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*ABSTRACT: This paper examines the interaction between topics and focused phrases and their behavior with respect to reconstruction and minimality in Brazilian Portuguese, and shows that a topic may be moved across a moved focused phrase, but may not move over a base generated focus or another (moved or base generated) topic. Such state of affairs is explained if focused phrases (when moved) are moved in the PF component of grammar, as argued by Aoun and Benmamoun 1996. Wh-phrases are argued to behave differently (being moved in the syntax) due to the presence of a wh-feature, which is moved to the Spec of CP during the syntactic derivation.*
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1. Introduction

In this work, we examine the interaction between topics, focused phrases, wh-phrases and their behavior with respect to reconstruction and minimality effects in Brazilian Portuguese (BP). It will be argued that both topics and focalized phrases may move from their argument position to a dislocated position in the left periphery of the sentence, or be merged already in that position, binding a null or an overt pronoun at the thematic position. Moved elements will display reconstruction, as expected. We assume, as commonly done (cf. Lebeaux, 1990; Chomsky, 1995; Aoun et al., 2001), that reconstruction implies movement. Since strong pronouns, not clitics, are used as resumptives in BP, whenever there is resumption, it will be assumed that no movement occurred. The interaction between topics, focused phrases and wh-phrases with respect to reconstruction reveals the following generalization: a topic may move across a moved focused phrase, but may not move over a base generated focus or another (moved or base generated) topic.

We argue that these interventions are instances of minimality effects (Rizzi, 1990). Moreover, reproducing the argument in Aoun and Benmamoun (1996), we conclude that focused phrases (when moved) are moved in the PF component (in BP).

The argument is organized as follows. Section 2 contains the relevant data on BP. In subsection 2.1, we characterize Topicalization, Left Dislocation and Focalization constructions, showing that both topics and focused phrases can be moved or base generated in the dislocated position; section 2.2 argues that only moved elements display reconstruction effects; subsections 2.3 and 2.4 examine the interaction between topics and focused phrases and topics and wh-phrases, respectively. Section 3 explains those interactions as instances of minimality. Section 4 argues that minimality is to be taken as a condition on derivations (or on the application of move-α) because Focalization involves a non-syntactic movement, which takes place at the PF component; section 5 offers a conclusion.

2. BP data

2.1 Topic and focus

Many authors have tried to define what is usually called Topicalization, (Clitic-) Left Dislocation and Focalization (Chomsky 1981; Rizzi 1986; Cinque 1990, a.o.). In this discussion, I will assume the cartographic view of Rizzi (1997) in which topics and focused phrases need to be in some relation to a specialized functional projection in the complementizer region of the clause. Such a relation may come to be by external or internal merge, characterizing what we will call movement. In other words, a topic may be merged in its thematic position and then remerged in Spec TopP, or it may be merged from the initial array in Spec TopP and be related to a thematic position (occupied, in some languages, by a clitic, a weak, a strong, or a null pronoun). I will assume that the projection of TopP is only triggered when some constituent contains a Topic feature; Agree between the Top head and the head of that constituent is necessary for convergence. Assuming also that left peripheral position such as topic and focus are “criterial” or “EPP” positions (i.e. they force the presence of some constituent in their specifier position; by containing an EPP feature or some other technical machinery), either the topic constituent is remerged in Spec TopP or another phrase from the array is merged there. In this way, topic constructions in BP will present the two possible structures depicted below:

(1) a. [C [TopP esse livro [TP você devia dar ~~esse livro~~ pra Maria (não pro Paulo)]].

this book you should give this book to Maria not to Paulo

b. [C [TopP esse livro [TP você devia dar ele pra Maria (não pro Paulo)]].

this book you should give it to Maria not to Paulo

In (1), both sentences contain a dislocated element that may be characterized as a topic, it expresses old information and it is separated from the rest of the clause (which express new information) by “comma intonation” (in Rizzi’s (1997) terms). The structure in (1a) is usually called Topicalization; the structure in (1b) is usually called Left Dislocation.[[1]](#footnote-1) Rizzi also recognize a formally similar but interpretively very different construction in English, in which a focused phrase, possibly containing new information, appears at the beginning of the sentence. We will call those structures, such as in (2), *Focalization*:

(2) ESSE LIVRO você devia dar \_ pra Maria (não uma agenda).[[2]](#footnote-2)

this book you should give to Maria (not a calendar)

In this case, the fronted element, bearing focal stress, usually introduces new information,[[3]](#footnote-3) whereas the open sentence that follows it expresses old information, given by the discourse. In English, just like in BP, this structural option is restricted to a specific kind of contrastive focus: (2) presupposes that you believe that you should give a calendar to Mary, and tries to correct that belief.

Romance languages usually express the topic-comment articulation (equivalent to English Left Dislocation) with the construction in (3), which Cinque (1990) calls Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD). Cinque argues CLLDed phrases are not moved, but merged in their dislocated position, although the construction is sensitive to strong islands and show connectivity effects. Cecchetto and Chierchia (1999), however, argue that DPs are indeed moved and only PPs are merged in their dislocated positions (however, it is unclear how Cecchetto and Chierchia would deal with data involving subjacency discussed by Cinque). In BP, third person clitics have been lost (at least in the colloquial oral variety), so nothing like CLLD exists. BP seems to resort to the same strategies used in English to express both the topic-comment and the focus-presupposition articulations, i.e. movement (possibly of a null operator) or base generation in the left periphery, possibly accompanied by a resumptive pronoun, (see (4)).

(3) Il tuo libro, lo ho letto.

Your book I have read it

(4) a. Pra Maria, (eu acho que) você devia dar um livro \_ (não uma agenda).

to Maria (I think that) you should give a book (not a calendar)

‘To Maria, (I think) you should give a book’

b. Pra Maria, (eu acho que) você devia dar um livro pra ela (não uma agenda).

to Maria (I think that) you should give a book to her (not a calendar)

‘To Maria, (I think) you should give a book to her (not a calendar).’

c. PRA MARIA (eu acho que) você devia dar um livro \_ (não pra Joana/\*não uma agenda).

to Maria (I think that) you should give a book (not to Joana/\*not a calendar)

‘To Maria, (I think) you should give a book (not to Joana).’

