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Abstract

This paper explores a newly identified contrastive topic configuration in Spanish. Coined by de Andrade (2018) for Galician and European Portuguese, the
D(emonstrative)-construction features a left-dislocated topic and d(emonstrative)-pronoun resumptive. This study investigates whether the D-construction exists in Spanish, and if so, with which syntactic properties.

We administered an acceptability judgment task on the D-construction, Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD), Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD) and Focus Fronting (FF) to Spanish speakers. The task tested the role of the left-dis locate, case connectivity, subject-verb inversion, embedding, recursivity, and sensitivity to island constraints.

Simple instances of the D-construction received consistently high ratings, demonstrating that it exists in Spanish. There was individual variation regarding the role of the left-dislocate and case connectivity. The D-construction did not require subject-verb inversion, was non-recursive and demonstrated selective island sensitivity. Findings for CLLD, HTLD and FF were mostly in line with previous literature.

The D-construction did not exactly pattern with CLLD, HTLD, nor FF; it is characterized by a unique set of syntactic properties. We propose that both left-dislocated elements are base-generated at Spec, TopP: the fronted DP is a hanging topic, and its resumptive d-pronoun is linked to a clitic within the main clause via an A’-chain.
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1. Introduction

A “D(emonstrative)-construction” that features a left-dislocated resumptive d(emonstrative)-pronoun and carries a contrastive topic interpretation has been proposed for European Portuguese (1) and Galician (2) (de Andrade 2018).¹ ² This study explored the acceptance and syntactic properties of an equivalent D-construction in Spanish (3).

(1) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 82 (1a))
O João, esse não tenho ideia de quem seja.
the João DEM NEG have.1SG idea of whom be.SBJV.3SG
‘(As for) João, I have no idea about who he is.’

¹ For the remainder of the paper, we use ‘Portuguese’ to refer to the European variety.
² Bold text is used to highlight the left-dislocated constituents and their resumptive elements.
³ Throughout the paper, if an example is not preceded by a corresponding reference, it was created by the authors.
(2) Galician (de Andrade 2018: 82 (1b))
\[
\text{Xoán, dese non teño nin idea.}
\]
\[
\text{Xoán of-DEM NEG have.1SG NEG idea}
\]
‘(As for) Xoán, I have no idea about who he is.’

(3) Spanish
\[
(A) \text{ Elena, a esa la vi ayer.}
\]
\[
\text{DOM Elena DOM DEM ACC.3SG.F saw.1SG yesterday}
\]
‘(As for) Elena, that girl I saw (her) yesterday.’

De Andrade (2018) determined the D-construction’s syntactic properties in Portuguese and Galician by consulting corpus data and comparing the construction’s properties to instances of Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) in Romance languages, Germanic Contrastive Left Dislocation (CLD), and Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD) in German and Portuguese. Based on the results of his analysis, de Andrade (2018: 102) concluded that the D-construction in Portuguese and Galician represented a “marked syntactic construction [to be described] in its own terms”.

For this study, we utilized experimental data drawn from a carefully-designed acceptability judgment task to explore the permissibility and syntactic properties of the D-construction in relation to CLLD (4), HTLD (5) Rand FF (6) in Spanish. \(^4\) \(^5\) Because these left-dislocated topic and focus configurations have been identified and described in terms of their associated syntactic, intonational and pragmatic characteristics in Spanish (e.g., Campos & Zampini 1990; Hernanz & Brucart 1987; López 2009; Rivero 1978, 1980; Villalba 2000; Zagona 2002; Zubizarreta 1998), considering their properties allowed us to better understand the syntactic properties of the D-construction in Spanish.

(4) Spanish
\[
\text{A Elena, la vi ayer.}
\]
\[
\text{DOM Elena ACC.3SG.F saw.1SG yesterday}
\]
‘Elena, I saw (her) yesterday.’

(5) Spanish
\[
\text{Elena, la vi ayer a esa chica.}
\]
\[
\text{Elena ACC.3SG.F saw.1SG yesterday DOM DEM girl}
\]
‘Elena, I saw that girl yesterday.’

\(^4\) Example (5), which is an instance of HTLD, appears to have two resumptive elements because there is clitic doubling.

\(^5\) We use a comma to denote either a prosodic break or a full pause. The D-construction, CLLD, HTLD and FF items in our Acceptability Judgement Task followed the comma conventions used in examples (3)-(6). In the remainder of the paper, any examples that appear punctuated differently follow the conventions used by the cited author.
In our task, we presented instances of CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction preceded by a couple of sentences that established an appropriate discursive context to native speakers of Spanish. These items were designed to test a selection of syntactic properties which distinguish left-dislocated constructions in Romance languages: the category of the left-dislocate, resumptive elements, DP case connectivity, subject-verb inversion, embedding, recursivity, and sensitivity to various island constraints (wh-islands, the Complex NP constraint, relative clauses, and adjunct islands).

Almost all speakers accepted CLLD within this task, and at least half of them accepted FF, HTLD and the D-construction. Importantly, we will show that the D-construction configuration does not pattern exactly with CLLD, HTLD and FF, but rather forms a different construction with its own properties.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the discourse notions of topic and focus as they were defined within this study. Section 3 introduces CLLD, HTLD and FF with an emphasis on distinguishing their syntactic properties in Spanish. Section 4 offers a description of the D-construction in Galician and Portuguese and its syntactic properties. Section 5 outlines the methods we used, including information about the participants, task, materials, and procedures. Section 6 presents the results attained from the acceptability judgment task. Finally, Section 7 discusses how the properties found to be associated with the D-construction in the acceptability judgment task compared to those of other left-dislocated constructions in Spanish, as well as to its Portuguese/Galician counterpart. Section 8 closes with some concluding remarks.

2. Topic and focus in Spanish

People generally engage in conversation with one another to expand upon their common ground, or shared knowledge (Halliday 1967; Jackendoff 1972; Reinhart 1981). Within a given exchange, speakers tend to offer old or presupposed information to establish a topic (or theme) of discourse, and provide new information (focus, or rheme) to comment on it further (Jacobs 1984, 1999; Lambrech 1994). When presenting new information, speakers use a combination of strategies to prioritize these words to the interlocutor (Erteschik-Shir 1997; Gundel 1994; Vallduví 1990). To achieve these pragmatic functions within the discourse, speakers use a combination of prosodic and syntactic features. Therefore, language-specific tools are available to efficiently revisit information that is already shared and to optimally frame new information. These tools fall within the realm of information structure, where
sentence-level constituents are governed by notions of the discourse and, thus, exist at the syntax-discourse interface.

In Spanish, canonical word order is SVO. Here we follow Zubizarreta’s (1998) claim that the canonical word order which arises in unmarked contexts can also be VSO. This means that in ‘out-of-the-blue’ contexts, as in responding to the question ‘what happened?’ (¿Qué pasó?), speakers tend to produce a configuration like (7).

(7)   Spanish (Zubizarreta 1999: 4217, (5))
      Todas las mañanas compra (V) Juan (S) el diario (O).
      all the mornings bought 3SG.PST Juan the newspaper
      ‘Juan bought the newspaper every morning.’

Other word orders are possible in Spanish, as in (8), but only for discourse-pragmatic reasons. For example, (8), which appears with a fronted object (i.e., in OSV order), would not be considered a felicitous response to the question “what happened?”, but it could appear in a different pragmatic context where the fronted element represents old information. This same sentence could not, however, surface as a response to the question ¿qué compró Juan? ‘what did Juan buy?’.

(8)   Spanish (Olarrea 2012: 603 (1))
      El periódico, (él) lo compraba todos los días.
      the newspaper (he) CL-it used-to-buy every day
      ‘He used to buy the newspaper every day.’

According to Zubizarreta (1998), non-contrastive/new information focus, such as the information requested by the previous question, tends to appear in sentence-final position in order to align with nuclear stress in Spanish, which is the neutral stress-marking pattern expected in declarative sentences. The relationship between nuclear stress and noncontrastive focus is outlined in the Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR), which can be either selection-driven (S-NSR) or constituent-driven (C-NSR) (Zubizarreta 1998: 18).

Following F(OCUS)-structure notation, focus constituents are distinguished from topic constituents using the distinctive feature [F(OCUS)]. Focus constituents are denoted [+F] and topic constituents are denoted [-F] or left unmarked, as in (9). Each F-structure is associated with one or more different Assertion Structures (AS) that are associated with explicit or implicit context questions (Zubizarreta 1998: 2).

Following Zubizarreta’s (1998: 38) Focus Prosody Correspondence Principle (FPCP), if the [F]-marked constituent appears in a position which does not coincide with nuclear stress – like sentence-medially or sentence-initially (9b) – then the statement would not be perceived as an adequate response within the context. More specifically, the first part of the FPCP dictates that the focused constituent within a phrase must contain that phrase’s intonational nucleus. The second part stipulates that the F-marked constituent must contain the most prominent word in that phrase. In other terms, there can only be one focused constituent per sentence (Zubizarreta 1998: 6).
Corrective/contrastive focus, characterized by the presence of emphatic stress on the focused constituent, may also surface in Spanish. Cases of emphatic stress follow Zubizarreta’s (1998: 45) Focus/Contrastive Stress Correspondence Principle, where a word with contrastive stress must be dominated by every F-marked constituent in the phrase. Stress of this type is freely assigned, but its relationship with F-structure is more restricted than in the case of noncontrastive focus. Zubizarreta (1998: 6-7) states that contrastive focus is preceded by a statement to situate its context within the discourse (a context statement). Contrastive focus then has two effects: first, it negates the value assigned to a variable in the AS of its context statement; second, it introduces an alternative value for the variable. For example, the constituent, un ratón ‘a mouse’ is marked with contrastive focus in situ in (10) to clarify that the speaker meant the cat ate a mouse, not a canary.

When a focus constituent is marked with emphatic stress and also moved to a left-dislocated position within the structure, the resulting syntactic configuration is known as Focus Fronting (FF) (Campos & Zampini 1990; Leonetti & Escandell-Vidal 2009), as in (11). Focus Fronting and contrastive focus are closely related. Focus Fronting occurs when contrastive focus is marked syntactically (i.e., through the fronting of the focus constituent, which also bears contrastive stress). Contrastive focus may remain syntactically unmarked and surface in-situ with contrastive stress.

