer points out that relatives with haber should be analyzed as if the antecedent and the embedded S were not dominated by an NP. If we accept this hypothesis, then extraction should be possible. Extraction out of relative clauses whose matrix verb is not haber is not possible.

Other NP – S sequences have to be analyzed along the lines proposed for (55), and allow extraction as well. (10b) has been judged consistently ungrammatical; I propose that there is only one possible analysis for la pretensión de S, with an NP that dominates the sequence and makes extraction impossible.
1.2. Left-Dislocation as Basic

I have already presented a transformational hypothesis for Left-Dislocation originally given by Ross (1967), and accepted in various other publications (for example, Neubauer (1970), Emonds (1976), and, for Spanish, Contreras (1976)). However, there has been a competing hypothesis that assigns the properties of left-dislocated structures to the base, eliminating the necessity for a movement transformation (see, for example, Hirschbühler (1974; 1975) for French; Van Riemsdijk and Zwarts (1974) for Dutch; Postal (1971), Rodman (1974), Gundel (1975), and Chomsky (1977) for English). The argumentation presented by Hirschbühler to motivate the proposal that left-dislocated structures are basic is applicable to Spanish as well.

Chomsky (1977) has pointed out that in a framework that rejects structure-building transformations, the variety of structures that precede NPs in TOP position eliminates a transformational solution in principle. In Spanish, too, there is a large number of configurations that can precede NPs in TOP position.

I will assume that left-dislocated structures are generated in the base with a phrase in TOP position and another phrase elsewhere in the string and that a rule of semantic interpretation establishes an anaphoric relation between the two phrases. The interpretive rule will be discussed in section 1.4.

1.3. Rules for Left-Dislocation

Left-dislocated structures can be embedded very freely in Spanish. The range of verbs that admit embedded phrases in TOP position is very wide. The class includes verbs of saying, volition, and doubt, factives of various types, and implicatives.

(14) a. Dicen que a María, ni quieren verla.
say (3-p) that Mary not even want (3-p) see - her

‘They say that, Mary, they do not even want to see her.’

3 The reasons in favor of a base analysis for Left-Dislocation lead to the rejection of a recent proposal (Contreras (1976)) in which topicalized and left-dislocated structures are generated by the same movement transformation, one which leaves a pronominal copy behind. In those cases that I have called topicalizations here, Contreras postulates the subsequent deletion of the pronoun. Contreras’s hypothesis could be interpreted as an attempt to make chopping rules copying ones, within the line of work seen in Perlmutter (1972) for relativization. Perlmutter proposes that all chopping rules are rules that leave a shadow pronoun subsequently deleted. This hypothesis predicts that if pronouns and full NPs have different properties with respect to some processes, the characteristic behavior of pronouns will be found in cases of chopping rules. Neubauer (1970) had presented some evidence against this type of proposal, but Perlmutter did not judge it conclusive. More recently, Cinque (1975) has pointed out that Topicalization is an example of a chopping rule for which the situation opposite to the one predicted by Perlmutter’s proposal is found in Spanish.

In a recent note, Cinque (1977) has suggested that lefthand NPs in so-called ‘left-dislocated structures’ enter into two different types of constructions: one is the result of a copying operation; the other has a base-generated topic and a pronoun, as discussed here. Cinque uses French and Italian material. I will not pursue this question here, as Cinque’s argumentation is not applicable to Spanish examples in a homogeneous way.
b. Quiero que, la lección primera, le digan a María que se prepare para mañana.
   'I want that the first lesson, they should tell Mary that she should prepare it for tomorrow.'

The rule that generates left-dislocated structures must allow for embeddings. I will use Chomsky's formulation (1977) for this purpose, postulating the two base rules in (15).

\[(15)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
& a. \quad R1 : \hat{S} \rightarrow \text{TOP} \hat{S} \\
& b. \quad R2 : \hat{S} \rightarrow \text{COMP} \left\{ \text{\hat{S}} \right\}
\end{align*}
\]

These rules allow recursions in which there is a succession of dislocated NPs, as in (16).

\[(16)\] En cuanto a María, la enciclopedia dicen que se la regalaron con respecto a Mary, the encyclopedia say (3-p) that her it gave (3-p)
   to her
   'With respect to Mary, the encyclopedia they say that they gave it to her.'

1.4. Coreference in Left-Dislocation

I will now discuss some aspects of the interpretive rule that establishes an anaphoric relation between the phrase in TOP position and a proform in the following proposition (\(\hat{S}\)) in (2).

As is well known, Dougherty (1969) noticed that in positions in which nouns and nonanaphoric pronouns can freely occur, pronouns that can be understood anaphorically can also be understood nonanaphorically (the "anaporn" relation). Left-dislocated structures, however, are cases in which nouns and nonanaphoric pronouns cannot freely occur, in the relevant sense, and, as a result, the anaphoric relationship between the phrase in TOP position and the proform elsewhere cannot be incorporated within the anaporn relation. More recently, Lasnik (1976) has proposed that NPs and pronouns be allowed to refer freely; he has eliminated from the grammar rules that stipulate coreference relations and has postulated a principle that indicates the cases in which two NPs must have disjoint reference (that is, instances in which coreferential readings for two NPs are excluded). Lasnik is interested in part in reflecting the anaporn relation: if a pronoun permits a nonanaphoric interpretation, under some circumstances it requires such an interpretation. Again, the anaphoric relationship between the phrase in TOP position and the following pronoun in a left-dislocated structure cannot be incorporated within Lasnik's disjoint reference rule, as it represents a case in which a noncoreferential reading is not possible.
Within a transformational analysis for left-dislocation, the obligatoriness of the anaphoric relation could be related to the transformation that affects the dislocated constituent. If Left-Dislocation is a copying rule that involves an NP and produces a pronoun, as in Ross (1967), it can be proposed (Wasow (1972, chapter I, 31)) that the pronoun has as an antecedent the affected NP. Under this view, copying transformations always generate pronouns whose antecedents are the moved NPs. The anaphoric relationship between an NP in TOP position and the pronoun that follows is established by the transformation and does not require rules of interpretation that mark coreference; the pronoun is automatically controlled. However, under an analysis that does not involve copying, an approach to anaphora that eliminates the notion of stipulated coreference needs to be supplemented by additional rules. For this, we must keep in mind that the pronoun that appears in a left-dislocated structure has a dual role. It functions as a bound variable with respect to the NP in TOP position, and as such it enters into an anaphoric relation with that element. It can also enter into relations of disjoint reference, etc., with other pronouns within the proposition. In other words, the pronoun in a structure such as (2) is treated as a bound variable by the rule of interpretation that relates it to the TOP-phrase, but it is treated as an ordinary NP by the rule or rules that connect it to other NPs within the S structure. The two functions appear to be independent. The nonintersecting relations that the pronoun bears with respect to other pronouns or NPs in the proposition are sensitive to the constraints discussed by Lasnik (1976) or Reinhart (1976) and the constraints that Chomsky (1977) places on rules of construal. The anaphoric relation that the pronoun bears to the phrase in TOP position is not sensitive to constraints on rules of construal.

To see how the two types of rules operate, let us consider a series of examples, with the assumption that all NPs and pronouns are generated in the base with indices, and that they are allowed to refer freely.

(17) a. Nos cuentan que (ella) quiere que la merezcas.  
   us tell (3-p) that (she) wants that her deserve (2-s)  
   ‘They tell us that she wants you to deserve her.’  

b. Nos cuentan que (ella) quiere merecerla.  
   us tell (3-p) that (she) wants deserve - her  
   ‘They tell us that she wants to deserve her.’