A focused structure like (4c) is usually taken to involve movement (of some phrase) to a focus-related position in the left periphery. This is due to the fact that resumption is impossible with focalization. Structures involving topics, on the other hand, are trickier. If BP topic structures are analyzed in the same manner as in English, we may assume that the topic in (4b) is merged already in the periphery, since it is accompanied by resumption; and the one in (4a) may have been moved to that position. However, either (4a) is like (4c), i.e. it involves movement, or it may have the same structure as (4b), but with a null resumptive PP. In other words, a sentence like (4a) is ambiguous between the structure (5a), in which the PP was moved, and (5b), in which the PP is merged already in the periphery. In the examples in (4) and (5) we use PPs instead of DPs to make clear that the topics (dislocated phrases) discussed here are not “hanging topics” as defined by Benincà and Poletto 2004. However, using PPs raises the question of what is the null resumptive category in thematic position, in such cases. I will simply assume that a null pronoun may resume a PP, since its Case will be valued by binding of the dislocated topic. Alternatively, the resumptive may be elided because it contains a subset of the features present in the topicalized PP (see Roberts 2010), making the uttering of it redundant. We have no space to discuss such matters. We will simply assume that the structures in (5) both exist in BP: one in which there is movement of some argument or adjunct to the left periphery, and one in which there is no movement and a (possibly null) pronoun occupies the theta position related to the topic (be it a DP or a PP). I will also assume that overt resumption implies lack of movement (although that may not be true of languages like Italian, in which clitics are used for resumption).

(5) a. [Pra Maria, [eu acho que você devia dar esse livro ~~pra Maria~~]

to Maria I think that you should give this book to Maria

b. [Pra Maria, [eu acho que você devia dar esse livro *pro*]

‘To Maria, I think you should give this book.’

That apparent Topicalization can be in fact Left Dislocation with a null resumptive pronoun is shown by the fact that apparent cases of Topicalization violate strong island contexts, from where wh-movement is impossible, in the same way Left Dislocated elements do:[[4]](#footnote-4), [[5]](#footnote-5)

(6) a. (Eu acho que) (d)o Pedro, eu conheço uma mulher que gosta (dele).

(I think that) of.the Pedro I know a woman that likes (of.him).

‘I think that Pedro, I know a woman who likes him.’

b. \* (De) quem voce conhece uma mulher que gosta?

(of) who you know a woman that likes

‘\*Who do you know a woman who likes?’

(7) a. (Eu acho que) filmes de arte, ver (eles) em vídeo é perda de tempo.

(I think that) films of art watch (them) in video is waste of time

‘I think that art movies, to watch them on video is a waste of time.’

b. \*O que ver em vídeo é perda de tempo?

what to watch in video is waste of time

‘\*What to watch in video is a waste of time?’

(8) a. (Eu acho que) o Pedro, a Maria só foi embora depois que encontrou (ele).

(I think that) the Pedro the Maria only went away after that saw (him)

‘I think that Pedro, Maria only went away after seeing him.’

b. \*Quem a Maria só foi embora depois que encontrou?

who the Maria only went away after that saw

‘\*Who did Maria only went away after seeing?’

Since extraction from strong islands is the relevant context, from (6-8), we conclude that topic-comment structures in BP are ambiguous between Topicalization, a syntactic derivation which involves movement, or Left Dislocation, which involves no movement but external merge of a phrase in a dislocated position related to a (silent or overt) pronoun in argument position. When the topic is related to a position inside a (strong) island, as in (6-8), the structure is unambiguously a case of Left Dislocation, even if no overt pronoun is present, since movement from strong islands is barred.

2.2 Island contexts and reconstruction

As expected, if Topicalization involves movement, reconstruction of topicalized phrases is possible:

(9) O seu melhor aluno, todo professor convidou \_ pra fazer pós.

the his best student every professor invited (him) to do graduate

‘His best student, every professor invited him to enter the graduate program.’

In (9), we see that the pronoun *seu* (‘his’) may be bound by the quantifier *todo* (‘every’). However, to have this bound reading, there must not be an overt resumptive pronoun in the argument position related to the topicalized phrase. With the overt pronoun, the only possible readings are the ones in which *seu* assumes second person interpretation[[6]](#footnote-6) or it refers to some student in particular. This is what we expect: the version of (9) with an overt pronoun in argument position is a case of Left Dislocation, which involves no movement and therefore cannot reconstruct the topic into the argument position. The version of (9) with a gap is ambiguous between Topicalization and Left Dislocation (using a silent pronoun). We can assume that, if the intended meaning of (9) requires reconstruction, the ambiguous sentence will be analyzed only as Topicalization.

Following this reasoning, we predict that, in island contexts, reconstruction should be never possible. An ambiguous sentence between a topicalized and a left dislocated structure will be analyzed as Left Dislocation only, since no movement can happen from inside of a (strong) island. This prediction is born out:

(10) a. O seu melhor aluno, todo professor que convidou (ele) pra fazer pós se arrependeu.

the his best student every professor that invited (him) to do graduate refl regretted

‘Your best student, every professor who invited him to enter the grad-program regretted it.’

b. O seu melhor aluno, que todo professor tenha aborrecido (ele) é duvidoso.

the his best student that every professor have bothered (him) is doubtful

‘Your best student, that every professor bothered him is doubtful.’

c. O seu melhor aluno, todo professor cumprimentou a família dele depois de sabatinar (ele).

the his best student every professor congratulated the family his after of questioning (him)

‘Your best student, every professor congratulated his family after questioning him.’

In either version of (10a-c), with an overt pronoun or a gap, the bound reading is impossible and so the possessive pronoun *seu* is interpreted as second person.[[7]](#footnote-7) The dislocated phrase cannot have been moved since it is related to a position inside an island. Consequently, no reconstruction takes place and the bound reading is impossible.

With respect to Focalization, it is shown in (11) that it is impossible to have a resumptive pronoun in the “original” place of the focalized phrase, which argues for a movement analysis:[[8]](#footnote-8)

(11) a. O LUIZ eu vi \_ ontem (não o Pedro).

b. \*O LUIZ eu vi ele ontem (não o Pedro).

the Luiz I saw (him) yesterday (not the Pedro)

‘LUIZ, I saw him yesterday (not Pedro).’

However, based on (12a-c), we can assume that Focalization also violates island constraints, which argues against a movement analysis:

(12) a. (Eu acho que) O PEDRO, eu conheço uma mulher que viu \_ .

(I think that) the Pedro I know a woman that saw \_

‘I think that Pedro, I know a woman who knows him.’

b. (Eu acho que) FILMES DE ARTE, ver \_ em video é uma perda de tempo.

(I think that) films of art watch \_ in video is a waste of time

‘I think that art movies, to watch on video is a waste of time.’

c. (Eu acho que) O PEDRO, a Maria só foi embora depois que viu \_.

(I think that) the Pedro the Maria only went away after that saw \_

‘I think that Pedro, Maria only went home after seeing him.’