---

6. Gussenhoven (2007: 87) discusses the focus-to-accent relation through the Sentence Accent Assignment Rule (SAAR), which dictates that constituents may be focused (contrastively) by accentuating only one word.

7. Focus Fronting and contrastive focus are closely related. Focus Fronting occurs when contrastive focus is marked syntactically (i.e., through the fronting of the focus constituent, which also bears contrastive stress). Contrastive focus may remain syntactically unmarked and surface in-situ with contrastive stress.
The following section discusses the discursive/pragmatic contexts in which CLLD, HTLD and FF typically arise and expands upon their syntactic properties.

3. Left-dislocated topic and focus configurations in Spanish

3.1. Introduction to CLLD, HTLD and FF

Originally identified across Romance languages by Cinque (1977), CLLD features a topic at the left edge which is doubled by a corresponding clitic in the main clause when available (as in (4), repeated here as (12)). The left-dislocated topic within CLLD is a sentence-topic that demonstrates grammatical dependence on elements within the main clause. This means that the fronted constituent preserves certain characteristics of its corresponding argument within the main clause. For example, if the fronted element corresponds to a direct object, it will be doubled by an accusative clitic in the main clause and appear marked with a differential object marker, a, if semantically required. If the fronted element relates to an object of a preposition, there is no clitic available for this type of argument, but the entire prepositional phrase will be left-dislocated in CLLD (i.e., rid of an overt co-referential clitic).

(12) Spanish
A Elena, la vi ayer.
DOM Elena ACC.3SG.F saw.1SG yesterday
‘Elena, I saw (her) yesterday.’

Pragmatically, CLLD can be used to refer to a previously stated topic and comment on it further. For example, in (13)-(15), Speaker A’s brother represents the topic, and CLLD is used to redirect attention to the brother and note that he has not gotten his visa yet. In (14), which is an instance of CLLD, tu hermano ‘your brother’ is a sentence topic which acts as an indirect object within the main clause, it is preceded by a to mark its dative case and is doubled by a corresponding third-person, singular, dative clitic le. Although (15) represents a grammatical utterance, this sentence would be an infelicitous continuation of the context set by (13).

---

8 In Spanish, corresponding clitics are available for direct objects (me, te, la/la, nos, los/las) and indirect objects (me, te, le, nos, les) (Mayer 2017); however, no corresponding clitics are available for, for example, mass nouns, for passives or for objects of prepositions.
(13) **Spanish (based on Cinque 1983/1997: 95 (5))**

**Speaker A**

Mi hermano y yo tenemos que hacer las maletas.

POSSESS brother CONJ I have.1PL COMP to do.INF DEF luggage

Nos vamos a Córcega mañana.

REFL.1PL go.1PL to Corsica tomorrow

‘My brother and I have to pack our luggage. We leave for Corsica tomorrow.’

**Speaker B**

Pero, he oído que...

CONJ have-heard.1SG COMP

‘But, I have heard that…’

(14) **Spanish (Cinque 1997: 94 (2))**

a tu hermano, no le han dado la visa.

DOM POSS brother NEG DAT.3SG have given.3PL DEF visa

‘(To) your brother, (they) have not given (him) a visa.’

(15) **Spanish**

*No le han dado la visa a tu hermano.

NEG DAT.3SG have-given.3PL DEF visa DOM POSS brother

‘They have not given your brother a visa.’

López (2009: 6) describes CLLD as representing “a discourse anaphor with a somewhat complex relationship with its antecedent—the relationship can be part/whole, set/subset, etc.” In (13)-(14), Speaker A’s brother represents the ‘part’ of the ‘whole’ (i.e., *mi hermano y yo*), for example. Arregi (2003) argues that CLLD can also be considered to carry a contrastive topic interpretation.

Another available left-dislocated topic configuration in Spanish, HTLD (Cinque 1977) features presupposed information at the left edge (as in (5), repeated as (16)). Different from CLLD, the left-dislocated topics within HTLD are discourse topics which lack grammatical dependence on any element within the main clause. In the case of HTLD, if a fronted element corresponds to a direct object within the main clause, it may appear doubled with an accusative clitic, but it will not be preceded by *a* to mark its accusative case at the left edge. In HTLD, regardless of the fronted element’s role within the main clause, this constituent will always appear in a default nominative form, rid of any features of connectivity to elements with which it corresponds. Accordingly, these topics are conceived as ‘hanging’ and tend to communicate what the conversation is generally about without referring to a definite or specific indefinite entity that was already mentioned within the conversation (i.e., the aboutness condition; Casielles-Suárez 2004; López 2009; Mathesius 1975; Villalba 2000; Zagona 2002).
Pragmatically, HTLD can be utilized to shift the discourse to an entirely new (or different) topic. For example, in (17), the speaker used HTLD to redirect the conversation about their childhood and make a comment about a different topic: the listener’s brother during that time. Topicalizing expressions, such as en cuanto a ‘regarding’ or con respecto a ‘with respect to’, may be used to introduce hanging topics; whether or not a topicalizing expression appropriately introduces a topic has been used as a test for identifying hanging topics for languages which lack features of case connectivity, like Portuguese (De Andrade 2018).

As stated in Section 2, FF (like (6), repeated as (18)) is interpreted as highlighting an element that comes from a contextually given set while excluding other alternative members from the set (Leonetti & Escandell-Vidal 2009: 157). In (19), the contextual set would be all of the people invited to the party. FF is used to highlight a tu hermano as an invitee while excluding Speaker A from the set. In other words, in (19), Speaker B uses FF to correct the direct object that was poorly defined by Speaker A, while filling this argument position with its correct value. The FF used by Speaker B clarified to Speaker A that their brother was the one to receive the invitation to the party, not them.

9 Following de Andrade (2018: 95, footnote 21), we acknowledge that some works, like Villalba (2000), distinguish between HTLD and dislocations preceded by a topicalizing expression. We treat them together for ease of presentation.

10 Benincà and Poletto (2004) provides six empirical tests to distinguish between Hanging Topics and Left Dislocated elements. In our paper, these correspond to the fronted constituents within HTLD and CLLD.
(18) **Spanish**

\[
\text{DOM } \text{ELENA} \text{ vi ayer, no a } \text{Marta.}
\]

‘I saw ELENA yesterday, not Marta.’ / ‘ELENA I saw yesterday, not Marta.’

(19) **Spanish** *(based on Cinque 1983/1997: 95 (6))*

**Speaker A**

Porque me han invitado, iré a la fiesta.

because dat.1SG have-invited.3PL will go.1SG to DEF party

‘Since they have invited me, I’ll go to the party.’

**Speaker B**

No, …

*(based on Cinque 1983/1997: 94 (3))*

A **TU HERMANO** han invitado, no a ti.

DOM POSS brother have-invited.3PL NEG DOM you

‘(They) have invited YOUR BROTHER, not you.’

While FF is traditionally related to a contrastive or corrective meaning, as exemplified in (18)-(19), Cruschina (2012, 2019) (see also Jiménez-Fernández (2015a), among others) has shown that FF can also be used to express surprise in Spanish (and other Romance languages), coined as *mirative FF*. This option is presented in (20).

(20) **Spanish** *(Cruschina 2019: 10, (8a))*

¡Imáginate! ¡Con el director quería hablar!

Imagine.IMP.2G-you with the director want.IMPF.3SG talk.INF

‘Guess what! The director he wanted to talk to!’

Along the same vein, recent reports have shown that native speakers also accept non-contrastive preverbal foci in response to *wh*-questions (e.g., Gabriel 2007, 2010 (Argentinian Spanish); Gutiérrez-Bravo 2006; Hoot 2012, 2016 (Mexican Spanish)). In response, Cruschina (2021) proposed a re-exploration of the typically binary conception of contrast for FF. Instead, Cruschina (2021) identified four subtypes of focus (information, exhaustive, mirative and corrective) that carry different degrees of contrast and, accordingly, a higher or lower likelihood to be marked through syntax, or arise as an instance of FF.

### 3.2. Syntactic properties of CLLD, HTLD and FF in Spanish

In the current analysis, the syntactic properties of left-dislocation were used to determine the extent to which the D-construction represents a unique configuration in Spanish. Therefore, within this section, CLLD, HTLD and FF will be distinguished in terms of the following properties: (i) the phrasal category (or role) of the dislocated
constituent, (ii) resumptive elements with which this constituent may appear, (iii) case connectivity between the fronted element and an argument position in the main clause, (iv) subject-verb inversion, (v) embedding, (vi) recursivity, and (vii) sensitivity to island constraints.

(i) The types of phrasal categories permitted at the left edge distinguish CLLD and FF from HTLD. Virtually any phrasal category can be CLLD-ed—including DPs, PPs (21), AdjPs, CPs, and QPs (Casielles-Suárez 2004; Cinque 1997; López 2009; Villalba 2000; Zagona 2002). This is also the case for FF provided that this category is parallel to that of the element within the assertive context (Campos & Zampini 1990) (22). Hanging topics, however, are restricted to DPs only, as demonstrated by the unacceptability of (23b) (López 2009; Villalba 2000; Zagona 2002).

(21) Spanish (Zagona 2002: 221 (41a))
De Juan, no me acuerdo.
of Juan NEG REFL remember.1SG
‘Of Juan, I don’t remember.’

(22) Spanish (Campos & Zampini 1990: 49 (3c))
EN ESA LIBRERÍA, compró Juan unos libros (y no in DEM bookstore bought.3SG Juan INDEF books CONJ NEG en ésta)
in DEM
‘IN THAT BOOKSTORE Juan bought some books (and not in this one).’

(23) Spanish (Zagona 2002: 221 (39a-b))
a. Juan, no me acuerdo de él.
Juan NEG REFL.1SG remember.1SG of him
‘Juan, I don’t remember him.’
b. *De Juan, no me acordo de él.
of Juan NEG REFL.1SG remember.1SG of him
‘Juan, I don’t remember him.’

