Grohmann & Etxepare (2003), Rodriguez-Ramalle (2005), and González i Planas (2011) observe that, in Spanish, embedded hanging topics (HTs) require re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation-*que* configurations in Spanish (cf. (3)), movement across re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 *optional-ity* in language. In this paper, I put forth the hypothesis that deletion of re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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) (Martin-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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation *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 re-complementation *que* with embedded HTs in Spanish stems from the unavailability of the movement derivation for the HT dislocate, thus preventing re-complementation-*que* deletion, which is now recast as a last-resort operation effected *only* when movement crosses *que*. Re-complementation *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
   ‘As for soccer, s/he likes that sport.’

(2) a. Dice que de fútbol, que no hablan nunca
   ‘S/he says that they never talk about soccer.’

(3) a. Dijo que cuando lleguen (que) me llaman
   ‘S/he told me they’ll call me when they arrive.’

(4) a.*Quién me dijiste que a tu madre, que la iba a llamar?
   ‘Who did you say was going to call your mom?’

(5) a. Me contaron que a su perro, que todo el mundo lo tiene que dejar fuera del teatro
   ‘They told me that everybody has to leave his/her dog outside of the theater.’

(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 […] <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 que 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)

(12) a.*A quién me dijiste que el fútbol, que ese deporte le gusta?
   ‘As for soccer, who did you say likes it?’

Selected references