There seems to be, then, two contradictory facts about Focalization: on one hand, it does not allow for a resumptive pronoun in the argument position related to the dislocated (focalized) phrase, which seems to indicate that that phrase was moved from the argument position; on the other hand, Focalization violates island constraints, which indicates that no movement is involved. Interestingly, although an overt resumptive pronoun is excluded in most of the cases, as seen in (11), they may appear if the position related to the dislocated phrase is inside a (strong) island (13):

(13) a. (Eu acho que) O PEDRO, eu conheço uma mulher que viu ele na festa .

(I think that) the Pedro I know a woman that saw him at.the party.

‘I think that Pedro, I know a woman who saw him at the party.’

b. (Eu acho que) FILMES DE ARTE, ver eles no video é perda de tempo.

(I think that) films of art watch them in video is waste of time

‘I think that art movies, to watch them on video is a waste of time.’

c. (Eu acho que) O PEDRO, a Maria só foi embora depois que viu ele.

(I think that) the Pedro the Maria only went away after that saw him

‘I think that Pedro, Maria only went home after seeing him.’

The contrast between (13) and (11) shows that sentences in which a focalized phrase is related to a position occupied by an overt resumptive pronoun inside an island are possible, whereas sentences in which the pronoun is not in an island are not. It is possible, then, to assume that focalized constituents may be generated in either position. In other words, Focalization may or may not involve movement, just like Topicalization/Left Dislocation. When the constituent is moved, an overt resumptive pronoun is impossible in the (argument) position related to the focalized phrase; when it is base generated in the left periphery position (in the case where insertion in the argument position and movement to the dislocated position would violate some island constraint, for instance), an overt or null pronoun occupies the position to which the focalized phrase is related to. The sentences in (13) indicate that this possibility is empirically correct. Theoretically, the assumption is also not problematic since the two possible derivations are not comparable in terms of economy: if there is no resumptive pronoun in the initial array, the focalized phrase is inserted (merged) in its thematic position and moves. If there is a resumptive pronoun in the initial array, the pronoun is inserted in the θ-position and the focalized phrase in the dislocated position.

The only open question is why it should be the case that, in sentences that do not involve islands, an initial array containing a resumptive pronoun is excluded. Although we do not have an answer for that question, the generalization we can extract from (12-13) is that the focalized phrase will be generated in the dislocated position (binding a null or overt resumptive pronoun) only if related to an argument position inside an island. Informally speaking, the numeration without the resumptive pronoun is always preferred, if a convergent derivation can be obtained.[[9]](#footnote-9) This resembles the behavior of wh-phrases in BP: wh-phrases are (not obligatorily, but usually) moved overtly; however, if the wh-phrase is inside an island, it obligatorily stays *in situ*. In this way, both focalized phrases and wh-phrases are preferably moved (for unclear reasons). As for violation of islands effects, we now see that no movement is involved when the focalized phrase is related to a position inside an island: it actually binds a (null or overt) resumptive pronoun in that position.

We should expect, following the considerations above, that focalized phrases reconstruct only when moved, and that seems to be what we get, i.e. sentences “b”, “c” and “d” in (14) only have the interpretation where *seu* is taken as a second person pronoun:

(14) a. O SEU DEPARTAMENTO todo professor acha o melhor.[[10]](#footnote-10)

the his department every professor considers the best

‘His department, every professor considers the best.’

‘Your department, every professor considers the best.’

b. COM O SEU DEPARTAMENTO todo professor que se preocupa foi embora.

about the his department every professor that refl worries went away

‘\*About his department, every professor who worries himself went away.’

‘About your department, every professor who worries himself went away.’

c. SOBRE O SEU DEPARTAMENTO que todo professor fale é natural.

about the his department that every professor talks is natural

‘\*His department, that every professor talks about is natural.’

‘Your department, that every professor talks about is natural.’

d. O SEU DEPARTAMENTO todo professor foi embora antes que fosse reconhecido.

the his department every professor went away before that was recognized

‘\*His department, every professor got out before it was recognized.’

‘Your department, every professor got out before it was recognized.’

Sentence (14a) is derived by movement since the position related to the focalized phrase is not in an island. Sentences (14b-d), conversely, are not derived by movement. As we expect, the former is ambiguous, allowing a bound reading of the pronoun *seu*. In the latter sentences, however, *seu* is interpreted as second person, so we conclude that both topics and focused phrases reconstruct only when they are derived by movement.

Summarizing, we have concluded that both focalized and topicalized phrases may be generated in the dislocated position or moved, according to the restrictions imposed on movement. It seems that movement is the default operation in the case of Focalization, which is intriguing but, as argued before, does not cause problems related to economy, since derivations with and without movement are not comparable as they present different initial arrays (containing a resumptive pronoun or not).

2.3 Interaction between focalized and topicalized phrases

In (15a, b), we see that a focalized phrase may appear to the right, but not to the left, of a topic, either in matrix or embedded contexts. In (15c, d), we see that the same ordering applies even when the topic and the focused phrase are in different clauses:

(15) a. (Ele disse que) pro Luiz, ESSES CDS a Maria recomendou.

he said that to Luiz these CDd the Maria recommended

‘(He said that) to Luiz, theses CDs, Maria recommended.’

b. \*(Ele disse que) PRO LUIZ esses CDs, a Maria recomendou.

he said that to Luiz these CDs the Maria recommended

‘(He said that) to Luiz, these CDs, Maria recommended.’

c. Pro Luiz, ele disse que ESSES CDS a Maria recomendou.

to Luiz he said that these CDs the Maria recommended.

‘To Luiz, he said that these CDs Maria recommended.’

d. \*PRO LUIZ ele disse que esses CDs, a Maria recomendou.

to Luiz he said that these CDs the Maria recommended

‘To Luiz, he said that these CDs Maria recommended.’