(ii) The types of resumptive elements (e.g., clitics, strong pronouns, and epithets) permitted to appear within the main clause of each construction differ across CLLD, HTLD and FF. When functioning as an accusative or dative argument, CLLD-ed constituents characteristically appear doubled by a coreferential clitic in the main clause: (24) shows a fronted DP direct object doubled by a corresponding accusative clitic, and (25) shows a fronted DP indirect object doubled by a corresponding dative clitic. A CLLD-ed constituent cannot be resumed by an overt category, such as a strong pronoun (26) or an epithet (27) (Aissen 2003; Escobar 1997; López 2009).
(24) Spanish (Casielles-Suárez 2004: 67 (57))
A tu hermana, la vi ayer.
DOM POSS sister ACC.3SG.F saw.1SG yesterday
‘Your sister, I saw (her) yesterday.’

(25) Spanish (Arregi 2003: 33 (6))
A Juan, le di un libro.
to Juan DAT.3SG gave.1SG INDEF book
‘To Juan, I gave (him) a book.’

(26) Spanish (Escobar 1997: 233 (2b))
*A Juan lo conozco a él.
DOM Juan ACC.3SG.M know.1SG DOM him
‘Juan, I know (him) (*him).’

(27) Spanish (López 2009: 4 (1.3e))
*A María, hace tiempo que no veo a esa sinvergüenza.
DOM María does time COMP NEG see.1SG DOM DEM shameless
‘María, I haven’t seen that shameless woman in a long time.’

When functioning as the object of a preposition, like in (28), the entire prepositional phrase appears at the left edge via CLLD. Objects of prepositions do not appear doubled with a resumptive element because they lack suitable coreferential clitics in Spanish. When functioning as the subject, CLLD-ed topics are resummed by pro (29) and only reveal themselves via agreement in person and number with the verbal suffix. Again, there are no coreferential subject clitics available in Spanish.

(28) Spanish (Casielles-Suárez 2004: 78 (105))
Con Juan, hablé ayer.
with Juan spoke.1SG yesterday
‘With Juan, I spoke yesterday.’

(29) Spanish (Escobar 1997: 240 (22A))
Juan, pro está de vacaciones.
Juan 3SG is.3SG on vacation
‘Juan, (he) is on vacation.’

HTLD-ed constituents which represent accusative ((2) above) or dative (30) arguments appear doubled by a corresponding clitic in the main clause (Escobar 1997). Various overt categories – like strong pronouns (31), epithets (32), or a combination of these resumptive elements – are also available (López 2009).
(30) Spanish (López 2009: 4 (1.3b))
Maria, no le enviaré ningún paquete.
‘(To) María, I will not send a package to her.’

(31) Spanish (Zagona 2002: 221 (40a-b))
Juan, lo vimos a él en la fiesta.
‘Juan, we saw him at the party.’

(32) Spanish (López 2009: 4 (1.3f))
María, hace tiempo que no veo a esa sinvergüença.
‘María, I haven’t seen that shameless woman in a long time.’

FF-ed constituents cannot be linked to any type of coreferential element within the main clause (Campos & Zampini 1990), as demonstrated by the ungrammaticality associated with the presence of the clitic los in (33). Along the same vein, strong pronouns (34) and epithets (35) are also not permitted in FF.

(33) Spanish (adapted from Campos & Zampini 1990: 48 (2c))
UNOS LIBROS, (*los) compró Juan en esa librería
INDEF books ACC.3PL.M bought.3SG Juan at DEM bookstore
(y no unas revistas).
CONJ NEG INDEF magazines
‘SOME BOOKS Juan bought in that bookstore, not some magazines.’

(34) Spanish
A MARTA escribió Pedro una carta (*a ella) (y no a Susana).
DOM Marta wrote.3SG Pedro INDEF letter DOM her and not DOM Susan
‘(TO MARTA) Pedro wrote a letter (and not to Susan).’

(35) Spanish
A MARTA escribió Pedro una carta (*a esa chica) (y no a
DOM Marta wrote.3SG Pedro INDEF letter to that girl and not DOM
Susan
‘(TO MARTA) Pedro wrote a letter (and not to Susan).’

(iii) In Spanish, [+HUMAN, +ANIMATE, +DEFINITE] direct objects are obligatorily marked with a differential object marker (DOM) – the preposition a. Objects that are [-HUMAN, +ANIMATE, +DEFINITE] or [+HUMAN, +ANIMATE, -DEFINITE] are optionally marked and [-HUMAN, -ANIMATE] objects are not marked (see Aissen
2003). Relevant to CLLD, HTLD and FF, the presence of the DOM a before a dislocated constituent, thus, signals that this element maintains a certain level of grammatical dependence, or case connectivity, with its argument position in the main clause.

The obligatory presence of the DOM a at the left edge (i.e., a manifestation of case connectivity requirements) distinguishes CLLD and FF from HTLD (Campos & Zampini 1990; Villalba 2000; Zagona 2002; Zubizarreta 1998). CLLD-ed (36) or FF-ed (37) direct objects that are [+HUMAN, +ANIMATE, +DEFINITE] demonstrate required case connectivity and must be preceded with a to mark their accusative case.\(^{11}\)

(36) Spanish
*(A) \(\text{Juan, lo vi ayer.}\)
\(\text{DOM Juan ACC.3SG.M saw.1SG yesterday} \)
‘Juan, I saw (him) yesterday.’

(37) Spanish
*(A) PEDRO escribió María una carta.
\(\text{DOM Pedro wrote.3SG María INDEF letter} \)
‘(TO PEDRO) María wrote a letter.’

Note that the preposition a serves more than one function in Spanish (see Fábregas 2013; Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007). Outside of acting as a differential object marker, a also represents the preposition ‘to’ and a dative case marker. Indirect objects, regardless of their semantic characteristics, are preceded by a in Spanish. Accordingly, CLLD-ed (38) and FF-ed (39) indirect objects are always preceded by the preposition a to mark their dative case.

(38) Spanish (adapted from Arregi 2003: 33 (6))
*(A) \(\text{Juan, le di un libro.}\)
\(\text{DOM Juan DAT.3SG gave.1SG INDEF book} \)
‘(To) Juan, I gave (him) a book.’

(39) Spanish
*(A) CRISTINA compró José un Mercedes para su cumpleaños (y no a Marta).
\(\text{DOM Cristina bought.3SG José INDEF Mercedes for birthday CONJ NEG DOM Marta} \)
‘FOR CRISTINA José bought a Mercedes for her birthday (and not for Marta).’

---

\(^{11}\) Escobar (1997) states that only elements that are [+SPECIFIC] may be CLLD-ed, and that this is a requirement of CLLD vs. clitic doubling or case connectivity.
HTLD-ed constituents lack case connectivity with the verb (Anagnostopoulou 1997; Escobar 1997; Suñer 2006) and always appear in a ‘default’ nominative form (López 2009: 4), lacking a even when the HTLD-ed constituent would semantically require it, as in (40).

(40) Spanish (Escobar 1997: 233 (1a))

Juan, lo conozco.

Juan ACC.3SG.M know:1SG

‘Juan, I know (him).’

(iv) A requirement for a post-verbal subject within the main clause distinguishes FF from CLLD and HTLD. FF requires subject-verb inversion (41) (Casielles–Suárez 2004; Hernanz & Brucart 1987), whereas CLLD (42) and HTLD (43) do not (Escobar 1997). This requirement is demonstrated by the grammaticality contrast between instances of FF with a post-verbal (41a) vs. a pre-verbal (41b) subject (Hernanz & Brucart 1987; Casielles–Suárez 2004). CLLD and HTLD, on the other hand, often surface with a preverbal subject, signaling that subject-verb inversion is not required (Escobar 1997).12

12 Arregi (2003) argues that CLLD involves contrastive topicalization, a particular type of topicalization. Within this framework, contrastive topics (CT) respond to partial answers to a multiple question and correspond with the question’s wh-phrases. Context for CTs provide a contrastive set, or a set of alternatives to the CT. Regarding subject placement within the structure, CLLD may contain a postverbal subject, but Arregi (2003) argues that the CLLD-ed object would have obligatory wide scope, resulting in the grammaticality contrasts demonstrated in examples (i) and (ii). (i) is ungrammatical because the CLLD-ed object was reconstructed below the postverbal subject in the structure and, within the framework adopted by Arregi (2003), a CLLD-ed object pronoun cannot be bound by a postverbal subject QP. (ii) shows that this can also be explained through scope. Only the interpretation in (iia), where the CLLD-ed object has wide scope, yields an acceptable instance of CLLD. In this case, ‘each’ reconstructs above ‘less than 3’. This is in contrast with the ungrammatical interpretation in (iib) where ‘less than 3’ reconstructs above ‘each’.

(i) Spanish (Arregi 2003: 41 (23))

*A su hijo, deberá acompañarlo cada madre.

DOM POSS son will-have to-accompany-him each mother

‘Her son, each mother, will have to accompany.’

(ii) Spanish (Arregi 2003: 41 (24))

Cada libro, lo leyeron menos de tres estudiantes.

each book, ACC.3SG.M read.3PL.PST less than three students

a. ‘For each book x, there are less than three students that read x.’

b. ‘There are less than three students that read every book.’
(41) a. Spanish (Casielles-Suárez 2004: 185 (43))
   EN PRIMAVERA visitóJuan Leningrado.
in spring visited.3SG Juan Leningrado
   ‘IN SPRING Juan visited Leningrado.’

 b. Spanish (Casielles-Suárez 2004: 185 (44))
   *EN PRIMAVERA Juan visitó Leningrado.
in spring Juan visited.3SG Leningrado
   ‘IN SPRING Juan visited Leningrado.’

(42) Spanish (Escobar 1997: 244 (34))
   A María, yo la he invitado.
   DOM María I ACC.3SG.F have.1SG invited.PTCP
   ‘Mary, I have invited (her).’

(43) Spanish (Escobar 1997: 244 (35b))
   En cuanto a María, yo la he invitado.
as for María I ACC.3SG.F have.1SG invited.PTCP
   ‘As for María, I have invited her.’

(v) The option to appear within an embedded position distinguishes CLLD and FF from HTLD. CLLD-ed (44) and FF-ed (45) constituents can appear in both root and embedded contexts (Casielles-Suárez 2004; López 2009; Villalba 2000; Zagona 2002; Zubizarreta 1998). HTLD, on the other hand, cannot be embedded and may only appear in root contexts (Casielles Suárez 2004; López 2009; Zagona 2002), as shown in (46).13

(44) Spanish (López 2009: 105 (3.49))
   Creo que a María no la vas a ver.
think.1SG COMP DOM María NEG ACC.3SG.F go.2SG to see.INF
   ‘I don’t think you’ll get to see María.’

