

Hanging Topics and CLLDs in Spanish: Accounting For An Embedded Asymmetry

Julio Villa-García, Villanova University

Grohmann & Etxepare (2003), Rodríguez-Ramalle (2005), and González i Planas (2011) observe that, in Spanish, embedded hanging topics (HTs) require recomplementation *que* (cf. (1a) vs. (1b)), unlike embedded clitic-left dislocations (CLLDs), which can optionally be followed by *que* (cf. (2a) vs. (2b)). Based on Villa-García's (2012) claim that recomplementation *que* in Spanish creates an island whose effect can be ameliorated by PF-deletion of the offending complementizer after movement crosses it, I argue that the obligatoriness of recomplementation *que* with embedded HTs reduces to the lack of movement of the HT. The seeming optionality of the low *que* with embedded CLLDs, for its part, reduces to two underlying derivations, one where the sandwiched CLLD is directly merged in between *ques* (the overt-*que* option, analogous to the HT derivation) and one where the CLLD moves (the deleted/null-*que* option).

In Villa-García (2012), I show that in recomplementation-*que* configurations in Spanish (cf. (3)), movement across recomplementation *que* creates a locality problem (cf. (4a)), which vanishes in the absence of *que* (cf. (4b)) (see also the data in (5), which show that reconstruction of the sandwiched CLLD is only available without recomplementation *que*). The author proposes two mechanisms for the deletion of the low *que*. First, the data support the Rescue-by-PF deletion analysis of the mitigating effect of ellipsis/deletion on island violations, illustrated for English in (6) (Ross 1969, Merchant 1999 *et seq.*, Lasnik 2001, Boeckx & Lasnik 2006, Bošković 2011, *i.a.*). The upshot of this account is that when movement crosses recomplementation *que*, *que* is *-marked (cf. (7a)). If *que** remains in PF, a violation occurs (cf. (4a)), since the presence of a * in PF is illicit; however, if *que** is deleted in PF (cf. (7b)), the derivation is salvaged (cf. (4b)). (See also (8) for the derivation of (5b), which involves movement of the CLLD to the specifier of recomplementation *que*). Second, Villa-García suggests that secondary *que* can be deleted in examples like (3) via an optional PF-deletion operation, much like optional *that* is deleted in English under Chomsky and Lasnik's (1977) *that*-deletion analysis of the alternation in (9), wherein *that* has been deleted when it does not surface (cf. (9b)). A theoretical question posed by such an account is how to handle the non-trivial issue of *optionality* in language. In this paper, I put forth the hypothesis that deletion of recomplementation *que* is *not* optional but induced by movement across it, *à la* Rescue-by-PF Deletion (see, e.g., Pesetsky & Torrego 2001 for an attempt to motivate the presence vs. absence of *that* in English in examples like (9)).

On the by-now standard assumption that HTs are directly merged in their surface position (López 2009, *i.a.*), I submit that recomplementation *que* is obligatory in examples like (1a) because no movement operation crosses it (cf. (10a)); hence *que* cannot be deleted, on the assumption that *que* deletion is last resort. Put differently, removing *que* when no movement crosses it violates last resort, as in (1b), whose derivation is furnished in (10b). In cases of CLLD (cf. (2)/(3)), however, there are two legitimate derivations, namely direct merge, as in (10c), or movement, as in (10d) (Martín-González 2002). If the CLLD is directly merged in between *ques*, then *que* is not deleted (cf. (2a)/(5a)/(10c)), since no movement operation crosses it, much like with HTs (cf. (1a)/(10a)). Not surprisingly, with recomplementation *que*, no reconstruction effects are observed, as indicated by the unavailability of the bound reading in (5a). By contrast, if the CLLD moves to the position in between *ques*, then recomplementation *que* is *-marked and deleted in the PF component as part of Rescue-by-PF deletion, as shown in (8)/(10d). As expected, the relevant dislocates exhibit reconstruction effects (cf. (5b)). I therefore conclude that the apparent optionality of recomplementation *que* with embedded CLLD is due to the availability of two different underlying derivations for CLLD –Merge or Move. The derivations available for embedded hanging topics and CLLDs in Spanish are given in (11).

Now, under the Rescue-by-PF-Deletion account, long-distance extraction across recomplementation *que* also leads to its *-marking and subsequent deletion in PF (cf. (4b)/(7)). This implies that the dislocate *a tu madre* in (4) may have been derived by Merge or Move. With HTs, which can only be directly merged in their surface position, it would also be theoretically possible to delete recomplementation *que* in PF for independent reasons, i.e., if a long-distance moving element crosses it (cf. (12a)). Yet, HTs themselves display island-creating properties (Cinque 1990, Cinque & Rizzi 2011), which means that removing *que* in such cases does not improve the status of the sentence, as shown in (12b), where the island *el fútbol* remains.