In the spirit of Rizzi (1997), we will assume a topic projection TopP dominating a focus projection FocP between CP and the Inflectional complex, where topics and focused phrases are moved to or generated at in order to check their T(opic) or F(ocus) features. Such assumption explains the order of constituents in (15a) and the impossibility of (15b) but does not explain why (15d) is also impossible since, in that case, the dislocated phrases occupy different clauses. That fact might be due to prosodic constraints since we know that a pause must follow a topic but no pause may follow a focused phrase, causing (15d) to have problems at PF. I will also assume that the TopP projection allows for multiple Spec positions, as in Kayne (1994), deriving the fact that in BP, and in Romance in general, there is no (theoretical) limit to the number of dislocated topics (but see Frascarelli 2007 for a different view). The FocP projection, on the other hand, cannot allow for multiple Spec positions since no more than one dislocated focalized phrase is observed. Rizzi (1997) tries to explain the “non-recursiveness” (in his terms) of FocP as an interpretative clash. He takes the Spec FocP position to be the focus, which could contain only new information, and the complement of the FocP to be the presupposition associated with that focus, which would contain only old information. In this way, no focalized phrase could be placed inside the presupposition of another focus since new information could not be contained inside the presupposition. However, Rizzi’s explanation would disallow all *in situ* focused phrases co-occurring with a dislocated focus and, if wh-phrases are considered as F-marked elements, as Rizzi himself assumes, we should not expect to find sentences with multiple wh-phrases. Besides, Zubizarreta (1998) convincingly argues that the notions of focus and presupposition on one hand and new and old information on the other should be kept apart, since their overlapping is only partial. The ban against two focused phrases moving overtly applies even if they sit in different clauses, seemingly having two different FocP projections as available landing sites. This is illustrated by (16):[[11]](#footnote-11)

(16) a. Roupas, pra mim, naquela loja, o Luiz nunca comprou.

clothes to me in.that shop the Luiz never bought

‘Chothes, to me, in that shop, Luiz never bought.’

b. \*ESSES CDs PRO LUIZ a Maria recomendou.

these CDs to Luiz Maria recommended

‘These CDs, to Luiz, Maria recommended.’

c. \*ESSES CDs eu acho que PRO LUIZ a Maria recomendou.

these CDs I think that to Luiz the Maria recommended

‘These CDs, I think that to Luiz Maria recommended.’

d. \*ESSE FILME a Maria recomendou PRO LUIZ (não aquele vídeo pro Paulo)

this movie the Maria recommended to Luiz (not that video to Paulo)

‘This movie, Maria recommended to Luiz (not that video to Paulo).’

e. Quem recomendou o que pra quem?

who recommended what to whom

‘Who recommended what to whom?’

In (16), we see that, contrary to what happens to topics (16a), no more than one focused phrase can be dislocated, even if the two focused phrases are in different clauses. There can be no more than one F-marked constituent even if one of them stays in situ, unless in the case of multiple wh-phrases, to which we will return. I will try to explain those facts by assuming, with Zubizarreta, that a focused phrase cannot be deaccented. At PF, dislocated phrases will receive ex-H pitch by virtue of occupying the Spec FocP position, and what follows the dislocated Ex-H pitch phrase is deaccented (this last part according to Zubizarreta). If two phrases occupy the Spec position of (the same or different) FocP projection, one of these two phrases would have to be both deaccented and Ex-H, causing the derivation to crash at PF. Even if the F-marked phrase stays in situ, it cannot be deaccented, explaining the impossibility of (16d). On the other hand, (16e) is possible because, as we independently conclude below, moved wh-phrases do not sit at Spec FocP but at Spec CP. In this way, moved wh-phrases are not marked Ex-H at PF and the rest of the sentence need not be deaccented. It is then predicted that a non-wh-phrase when focus-moved cannot co-occur with any F-marked phrase, including a wh *in situ*, and the prediction is born out, as seen in (21) below.

It also seems problematic that both topics and focalized phrases can either stop at the embedded CP complex or move up to the matrix clause even if related to a position in the lower clause. We will assume that, in the former case, TopP and FocP are simply not present in the structure of the matrix clause. If they were, then topics and focused phrases should move to that position, in order to check the features of the Top and the Foc heads. However, having checked their features in the lower clause would prevent those phrases from moving any further and the derivation would not converge. In the latter case, when topics and/or focus move to the matrix CP complex from an embedded clause, it must be the case that there are no TopP and FocP in the lower CP complex, for the reasons just described.

With these considerations out of the way, it is possible now to examine the interaction between moved topics and focalized phrases. Consider (17):

(17) a. O seu melhor aluno, PRA FAZER PÓS (eu tenho impressão que)

the his best student to do graduate (I have impression that)

todo professor convidou.

every professor invited

‘His best student, to enter the graduate program, I have the impression that every professor invited.’

b. O seu melhor aluno, eu tenho impressão que PRA FAZER PÓS

the his best student I have impression that to do graduate

todo professor convidou.

every professor invited

‘His best student, I have the impression that, to enter the graduate program, every professor invited him.’

In (17a, b), the focalized phrase was moved since it is not related to a position inside an island. Both sentences in (17) allow a bound reading of the pronoun in the topic phrase, so the topic must have been derived by movement if that interpretation is considered. We see, then, that Topicalization can apply over a focused phrase derived by movement. However, if the focused phrase is base generated in the dislocated position, the bound reading of the pronoun in the topic becomes unavailable:

(18) a. O seu melhor alunoi, (eu tenho impressão que) GEOGRAFIAj todo professor que

the his best student I have impression that geography every professor that

ensina \_j convidou \_i pra jantar.

teaches invited to dinner

‘Your best student, I have the impression that, Geography, every professor who teaches it invited him to dinner.’

b. O seu melhor aluno, todo professor que ensina geografia convidou \_ pra jantar.

the his best student every professor that teaches geography invited to dinner

‘His best student, every professor who teaches Geography invited him to dinner.’

c. O seu melhor alunoi, (eu tenho impressão que) EMPREGOj todo professor

the his best student I have impression that job every professor

apresentou \_i a um empresário que ofereceu \_j

introduced to one entrepreneur who offered

‘Your best student, I have the impression that, a job, every professor introduced him to an entrepreneur who offered it.’

d. O seu melhor alunoi, todo professor apresentou \_i a um empresário que ofereceu emprego.

the his best student every professor introduced to one entrepreneur that offered job

‘His best student, every professor introduced him to an entrepreneur who offered him a job.’

In (18a, c), the focused phrase must be generated in the dislocated position since it is related to a position inside a strong island. The topic, on the other hand, could in principle be moved or base generated since it is not related to a position inside an island. Those sentences, however, do not allow for the bound reading of the pronoun inside the topic, so the topic must have been left dislocated (generated at the dislocated position). Sentences (18b, d), without the intervention of the focused phrase, do allow for the bound reading. We conclude, then, that a topic can be topicalized over a moved focused phrase but not over a base generated focused phrase. This conclusion contrasts with the interaction between two topics:

(19) a. O seu melhor aluno, pra fazer pós, (eu tenho impressão que) todo professor

the his best student to do graduate I have impression that every professor

convidou.

invited

‘His best student, to enter the graduate program, I have the impression that every professor invited him.’

b. O seu melhor aluno, eu tenho impressão que pra fazer pós, todo professor convidou.

the his best student I have impression that to do graduate every professor invited

‘Your best student, I have the impression that, to enter the graduate program, every professor invited him.’

c. Pra fazer pós, o seu melhor aluno, todo professor convidou.

to enter the grad-program his best student every professor invited

‘To enter the graduate program, his best student, every professor invited.’

d. Pra fazer pós, eu tenho impressão que o seu melhor aluno, todo professor

to enter the grad-program I have the impression that his best student every professor

convidou.

invited

‘To enter the graduate program, I have the impression that, his best student, every professor invited him.’