(45) Spanish (Zubizarreta 1999: 4241 (145))
   Estoy segura de que NADA te regalará Pedro.
am.1SG sure of COMP nothing DAT.2SG will gift.3SG Pedro
   [Pedro me regalará un libro.] Pedro DAT.1SG will gift.3SG INDEF book
   ‘I’m sure that Pedro will not give you ANYTHING. [Pedro will give me a book]’

13 A reviewer noted that (46) is not ungrammatical in their variety.
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(46) Spanish (Zubizarreta 1998: 188 (ix))
*Sin embargo, estoy segura que, **Bernardo**, nadie confía en ese idiota.
however  am.1SG sure COMP Bernardo no one trusts.3SG
in DEM idiot
‘However, I’m sure that, Bernardo, no one trusts that idiot.’

(vi) Recursivity, or the ability to simultaneously front multiple constituents, distinguishes CLLD from HTLD and FF. CLLD is a recursive phenomenon, meaning that multiple constituents may be CLLD-ed (Villalba 2000; Zagona 2002), as in (47). HTLD (Villalba 2000; Zagona 2002), as in (48), and FF (Hernanz & Brucart 1987), as in (49), pattern similarly in that neither are recursive. That is, only one constituent may be FF-ed or HTLD-ed at a time.

(47) Spanish (Casielles-Suárez 2004: 74 (88))
A Pedro los libros ya se los compré.
DOM Pedro DEF books already DAT.3SG ACC.3PL.M bought.1SG
‘Pedro, the books, (I) already bought (them) (for him).’

(48) Spanish (Zagona 2002: 223 (47b))
*Juan, el libro, él no lo ha comprado.
Juan DEF book he NEG ACC.SG.M has.3SG bought.PTCP
‘Juan, the book, he hasn’t bought it.’

(49) Spanish (Hernanz & Brucart 1987: 96 (66a))
*A PEDRO UNA CARTA escribió María.
DOM Pedro INDEF letter wrote.3SG María
‘(TO) PEDRO A LETTER María wrote.’

(vii) Various types of syntactic islands have been used to determine whether these structures involve movement.¹⁴ All three constructions differ in terms of their acceptability within various island contexts and, thus, have been proposed to have different syntactic derivations.

CLLD-ed constituents can relate to an argument situated within *wh*-islands (50) but not within Complex NPs (51), relative clauses (52) or adjunct islands (53). Accordingly, the varied island sensitivity displayed by CLLD has been described as *selective* (López 2009).

---

¹⁴ There is debate about whether some islands are considered strong vs. weak. For example, Cinque (1990) called Complex NPs ‘strong’ islands, but Suñer (2006) considered them ‘weak’. We follow Suñer’s (2006) classification of strong (RC Extraction and Adjunct islands) vs. weak (*wh*-islands and Complex NPs) syntactic islands in Spanish.
(50) Spanish (Suñer 2006: 136 (21a))
A Mara, no recuerdo quién preguntó (que) dónde
DOM Mara NEG remember.1SG who asked.3SG COMP where
la había visto yo.
ACC.3SG.F had.1SG seen.PTCP I
‘Mara, I don’t remember who asked where I had seen (her).’

(51) Spanish (Suñer 2006: 136 (18a))
??A Mara, existe la posibilidad de que la arresten.
DOM Mara exists.3SG DEF possibility COMP ACC.3SG.F arrest.3PL
‘Mara, it is possible that they arrest (her).’

(52) Spanish (Zubizarreta 1998: 187 (i))
*Estoy segura que a Pedro, conocemos a la mujer
am.1SG certain COMP DOM Pedro know.1PL DOM DEF woman
que lo traicionó.
COMP ACC.3SG.M betrayed.3SG
‘I’m sure that, Pedro, (we) know the woman that betrayed (him).’

(53) Spanish (Zubizarreta 1998: 187 (ii))
*Me parece mejor que a Pedro, terminemos la
dat.1SG seems.3SG better COMP DOM Pedro finish.1PL DEF
assignment before calling-INF-ACC.3SG.M
‘It seems better to me if, Pedro, we will finish the assignment before calling
(him).’

Following Chomsky (1981a), Hernanz and Brucart (1987), Cinque (1990),
we propose the derivation in Figure 1 for (54). As shown in the structure,
the CLLD-ed a Elena is base-generated in Spec Top(ic)P, and is coreferential with
the covert DP in verb-complement position. This covert DP is in turn licensed by
the clitic la, which takes the verb vi as a host (note that the verb starts low in the
structure in V and undergoes head-to-head movement until it lands in AgrS). According
to Cinque (1990), the relationship between the left-dislocated element and its
Corresponding
over co vert DP in the main clause is established via an A’-chain that links these elements
through a long-distance dependency (indicated through superindexation <↓> in Figure
1). Usually, A’-chains are generated by movement. However, Cinque (1990) proposes
that A’-chains can also be formed in the absence of movement. This explains
the movement-like properties of CLLD and the selective island sensitivity.15

---

15 For an alternative approach involving a bi-sentential analysis of CLLD, see Ott (2014,
HTLD is not sensitive to island effects (López 2009; Zagona 2002). That is, HTLD-ed constituents can relate to an argument situated within wh-islands (55), Complex NPs (56), relative clauses (57), or adjunct islands (58).

(54) **Spanish**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A Elena, la vi ayer.} \\
\text{DOM Elena ACC.3SG.F saw:1SG yesterday} \\
\text{‘Elena, I saw (her) yesterday.’}
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 1.** Syntactic derivation of CLLD in Spanish

(55) **Spanish (Rivero 1980: 380 (47b))**

\[
\text{Dinero, te pregunta (que) por qué no tiene.} \\
\text{money DAT.2SG asks.3SG COMP for why NEG have.3SG} \\
\text{‘Money, (s)he asks you why (s)he doesn’t have.’}
\]

(56) **Spanish (Escobar 1997: 242 (30))**

\[
\text{Juan, tengo la impresión de que lo conocí a él en New York.} \\
\text{Juan have.1SG DEF impression COMP ACC.3SG.M met.1SG DOM him in New York.} \\
\text{New York} \\
\text{‘Juan, I get the impression that I met him in New York.’}
\]
(57) Spanish (Zubizarreta 1998: 188 (x))
(En cuanto a) el Sr. Gonzales, conocemos a la mujer que
(as for) DEF Mr. Gonzales know.1PL DOM DEF woman COMP
lo betrayed.3SG
‘(As for) Mr. Gonzales, we know the woman that betrayed (him).’

(58) Spanish (Zubizarreta 1998: 188 (xi))
(En cuanto a) el Sr. Gonzales, terminaremos la tarea
(as for) DEF Mr. Gonzales will finish.1PL DEF assignment
antes de calling.1INF-ACC.3SG.M
‘Regarding Dr. Gonzales, we will finish the assignment before calling him.’

Following Hernanz and Brucart (1987) and Rivero (1980), this fronted DP
within HTLD is base-generated in the Spec, TopP position (like CLLD; see Figure 1).
As shown by the structure in Figure 2 for (59), the HTLD-ed DP Elena is correferential
with a resumptive element within the main clause (the DP (a ella) in verb-complement
position). However, unlike CLLD, it does not demonstrate grammatical dependence
on any element at the sentence level. Similar to CLLD, this is represented through the
use of super-indexation within the structure, the difference here being that the DP
remains available within the VP, and thus, can be filled with a corresponding element,
like a strong pronoun or epithet (a ella in (59)). The lack of grammatical dependence
also explains the insensitivity of HTLD to island effects.\(^\text{16}\)

(59) Spanish
Elena, la vi ayer (a ella).
Elena ACC.SG.F saw.1SG yesterday DOM her
‘Elena, I saw her yesterday.’

\(^{16}\) See Villa-García (2023) for an alternative non-movement analysis of HTLD following
FF is sensitive to all syntactic islands (Campos & Zampini 1990; Hernanz & Brucart 1987; Zubizarreta 1999). That is, FF-ed constituents cannot be extracted from wh-islands, complex NPs, relative clauses or adjunct islands, as shown in (60)-(63).  

(60) Spanish (Hernanz & Brucart 1987: 97 (72a))

*EL DINERO ignora María quién tiene __.

DEF money ignores.3SG Marfa who has

‘THE MONEY María ignores who has.’

(61) Spanish (Hernanz & Brucart 1987: 97 (72b))

*A PEDRO tengo la seguridad de que nadie

DOM Pedro have.1SG DEF certainty COMP no one

ha visto antes __.

has.3SG seen.PTCP before

‘PEDRO I’m sure that no one has seen before.’

---

17 ‘__’ is used to represent the gap left within the main clause by the left-dislocated element.
(62) Spanish (Campos & Zampini 1990: 50 (6b))

*UN MERCEDES conozco al chico que se ganó en la lotería ayer.

‘A Mercedes (I) know the boy that won in the lottery yesterday.’

(63) Spanish (Zubizarreta 1999: 4240 (133))

*A PEDRO terminamos la tarea antes de llamar. (y no DOM Pedro finish.1PL DEF assignment before calling. INF CONJ NEG a JUAN)

DOM Juan

‘PEDRO we finish the homework before calling.’

Following Hernanz and Brucart (1987) and Campos and Zampini (1990), FF in Spanish demonstrates sensitivity to all syntactic islands because it involves an A’-element being moved from the verb complement position to the specifier position of the Foc(us)P, as in Figure 3 for (64). Consequently, the contrastive focus constituent (i.e. MANZANAS in (64)) also triggers the verb (compró) to raise from AgrS to Foc (i.e., subject-verb inversion) and cannot correspond to any resumptive element within the main clause. This also explains the requirement for case connectivity features on the FF-ed constituent.

(64) Spanish (Zubizarreta 1999: 4239 (120))

MANZANAS compró Pedro (y no peras).

‘Pedro bought APPLES (and not pears).’
To summarize the information synthesized in this section, Table 1 presents a comparison of the syntactic properties of CLLD, HTLD, and FF in Spanish. In the following section, we present what is known about the D-construction in Portuguese and Galician (de Andrade 2018) regarding these properties.