In (17a), the rule of disjoint reference does not apply because la ‘her’ is inside a tensed sentence (present subjunctive), and ella ‘she’ is the immediately dominating clause. If the interpretive rule applies before deletions, there is a specified subject tú ‘you’ in the

---

4 The problem of the obligatory anaphoric relation of the pronoun and the TOP-phrase in a left-dislocated structure resembles the one found in connection with the ‘’*nonsloppy*’’ reading in a sentence such as *John saw him and Bill did too*. Williams (1977) and Sag (1977) have discussed VP Deletion/Interpretation from different perspectives, but both of them propose a rule that ensures that the form which corresponds to the *him* in the deleted/interpreted second VP is treated as a bound variable.
most deeply embedded clause, and that subject prevents the application of the rule as well. In brief, because of the Tensed-S Condition, and the Specified Subject Condition, the reference of *la ‘her’* is free; the clitic pronoun can be understood as having the same reference as *ella ‘she’*, or as having arbitrary reference. In (17b), the rule of disjoint reference applies with no impediment. The most deeply embedded clause is nontensed; its subject does not ‘count’ because it could be claimed that (a) it is controlled by *ella* in the upper clause, or that (b) it has been deleted by Equi, leaving no trace (the two alternatives have the same effect for our purposes). As a result, *ella* and *la* cannot intersect in reference.

In sentences with an NP in TOP position, the situation is the same, as seen in (18).

(18)  

a. La reina de las Españas, nos cuentan que (ella) quiere que *la*  
the queen of the Spains  us  tell (3-p) that (she) wants that *her*  
merezcas.  
\[\text{deserve (2-s)}\]  
‘The Queen of the Spains, they tell us that she wants you to deserve her.’  
b. La reina de las Españas, nos cuentan que (ella) quiere merecerla.  
the queen of the Spains  us  tell (3-p) that (she) wants deserve - *her*  
‘The Queen of the Spains, they tell us that she wants to deserve her.’

The rule of disjoint reference applies within the proposition in (18), and observes the constraints mentioned for (17). The reference of *la* in (18a) is free, but the reference of *la* in (18b) must not intersect with that of *ella*. In addition, a pronoun with the appropriate number and gender inflections (feminine, plural) must be interpreted as coreferential with the NP in TOP position. Either *la* or *ella* can be selected for this purpose, with the reference of *la* constrained by the disjoint reference rule, as already indicated. While the rule of disjoint reference is sensitive to the Specified Subject Condition and the Tensed-S Condition, as indicated by the readings discussed in relation to (17a) or (18a), the rule that relates the TOP-phrase to a pronoun in the proposition is not. It establishes an anaphoric connection across one or more tensed sentences, and across one or more specified subjects, both in (18a) and (18b), regardless of the pronoun which is selected as the anaphor. Suppose that a pronoun is generated in TOP position, as in (19b):

(19)  

a. Juan, me dicen que (*él*) sí quiere hablar.  
John  me tell (3-p) that (he) yes wants speak  
‘John, they tell me that he does want to talk.’  
b. *El, me dicen que Juan sí quiere hablar.  
he  me tell (3-p) that John yes wants speak  
‘Him, they tell me that John does want to talk.’

Lasnik’s rule of noncoreference stipulates that the pronoun *él ‘he’* must be noncoreferential with the NP *Juan ‘John’* because *él* precedes and commands *Juan* and *Juan* is
not a pronoun ('If NP₁ precedes and commands NP₂, and NP₂ is not a pronoun, then NP₁ and NP₂ are noncoreferential' (Lasnik (1976, 6))). In this respect, sentence (19b) is similar to (20b), because él and Juan must be noncoreferential as well.

(20) a. Juan me dice que él sí quiere hablar.  
    John me tells that he yes wants talk  
    'John tells me that he does want to talk.'

b. El me dice que Juan sí quiere hablar.  
    he me tells that John yes wants talk  
    'He tells me that John does want to talk.'

The similarity between (19b) and (20b) stops at this point. (20b) has a noncoreferential reading because the sentence involves a structure in which NPs and nonanaphoric pronouns can freely occur, but (19b) lacks the noncoreferential reading because it is a structure to which the anaporn relation does not apply and as such it is ill-formed. In a parallel fashion, (20a) exhibits a pronoun él with free reference, while (19a) falls outside of the anaporn relation and receives an interpretation in which él must be anaphorically related to Juan.

A left-dislocated structure is interpreted with $\hat{S}$ as an open sentence satisfied by the NP in TOP position; there must be at least one NP in the proposition that is interpreted as anaphoric to the TOP-phrase. The pronoun can then be translated in logical form by the same variable as the NP in TOP position. We can view this process in two steps:

(21) $\hat{S}[TOP[NP_i] \hat{S}[. . .pronoun. . .]] \rightarrow \hat{S}[TOP[NP_i] \hat{S}[. . .pronoun_i. . .]]$

(22) $\hat{S}[TOP[NP_i] \hat{S}[. . .pronoun_i. . .]] \rightarrow \hat{S}[TOP[(NP)_x] \hat{S}[. . .x . . .]]$

The interpretive rules would mark as ill-formed a sentence in which no variable is satisfied by the phrase in TOP position. To conclude, the structure $\hat{S}[TOP[NP] \hat{S}[. . . pronoun . . .]]$ is interpreted with the proform as a variable bound by the node TOP[NP], and the semantic interpretation determined by the derivation of $\hat{S}$, including aspects of anaphora independently needed in sentence grammar.

2. The Diagnosis of Left-Dislocation

In this section, I will consider structures that originate as left-dislocations, but which, at surface structure level, have lost some of their characteristics through an independent process that deletes the pronoun generated in the base, if it is a subject.

2.1. Left-Dislocation or Raising?

I will now proceed to argue in favor of a left-dislocation type of analysis for the sentences in (3), (23), and (24).
(23) Mis amigos, parece que van a votar al PSOE o al PC.
my friends seems that are going to vote for the PSOE or for the PC
‘My friends, it seems that they are going to vote for the PSOE or the PC.’

(24) Camuñas y Calvo Sotelo, resultó que se presentaron con el independiente de Suárez
‘Camuñas and Calvo Sotelo, it happened that they ran with Suárez, the independent.’

2.1.1. An indication that the sentences in (3), (23), and (24) are not the result of Raising
or NP Preposing is given by the lack of agreement between the NP in initial position
and the matrix verb in (23) and (24).

In Spanish, both *parecer ‘seem’ and *resultar ‘happen’ are verbs that allow Raising.
However, constructions which are the result of such a process must undergo Subject-
Verb Agreement in the matrix clause obligatorily, as in (25a), as compared to (25b).

(25) a. Los niños parecen estar enfermos.
the children seem to be sick.
‘The children seem to be sick.’

b. *Los niños parece estar enfermos.
the children seems to be sick
‘The children seems to be sick.’

Since verbs agree in person and number with their (derived) subjects obligatorily, it can
be concluded that the rule of Raising has as output the structure which makes the NP
which is extracted the subject of the matrix sentence.

In (23) and (24), there is no agreement. The application of Subject-Verb Agreement
produces an ungrammatical result.