In (19), the topic containing the pronoun seu might have been moved or generated in the dislocated position, since we are assuming that those structures are usually ambiguous between Topicalization and Left Dislocation. The second topic, however, must have been moved, since a pronominal element cannot refer to the VP *fazer pós* inside the PP.[[12]](#footnote-12) The sentence (19b), however, does not allow a bound reading of the possessive pronoun in the higher topic, whereas the ones in (19a,c,d) do. The generalization then seems to be that, in contrast with the facts in (18), a topic can be moved over another moved topic only if they occupy Spec positions of the same projection. The same pattern can be seen with respect to a base generated topic. Topicalization over a base generated topic is not possible, so sentences (20b, d) do not allow for the bound reading. Sentences (20a, c), however, allows for the bound interpretation since both topics are Specs of the same Top projection:

(20) a. O seu melhor aluno, geografia, todo professor que ensina convidou pra jantar.

the his best student, geography, every professor that teaches invited to dinner

‘His best student, geography, every professor who teaches it invited him to dinner.’

b. O seu melhor aluno, eu tenho impressão que geografia, todo professor

the his best student, I have the impression that geography, every professor

que ensina convidou pra jantar.

that teaches invited to dinner

‘Your best student, I have the impression that, geography, every professor who teaches it invited him to dinner.’

c. O seu melhor aluno, emprego, todo professor apresentou a

the his best student job every professor introduced to

um empresário que ofereceu.

one entrepreneur that offered

‘His best student, a job, every professor introduced him to an entrepreneur who offered.’

d. O seu melhor aluno, eu tenho impressão que emprego, todo professor apresentou a

his best student I have impression that a job every professor introduced to

um empresário que ofereceu.

one entrepreneur that offered

‘Your best student, I have the impression that, a job, every professor introduced him to an entrepreneur who offered.’

The fact that reconstruction is impossible in (19b) and (20b, d) resembles the Arabic cases treated by Aoun and Benmamoun (1996) as Minimality effects. However, it seems that the relevant notion here is not one of government as in Rizzi’s (1990) Relativized Minimality, since all moved topics in those cases are complements, therefore being head governed by some [+V] head. The notion of “shortest movement” of Chomsky (1993, 1995) seems more adequate. Something like the Minimal Link Condition (MLC) and the notion of equidistance[[13]](#footnote-13) of Chomsky (1993) could handle (19b) and (20b, d): in those cases, if the topics are moved from the lower clause, they have to reach the closest TopP. If there is a TopP projection in the embedded clause, both topics move to the Spec positions of that projection. Further movement, as in (19b) and (20b,d) will be barred because the topics have already checked their features and movement is last resort. If no TopP is projected in the embedded clause, then both topics move to the higher clause, as in (20c). In both cases, the two topics are equidistant from their argument position, deriving the fact that no intervention will ensue if the topics are Specs of the same head. The only way to check features of both topic heads if two TopP are present in the structure is resorting to base generation of one of the topics in the Spec position of the higher TopP, which is the strategy used in (19b) and (20b, d) explaining the lack of reconstruction. This approach runs into problems, however, in trying to explain why reconstruction is also impossible in (18a, c) where a base generated focused phrase intervenes between the topic and its original position. In those cases, there is, presumably, no feature that a topic could check in the domain of the head of the Focus projection so movement of the topic does not “skip” any position where its features could have been checked. In this sense, Relativized Minimality is descriptively more adequate since any A’-specifier will intervene between the topic and its trace (unless the focused phrase is derived by movement, for reasons that will become clear as we proceed). We will keep to the descriptive generalization, assuming that those cases involve some kind of Minimality effects. In this way, a topic cannot be moved over a base generated focused phrase or another (moved or base generated) topic (unless the two topics are equidistant from the trace positions) because a specifier position of a “similar kind” intervenes between the moved phrase and its trace position.

2.4 Interaction with wh-phrases

Still following Rizzi (1997) and Zubizarreta (1998), we assume that a wh-phrase always bears the feature F and is moved to Spec FocP. Thus, we predict not only that a wh-phrase cannot co-occur with a dislocated focalized phrase in the same CP complex in any order, since they compete for the same position, but also that a moved wh-phrase cannot co-occur with a fronted focused phrase at all (even if in different clauses), since prosodic constraints do not allow a Foc projection inside the presupposition of another FocP. In the same way, in situ focused phrases and wh-phrases cannot co-occur with a dislocated focused phrase because F-marked constituents cannot be deaccented:

(21) a. \*O que PRO JOÃO você deu?

what to João you gave

b. \*PRO JOÃO o que você deu?

to João what you gave

c. \*PRO JOÃO você deu o quê?

to João you gave what

d. \*O que você acha que PRO JOÃO eu dei?

what you think that to João I gave

e. \*PRO JOÃO você acha que o que eu dei?

to João you think that what I gave

f. \*PRO JOÃO você acha que eu dei o quê?

to João you think that I gave what

We should also expect, following our discussion, that a wh-phrase could not be fronted across a topic in matrix contexts since TopP dominates FocP, to where we are assuming wh-phrases are moved (see (22)). Unexpectedly, however, we see, in (23), that wh-phrases cannot be moved over a (moved or base generated) topic even if the topic sits in the embedded CP:

(22) a. \*Quem o João, viu (ele) ontem?

who the João saw (him) yesterday

b. \*?O que pro João, você deu?

what to.the João you gave

c. \*?O que o seu melhor aluno, todo professor convidou pra fazer?

what his best student each professor invited to do

(23) a. \*Quem você acha que o João, viu (ele) ontem?

who1 you think that João t1 saw (him) yesterday

b. \*O que o Pedro acha que pro João, você deu (pra ele)?

what Pedro think that to João you gave (to him)

c. \*O que você acha que o seu melhor aluno, todo professor convidou (ele) pra fazer?

what you think that the his best student every professor invited (him) to do

(22-23) show that a wh-phrase is never moved over a topic. Nevertheless, a topic can precede a wh-phrase, which is expected if wh-phrases sit in Spec FocP:

(24) a. O João, quem viu (ele) ontem?

the João who saw (him) yesterday

‘As for João, who did see him yesterday?’

b. O João, o que você deu pra ele?

the João what you gave to him

‘To João, what did you give to him?’

c. O seu melhor aluno, o que todo professor convidou pra fazer?

the his best student what every professor invited to do

‘Your best student, what did every professor invited to do?’