**Table 1. Syntactic properties of CLLD, HTLD and FF in Spanish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>CLLD</th>
<th>HTLD</th>
<th>FF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Any XP can be left-dislocated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Resumptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Resumptive elements are required</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strong pronoun resumptives are permitted</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Demonstrates case connectivity with its original position in the verbal argument</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Requires subject-verb inversion</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✘</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The D-construction

4.1. The Portuguese/Galician D-construction

De Andrade (2018) identified the D-construction in Portuguese (65) and Galician (66) and offered the first description of its properties and uses. As demonstrated by examples (65) and (66), within the D-construction, the fronted DP takes a resumptive d-pronoun at the left edge to pragmatically communicate a contrast. De Andrade (2018) asserts that the D-construction could be elicited by a conjunctive question: a question that is not as specific as the answer that it requires (Lee 2003). For example, (65) and (66) would be considered valid responses to a question like ¿Conoces a los hermanos? ‘Do you know the brothers?’ (provided that the brothers are Pedro and João/Xoán).

(65) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 82 (1a))

(O Pedro eu conheço;)
DEF Pedro I know.1SG
[ o João], esse non tenho ideia de quem seja.
DEF João DEM NEG have.1SG idea of whom be.SBJV.3SG
‘I know Pedro; (as for) João, I have no idea about who he is.’

(66) Galician (de Andrade 2018: 82 (1b))

(A Pedro eu coñézo;)
to Pedro I know.1SG-3SG
[Xoán], dese non teño nin idea.
Xoán of-DEM not have.1SG even idea
‘(as for) Xoán, I have no idea about who he is.’

At the most general level, the D-construction differs from other left-dislocated configurations in Romance in terms of two key syntactic properties: (i) the appearance of a resumptive d-pronoun (i.e., ese (m) / esa (f) / iso (n) in Galician; esse (m) / essa (f) / isso (n) in Portuguese) directly after its left-dislocated DP antecedent (and not in

| (v) May appear in embedded contexts | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |
| (vi) Is recursive | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ |
| (vii) Demonstrates sensitivity to island constraints | ✓ | ✗ | ✓ |
any other position, as demonstrated by (67) for Portuguese, and (ii) the required case connectivity between the DP and its D-pronoun resumptive.\textsuperscript{18}

(67) a. Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 93 (37a))

\[ Os \text{ \textit{filmes de Hitchcock}}, \text{esses os alunos conhecem.} \]
\text{DEF movies of Hitchcock DEM DEF students know:3PL}

‘(As for) Hitchcock’s movies, the students know them.’

b. Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 93 (37b))

*\[ Os \text{ \textit{filmes de Hitchcock}}, os alunos conhecem esses. \]
\text{DEF movies of Hitchcock DEF students know:3PL DEM}

‘(As for) Hitchcock’s movies, the students know them.’

Following Bernstein’s (2001) proposal for the internal structure of the fronted DP, de Andrade (2018: 85) accounts for the contrast in (67) by claiming that the d-pronoun can occupy a focus position inside the DP structure of the dislocate in Galician (as in 68a), but a similar construction is ungrammatical in Portuguese (as in 68b).

(68) a. Galician (de Andrade 2018: 85 (9a))

\[ A \text{ \textit{rapaza esa}} atopeina en ocasiões aqui. \]
\text{the girl DEM.F met.1SG-3SG.F in occasions here}

‘This girl, I met her sometimes here.’

b. Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 85 (9b))

*\[ A \text{ \textit{rapariga essa}}, encontrai(-a) às vezes aqui. \]
\text{the girl DEM.F met.1SG(-3SG.F) to.the times here}

‘This girl, I met her sometimes here.’

From a pragmatic standpoint, the addition of a d-pronoun linked to a dislocated topic constituent acts as “a strategy to promote a referent into the sentence topic and at the same time contrasting it to other salient members of a partially ordered set” (de Andrade 2018: 81). Thus, with a contrastive topic interpretation, the D-construction may seem to serve a similar pragmatic function as CLLD (Arregi 2003), while contrasting the topic over another possible member of the set, like the corrective use of FF. However, when considering their syntactic characteristics, the D-construction clearly differs from these constructions in Portuguese and Galician.

\textsuperscript{18} De Andrade (2018: 95) claims that (ii) cannot apply for Portuguese because “the lack of case-marking prevents one from testing Case connectivity in this language.” Examples of German HTLD’s lack of case connectivity and Portuguese HTLD’s ability to be preceded by a topicalizing expression were provided by de Andrade (2018: 94-95), but case connectivity was not discussed for Galician.
Before comparing the D-construction’s properties to the left-dislocated constructions in Spanish, we will first comment on the extent to which similar forms of CLLD, HTLD, and FF exist in Galician and Portuguese. Regarding CLLD, a similar configuration exists in Portuguese, but without the presence of clitic doubling (69a). CLLD in Galician is also an available topic configuration, but clitic doubling (enclisis) is required (69b) (de Andrade 2018: 98). Therefore, CLLD exists in all three languages, but its syntactic properties manifest differently in each one.

(69)  

a. Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 98 (43b))
Dei-lhe um presente {ao João}/(ele).
gave.1SG-3SG.DAT a gift to.the João to him
‘I gave João a gift.’

b. Galician (de Andrade 2018: 98 (43a))
Deille un regalo {a Xoán}/(el).
gave.1SG-3SG.DAT a gift to Xoán to him
‘I gave Xoán a gift.’

De Andrade (2018) notes that there are two types of HTLD, HTLD I and HTLD II. HTLD I – “a structure with a D-pronoun resumptive in a left-dislocated position but without obligatory case connectivity with the dislocated DP” (p. 95) – corresponds to the D-construction. HTLD I is noted to be common in Germanic languages. HTLD II (equivalent to what we have referred to as HTLD thus far) contains a resumptive personal pronoun in the middle field and exists in Spanish, Galician and Portuguese.

The existence of a comparable configuration to FF in Spanish has been a source of debate within discussions of information structure for Galician and Portuguese. Costa (2004) argued that Portuguese lacks a Spanish-like FF and, instead, attests a form of FF that is more similar to topicalization found in English (Gupton 2014: 84). Costa and Martins (2011) counter this by demonstrating that Portuguese attests a Contrastive Focus Fronting configuration that is distinguishable from topicalization. In conclusion, both FF and English-like topicalization are possible in Portuguese.

For Galician, Gupton (2014: 200-202) claims that the contrastive sentences in Galician represent contrastive topics rather than contrastive focus in order to account for grammatical differences between these configurations and their Spanish (and Italian) counterparts. Accordingly, corrective contrast in Galician manifests without triggering proclisis, with optional subject-verb inversion and the lack of a resumptive clitic associated with CLLD (Gupton 2021: 45). Gupton (2021: 56-57) proposes a “prosodic isomorphism expansion of the Rizzian Cartographic Program” where wh-phrases, fronted (corrective focus), and verum fronted focus constituents cannot co-occur and trigger proclisis. All elements would link to the speech context and appear in Spec.FinP via movement.

Taken as a whole, there are some similarities and some differences in how information structure is expressed across Spanish, Galician and Portuguese. In any case, all three languages permit the left dislocation of topic and focus constituents.
along with a predetermined set of syntactic characteristics. CLLD is available in all three languages; Galician and Portuguese CLLD mainly differ in their requirements for resumptive elements. HTLD II also exists in all three languages. FF is attested in all three languages, but cleft constructions seem to be preferred when expressing contrastive focus in both Galician and Portuguese. Based on this, we anticipate that the D-construction may also arise in Spanish, but with a different set of syntactic properties and a different pragmatic use. Following de Andrade (2018), the remainder of this subsection presents the syntactic properties of the D-construction in Portuguese and Galician with those of CLLD, HTLD, and FF in Spanish.

(i) First, similar to the hanging topic in HTLD, the D-construction in Portuguese and Galician is restricted to DPs only. For instance, the Portuguese example in (70), which has a fronted PP, is ungrammatical.

(70) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 91 (26a))
*[À Maria], a essa eu não (lhe) enviarei o pacote.
to.DEF Maria to DEM I NEG (3SG.DAT) send.FUT.1SG DEF package
‘To Maria, I will not send her the package.’

(ii) Within the D-construction in Portuguese, a fronted DP is characteristically resumed by a d-pronoun in left-peripheral position while also being optionally doubled by a clitic in the main clause. In (71), the d-pronoun essa is required and must refer to the left-dislocated constituent, A Joana, and not to the other topic mentioned within the context, a moça. In Galician, a resumptive clitic is required in the main clause of the D-construction, as in (72). These clitic requirements mimic the requirements for clitic resumption within CLLD for both languages as well, where it is optional in Portuguese and required in Galician.

(71) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 82 (2))
(Acabo de ver a moça; do quarto andar.)
finish.1SG of see.INF DEF girl of.DEF fourth floor
[A Joana], essa eu verei amanhã.
DEF Joana DEM I will see.1SG tomorrow
‘I have just seen the girl from the fourth floor. (As for) Juana, I will see her tomorrow.’

(72) Galician (de Andrade 2018: 88 (16))
[...]
teno case claro onde van ir a parar
have.1SG almost clear where go.3PL go.INF to stop.INF
as nosas reclamación pero a lo menos [o pracer] ese
DEF our complaints but at ACC.SG.M less DEF pleasure DEM
non nolo poden quitar.
NEG 1PL.DAT-3SG can.3PL take.INF
‘…I have it almost clear where our complaints end up going, but at least the pleasure, they cannot take it from us.’

(iii) For the D-construction, case connectivity must be defined between two pairs of elements: (a) the left-dislocated element and its corresponding gap position, and (b) the DP and its resumptive d-pronoun. Due to the lack of overt case-marking features (outside of the pronominal system) in Portuguese, de Andrade (2018) tested for case connectivity by seeing whether the topic could be preceded by topicallyizing expressions, like quanto a in (73). Because the resultant configuration was deemed acceptable (with or without the appearance of a) the topic in (73) was considered a hanging topic.

(73)  Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 95 (33a))

[Quanto aos alunos], (a) esses eu não culpo.
how.much to.DEF students to DEM I NEG blame.1SG
‘As for the students, I don’t blame them.’