(26) *Mis amigos parecen que van a votar al PSOE o al PC. (corresponding to (23))

(27) *Camuñas y Calvo Sotelo resultaron que se presentaron con el independiente de Suárez. (corresponding to (24))

The obligatory lack of agreement in (3), (23), and (24) leads to the conclusion that
the NP in the matrix does not function as the subject of *parece and *resultó. If, as a
consequence, a Raising analysis along the lines of (5) for (3) is rejected, three alternate
analyses seem to be open in principle.

A) (3), (23), and (24) are the result of Topicalization, traditionally a movement
transformation that leaves a gap.

B) The initial NP is generated in the base as the TOP-phrase of a left-dislocated
structure, as in (2). The pronoun, generated in the base, is deleted by the rule that
applies to nonemphatic subject pronouns in all types of environments, and which is independently needed in the grammar of Spanish. Under this proposal, the basic structure of (23) is (28), where the deletion is indicated as well:

\[
\text{(28) } \$[\text{TOP}[\text{mis amigos}] \Downarrow \phi \text{ (by Subject-Pronoun Deletion)}
\]

(C) The sentences are derived by Raising within a left-dislocated structure, with the subsequent deletion of the pronoun, as indicated in (29).

\[
\text{(29) } \Downarrow \phi \text{ (by Subject-Pronoun Deletion)}
\]

In (29), \emph{ellos} raises to the subject position of \( \hat{S} \), and is deleted by Subject-Pronoun Deletion at that point.

I will discuss proposals (A) and (B) in the following sections, arguing in favor of (B) as the correct solution. I will now dispose of proposal (C) because its rejection depends on the agreement material presented above.

If Raising had occurred prior to Subject-Pronoun Deletion in (3), (23), and (24), making \emph{ellos} the subject of \emph{parecer} and \emph{resultar}, plural agreement would be obligatory for the verb in (23) and (24). The obligatory lack of agreement in (3), (23), and (24) leads to the conclusion that there has not been Raising.\(^5\)

2.1.2. Raising cannot extract a constituent out of a complex phrase, such as a relative clause. Consider (30a). It should be impossible to move \emph{los hombres} ‘the men’ out of the relative structure which contains it, to locate it in subject position in the matrix clause.

---

\(^5\) Sentences such as those in (i) involve Raising within a left-dislocated structure, with the subsequent deletion of the subject pronoun in (ia).

(i) a. \text{Los hombres, parecen ser felices.} \quad \text{The men seem (3-p) be happy. ‘The men, they seem to be happy.’}
   b. \text{Los hombres, ellos parecen ser felices.} \quad \text{The men they seem be happy. ‘The men, they seem to be happy.’}

The structure in (ia) is not the result of Topicalization. The derivation of (ia) should be as follows: the basic structure is (iia), where agreement in the lower clause is already indicated and irrelevant to this discussion: Raising applies to give (iib); Subject-Verb Agreement in the upper clause gives (iic); then Subject-Pronoun Deletion gives (iid). The derivation of (ib) is similar, except that Subject-Pronoun Deletion does not apply. t is the trace left by Raising.

(ii) a. \$[\text{TOP}[\text{los hombres}] \Downarrow \phi \text{ [los ser felices]]}
   b. \$[\text{TOP}[\text{los hombres}] \Downarrow \phi \text{ [t ser felices]]}
   c. \$[\text{TOP}[\text{los hombres}] \Downarrow \phi \text{ [ellos ser felices]]}
   d. \$[\text{TOP}[\text{los hombres}] \Downarrow \phi \text{ [ellos ser felices]]}
a. Parece que alguien a quien estos hombres consideraban su
salvación se ha suicidado.

‘It seems that someone whom these men considered their
salvation has committed suicide.’

b. [Δ parece qnp[alguien nqa quien estos hombres consideraban su
salvación]] vnp[se ha suicidado]]

*Estos hombres parecen que alguien a quien consideraban su
salvación se ha suicidado.

‘These men seem that someone whom (they) considered their
salvation has committed suicide.’

Consider (32), and compare it with (31). (32) is well-formed. The difference between
the two sentences is that in (32) there is no agreement between the matrix verb, which
appears in the singular, and the initial NP in the plural.

Estos hombres, parece que alguien a quien consideraban su
salvación se ha suicidado.

‘These men, it seems that someone whom (they) considered their
salvation has committed suicide.’

The reasons given in connection with the deviance of (31) eliminate a Raising analysis
for (32), (3), (23), and (24), because these sentences share common characteristics.

2.1.3. It is not the case that a subject can be ‘‘raised’’ across conjuncts. Such a
movement would violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint (Ross (1967)). Consider,
for instance, (33b). It should not be possible to move the subject of the second conjunct,
esos economistas ‘those economists’, to make it the subject of resulta ‘happen’ in the
first conjunct, violating the Propositional Island Condition, among other constraints.
The output of this type of movement is deviant, as seen in (34).

a. Resulta que el partido presentó el programa económico, y
happens that the party presented the program economic and
esos economistas se sienten decepcionados.
those economists themselves feel deceived

‘It happens that the party presented the economic program and those
economists feel deceived.’
b. \[ s[\triangle \text{resulta que el partido presentó el programa económico}] \quad \text{y} \quad s[\text{esos economistas se sienten decepcionados}] \]

*(Esos economistas resultan que el partido presentó el programa económico y se sienten decepcionados.)*

Those economists happen that the party presented the economic program and they feel deceived.'

However, consider (35): it is a grammatical string in which there is no agreement between *resulta* ‘happens’ in the singular, and the initial NP *esos economistas* in the plural. For the reasons just given, the sentence cannot be considered the output of a raising-type process across conjuncts.

(35) *Esos economistas, resulta que el partido presentó el programa económico, y se sienten decepcionados.*

Those economists, it happens that the party presented the economic program and they feel deceived.'

In brief, I have shown in sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3 that a Raising analysis for (3), (23), (24), (32), and (33) goes against several of the general conditions that movement rules obey, and makes the wrong predictions about verb agreement. It would appear that, regardless of the specific formulation that is accepted for the conditions on rules that I have mentioned, a Raising analysis with or without left-dislocation is excluded by the previous argumentation.

### 2.2. Left-Dislocation or Topicalization?

I will now turn to the other two possibilities mentioned previously: Topicalization, traditionally considered a movement rule leaving a gap, versus left-dislocation as basic with Subject-Pronoun Deletion.

I will no longer be restricted to verbs that allow Raising, but I will consider sentences in which such an analysis is excluded in principle: (4) and (36).

(36) *Los estudiantes, dice María que no quieren examinarse.*

The students says Mary that not want (3-p) examine - themselves

‘The students, Mary says that they do not want to take exams.’

For these sentences and those discussed in section 2.1, it could be proposed that there has been movement of the embedded subject NP to initial position through Topicalization, as in (37).
2.2.1. A first indication that these sentences are not the result of Topicalization could be that the process is limited to indefinite NPs in most cases, while left-dislocation is not constrained as to the definiteness of the NP in TOP position. Compare (38a,b) and (39a,b) in this respect.

(38) a. Libros, dicen que lee.
    books say (3-p) that read (3-s)
    'Books, they say that he reads.'

   b. *Los libros, dicen que lee.
    the books say (3-p) that reads (3-s)
    'The books, they say that he reads.'

(39) a. A la niña, dicen que le habló.
    to the little girl say (3-p) that her talked (3-s)
    'To the little girl, they say that he talked to her.'

   b. *A la niña, dicen que habló.
    to the little girl say (3-p) that talked (3-s)
    'To the little girl, they say that he talked.'