Notice that we are following Rizzi in assuming exactly the same derivation for sentences (24c) and (25). However, there is an asymmetry between these two sentences left unexplained: as mentioned before, (25) allows reconstruction of the topic to the argument position; (24c), on the other hand, does not allow that reading (the topic must be left dislocated):

(25) O seu melhor aluno, PRA FAZER PÓS (eu tenho impressão que) todo professor

his best student to enter the grad program (I have the impression that) every professor

convidou.

invited

‘His best student, to enter the graduate program, I have the impression that every professor invited.’

If both focused phrases and wh-phrases are moved to Spec Foc, as Rizzi assumes, this asymmetry cannot be explained. Nevertheless, Rizzi’s arguments, involving adjacency effects and possible word orders in Italian, are very convincing to the effect that wh-phrases are moved to Spec FocP. The impossibility of having a wh-phrase and a focused phrase both fronted in the same sentence in BP, in any order, seems to argue that, in this language, it also should be the case that wh-phrases and focused phrases compete for the same position. However, BP differs from other Romance languages in an important aspect: a wh-phrase can always be followed by the complementizer *que*, even when there is a preceding topic. Consider the sentences below:

(26) a. O João, o que que você deu pra ele?

the João what that you gave to him

‘To João, what did you give to him?’

b. Da Maria, quem que gosta dela?

of.the Maria who that likes (her)

‘As for Maria, who likes her?’

c. O seu melhor aluno, o que que todo professor convidou pra fazer?

the his best student what that every professor invited to do

‘Your best student, what did every professor invited him to do?’

The possibility of having a complementizer following the wh-phrase indicates that the latter is not in Spec FocP but in Spec CP. This is in fact what we expect, considering that wh-phrases have two features that must be checked during the derivation: a F(ocus) feature and a wh-feature. In languages like Italian, it is plausible to assume, as Rizzi does, that the wh-feature is generated under T in main questions, and I to C movement applies to bring that feature to the C system, where the wh-phrase can check it (or, in Rizzi’s terms, the wh-Criterion can be satisfied). This assumption explains the asymmetry between wh-phrases and focused phrases in Italian seen in (27):

(27) a. QUESTO Gianni ti dirá.

this Gianni to.you will.say

b. \*Che cosa Gianni ti dirá?

what Gianni to.you will.say?

Sentence (27b) is ungrammatical since, besides its F-feature, the wh-phrase in Spec Foc must also check its wh-feature but I to C has not applied. In BP, where there is no I to C movement, we can assume that wh-features are inherently possessed by C0. In BP, then, a wh-phrase moves to Spec Foc to check its F-feature and then moves further to Spec CP to check its wh-feature, explaining why it can always be followed by an overt complementizer.[[14]](#footnote-14) This conclusion has two important corollaries: the sentences in (23), where a wh-phrase precedes a topic are ungrammatical not because TopPs are higher than FocPs but because wh-phrases cannot be moved over (moved or base generated) topics in any context; secondly, there is a second topic position higher than CP for left dislocated topics.[[15]](#footnote-15)

The fact that wh-phrases are never moved over a topic explains the asymmetry between (25), where reconstruction of the topic is possible, and (24c) and (26c) where the bound reading of the pronoun inside the topic is never possible: in the former, the topic might have been topicalized (moved) to Spec TopP, from where it can reconstruct, but in the latter two sentences, the topic can only be at the left dislocated position above CP, since the presence of the wh-phrase in Spec CP prevents any topic from being moved to or generated at Spec TopP (since any topic, moved or base generated, induces what we have been calling a Minimality effect between the wh-phrase and its base position). That a left dislocated topic can occupy a different position than a topicalized topic is corroborated by the fact that, in BP, some topics are not related to any position inside the sentence:

(28) a. Peixe, eu gosto muito de namorado.

fish, I like lots of.the red.snapper

‘As for fish, I like red snapper a lot.’

b. A Maria, o Pedro não quer nem saber de casamento.

the Maria, the Pedro not want even know of wedding

‘As for Maria, Pedro doesn’t even want to hear about a wedding.’

In such cases, it would be problematic to assume that there is a TopP where the left dislocated topic is merged in, since no element in the sentence bears the feature Topic. Some left dislocated phrases, then, must be adjoined to the sentence, explaining why they can appear in a position higher than a wh-phrase in Spec CP. This is corroborated by the fact that the kind of topic in (28) cannot appear in embedded contexts:

(29) a. \*Eu acho que peixe, a Maria gosta muito de namorado.

I think that fish, the Maria likes lot of red snapper

‘I think that, as for fish, Maria likes red snapper a lot.’

b. \*Eu acho que a Maria, o Pedro não quer nem saber de casamento.

I think that the Maria, the Pedro not want even know of wedding

‘I think that about Maria, Pedro does not even want to hear of marriage.’

It also becomes clear now why multiple wh questions are possible, contrasting with the sentences in (21). In (30), for instance, the wh-phrase is in Spec CP position and so does not receive Ex-H at PF. The sentence need not be deaccented in this case and another wh *in situ* is possible:[[16]](#footnote-16)

(30) Quem recomendou o que pra quem?

who recommended what to whom

3. Minimality

Let us recapitulate what we have concluded so far: a) movement of a topic is possible over a moved but not over a base generated focused phrase; b) movement of a topic is impossible over another topic (either moved or base generated) and movement of wh-phrases is impossible over topics. These conclusions are summarized below (where elements related to traces indicate movement and elements related to pro indicate base generation):

(31) a. OK topic1 ………. focus2.. ………..t2………….…………..t1…

b. \* topic1 ………. focus2……..[island....pro2…]……….…t1…

c. \* topic1 ………. topic2……….. t2/pro2………………….t1…

d. \* wh1…………..topic2………..t2/pro2…………………..t1…[[17]](#footnote-17)

As we said before, the facts in (31) seem to be related to Minimality effects. Two choices immediately present themselves: either Minimality is a constraint applying to LF representations or a constraint on derivations (see Chomsky 1995, Aoun and Benmamoun 1996). Taking Minimality as a constraint on LF representations could explain the fact that a topic can be moved over a focused phrase since, at LF, both phrases are reconstructed to their argument position and no intervention takes place. However, it would fail to explain why a topic could not be moved over another topic, since reconstruction could apply here as well. On the other hand, if we take Minimality as a constraint on derivations, the intervention of a topic by another topic is explained but the non-intervention of a topic by a focused phrase is left out. We then reach the paradox that Minimality cannot be taken either as a constraint on LF representations or on derivations. In the next section, we argue that this paradox can be solved if Focalization is taken to involve movement in the PF component, and not in the syntax.