De Andrade (2018) compared the D-construction in Portuguese to instances of CLD in German when discussing case connectivity. Gupton (2014, 2021) does not explicitly address this feature in Galician, so the status of the D-construction in Galician regarding case connectivity features remains unclear.

(iv) The D-construction in Portuguese does not require subject-verb inversion. For example, in (74), the subject os alunos appears in pre-verbal position and the construction maintains grammaticality. This property remains unspecified for the D-construction in Galician.

(74)  Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 93 (37a))

[Os filmes de Hitchcock], esses os alunos conhecem.
DEF movies of Hitchcock DEM DEF students know:3PL
‘(As for) Hitchcock’s movies, the students know them.’

(v) The D-construction is restricted to root contexts. In (75), the D-construction in Portuguese was deemed ungrammatical because the configuration appears within an embedded context, introduced by disse que ‘said that’. The D-construction in Galician was not considered in embedded contexts by de Andrade (2018), so this property remains undefined.

(75)  Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 91 (26d))

*O homem disse que [os miúdos], esses não encontrou.
DEF man said.3SG COMP DEF children DEM NEG met.3SG
‘The man said that he did not meet the children.’

(vi) In the D-construction, it appears that both the hanging topic and its resumptive d-pronoun are non-recursive. That is, the topic and its corresponding d-
pronoun together cannot appear before another instance of the D-construction, as in (76) in Portuguese. The permissibility of (77) indicates that although the D-construction permits two consecutive hanging topics only one of those hanging topics can take a resumptive d-pronoun at the left edge in Portuguese. Recursivity remains unspecified for the D-construction in Galician.

(76) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018:91, (26c))

\*[O queijo], esse, [aos alunos], a esses, eu dei
DEF cheese DEM to.DEF students to DEM I gave.1SG
(-lhos).
(-3SG.DAT-3PL)

‘For the cheese, it holds that to the students, I gave it to them.’

(77) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018:92 (30d))

[O Pedro], [o carro], esse ele, comprou.
DEF Pedro DEF car DEM he bought.3SG
‘(As for) Pedro, the car, he didn’t buy it.

(vii) De Andrade (2018) states that the D-construction in Portuguese demonstrates sensitivity to selective ‘weak’ islands, like that of (77). It is worth noting, however, that the ‘weak’ island in (78) is notably different from the types of islands discussed for Spanish throughout Section 3, and it is not typically considered an island context in Spanish. Instead, (78) seems to represent an embedded context, and confirms the claim represented by example (75) that the D-construction can only surface in root contexts.

Considered a strong island by de Andrade (2018), the grammaticality of (79) demonstrates that the left-dislocated DP within the D-construction in Portuguese can relate to a position within a Complex NP (de Andrade 2018). The Complex NP Constraint in this work, following previous literature, is typically considered a ‘weak’ island. Therefore, the findings related to sensitivity to syntactic islands for the D-construction in Portuguese remain unclear but seem to imply that the construction is not sensitive to islands (pending data from relative clauses or adjunct islands). The same property was not considered for Galician by de Andrade (2018).

(78) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 91 (26e))

*[Os miúdos], lamento que, esses, não tenhas encontrado.
DEF children regret.1SG COMP DEM NEG have.2SG met.PTCP
‘The children, I regret that you haven’t met (them).’

(79) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 93 (30e))

[O Manel], esse o Pedro odeia o facto (de) que a
DEF Manel DEF Pedro hates.3SG DEF fact (of) COMP DEF
Maria (o) tenha beijado.
Maria (3SG) has.SBJV.3SG kissed.PTCP
‘(As for) Manel, Pedro hates the fact that Maria has kissed him.’
De Andrade (2018) determined that the D-construction’s structural properties in Portuguese and Galician could be explained by a derivation that involved two different strategies: (i) left-dislocation of the DP via HTLD and (ii) left-dislocation of the resumptive d-pronoun via a process resembling CLLD. Within this derivation, de Andrade (2018) assumed a non-movement analysis for both HTLD and CLLD, indicating that both the left-dislocated DP and resumptive pronoun within the D-construction were base-generated in this position. To account for the difference in clitic doubling requirements across the two languages, de Andrade (2018: 99) proposed that in Portuguese, the D-construction base-generated topicalization of the left-dislocate followed by the CLLD (linking via an A’-chain) of the d-pronoun to the outer specifier of IP (80). In Galician, the d-pronoun is base-generated at Spec, TopP and linked to its corresponding clitic via an A’-chain (81) as in CLLD. The structures provided by de Andrade (2018) are given in Figures 4 and 5.

(80) Portuguese (de Andrade 2018: 85 (10b))

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[\dots] [o \textit{João}], } \textit{esse} \text{ prendi no quarto.} \\
\text{DEF João DEM locked.1SG in.DEF room} \\
\text{‘(as for) João, I have locked him in the room.’}
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 4.** Syntactic derivation of the D-construction in Portuguese

![Diagram of Portuguese D-construction](source)

**Source:** de Andrade (2018: 101 (53a))

(81) Galician (de Andrade 2018: 89 (21b))

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{[Xoán], } a \textit{este} \text{ prendino no cuarto.} \\
\text{Xoán to DEM locked.1SG-3SG in.DEF bedroom} \\
\text{‘(As for) Xoán, I have locked him in the bedroom.’}
\end{array}
\]
To conclude, the syntactic properties of Spanish CLLD, HTLD and FF (Section 3.2) and the Portuguese/Galician D-construction (Section 4.1) are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Syntactic properties of CLLD, HTLD and FF in Spanish vs. the D-construction in Portuguese (EP)/Galician

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLLD</th>
<th>HTLD</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>D-Construction (EP/Galician)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Any XP can be left-dislocated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Resumptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Resumptive elements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Strong pronoun</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resumptives are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Demonstrates case</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ / ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connectivity with its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original position in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Requires subject-verb</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) May appear in</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embedded contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Is recursive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Demonstrates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitivity to island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
De Andrade’s (2018) D-construction in Portuguese and Galician patterns with HTLD in Spanish in that both constructions contain hanging topics at the left edge, are limited to DPs, cannot be embedded and are non-recursive. The fronted DP within the D-construction in Portuguese/Galician is a hanging topic, and its left-dislocated resumptive d-pronoun arrives at its position via topicalization in Portuguese and CLLD in Galician, causing this configuration to share certain case connectivity features with both HTLD (i.e., for the hanging topic DP) and CLLD (i.e., for the resumptive d-pronoun). Although both constructions have a contrastive interpretation, FF in Spanish differs from the D-construction in Portuguese/Galician in that it features a fronted focus constituent rather than a hanging topic, cannot take a resumptive element, while the presence of a d-pronoun resumptive at the left edge epitomizes the D-construction. Additionally, FF requires obligatory subject-verb inversion while the D-construction does not.

All in all, the D-construction as described by de Andrade (2018) for Portuguese and Galician shares certain characteristics with all three constructions in Spanish. To generalize, the D-construction syntactically patterns with both HTLD and CLLD (because it involves the mechanisms associated with both configurations) while pragmatically communicating a contrast, like FF. The remainder of this paper focuses on the acceptability and syntactic properties of the D-construction in Spanish.

4.2. Current study: the D-construction in Spanish

This study sought to confirm whether the D-construction, a newly identified contrastive topic configuration in Portuguese and Galician (de Andrade, 2018) also exists in Spanish and, if so, with which syntactic properties it manifests.

The following research questions and hypotheses guided our study:

- **RQ1.** To what extent do Spanish speakers accept the D-construction?
- **RQ2.** Which syntactic features characterize the D-construction in Spanish? Does this construction in Spanish pattern similarly to its Portuguese/Galician counterpart identified by de Andrade (2018)?
- **RQ3.** To what extent does the D-construction in Spanish pattern like an instance of CLLD, HTLD and/or FF?

Regarding RQ1, even though some syntactic requirements differ between Spanish, Galician and Portuguese – such as the permissibility of enclisis vs. proclisis, clitic doubling, IP-scrambling and/or topicalization, case-marking requirements and differences in DOM (de Andrade 2018) – we hypothesize that the D-construction might be an available structure in Spanish, and, in turn, be accepted by Spanish-speakers. At the same time, because Galician and Portuguese do differ from each other and from Spanish in their expression of information structure, it is possible that a similar construction may manifest with different properties or with a different pragmatic interpretation in Spanish.
In terms of RQ2, the aforementioned grammatical differences which exist between Spanish, Portuguese and Galician – namely, the lack of case-marking in Portuguese, the presence of clitic doubling in a focus context in Galician (Gupton 2014: 200), and the usage of DOM in Spanish – may cause this construction to manifest differently across these three Romance languages, as we have already seen for Portuguese and Galician in de Andrade (2018). Based on these contrasts, we hypothesize that fronted objects within the D-construction in Spanish may require case connectivity, contrary to Portuguese/Galician. This follows de Andrade’s formal analysis for both Portuguese and Galician whereby CLLD was involved in at least some part of their respective derivations. In this case, it is possible for the fronted DP to be a hanging topic (in a default nominative form) or a CLLD-ed topic (with case connectivity). Therefore, case connectivity will be an important property to consider.

If the characteristics presented for Portuguese and Galician by de Andrade (2018) hold for its Spanish counterpart, the D-construction would involve mechanisms associated with both HTLD and CLLD. That is, the fronted element within the D-construction would represent a hanging topic, an instance of HTLD, while the resumptive d-pronoun at the left edge would demonstrate case connectivity features, like CLLD, with the argument in the main clause. Based on this assumption, the D-construction would lack case connectivity in the DP hanging topic but demonstrate case connectivity in the CLLD-ed d-pronoun. Therefore, this construction may share certain properties with CLLD related to the A’-chain, while also sharing properties with HTLD. We hypothesize that the resumptive d-pronoun within the D-construction, along with the dislocated topic which precedes it, will demonstrate case connectivity features, and require the main clause to contain a coreferential clitic linked in some way to both left-dislocated elements.