Since the sentences I have presented so far have definite NPs in TOP position, it could be argued that the Topicalization analysis goes against the restrictions that this process has in Spanish, and that a left-dislocation plus Pronoun Deletion analysis avoids the problem. However, this argument is of limited value, since there are a few cases in which definite NPs appear in TOP position with no pronoun in the following structure, and where the gap has to be associated with a nonsubject. Example (40a) is from Hatcher (1956); (40b) is mine:

(40) a. La reina de las Españas te mereces, hermoso.
    the queen of the Spains yourself deserve beautiful
    'The Queen of the Spains you deserve, beautiful one.'

   b. El Sol y la Luna te daría, vida mía.
    the Sun and the Moon you give (1-s) life mine
    'The Sun and the Moon I would give you, my love.'

There seems to be a limited class of verbs that are "bridges" for topicalizations of definite NPs in nonsubject position: merecer 'to deserve', dar 'to give', querer 'to want', desear 'to desire', and a few others. The movement is blocked by verbs such as tener 'to have' and conocer 'to know' whose definite object NP is a referring expression. In other words, the possibility of extraction may correlate with one of the semantic

---

6 See footnote 12 for the formal properties that classify these sentences as topicalized strings.
dimensions of nonreferentiality. I do not know if this aspect could be related to the notion of semantic dominance as discussed in Erteschik (1977).

(41) *La reina de las Españas tienes, hermoso.
   the queen of the Spains have (2-s) beautiful
   'The Queen of the Spains you have, beautiful one.'

In the sentences I have discussed so far there is no restriction as to the type of verb in the clause in which the gap must be located, as seen in (42).

(42) a. La reina de las Españas, dicen que ____ se merece todo.
   the queen of the Spains say (3-p) that ____ herself deserves all
   'The Queen of the Spains, they say that she deserves everything.'
   b. La reina de las Españas, dicen que ____ tiene de todo.
      the queen of the Spains say (3-p) that ____ has (3-s) of all
      'The Queen of the Spains, they say that she has everything.'

In consequence, it still seems possible to maintain that the hypothesis that there has been Topicalization in (36), and in the sentences discussed in section 2.1, does not take into account the restrictions on definiteness that apply to this process in Spanish.

2.2.2. I have already presented some structural properties with respect to the sentences in section 2.1 that eliminate a Topicalization proposal together with the Raising proposal.

First, Topicalization is subject to the CNPC, as seen in (10b) as compared with (10a). The sentences with a TOP-phrase and no subject pronoun are not sensitive to this constraint, as seen in (4), and in (42) in connection with relative clauses.

Topicalization cannot move an NP from inside a relative clause. Movement of dinero 'money' to initial position should be impossible in (43a), as (43b) indicates.

(43) a. [↓] NP[alguien s[que tenga dinero]] VP[no puede comprender mi situación]
   b. *Dinero, alguien que tenga no puede comprender
      money someone who would have not can understand
      mi situación.
      my situation
      'Money, someone who would have cannot understand my situation.'

A Topicalization analysis for (32) would allow this transformation to extract out of relative clauses and different types of complex NPs.

Second, Topicalization does not apply across conjuncts. In (44a), movement of dinero out of the second conjunct should be impossible, as seen in (44b).

(44) a. [↓] s[mi madre ha venido] y s[tengo dinero]
b. *Dinero, mi madre ha venido y tengo.
   money my mother has come and have (1-s)
   ‘Money, my mother has come and I have.’

In (35), there is a TOP-phrase in initial position, and a gap in the subject position of the second conjunct. A Topicalization analysis for (35) is impossible in view of what has been said.

In brief, Topicalization is restricted in relation to the definite NPs it can move, while no restriction appears in connection with the fronted definite NPs of sentences such as (42). Topicalization is subject to the CNPC; no such restriction is involved in the examples in section 2.1 or in this section. Topicalization is subject to the Coordinate Structure Constraint, which is not applicable to the sentences with no number agreement between initial NP and following verb in section 2.1, or to those in this section. As a consequence, a Topicalization analysis must be rejected, regardless of the specific treatment proposed for this rule.

2.3. Advantages of a Left-Dislocation Analysis

The hypothesis that the examples in sections 2.1–2.2 originate as left-dislocated structures, with a basic phrase marker of the type of (2), avoids the problems that the Raising and Topicalization analyses pose. The gap in subject position within one of the clauses that follow the TOP-phrase can be attributed to Subject-Pronoun Deletion.

Subject-Pronoun Deletion applies after Subject–Verb Agreement, as already pointed out. It is a rule that does not involve deletion under conditions of identity, and, as such, it appears to be a free deletion, not subject to the constraints that apply to movement or deletion-under-identity rules. Subject-Pronoun Deletion applies to nonemphatic pronouns in matrix and embedded clauses alike, irrespective of the environment. Conditions on rules such as the CNPC, the Coordinate Structure Constraint, and the Specified Subject Condition that are apparently violated in many of the cases I have presented are not applicable because the derivational history of the relevant sentences does not involve movement, but a process of deletion that is not sensitive to conditions of identity.

The proposed analysis fills a gap in the distribution of pronouns in constructions with TOP-phrases. Traditional grammars often point out that in structures of the type of (45), the clitic is obligatory, as seen by the deviance of (45b):

\[
\begin{align*}
(45) \quad & \text{A Juan, lo que dicen que parece que } \begin{cases} 
    \text{a. le} \\
    \text{b. *__} 
\end{cases} \text{ interes} \\
& \text{to John that which say (3-p) that seems that } \begin{cases} 
    \text{a. him} \\
    \text{b. *__} 
\end{cases} \text{ interests} \\
& \text{estudiar es la biología. study is the biology}
\end{align*}
\]
‘John, what it seems that is interesting \{a. to him \ b. \} is to study biology.’

In our terms, the obligatoriness of the clitic pronoun in (45) is a direct consequence of the CNPC that does not allow Topicalization out of relative clauses. Only a left-dislocated structure is possible in this case: that is, the clitic is obligatory. However, the distributional pattern is broken when dealing with subject pronouns; they are optional, as in (46):

(46) Juan, lo que dicen que parece que \{a. él \ b. \} quiere estudiar es la biología.

‘John, what they say that seems that \{a. he \ b. \} wants to study is the biology.’

Under our proposal, (46b) is parallel to (45a) in the sense that it does not violate the CNPC because it is not the output of Topicalization, but rather of Subject-Pronoun Deletion within a left-dislocation. The CNPC is inapplicable. (45b) could only be the result of Topicalization, a rule which is subject to the CNPC.