4. Focalization as PF-movement

There is an asymmetry between reconstruction of topics and focused phrases that have not yet been explained: reconstruction must be total just in the case of Focalization, but not Topicalization. We see that reconstruction is total in (32a) since the pronoun in the relative clause of the focused phrase can be bound by the quantified sentential subject but, in (32b), if there is reconstruction, it must be partial, because the pronoun in the topic phrase cannot be bound by the subject, which is not predicted by our analysis so far, since the topic apparently could be moved in that case:

(32) a. O ALUNO QUE ELE ORIENTOU, cada professor indicou pra um emprego.

the student that he advised each professor recommended for a job

‘The student that he advised, each professor recommended for a job.’

b. O aluno que ele orientou, cada professor indicou pra um emprego.

the student that he advised each professor recommended for a job

‘The student that he advised, each professor recommended for a job.’

The same pattern can be seen in (33) concerning binding facts discussed by Lebeaux (1989). In (33a, c), coreference between the pronoun and the R-expression inside the focalized phrase is impossible, while, in (33b, d), coreference is possible:[[18]](#footnote-18)

(33) a. A PROPOSTA QUE O JOÃOi FEZ ele\*i/j aprovou \_ na mesma reunião.

the proposal that the João made he approved in.the same meeting

b. A proposta que o Joãoi fez, elei/j aprovou na mesma reunião.

the proposal that the João made he aproved in.the same meeting.

‘The proposal that João made, he approved in the same meeting.’

c. A AFIRMAÇÃO DE QUE O JOÃOi GOSTA DA MARIA ele\*i/j negou.

the affirmation of that the João likes of.the Maria he denied

d. A afirmação de que o Joãoi gosta da Maria, elei/j negou.

the affirmation of that the João likes of.the Maria he denied

‘The claim that João likes Maria, he denied.’

Lebeaux treats similar “anti-reconstruction” effects in English by assuming that principle C of the Binding Theory applies throughout the derivation and by ordering two different operations: adjoin-α and move-α. In this way, non-subcategorized elements (adjuncts) would be generated as separated phrase markers and then adjoined after move-α has applied. This mechanism would explain the asymmetry between arguments and adjuncts shown in (34):

(34) a. \*Hei denied the claim that Johni made.

b. \*Hei denied the claim that Johni likes Mary.

c. Which claim that Johni made did hei latter deny t ?

d. \*Whose claim that Johni likes Mary did hei deny t?

In (33), however, arguments and adjuncts pattern together: Focalization shows anti-reconstruction effects, and Topicalization does not, when the focused/topic phrase includes both subcategorized and non-subcategorized relatives. Let us first look at Topicalization. Sentence (33d) should not be possible in the coreferential reading, just like (34d). It seems to be the case, as it is natural, that generation of topics in the dislocated position does not happen only to avoid island effects but to avoid any violation of a constraint or principle that would ensue with a movement operation. In other words, as all topic-comment structures are ambiguous between a Left Dislocation and a Topicalization structure, if one of those structures would violate a principle or constraint, the other alternative is preferred. In this way, the coreferential reading in (33d) is grammatical because the topic is interpreted as left dislocated: as the topic was generated already in the dislocated position, there is no violation of principle C. Topicalization (base generation in the argument position and later movement), on the other hand, would violate principle C. Sentence (33b), however, is still ambiguous between Topicalization and Left Dislocation but shows only partial reconstruction since the relative clause, being non-subcategorized, is adjoined to the topic only after movement if the topic is topicalized. Turning now to Focalization, the problem is reverse: (33a) should be possible with the coreferential reading and (32a) should not show radical reconstruction. It seems, then, that both (32a) and (33a) show that the focused phrase is moved only after the adjunct is inserted in the derivation.

This fact can be explained if the operation move-α in Focalization is not a syntactic operation, i.e. it applies in the PF component. As a post-Spell Out movement, Focalization is expected not to interfere with LF operations: focused phrases show total reconstruction even if an adjunct is contained in it, as in (32a), and Focalization does not alter binding relations, as in (33a).

Going back to the facts summarized in (31) above, we saw that a moved focused phrase does not prevent a moved topic to reconstruct (see (25), repeated below), while a base generated focused phrase (35a), a (moved or base generated) topic (35b) or a (moved) wh-phrase (24c) do:

(25) O seu melhor aluno, PRA FAZER PÓS (eu tenho impressão que) todo professor

his best student to enter the grad program (I have the impression that) every professor

convidou.

invited

‘His best student, to enter the graduate program, I have the impression that every professor invited.’

(35) a. O seu melhor aluno, (eu tenho impressão que) GEOGRAFIA todo professor que

the his best studenti (I have impression that) geographyj every professor that

ensina \_j convidou \_i pra jantar.

teaches \_j invited \_i to dinner

‘Your best student, (I have the impression that) Geography, every professor who teaches it invited him to dinner.’

b. O seu melhor aluno, pra fazer pós, todo professor convidou.

the his best student to enter the grad-program every professor invited

‘Your best student, to enter the graduate program, every professor invited.’

(24) c. O seu melhor aluno, o que todo professor convidou pra fazer?

the his best student what every professor invited to do

‘Your best student, what did every professor invited to do?’

If we take Focalization as an operation in the PF component, those data can be handled in a simple way: (moved) focused phrases differ from topics and wh-phrases in that both latter phrases are crossed by a topic on its way to Spec TopP; focused phrases, on the other hand, will not be crossed since they are moved only at the PF component. Base generated focused phrases, however, will be crossed by the topic, giving rise to Minimality effects. In the same way, if a topic is moved to (or base generated at) Spec TopP, movement of a wh-phrase from FopP to CP will cross the topic. The only possibility of having a topic co-occurring with a wh-phrase, then, is if the topic is base generated at the left dislocated position adjoined to CP, which is a different position available for topics in BP, as seen above.

