In this squib I will discuss topicalized structures in Spanish in relation to the four diagnostic properties for Wh Movement presented in Chomsky (1977). The conclusion will be that Topicalization is a movement transformation in Spanish, but that it cannot be identified with Wh Movement. I will first deal with the characteristics shared by the two rules, and will conclude with the differences that distinguish between them.

1. Topicalization is the process that yields configurations of type (1).

(1) Dinero, dicen que tiene.
   ‘Money, (they) say that (he) has.’

In (1) there is a gap and no pronoun, as compared to the situation found in left-dislocated structures such as (2), which will not be discussed.

(2) El libro, dicen que lo compró.
   ‘The book, (they) say that (he) bought it.’

According to Chomsky (1977), structures such as (1) in English involve a TOP node generated in the base, together with a wh-phrase that is moved to COMP position and is then deleted by a process required in comparatives as well. As a consequence, topicalized structures share the four diagnostic properties of other constructions that are the result of Wh Movement—characteristics to which I return below.

If we adapt Chomsky’s proposal to Spanish, (1) should derive from the basic structure in (3) (many details omitted; qué indicates a wh-phrase).

(3) [§ [top dinero] [§ COMP dicen [§ COMP tiene qué]]]

Under such an analysis, the properties found in relatives and in direct and indirect questions should also be found in topicalized configurations, which I will now examine.
2. Topicalization leaves a gap because it moves a phrase. The gap is indicated by a dash in (4).

(4) Dinero, sí que tiene ___.
   ‘Money, yes (= it is true) that (he) has.’

*Wh Movement also leaves a gap, as shown in (5).

(5) ¿Qué tiene ___?
   ‘What (does he) have?’

3. Where there is a bridge, the topicalized phrase may be moved out of tensed clauses (with an apparent violation of the Propositional Island Constraint), across specified subjects (against the Specified Subject Condition), and through several successive cycles (violating Subjacency). Similar characteristics are found with respect to Wh Movement, as in (7).

(6) Dinero, dicen que María cree que parece que sí que tiene.
   ‘Money, (they) say that Mary thinks that (it) seems that yes (= it is true) that (he) has.’

(7) ¿Qué dicen que María cree que parece que sí que tiene?
   ‘What (do they) say that Mary thinks that (it) seems that yes (= it is true) that (he) has?’

4. Topicalization observes the Complex NP Constraint (CNPC) ((8)), as does Wh Movement ((9)).

(8) a. Dinero, acepto que pretendan que no tienen.
    ‘Money, (I) accept that (they) should pretend that (they) do not have.’
   b. *Dinero, acepto la pretensión de que no tienen.
    ‘Money, (I) accept the pretension that (they) do not have.’

(9) a. ¿Qué aceptas que pretendan que no tienen?
    ‘What (do you) accept that (they) should pretend that (they) do not have?’
   b. *¿Qué aceptas la pretensión de que no tienen?
    ‘What (do you) accept the pretension that (they) do not have?’

In brief, topicalized structures and configurations in which a wh-phrase has been moved share three of the diagnostic properties of Wh Movement: the gap, the bridge, and the CNPC. I will now turn to a property that is not shared.

5. Direct and indirect questions, together with restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses, are subject to the Wh-Island Constraint (Chomsky (1973)).
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(10) a. *¿Qué problemas dijo cuándo resolvían?
   ‘Which problems (did he) say when (they) would solve?’

b. ¿Dijo cuándo resolvían qué problemas?
   ‘(Did he) say when (they) would solve which problems?’

The basic structure of the examples in (10) is as shown in (11), many details aside.

(11) [COMP dijo [COMP resolvían qué problemas cuándo]]

The impossibility of (10a) is due to the Wh-Island Constraint. Movement of qué problemas to the internal COMP is blocked because the position is filled with cuándo. Movement of qué problemas to the higher COMP is not possible because such a process would violate the Propositional Island Constraint. Strict cyclicity prevents the movement of cuándo into the lower COMP when such a position is freed by the movement of the other wh-phrase into the higher COMP. Compare (10a) to (12), in which there is no blocking element for the movement:

(12) ¿Qué problemas dijo que resolvían?
   ‘Which problems (did he) say that (they) would solve?’

Consider now a different condition involving Wh Movement. When we consider examples such as those in (13), it would appear that Wh Movement can move a wh-phrase across a wh-subject, even though, as we have already seen in (10a), the transformation cannot move a wh-phrase across a COMP that is already filled.