3. Topicalization

3.1. Topicalization Is Not Wh Movement

I will now sketch an analysis of Topicalization as a successive cyclic movement transformation (that is, one that observes Subjacency) and, at the same time, distinguish it from Wh Movement in Spanish. I will then proceed to consider the properties of left-dislocated structures in which Topicalization applies within the Š structure (see (2)). Let me first recapitulate the main reason not to identify Topicalization with Wh Movement in Spanish (Rivero (1977)). Chomsky (1977) has recently proposed that Topicalization be identified with Wh Movement in English. Topicalized sentences are assigned the basic structure of left-dislocated configurations, as in (2). Wh Placement and Wh Movement apply in Š, as indicated in (13), and, subsequently, the wh-phrase in COMP position is deleted. Under such an analysis, the characteristics of relatives and direct and indirect questions should be found in topicalized configurations. There are four diagnostic properties assigned by Chomsky to Wh Movement structures in English. Those properties are connected with Wh Movement in Spanish as well. Three of those characteristics are shared by topicalized strings, but one of them, the Wh-Island Con-
straint (Chomsky (1973)), is inapplicable to Topicalization. Direct and indirect questions are subject to this constraint—(47a), (48a)—while topicalized sentences are not—(47b), (48b):\(^7\)

\[(47)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & *¿Qué te pregunta (que) por qué no tiene? \\
& \text{what you ask (3-s) (that) why not has} \\
& \text{‘What does he ask you why he does not have?’}
\end{align*} \]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Dinero, te pregunta (que) por qué no tiene.} \\
& \text{money you ask (3-s) (that) why not has} \\
& \text{‘Money, he asks you why he does not have.’}
\end{align*} \]

\[(48)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & *¿Qué preguntan (que) quién tiene? \\
& \text{what ask (3-p) (that) who has} \\
& \text{‘What do they ask who has?’}
\end{align*} \]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Dinero, preguntan (que) quién tiene.} \\
& \text{money ask (3-p) (that) who has} \\
& \text{‘Money, they ask who has.’}
\end{align*} \]

In (47a) and (48a), movement of the \textit{wh}-phrase \textit{qué} ‘what’ to the higher COMP is blocked by the presence of a \textit{wh}-phrase (\textit{por qué} ‘why’ and \textit{quién} ‘who’, respectively) in the lower COMP. Strict cyclicity prevents the movement of one of the \textit{wh}-phrases into the lower COMP when such a position is freed by the movement of the other \textit{wh}-phrase into the higher COMP. However, a \textit{wh}-phrase in a lower COMP does not block Topicalization to the matrix: (47b) and (48b). Because of this crucial difference, Topicalization cannot be identified with \textit{Wh} Movement in Spanish.

\subsection*{3.2. Topicalization as Movement to COMP}

At this point, it should be pointed out that Topicalization is possible in the same range of embedded structures that allow left-dislocations (see section 1.3). The large variety of matrix elements that allow topicalizations eliminates the possibility of considering this to be a root transformation in the sense of Emonds (1976), with an analysis in which a limited class of matrices are treated as presentential elements. Under the proposal that transformations that apply within embedded structures are cyclic, it follows that Topicalization is a cyclic rule in Spanish. Later on, the demonstration that Topicalization observes Subjacency will further motivate this conclusion.

The different properties of Topicalization in Spanish can be reflected by the following analysis. Topicalization is a movement rule that applies in a left-dislocated basic structure of the type of (2). The rule moves a constituent—sometimes identical to the phrase in TOP position in \( \hat{S} \)—to a node dominated by COMP in \( \hat{S} \). The Spanish COMP

\(^7\) I consider \textit{Wh} Movement in questions alone. Similar arguments can be developed in relation to relatives. This indicates that Topicalization cannot be identified with the rule for relatives (if relatives and interrogatives are generated by different processes).
dominates two types of dummy nodes, one for *wh*-phrases and another one for topicalized phrases (*t*-phrases from now on). These nodes cannot be doubly filled. Topicalization observes Subjacency; that is, it is a bounded transformation that cannot apply more than once in certain structures because the movement of a *t*-phrase may block the movement of other candidates to be transported by Topicalization. However, Topicalization and *Wh* Movement can both apply within one sentence with no resulting ungrammaticality, as seen in (47b) and (48b), given that two types of empty nodes are provided for these two movements into COMP position. When the *t*-phrase that moves into COMP is identical (totally or in part) to the basic phrase in TOP position, deletion under identity occurs.

I will not list other possible analyses for Topicalization. As I motivate the different features of my proposal, I will nevertheless point out the shortcomings of some logical possibilities that recent discussions on rules suggest.

The phrase structure rules of Spanish generate a complementizer node that has two dummy nodes, as in (49).

(49) COMP → QU Δₜ Δₕₗₜₜ

The indices *t* and *wh* attached to the dummy nodes are for ease of exposition in the discussion. QU identifies the complementizer in a general way, without further specification as to its classes in the grammar of Spanish. The rule involved in relatives and interrogatives places the moved *wh*-phrase in COMP position to the right of the complementizer QU and to the right of the node Δₜ. Topicalization places the topicalized phrase in COMP position to the right of the complementizer QU and to the left of the node Δₕₗₜₜ. That *wh*-phrases move to the right of the complementizer is seen in sentences that permit both the complementizer *que* ‘that’ and the *wh*-phrase to cooccur as in (50).

(50) a. Te preguntan que para qué quieres el préstamo.
you ask (3-p) that for what want (2-s) the loan
‘They ask you what do you want the loan for.’

b. *Te preguntan para qué que quieres el préstamo.

The characteristics of (50) cannot be attributed to an idiosyncratic feature of one or two verbs in the lexicon, but are connected in a very general way with verbs of saying. Verbs that can be followed by the complementizer *que* preceding the *wh*-phrase are, for instance, *preguntar* ‘ask’, *decir* ‘say’, *repetir* ‘repeat’, *tartamudear* ‘stutter’, *gritar* ‘scream’, *pensar* ‘think’, *susurrar* ‘whisper’, to name but a few. Sentences such as those in (51) are well-formed, and their interpretation classifies them as indirect questions.

*Chomsky and Lasnik (1977, 434) propose as a tentative principle of Universal Grammar that the rule of Wh Movement places the *wh*-phrase in COMP position to the left of the complementizer. As the following discussion indicates, the principle cannot be generalized to Spanish, raising questions as to its universal character.*
It appears that the presence of *que* is not governed by a limited list of main verbs, and that the complementizer can cooccur with all types of wh-phrases, as seen in (50) and (51). This justifies the postulation of COMP → QU \( \Delta_\text{wh} \) as one of the phrase structure rules of Spanish. That Topicalization locates a phrase to the right of the complementizer, but to the left of the wh-phrase, is seen in (52).

(52) a. Dinero, te preguntan que tanto para qué quieres.
    money you ask (3-p) that so much for what want (2-s)
    ‘Money, they ask you what do you want so much for.’

b. *Dinero, te preguntan que para qué tanto quieres.

c. \( \text{s}_\text{TOP}[\text{dinero}] \text{s}_\text{[te preguntan]} \text{s}_\text{[COMP[que tanto1 para qué2]} \text{s}_\text{[quieres t1 t2]]] \)

In (52a), *dinero* ‘money’ is the phrase generated in TOP position in the base in a left-dislocated structure of the type of (2). *Tanto* ‘so much’ is a topicalized phrase that has been moved into COMP position after the complementizer *que* ‘that’ and before the wh-phrase *para qué* ‘for what’, as seen in (52c). \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) are the traces of *tanto* and *para qué*, respectively. In (52), a rule of deletion has reduced the t-phrase *tanto dinero* ‘so much money’ to *tanto* ‘so much’, under identity conditions with the TOP-phrase *dinero* ‘money’. In other words, *tanto* is what remains of the t-phrase in COMP position once constituents identical to the TOP are removed. I will return to this deletion. If the t-phrase moves to the highest COMP in the sentence, we obtain (53a) without a complementizer in the matrix, or (53b) with a complementizer between the phrase in TOP position and the t-phrase in COMP position, as indicated in (53c). (53b) is more emphatic than (53a), a difference that I will not discuss here.