Finally, with respect to RQ3, if the D-construction patterns with CLLD, the fronted element would require case connectivity and not be restricted to DPs, clitic doubling would be required, subject-verb inversion would not be obligatory, embedding and recursivity would be permitted, and the construction would be sensitive to strong, but not weak, syntactic islands. If the D-construction patterns with HTLD, the fronted element would appear in a default nominative form and be restricted to DPs only, clitic doubling would be required, subject-verb inversion would not be obligatory, embedding and recursivity would not be permitted, and the construction would be insensitive to all island constraints. If the D-construction patterns with FF, the fronted element would require case connectivity and not be restricted to DPs, no other resumptive elements (besides the d-pronoun) would be permitted in the main clause, subject-verb inversion would be obligatory, embedding would be permitted, but not recursivity, and the construction would be sensitive to all island constraints. There is also a possibility that the D-construction in Spanish could pattern with a combination of configurations or, along the same vein, not pattern exactly with any of them. See Table 2 in Section 4.1 for a summary of these properties.
5. Methods

To explore the syntactic properties of the D-construction vs. those of CLLD, HTLD and FF, we administered a sociolinguistic background questionnaire, an acceptability judgment task and a follow-up questionnaire as an online Qualtrics XM survey (Qualtrics Labs 2009).

5.1. Participants, materials and procedure

The sociodemographic questionnaire included questions on the participants’ age, occupation, education level, birthplace, and current residence. Participants were also asked to indicate any other languages spoken. For each language, they were prompted to provide their age of acquisition and the amount of time they spent living in a place where this language was spoken. Twenty-seven adult native speakers of Spanish participated in this study. Only the data from participants who completed the survey in its entirety were included in the analysis. Data from six participants was discarded (see Section 5.2 for details). Therefore, the data collected from twenty-one adult (\(M = 42\) years old; range: 20-72 years; 4 male) native speakers of Spanish were analyzed for this paper.\(^{19}\) See Appendix A for more information about the participants.

The acceptability judgment task was designed to test the D-construction for case connectivity, subject-verb inversion, category of the left-dislocate, embedding, recursivity and sensitivity to four island constraints: two weak islands (\textit{wh}-islands, and the Complex NP Constraint) and two strong islands (relative clause islands, and adjunct islands). CLLD, HTLD and FF items were included as a control and to verify their properties in terms of embedding, recursivity and syntactic island sensitivity.

The acceptability judgment task presented instances of the D-construction (82), CLLD (83), HTLD (84), and FF (85) following a discursive context and prompted participants to rate them on a scale of 1 \textit{muy mal} ‘very bad’ to 7 \textit{muy bien} ‘very good’. Of the 200 total items presented, 147 were experimental items (60 D-construction items, 29 CLLD items, 29 HTLD items, and 29 FF items), and 53 were fillers.\(^{20}\) See Appendix B for a full list of the experimental items.

(82) Hablo mucho con Pedro y María, pero…

\begin{tabular}{llll}
students\(\textsc{sing}\) & a lot & with & Pedro & CONJ & María & but
\end{tabular}

‘I speak to Pedro and María often.’

\(^{19}\) Data were analyzed from 21 native speakers. 15 participants spoke Peninsular Spanish, four Mexican Spanish, two Colombian Spanish, and one Argentinean Spanish. Three of the participants were simultaneous bilinguals of Spanish and another Romance language, and three speakers were early sequential bilinguals with Spanish or another Romance language as their L1. Their ratings did not differ significantly from those of other participants.

\(^{20}\) The acceptability judgment task included more D-construction items than other items because more aspects were tested regarding this construction.
Pedro, a ese no lo he llamado desde hace mucho tiempo. ‘Pedro, that guy I haven’t called in a while.’

(83) No habíamos visto a nuestros primos hacía más de tres años. ‘We had not seen our cousin in more than three years.’

A mi prima Emilia, la vimos ayer en el partido de fútbol. ‘My cousin Emilia, we saw (her) yesterday at the soccer game.’

(84) Normalmente cenó con mis amigas cada semana. ‘Normally I eat dinner with my friends every week.’

Alejandra, hace seis meses que no la veo. ‘(As for) Alejandra, it has been six months since I saw her.’

(85) A Ricardo le encanta pasar tiempo en la biblioteca. ‘Ricardo enjoys spending time at the library. He told me that he doesn’t like to read fiction novels.’

Ricardo lee autobiografías todos los días. ‘Ricardo reads AUTOBIOGRAPHIES every day.’

All items were preceded by one or two sentences to establish an appropriate discursive context. For the D-construction to carry a contrastive topic interpretation, the context introduced multiple topics. The D-construction items then featured only one of these topics at the left edge, thus establishing a contrast. For example, in (82), both Pedro and María were presented as topics, and the D-construction was used to single out Pedro and comment further.

Context sentences for CLLD items were designed to create a part/whole or subset/set relationship between the CLLD-ed constituent and its antecedent. For example, in (83), a nuestros primos ‘our cousins’ was introduced within the context, and CLLD was used to shift the topic to just one of these cousins, a mi prima Emilia ‘my cousin Emilia’, and comment on the last time they saw her.

HTLD contexts were constructed so that the target construction would carry the interpretation of a discourse shift associated with hanging topics. To achieve this, hanging topics within the HTLD structures were never explicitly stated within the context. For example, in (84), the general topic of my friends (mis amigas) was stated
within the context; then, an instance of HTLD was used to shift the topic to just one friend, Alejandra, with whom they had a bad experience.\footnote{As a reviewer pointed out, some participants could have interpreted (84) as Alejandra not being part of the group.}

FF items appeared after their corresponding assertive context was established. The pragmatic interpretation was either one of correction or contrast. To indicate emphatic stress on the FF-ed XP, these items appeared capitalized. For example, in (85), the context stated that Ricardo did not like to read fiction books (novelas de ficción). Then, the speaker used FF to redefine the object within the assertive context from ‘fiction books’ to ‘autobiographies’ (autobiografías). ‘Autobiographies’ appeared capitalized to signal contrastive focus on this object.

To determine which syntactic properties characterized the D-construction, items were designed to differ in terms of the grammatical properties which have been used in previous analyses to distinguish CLLD and HTLD from each other and from FF: case connectivity, subject-verb inversion, role of the fronted element, embedding, recursivity, and sensitivity to a selected set of island constraints. Based on the results of a norming study with 19 participants, which tested for the presence of resumptive elements and for case connectivity in two different arguments (the fronted DP and its resumptive pronoun), the d-pronoun in this study always showed case connectivity and appeared with clitic doubling. We focused on whether the fronted DP demonstrated case connectivity with its argumental position.

To reduce the survey’s length, we isolated the relevant properties (i.e., subject-verb inversion, category of the left-dislocate, embedding, recursivity, and sensitivity to island constraints) by balancing for case connectivity and/or subject-verb inversion when needed. For example, when testing the D-construction items for the category of the left dislocate, half of the items with fronted objects of prepositions appeared with case connectivity and half of the items appeared without case connectivity.

Sixty instances of the D-construction appeared within the acceptability judgment task. To test if the D-construction was restricted to DP/NPs only or could also appear with a different phrasal category at the left edge (i.e., to test the role of the d-pronoun), in eight items the fronted element functioned as the object of a preposition. Four of these items appeared with case connectivity (86) and four appeared without case connectivity (87).

\begin{equation}
(86) \quad \text{[…] [pp con Pancho], [pp con ese] no podemos contar para nada.}
\end{equation}

\text{with Pancho with DEM.3SG.M NEG could.1PL count.INF for nothing}

\text{‘On Pancho, on that guy, we cannot count for nothing.’}\footnote{From now on, we will use […] to denote that this construction was taken out of context.}
The D-construction in Spanish
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(87) [...] [DP Ricardo], [en ese] no quiero ni pensar.
Ricardo in DEM.3SG.M NEG want.1SG not-even think.INF
‘(As for) Ricardo, of that guy I do not even want to think.’

Resumptive elements, corresponding to accusative/dative clitics, were included in all items whenever the left-dislocated element was a direct object (88) or indirect object (89). Four instances of the D-construction featuring dislocated subjects were also included.

(88) [...] (a) Mario, a ese lo vi robando
DOM Mario DOM DEM.3SG.M ACC.3SG.M saw.1SG stealing
una manzana.
INDEF apple
‘Mario, that guy I saw (him) stealing an apple.’

(91) [...] (a) Marisol, a esa nunca la he visto.
Marisol DOM DEM.3SG.F never ACC.3SG.F have-seen.1SG
‘(As for) Marisol, that girl I have never seen (her) before.’

(92) [...] La tarta, esa no sabía quién la había hecho.
DEF cake DEM.3SG.F NEG knew.1SG who ACC.3SG.F had-made.3SG
‘The cake, that one I do not know who made (it).’

Eight items were designed to test for subject-verb inversion. Specifically, we included four items with subject-verb (SV) word order (93) and four with verb-subject
(VS) word order (94). As this characteristic could not be considered in isolation from case connectivity, half of the items appeared with case connectivity (like (93)) and the other half appeared without case connectivity (like (94)).

(93) [...] a Juana, a esa Ricardo no la conoce.
   DOM Juana DOM DEM.3SG.F Ricardo NEG ACC.3SG.F know.3SG
   ‘Juana, that girl Ricardo does not know (her).’

(94) [...] Jaime, a ese lo ayudó Josefina con todos los deberes.
   ‘(As for) Jaime, that guy Josefina helped (him) with all the homework.’

Four embedded instances of the D-construction were included: two of these items appeared with case connectivity (95) and two appeared embedded without case connectivity.

(95) [...] No podía creer que a Ana, a esa
   NEG could.3SG believe.1NF COMP DOM Ana DOM DEM.3SG.F
   la vi saltar del barco.
   ACC.3SG.F saw.1SG jumping from-DEF boat
   ‘I could not believe that Ana, that girl I saw (her) jumping off of the boat.’

Recursive D-construction items ($n = 4$) typically contained a fronted subject followed by an inanimate, fronted object to avoid interference from case connectivity preferences (96).

(96) [...] Felipe ese, la mochila, esa, otra vez
   Felipe DEM.3SG.M DEF backpack DEM.3SG.F other time
   se la dejó en casa.
   REFLEX ACC.3SG.F left.3SG at home
   ‘Felipe, that guy, the backpack, that one once again (he) left (it) at home.’