If focalized phrases are moved in the PF component, there is no argument left against treating Minimality as a constraint on derivations: a (moved or base generated) topic intercepts another topic on its way to Spec TopP, but a (moved) focused phrase does not since it will only be moved at PF. The same facts could also be handled if Minimality is taken to be a condition on the application of the operation Move-α, as argued by Aoun and Benmamoun, since, in Arabic, a PF-moved constituent intercepts another PF-moved constituent. This cannot be seen in BP due to the independent fact that there can be only one dislocated focused phrase. Nevertheless, as the second option handles both the data in BP and Arabic it should be preferred.

5. Conclusion

We have shown that topics in BP can be moved, characterizing the construction we have been calling Topicalization, or generated already in a dislocated position, characterizing Left Dislocation. As expected, only the former will show reconstruction effects. A left dislocated topic which is related to a (argument) position occupied by a null or overt resumptive pronoun in the argument position can be generated as the Spec of a TopP in the C system or in a position adjoined to CP. A topic that is not related to any position in the sentence can only be adjoined to CP.

In the same way, a focalized phrase can be moved to the Spec of a FocP or be generated in that position, being related to a null or overt resumptive pronoun in the sentence. When moved, the focused phrase is moved in the PF component and so will not affect any LF operation: it shows total or radical reconstruction and it does not alter binding relations. When it is generated already in the dislocated position, it must be related to a position inside an (strong) island.

Wh-phrases, in BP, are moved to Spec FocP and then to Spec CP in order to check its focus and wh-features, which are inherently possessed by C0.

The various intervention facts holding between topics and focused phrases in BP are explained as Minimality, although it is unclear which common feature among topics and focused phrases would be responsible for such effects. We also see that Minimality should be taken as a condition on derivations (or on the operation move-α) and that PF movement is constrained in the same ways as syntactic movement is: it is driven by feature checking considerations, observes islands, etc.
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1. The analysis of Topicalization in English may not be as simple as described by (1a) for BP; it may involve movement of a null operator. The assumption of a null operator, opposed to actual movement of the focused phrase in Focalization, is used in Rizzi (1997) to highlight his claim that Focus is quantificational while Topic is not, explaining for instance why only Focus movement (and Topicalization in English) gives rise to WCO effects. I will disregard these language particular idiosyncrasies. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Throughout this paper, capitalized letters indicate phrases receiving Extra High (Ex-H) pitch, as defined in Zubizarreta (1998): a nuclear pitch accent that is higher relatively to the other pitch accents in the intonational contour than in the case of “unmarked” main prominence. Also throughout, an underscore marks the argumental position related to the dislocated focused phrase. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. One instance in which the fronted focused phrase constitutes old information, pointed out by Zubizarreta (1998), is the case of answers to wh-questions where the alternatives are explicit in the discourse, as in the extract below:

   (i) Q: What does John read every day: the news or the horoscope?

   A: The NEWS John reads every day. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. There is a preference, in BP, to use the silent pronoun when referring to inanimate things and a full pronominal when referring to animate beings. Disregard to that preference does not lead to ungrammaticality. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The topics in (6-8) cannot be the hanging topics discussed by Benincà and Poletto 2004, since they follow the complementizer in embedded clauses. In fact, BP does not have the kind of hanging topic discussed by the Italian authors. BP has a kind of hanging topic found also in Chinese, which is a topic that has no thematic place in the sentence, discussed later on in this work. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. In BP, as the pronoun *você* (which is syntactically third person) replaced the second person pronoun *tu* ‘you’, the third person possessive pronouns *seu* ‘his’ became ambiguous between second and third person interpretations, so the analytical form *dele* (literally of+him) is used for third person in most cases, in order to avoid ambiguity. Therefore, a phrase such as “o seu melhor aluno” may be translated either as ‘his best student’ or as ‘your best student’. This ambiguity will be crucial in telling when reconstruction is allowed. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The sentences in (10) are somewhat marginal if *seu* is interpreted as third person when it is not bound. This is due to the fact, pointed out in Negrão and Müller (1996), that, in BP, there has been a specialization of pronominal forms: *seu* (interpreted as third person) is used in bound contexts (when the pronoun is bound by a quantifier) whereas *dele* (of+him) is used otherwise. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. There may be some BP speakers who accept (11b), focalization with resumption; my own judgment is only representative of the BP spoken in big cities, generally by educated people. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. I do not see how this generalization should be formalized since it clearly cannot be stated as a condition on well-formedness of numerations. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Mary Kato (p.c.) suggested that the absence of the bound reading in the “b” example, for instance, in contrast with “a” could be caused by the complexity of the former. It is easy to show, however, that increasing the complexity of (14a) would not affect the possibility of the bound reading:

    (i) O SEU DEPARTAMENTO todo professor que chegou da Europa acha o melhor.

    the his department every professor that arrived from Europe considers the best [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. I intentionally placed the direct object in the higher dislocated position in (16b, c, d) to show that the impossibility of moving two focalized phrases is not related to superiority effects. This can also be seen by the fact that (16c), for instance, is bad with both orders:

    (i) \*PRO LUIZ eu acho que ESSES CDS a Maria recomendou.

    to Luiz I think that these CDs Maria recommended [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Left dislocation of a PP with a VP complement related to a position inside an island will be, then, also impossible and those sentences will never be possible since neither the Topicalization or Left Dislocation strategies are possible:

    (i) \*Pra fazer pós, o professor que convidou o seu melhor aluno t/*pro* se arrependeu.

    to enter the grad-program, the professor that invited the his best student self regretted

    ‘To enter the graduate program, the professor who invited his best student regretted doing it.’ [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. If α, β are in the same minimal domain, they are equidistant from γ. (Chomsky 1993: 17). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. We also assume that the head of CP is optionally null when a wh-phrase occupies its Spec. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. That only base generated topics can appear in that position is also clear since movement is only driven by feature checking considerations (as it is commonly assumed). In this way, no topic could be moved to this adjoined position because there is no relevant (topic) feature that can be checked there. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Following this logic, we should expect that something like (i) would be possible. However, although (i) would have no problem at PF, it is semantically awkward. For one thing, the sentence asserts that *João* is the correct value for the variable in “Pedro recommended something to x” but at the same time it questions what is the x such that Pedro recommended x to João. The sentence is then impossible since one cannot assert that *João* is the correct value for a certain variable if one does not know which variable that is:

    (i) O que o Pedro recomendou PRO JOÃO?

    what the Pedro recommended to João [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. This structure will always derive an ungrammatical sentence (irrespectively of its reading), since the wh-phrase does not have the option of being generated already in CP and movement would cause a Minimality violation. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The most embedded element inside the focused phrase receives main prominence in (33a, c): the verb *fez* and *Maria* respectively. However, varying the main prominence inside the focused phrase does not seem to alter the possibility of coreference. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)