(13) a. ¿Qué dijiste que vio quién?
   ‘What (did you) say that saw who (= wh-someone saw)?’

b. Me preguntaron qué vio quién.
   ‘(They) asked me what saw who (= who saw what).’

The above sentences are parallel in structure and degree of grammaticality to those in (14).

(14) a. ¿Qué dijiste que vio Juan?
   ‘What (did you) say that saw John (= that John saw)?’

b. Me preguntaron qué vio Juan.
   ‘(They) asked me what saw John (= what did John see).’
Let us remember at this point that to prevent Wh Movement from moving a wh-phrase across a wh-subject, Chomsky (1973) proposes a condition requiring that a rule that is ambiguous in its application must select the superior term, i.e. the one that is closer to the root of the tree. The condition blocks *I remember what who saw, while permitting I remember who saw what. I will now argue that such a condition is operative in Spanish as well. For this it should be pointed out that quién ‘who’, the subject wh-phrase in (13a) and (13b), does not seem to have undergone Wh Movement, but rather to have been postposed by Subject-Verb Inversion. Without proposing an output for this last rule, I will assume that quién ‘who’ is no longer superior to qué ‘what’ when Wh Movement applies to this latter constituent to locate it in COMP position in (13a) and (13b). In other words, Subject-Verb Inversion applies to the wh-subject, which, as a result, is no longer superior to the wh-object qué; Wh Movement is able to apply to qué with no ensuing ungrammaticality. If Subject-Verb Inversion had not applied, movement of qué would have been impossible because quién would have been superior to it, as seen in (15a,b) when compared with (13a,b).

(15) a. *%Qué dijiste que quién vio?
   ‘What (did you) say that who saw?’
      ‘(They) asked me what who saw.’

Another indication that (13a,b) involve Subject-Verb Inversion is the behavior of the complementizer que ‘that’ in this type of structure (this was pointed out to me by Violeta Demonte). With verbs such as decir ‘tell’ and preguntar ‘ask’, the complementizer is optional if there is a wh-phrase in COMP position in the embedded clause.

(16) a. Me preguntaron (que) quién vio qué.
   ‘(They) asked me (that) who saw what.’
 b. Me preguntaron (que) qué vio quién.
   ‘(They) asked me (that) what saw who (= subject).’

However, if the lower COMP is not filled by a wh-phrase, the complementizer is obligatory, as in (17a), with a wh-phrase that has been moved to the matrix:

(17) a. ¿Qué dijiste que hiciste?
   ‘What (did you) say that (you) did?’
 b. *¿Qué dijiste hiciste?
   ‘What (did you) say (you) did?’

The Subject-Verb Inversion analysis for (13a) makes the que complementizer in that sentence obligatory; a correct predic-
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tion, as seen in (18):

(18) *¿Qué dijiste vio quién?

In summary, I conclude that the Wh-Island Constraint that prevents movement through a wh-COMP, and the constraint that prevents movement across a wh-phrase that is superior to the one to be moved, are both operative in Spanish.

Let us now return to topicalized structures and their relation to these two constraints. First, topicalized strings are not subject to the Wh-Island Constraint preventing movement across an already filled COMP.

(19) Dinero ¿para qué dices que quieres?
   ‘Money, for what (do you) say that (you) want?’

Under the analysis that considers Topicalization as Wh Movement, it should be impossible to move a topicalized wh-phrase together with para qué ‘for what’ to the matrix COMP in (19), for the reasons given in connection with (10a).

Second, Topicalization is not sensitive to the constraint dealing with the superior constituent. Compare (20a,b) with (15a,b):

(20) a. Dinero, me preguntaron quién tiene.
    ‘Money, (they) asked me who has.’
   b. Dinero ¿quién dijiste que tiene?
    ‘Money, who (did you) say that has?’

Under the Topicalization-as-Wh-Movement analysis, (20a) should be ungrammatical, because there has been movement of a wh-phrase in object position in the embedded sentence across a wh-phrase that is superior to it, i.e. quién. Similar reasons should exclude (20b), in addition to the Wh-Island Constraint.

In view of the above material, it cannot be maintained that Topicalization involves Wh Movement in Spanish, given that it is not possible to argue that the Spanish COMP can be doubly filled in general.
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