(53) a. Dinero, tanto, te preguntan (que) para qué quieres.
    money so much you ask (3-p) (that) for what want (2-s)
    ‘Money, so much, they ask you what you want (it) for.’

b. Dinero, que tanto, te preguntan (que) para qué quieres.
    money so much you ask (3-p) (that) for what want (2-s)

c. \( \text{s}_\text{TOP}[\text{dinero}] \text{s}_\text{[COMP[(que) tanto1]} \text{s}_\text{[te preguntan s}_\text{[COMP[(que) para qué2]} \text{s}_\text{[quieres t1 t2]]] \)
If the t-phrase and the wh-phrase are both within COMP, then the possibility of placing the complementizer que between the t-phrase and the wh-phrase is excluded by the phrase structure rule I have proposed ((54)):

(54) a. Niños, murmuró que tantos, para qué quería.
    children murmured (3-s) that so many for what wanted (3-s)
    ‘Children, he murmured why would he want so many.’

b. *Niños, murmuró tantos, que para qué quería.

The complementizer que, which is obligatory with verbs of saying other than decir ‘say’ and preguntar ‘ask’ in indirect questions, is placed before the t-phrase and not after it. Murmurar is not used parenthetically here.

Under the present analysis, Topicalization can be made sensitive to the CNPC for the same reasons that make Wh Movement observe this condition. Topicalization is a cyclic rule that observes Subjacency. NP as a cyclic node lacks a COMP; therefore, the topicalized phrase cannot move out of a complex NP. The Wh-Island Constraint, a consequence of Subjacency, too, is not applicable to Topicalization, because wh-phrases and t-phrases move into different positions in COMP. In this sense, the Spanish COMP can be doubly filled, but, as we shall see, the empty nodes cannot be doubly filled.

A t-phrase cannot block the movement of a wh-phrase and vice versa, as seen before. However, it should be the case that if Topicalization moves a t-phrase into COMP position, no further movement of a t-phrase into that COMP should be possible, if each one of the nodes cannot be doubly filled, as in (55).

(55) a. Dinero dicen que cree que tiene ganas de ahorrar.
    money say (3-p) that believes that has desires of save
    ‘Money, they say that he believes that he has the desire to save.’

b. Ganas dicen que cree que tiene de ahorrar dinero.
    desires say (3-p) that believes that has of save money
    ‘The desire they say that he believes that he has of saving money.’

c. *Dinero, ganas dicen que cree que tiene de ahorrar.
    money desires say (3-p) that believes that has of save

In (55a), Topicalization can apply to extract a phrase in the most deeply embedded sentence across ganas in a higher sentence; as a consequence, ganas de ahorrar ‘desires to save’ cannot be analyzed as a complex noun phrase. I will propose the following structure for the string: \[ v_p[[tienen]_{NP}[ganas]_S[de ahorrar]] \]. The CNPC is not applicable in this case because \[ NP[ganas] \] as a cyclic node does not dominate S, nor is there an NP node dominating both \[ NP[ganas] \] and \[ S[de ahorrar] \]. This analysis has the additional advantage of providing a structure for ganas that allows its topicalization. The head noun in a complex NP does not appear in TOP position in left-dislocated or topicalized structures (Acepto el hecho de que nos critique ‘I accept the fact that he should criticize us’, but *El hecho, acepto (de) que nos critique).
In (55a), a t-phrase from the object position of the most deeply embedded clause—dinero—moves to the matrix. In (55b), the t-phrase originates in the object position of tiene 'has': ganas. As (55c) indicates, it is not possible to have two t-phrases move into the same COMP position at once. Compare (55c) with (55d), a left-dislocated structure involving the movement of only one t-phrase:

(55) d. El dinero, ganas cree que tiene de ahorrarlo.
the money desires believes that has of save - it
'The money, the desire he believes that he has to save it.'

Under the proposed analysis, there are two TOPs in initial position: el dinero and ganas. El dinero is associated with lo 'it' and there is no movement of this last constituent to the matrix. However, there is movement of a t-phrase associated with ganas into COMP position in the matrix. Since Topicalization moves only one phrase, the t-phrase position in COMP is not doubly filled. The situation is similar in the case of Wh Movement. The Spanish COMP cannot be doubly filled by wh-phrases: *¿Quién qué quiere? ‘Who what wants?’ It can be assumed that the deviance of (55c) and the deviance of (56a) are related, and are consequences of the hypothesis that the COMP node cannot be doubly filled by a t-phrase, together with the Subjacency Condition (in connection with the Specified Subject Condition and/or the Propositional Island Condition):

(56) a. *Dinero, dicen que ganas sí tiene de ahorrar.
money say (3-p) that desires yes has of save
'Money, they say that desire he has of saving.'

b. El dinero, dicen que ganas sí tiene de ahorrarlo.
the money say (3-p) that desires yes has of save - it
'The money, they say that desire he has of saving it.'

The ungrammaticality of (56a) is predicted under the hypothesis that Topicalization observes Subjacency, and operates in an iterative fashion from COMP to COMP. In (56a), there are two phrases affected by Topicalization, ganas and dinero. Topicalization of ganas to an intermediate COMP blocks the topicalization of dinero to the matrix. Subjacency and the Specified Subject Condition and/or the Propositional Island Condition prevent the movement of dinero over an intermediate COMP already filled by a t-phrase ((57)).

(57) §[TOP[dinero] §[COMP §[dicen §[COMP §[TOP[ganas] §[COMP[ganas] §[sí él tiene t, de ahorrar dinero]]]]]]

9 I take NP and § (but not S) as the cyclic (or bounding) nodes for Subjacency. An anonymous reviewer pointed out that my analysis predicts that embedded left-dislocated structures should not constitute t-islands, but they do, as seen in (ia):

(i) a. Dicen que ese dinero, creen que Juan tiene ganas de ahorrarlo.
say (3-p) that that money believe (3-p) that John has desires of save - it
'They say that that money, they believe John wishes to save it.'
(56b) does not involve movement in connection with *el dinero. *El dinero is related to the clitic lo ‘it’ in the most deeply embedded sentence, and no transformation (except the preposing of the clitic, under some analyses) is required for the positions of these two constituents. There is only one application of Topicalization; it moves the t-phrase ganas into the COMP that follows the embedded TOP-phrase.

I will now give the reasons to consider that in a sentence such as (62a), dinero is a phrase generated in the base in TOP position, while mucho is the remaining portion of a phrase moved into COMP by Topicalization. Consider (58). Two analyses seem to be possible in principle: Topicalization-as-movement as outlined above, or Topicalization as unbounded deletion-under-identity.

\[ \text{b. *Ganas, dicen que ese dinero, creen que Juan tiene de ahorrarlo.} \]
\[ \text{desires say (3-p) that that money believe (3-p) that John has of save - it} \]

(ib) is the result of moving the NP ganas in the embedded clause from COMP to COMP in the structure indicated in (ii), which is generated in accordance with the phrase structure rules in (15), and which shows that an embedded TOP will always be immediately preceded and immediately followed by a COMP.

\[ \text{(ii) } \text{s}\{\text{TOP-ganas} \} \text{s}\{\text{COMP}_1 \text{s}[. . . \text{s}\{\text{COMP}_2 \text{s}\{\text{TOP-ese dinero} \}]}\}\]
\[ \text{s}\{\text{COMP}_3 \text{s}[. . . \text{s}\{\text{COMP}_4 \text{s}[. . . \text{ganas de ahorrarlo} \}]}\}\]

If S is binding and S is not, as I have assumed, Subjacency is not violated. If S were binding and S were not, a possibility I have not entertained for the reasons given below. Subjacency would not be violated either.