Overall, I argue that the obligatoriness of recomplementation *que* with embedded HTs in Spanish stems from the unavailability of the movement derivation for the HT dislocate, thus preventing recomplementation-*que* deletion, which is now recast as a last-resort operation effected *only* when movement crosses *que*. Recomplementation *que* is optional with CLLDs, since such constituents can be derived by Merge or Move.

- (1) a. Dice que el fútbol, **que** ese deporte le gusta
says that the soccer that that sport cl. likes
'As for soccer, s/he likes that sport.'
b. *Dice que el fútbol, ese deporte le gusta
→ Mandatory recomplementation
que with embedded HTLD
- (2) a. Dice que de fútbol, **que** no hablan nunca
says that of soccer that not talk ever
'S/he says that they never talk about soccer.'
b. Dice que de fútbol, no hablan nunca
→ Optional recomplementation
que with embedded CLLD
- (3) a. Dijo que *cuando lleguen* (**que**) me llaman
said that when arrive that cl. call
'S/he told me they'll call me when they arrive.'
b. Me dijo que *a mi prima* (**que**) la echaron
cl. said that my cousin that cl. threw
'S/he said my cousin was fired.'
- (4) a. *Quién me dijiste que a tu madre, **que** la iba a __ llamar?
who cl. said that your mother that cl. was to __ call
'Who did you say was going to call your mom?'
b. Quién me dijiste que a tu madre la iba __ a llamar?
- (5) a. Me contaron que a su_{i/j} perro, **que** todo el mundo_i lo tiene que dejar fuera del teatro
cl. told that his dog that all the world cl. has that leave out of+the theater
'They told me that everybody has to leave his/their dog outside of the theater.' (✗ bound reading)
b. Me contaron que a su_{i/j} perro, todo el mundo_i lo tiene que dejar fuera del teatro
(✓ bound reading)
- (6) a. *That he will hire someone is possible, but I will not divulge who that he will hire is possible
b. That he will hire someone is possible, but I will not divulge who ~~that he will hire is possible~~
- (7) a. Quién...dijiste [_{CP} que [...[**que***... <quién>]]] (movement across *que* → *-marking)
b. Quién...dijiste [_{CP} que [...[~~**que***~~... <quién>]]] (*que** removed in PF → violation circumvented)
- (8) a. ...[_{CP} que [...a su perro [**que***... <a su perro>]]] (movement across *que* → *-marking)
b. ...[_{CP} que [...a su perro [~~**que***~~... <a su perro>]]] (*que** removed in PF → violation circumvented)
- (9) a. I think that Philly rocks
b. I think ~~that~~ Philly rocks
- (10) a. ...[_{CP} que [... el fútbol [**que** ...]]] (cf. (1a); directly merged HT: no *que* deletion)
b. *...[_{CP} que [... el fútbol [~~**que**~~ ...]]] (cf. (*1b); no movement: illicit *que* deletion)
c. ...[_{CP} que [... de fútbol [**que** ...]]] (cf. (2a); directly merged CLLD: no *que* deletion)
d. ...[_{CP} que [... de fútbol [~~**que***~~... <de fútbol>]]] (cf. (2b); moved CLLD: *que** deletion)
- (11) Embedded HT (direct merge) Embedded CLLD (direct merge or move)
- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| ...que HT que | ...que CLLD que |
| | ...que CLLD que* /∅ <CLLD> |
- (12) a. *A quién me dijiste que *el fútbol*, **que** ese deporte le gusta?
who cl. said that the soccer that that sport cl. likes
Intended meaning: 'As for soccer, who did you say likes it?'
b. *A quién me dijiste que *el fútbol*, ~~**que***~~ ese deporte le gusta?

Selected references

Bošković, Željko. 2011. Rescue by PF deletion, traces as (non-)interveners, and the *that*-t effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41.// Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1977. Filters and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11.// Grohmann, Kleanthes K., and Ricardo Etxepare. 2003. Root Infinitives: A Comparative View. *Probus* 15.// Martín-González, Javier. 2002. *The Syntax of sentential negation in Spanish*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.// Ross, John Robert (1969). Guess who? *Chicago Linguistics Society* 5.// Villa-García, Julio. 2012. Recomplementation and locality of movement in Spanish. *Probus* 24.