The reviewer suggested that a reanalysis of Topicalization as a TOP-to-TOP iterative movement rule, along with a filled TOP in (ii), could be used to account for the ungrammaticality of (ib). Other possibilities, however, are to stipulate that S is binding, or that the TOP-phrase is not a ‘bridge’ for the application of certain rules. Notice that if S is binding, a TOP-to-TOP analysis would go against the Propositional Island and Specified Subject Conditions, while the COMP-to-COMP analysis does not. I have assumed that opacity conditions are applicable to structures involving Topicalization.

There are reasons not to consider S as a cyclic or bounding node in Spanish. Left-branch modifiers belonging to the class of degree and quantity wh-phrases can move in isolation from the constituent they modify, as in (iiiib):

\[ \text{(iii) a. } \text{¿Cómo dices que bebieron de vino? – NP} \]
\[ \text{how say (2-s) that they drank (3-p) of wine} \]
\[ \text{‘How much wine do you say they drank?’} \]

\[ \text{b. } \text{¿Cómo dices que es de inteligente? – AP} \]
\[ \text{how say (2-s) that is of intelligent} \]
\[ \text{‘How intelligent do you say he is?’} \]

In (iiiia) in particular, cómo ‘how’ is moved out of the NP cómo de vino, and into COMP position within the structure s\{COMP s[. . . NP[cómo . . .] . . .]}. If S were bounding, Wh Movement could not extract anything from an NP, that is, cómo could not be moved into COMP. If S is not bounding, the movement is possible.

If, under further investigation, the ‘t-Island Constraint’ can be explained through a different hypothesis, then the main argument for the iterative character of Topicalization comes from sentences such as (62) below. Another indication that the rule is iterative is given by the possibility of inverting the subject of the clauses that intervene between the phrase in TOP position and the site where the movement originated, as in (iv).

\[ \text{iv. } \text{Dinero, mucho dicen mis padres que no tiene Juan.} \]
\[ \text{money much say (3-p) my parents that not has John} \]
\[ \text{‘Money, my parents say that John does not have a lot.’} \]

In (iv), the subject of the matrix and the subject of the embedded clause have both been inverted. If Topicalization is iterative, it is not necessary to come back to an already exhausted cycle to invert an embedded subject, a proposal that would go against strict cyclicity.
Many books, it happens that they say that they believe that he does have.'

In the literature, Topicalization has always been considered a movement rule. However, recent work by Bresnan (1975; 1976) and others on unbounded rules suggests the possibility of a deletion-without-movement analysis for Topicalization, as in (59).

\[(59) \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} Z - \text{TOP phrase} - X \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \text{target phrase} - Y \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
1 & 2 & 3 & \phi & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

I will not entertain this hypothesis, for two reasons. The first one is that the proposed deletion in (59) should be a process which is sensitive to the CNPC—(60)—and similar constraints in certain cases.

\[(60) \hspace{1cm} *\text{Muchos libros, resulta que alguien que tiene no quiere descuentos.} \]

\[
\text{many books happens that someone who has not want discounts} \]

\['\text{Many books, it happens that someone who has does not want a discount.'} \]

But in other cases, it should be a process that does not obey those constraints, as deduced from (61):

\[(61) \hspace{1cm} \text{Libros, resulta que alguien que tiene muchos no quiere ni recibirnos.} \]

\[
\text{books happens that someone that has many not want even see us} \]

\['\text{Books, it happens that someone who has many does not even want to see us.'} \]

I will present a second argument against Topicalization as unbounded deletion later on in the article.

I propose that sentences such as (58) have undergone Topicalization-as-movement, with a subsequent deletion-under-identity. Topicalization is sensitive to the constraints, deletion is not.

(61) is a left-dislocation with deletion of the constituent which is identical to the phrase in TOP position. Since only deletion is involved, the constraints are inapplicable.

\[(62) \hspace{1cm} \text{a. Dinero, resulta que dicen que creen que, mucho, sí que tiene.} \]

\[
\text{money happens that say (3-p) that believe (3-p) that much yes that has} \]

\['\text{Money, it happens that they say that they believe that, a lot, he does have.'} \]
b. Dinero, resulta que dicen que mucho, creen que sí  
   money happens that say (3-p) that much believe (3-p) that yes  
   que tiene.  
   that has  
   ‘Money, it happens that they say that, a lot, they believe that he does have.’

c. Dinero, resulta que, mucho, dicen que creen  
   money happens that much say (3-p) that believe (3-p) that yes  
   que tiene.  
   that has  
   ‘Money, it happens that, a lot, they say that they believe that he does have.’

d. Dinero, mucho, resulta que dicen que creen  
   money much happens that say (3-p) that believe (3-p) that yes  
   que tiene.  
   that has  
   ‘Money, a lot, it happens that they say that they believe that he does have.’

The sentences in (62) are left-dislocated structures in which Topicalization applies. The basic structure of the sequences in (62) is (63).

(63) $s[\text{Top} [\text{dinero}] \ s[\text{COMP resulta} [\text{que dicen} [\text{que creen} [\text{que sí que tiene mucho dinero}]])]]$

The $t$-phrase *mucho dinero* moves by Topicalization in a successive cyclic fashion (Postal (1972)); that is, it observes Chomsky’s Subjacency Condition. The $t$-phrase moves by Topicalization to a position which immediately follows the complementizer *que* ‘that’ within each cycle, until it reaches the highest cycle, giving the order *dinero*,

10 The length of the sequence over which the movement takes place may affect the grammaticality of the sentences:

(i) a. *Dinero, mucho tiene.*  
   money much has (3-s)  
   ‘Money, much (he) has.’

   b. Dinero, mucho dicen que tiene.  
   money much say (3-p) that has (3-s)  
   ‘Money, much (they) say that (he) has.’

This is unrelated to Topicalization, and appears in connection with other rules:

(ii) a. *¿Cómo de inteligente es?*  
   how (of) intelligent is (3-s)  
   ‘How intelligent is he?’

   b. ¿Cómo de inteligente dicen que es?  
   how (of) intelligent say (3-p) that is (3-s)  
   ‘How intelligent do they say that he is?’

A well-formed counterpart of (iiia) is ¿Cómo es de inteligente?
mucho in (62d). In that sentence, dinero is the TOP-phrase in basic position, mucho is the topicalized element. The t-phrase is reduced from mucho dinero to dinero by a rule of deletion that is independent of Topicalization, as we have already seen. It applies in conjunction with other rules as well. For example, (65a) below is a left-dislocated structure, with Wh Movement in S and the deletion of dinero in the wh-phrase under conditions of identity with the phrase in TOP position. The deletion-under-identity rule can be formalized as shown in (64).

\[(64) \ W_1 - N - W_2 - NP[QP - N] - W_3 \rightarrow 1 2 3 4 \phi 6\]

I have not considered △-deletion or PRO-deletion as alternatives because deletion-under-identity ensures number and gender agreement between the TOP-phrase and the remaining quantifier, eliminating (65b–d).

\[(65) \ \text{Dinero, } \begin{cases} \text{a. } \text{cuánto (m. sg.)} \\ \text{b. } *\text{cuánta (fem. sg.)} \\ \text{c. } *\text{cuántos (m. pl.)} \\ \text{d. } *\text{cuántas (fem. pl.)} \end{cases} \text{ tienes?} \]

Money, how much (you) have?’

However, since left-dislocated structures require a mechanism to ensure the gender and number agreement of the TOP-phrase and some pronoun, these different proposals could be equivalent.

If this analysis is correct, the movement of the t-phrase should be sensitive to the constraints that apply to Topicalization. (61) is not subject to those conditions because the TOP-phrase and mucho are in their basic positions. However, consider the following sentences:

\[(66) \begin{align*} \text{a. } & \text{Dinero, resulta que aceptan que María opine que money happens that accept (3-p) that Mary think that} \\ \text{sí que tiene mucho. yes that has much} \\ \text{‘Money, it happens that they accept that Mary should think that he does} \\ \text{have a lot.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Dinero, resulta que, mucho, aceptan que María opine que money happens that much accept (3-p) that Mary think that} \\ \text{sí que tiene. yes that has} \\ \text{‘Money, it happens that, a lot, they accept that Mary should think that he does have.’} \end{align*}\]
(67) a. Dinero, resulta que aceptan la opinión de María de money happens that accept (3-p) the opinion of Mary of que sí que tiene mucho.
that yes that has much ‘Money, it happens that they accept Mary’s opinion that he does have a lot.’
b. *Dinero, resulta que, mucho, aceptan la opinión de María de que sí que tiene. ‘Money, it happens that, a lot, they accept Mary’s opinion that he does have.’

In (66), the $t$-phrase moves iteratively from $\hat{S}$ to $\hat{S}$, as already discussed. In (67), *mucho can move iteratively from $\hat{S}$ to $\hat{S}$. Once the movement reaches the NP *la opinión de María, the CNPC becomes operative and *mucho can no longer be extracted, as indicated by the deviance of (67b).

Consider now sentences which involve Topicalization, but in which no quantifier remains, such as (10a,b). Rule (64) cannot apply in (10), as there is no quantifier within the NP. Furthermore, if the deletion applied, it would be sensitive to conditions on sentence grammar, as indicated by the deviance of (10b), while rule (64) is not subject to those conditions, as demonstrated above. What I will hypothesize in these cases is that Topicalization applies, moving the $t$-phrase iteratively up to the COMP that immediately follows the TOP-phrase. At that point, a deletion-under-identity rule that involves no essential variable—given that the only element between the TOP-phrase and the $t$-phrase is the complementizer QU—applies. The deviance of (10b) results from the movement properties of Topicalization, in a way similar to other examples I have discussed so far.11,12

11 Chomsky and Lasnik (1977, 435) have proposed that elements in COMP position may freely delete, except when they have lexical content (the deletion is then prevented by recoverability principles).

Under this approach, it could be assumed that Topicalization moves a constituent with no lexical content into COMP position; this element would be freely deleted by a rule of core grammar. However, it is not the case that elements in COMP position (*que) can freely delete in Spanish, as seen in the following examples:

(i) a. *El hombre Juan vio. ‘The man John saw.’
b. El hombre que Juan vio. ‘The man that John saw.’

(ii) a. *Creo que Juan habló. ‘(I) believe John talked.’
b. Creo que Juan habló. ‘(I) believe that John talked.’

12 Now that I have shown the restrictions on Topicalization, it is possible to see that sentences with fronted definite NPs of the type of (40) share the constraints of topicaized structures, and are unlike left-dislocated structures. This can be seen in relation to complex phrases, as in (ia,b):

(i) a. La reina de las Españas, estate seguro que te mereces, hermoso. the queen of the Spains be certain that yourself deserve (2-s) beautiful ‘The Queen of the Spains, you can be certain that you deserve, beautiful one.’
I will now turn to a second aspect that leads to the rejection of Topicalization as an unbounded deletion rule without movement.

I have shown that Topicalization is not sensitive to the Wh-Island Constraint, while Wh Movement is. Topicalization, on the other hand, is sensitive to what could be called the "t-Island Constraint", but Wh Movement is not. The Subjacency Condition, together with the assumption that the Spanish COMP dominates two dummy nodes, provides a unified explanation for these phenomena and, at the same time, for the Complex NP Constraint, to which both Topicalization and Wh Movement are sensitive in Spanish.

In her recent work dealing with the properties of unbounded rules, J. Bresnan (1976) has proposed that the Wh-Island Constraint follows from the assumption that some interrogative phrases do not move into COMP but are Chomsky-adjoined to Ș, as in (68),

\[(68) \; \delta[wh\text{-phrase}\; \delta[(\text{COMP}) \ldots]]\]

together with the proviso that A and B in structures of the form \(\delta[\ldots A \ldots B]\), where \(\alpha\) is a cyclic node, cannot be related by transformation unless they are in the same cyclic domain ("A and B are in the same cyclic domain if either B is subjacent to A, or there is a sequence of COMP's \(c_1, \ldots, c_n\) such that B is subjacent to \(c_n\), \(c_i\) is subjacent to \(c_{i-1}\) for each \(i \geq i > 1\), and \(c_1 = A"") (Bresnan (1976, 364))). Since nothing within the lower Ș in (68) is subjacent to anything higher than the upper Ș once Wh Movement has created the complex phrase, examples such as *Which problems were you wondering who solved? cannot be generated; which problems (B) cannot be moved into position A in the matrix since A and B (the basic position) are not in the same cyclic domain. Deletion transformations are subject to the same constraint.

If we apply Bresnan's explanation for the Wh-Island Constraint to Spanish, it follows that Topicalization as movement or deletion should be impossible in (47b) or (48b). Under a movement proposal, the constituent dinero (B) would be moving into position A in the matrix over a complex wh-phrase: por qué 'why' or quién 'who'. Two elements that are not in the same cyclic domain would be related by Topicalization. Under an unbounded deletion analysis, the constituent dinero in TOP position (A) would cause the deletion of dinero (B) in object position in the embedded clause across a
complex phrase both in (47b) and in (48b). Again, the two constituents would not be in the same cyclic domain. If wh-phrases are moved into COMP position in Spanish (as their position after the complementizer que in (50) and (51) would seem to indicate), Topicalization as an unbounded deletion rule could apply across a wh-phrase, but not across a complex NP—a correct prediction. However, if wh-phrases move into COMP position in Spanish, then there is no longer an explanation for the Wh-Island Constraint in Bresnan’s terms. In brief, if we treat Topicalization as unbounded deletion, the Wh-Island Constraint and the Complex NP Constraint can no longer receive a unitary explanation in Spanish in terms of principles dealing with cyclic domains. The movement analysis I have presented provides an answer to this problem.

To summarize, I have proposed an analysis for Topicalization as a movement-into-COMP rule into a dummy node to the right of the complementizer and to the left of the wh-phrase node. This movement occurs within a left-dislocated structure and obeys Subjacency. Topicalization is subject to the CNPC but not to the Wh-Island Constraint, as a consequence of Subjacency and the structure assigned to the Spanish COMP.

4. Conclusions

In this article, I have proposed that left-dislocated structures be generated in the base, with an NP in a TOP node immediately dominated by an S node, and an NP or pronoun elsewhere in the string. Such a configuration may appear embedded in many types of complement clauses and relative sentences. From this analysis, it follows that left-dislocated structures are not constrained by conditions associated with movement rules. Left-dislocated structures in Spanish may lose their basic syntactic characteristics through an unrelated transformational process that deletes subject pronouns freely. I have also motivated an analysis of Topicalization as a movement process into COMP, one that cannot be identified with Wh Movement but which applies iteratively, within the limits set by the Subjacency Condition. I have eliminated the possibility of postulating movement transformations—Raising and Topicalization—that would violate a wide set of conditions that apply to movement rules in general. By proposing analyses that do not require movement rules that are not sensitive to constraints on transformations, by limiting the movement rule analysis to cases that are subject to those constraints, I have implicitly argued for the validity of those movement restrictions in Spanish.
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