To test for sensitivity to various types of syntactic islands, the fronted element within the D-construction related to positions within wh-islands ($n = 4$) (97), complex NP/DPs (i.e., the Complex NP Constraint) ($n = 4$) (98), relative clauses ($n = 4$) (99), and adjunct islands ($n = 4$) (100). The D-construction items featured either inanimate objects or subjects, again, to avoid interference from case connectivity. Whenever an item featured an animate object with case connectivity, another item was included without case connectivity to account for this feature.
The remaining experimental items were instances of CLLD \((n = 29)\), HTLD \((n = 29)\) and FF \((n = 29)\). Items featuring fronted human objects \((n = 5)\), subjects \((n = 3)\) and objects of prepositions \((n = 3)\) were devised to represent basic instances of each construction \((n = 11)\). All constructions were also tested for embedding \((n = 3 \text{ items each})\), recursivity \((n = 3)\), and sensitivity to wh-islands \((n = 3)\), the Complex NP Constraint, \((n = 3)\), relative clauses \((n = 3)\) and adjunct islands \((n = 3)\). Within these items, CLLD and FF fronted objects appeared with case connectivity, while HTLD did not. HTLD and CLLD appeared with coreferential clitics when available. FF items demonstrated obligatory subject-verb inversion, contrastive stress and the absence of resumptive elements.

All filler items \((28 \text{ grammatical}, 25 \text{ ungrammatical})\) featured sentences that contained a subordinate clause to maintain comparable complexity to the experimental items.\(^{23}\) All ungrammatical fillers were deemed as such due to a mood and/or tense violation \(i.e.,\) unexpected usage of indicative vs. subjunctive \((101)\).\(^{24}\)
(101) Mi jefe puso a Julia a cargo de un gran proyecto.  

‘My boss put Julia in charge of a huge project.’

Confía en que ella sea responsable.  

‘He trusted that she would be responsible.’

Two versions of the acceptability judgment questionnaire were constructed with items in pseudorandomized order, avoiding two items of the same type from appearing consecutively. Within the instructions, participants were told to assess the acceptability of the target sentence on a scale from 1 (muy mal ‘very bad’) to 7 (muy bien ‘very good’) as it fit within the context. Participants were presented with two practice items before being instructed to complete the task. Directly following the task, they responded to the follow-up questionnaire. The follow-up questionnaire debriefed the participants on the D-construction and then presented a basic example alongside questions asking (a) whether this expression sounded good to them, and if not, why? (b) whether it carried a negative/positive connotation or depended on the context, and (c) if they had any further comments about the construction.25 Completing the survey took a median time of 42 minutes.

5.2. Data analysis

Eight experimental items were discarded due to unexpectedly low or high ratings (i.e., a standard deviation of 1.5 or higher from the mean). After these items were discarded, a total of 59 D-construction items, 28 CLLD items, 27 HTLD items and 25 FF items were analyzed per participant.

Three participants without significant differences between the grammatical and ungrammatical filler ratings (based on t-tests) were discarded. Data from three additional participants were discarded because they did not accept CLLD. Given that items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale, a rating above four was the threshold for acceptance for each item. In total, 139 experimental items rated by 21 speakers, or 2,919 total experimental items, were analyzed. 1,239 of these were instances of the D-construction.

Data were analyzed in multiple steps. We first looked at the acceptance of basic instances of the D-construction (n = 35), CLLD (n = 11), HTLD (n = 10), and FF (n = 8). These were instances of these constructions with one fronted object, subject, or object of a preposition in main clauses. The average rating of these items was calculated (by participant for each construction) and used to assess whether each participant accepted or rejected the construction at hand. An average rating above four

---

25 Question (b) was included because we hypothesized based on our own intuitions that the D-construction may have a pejorative connotation in Spanish. We maintained a neutral context within all items representing instances of the D-construction to control for positive vs. negative interference.
signaled an acceptance of the given construction in its basic form. These results are reported in Section 6.1.

After considering the general acceptance of each construction in its basic form, the ratings for each syntactic property were considered separately. First, we considered the properties included for just the D-construction: the role of the d-pronoun, case connectivity, and subject-verb inversion. These properties were assumed for CLLD, HTLD and FF based on their descriptions in the literature (as outlined in Section 5.1). For example, we analyzed and compared how each participant rated the D-construction with a fronted DP vs. a fronted PP in a context where the fronted element functioned as the object of a preposition in the main clause in order to determine if the left dislocate within the D-construction was restricted to DPs only (like HTLD) or permitted other phrasal categories (like CLLD or FF).

In this part of the analysis, we calculated how many items each participant accepted out of the total number of items designed to test that property. If a participant rated more than half of the items testing the property over 4, then we concluded that they accepted the D-construction with the property at hand. We calculated the percentage of participants who accepted each construction in terms of each property and then summarized the group’s preferences.

For the remaining properties – embedding, recursivity and sensitivity to various island constraints – we included CLLD, HTLD, FF and D-construction items. That is, we considered participant preferences for all four constructions. These more complex properties allowed us to confirm the assumptions for each configuration from the literature with acceptability ratings (i.e., can CLLD and FF actually appear in embedded contexts, but not HTLD, according to our participants?). As before, we calculated how many items for each property received ratings over 4 for each participant, calculated the percentage of participants who accepted each construction in terms of each property, and then summarized the group’s preferences.26

6. Results

6.1. Basic instances of the D-construction, CLLD and HTLD

Figure 6 presents the percentage of participants who accepted basic instances of CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction. All participants (100%) accepted CLLD, 13 out of 21 participants (62%) accepted HTLD, 16 out of 21 participants (76%) accepted FF, and 11 out of 21 participants (52%) accepted the D-construction in their basic forms. All but one participant who rejected the D-construction in its basic form rejected at least one other construction (i.e., HTLD or FF).

26 We also analyzed our data using standardized z-scores. To check for significant differences between conditions, we conducted one-sided independent samples t-tests (where relevant). The findings were largely the same as those presented in Section 6 (see Appendix C).
Overall, these results demonstrate that the D-construction was accepted in its basic form by slightly over half of the participants in this study. It is important to note that, unlike the basic CLLD, HTLD, and FF items, the basic D-construction items were designed to test features such as case connectivity and subject-verb inversion. Therefore, in some cases, participants who rejected the D-construction may have just been sensitive to (a combination of) these features rather than to the construction itself. Therefore, their acceptance of individual properties required further analysis.

It is worth pointing out that all participants rated at least one instance of the D-construction favorably. Along the same vein, at least one participant accepted CLLD, HTLD and FF in their basic forms; seven participants accepted all four constructions.

**Figure 6.** Percentage of participants who accepted basic instances of CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction

![Figure 6](image)

6.2. Syntactic properties of the D-construction

The findings regarding the role of the d-pronoun (Section 6.2.1), case connectivity (Section 6.2.2) and subject-verb inversion (Section 6.2.3) are presented for the D-construction only. Findings for the items within embedded (Section 6.2.4), recursive (Section 6.2.5) and island contexts (Section 6.2.6) are presented for all constructions (CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction).

6.2.1. The role of the left dislocate

Overall, 2 out of 21 (10%) participants accepted the D-construction with fronted PPs only (and not with fronted DPs), 4 out of 21 (19%) accepted the D-construction with fronted DPs only, and 9 out of 21 (43%) participants accepted the D-construction with a fronted PP or a fronted DP. 5 out of 21 (24%) participants rejected the D-construction with a fronted DP or PP. Thus, the most common pattern across participants was to accept the D-construction items in both forms (Figure 7).
Figure 7. Percentage of participants who accepted the D-construction only with fronted PPs, only with fronted DPs, or with both, or who rejected the D-construction with fronted DPs and PPs
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Taken as a whole, the fact that almost half (43%) or the participants accepted the D-construction with fronted PPs or DPs demonstrates that the D-construction is not restricted to fronted DP/NPs, like HTLD, for at least some participants. Note that if we consider only the 11 participants who accepted the D-construction in its basic form, nine out of these 11 participants (82%) accepted the D-construction both with fronted DPs and with fronted PPs, and 2 out of them (18%) only accepted the D-construction with fronted DPs (like HTLD).

6.2.2. Case connectivity

Overall, 16 out of 21 participants (76%) accepted the D-construction items that tested for case connectivity. Four out of 21 (19%) participants accepted more D-construction items with case connectivity, similar to CLLD or FF. One out of 21 (5%) participants accepted more D-construction items without case connectivity, like HTLD. Finally, 11 out of 21 (52%) participants accepted the D-construction in both forms. Thus, the most common pattern was to accept the D-construction items both with and without case connectivity (Figure 8).

Figure 8. Percentage of participants who accepted the D-construction only with case connectivity, only without case connectivity, with or without case connectivity, and the percentage who rejected it regardless
There seems to be some individual variation regarding preferences for case connectivity for the D-construction. A closer look at the participant characteristics did not reveal a factor that explains these differences. We will return to this in the Discussion.

6.2.3. Subject-Verb inversion

Overall, 17 out of 21 (81%) participants accepted the D-construction items that tested for subject-verb inversion. Four out of 21 (19%) participants accepted more items with SV order, 3 out of 21 (14%) accepted more items with VS order, and 10 out of 21 (48%) showed no preference. As shown in Figure 9, the most common pattern was to accept the D-construction items regardless of subject-verb order. The fact that several participants accepted the D-construction with pre-verbal subjects demonstrates that subject-verb inversion is not required.

Figure 9. Percentage of participants who accepted the D-construction only with SV order, only VS order, and with SV or VS order, or rejected it regardless

6.2.4. Embedding

Figure 10 presents the percentage of participants who accepted each construction when it appeared in an embedded context. Overall, seventeen out of 21 participants (81%) accepted CLLD items with embedding, 7 out of 21 participants (33%) accepted HTLD items with embedding, and 5 out of 21 participants (24%) accepted FF items with embedding. In the literature, it is assumed that CLLD and FF permit embedding, but HTLD is restricted to root contexts only. Therefore, the preferences for CLLD and HTLD tended to pattern with the literature, but the preferences for FF items in embedded contexts did not.

As for the D-construction, seven out of 21 participants (33%) accepted this construction with embedding. Six of these seven participants were part of the group of 11 participants that accepted the D-construction in its basic form. All seven participants who accepted the D-construction in embedded contexts also accepted at least one other construction with embedding. Specifically, three of them also accepted both CLLD and HTLD in embedded contexts, but not FF; two participants accepted all four constructions in embedded contexts; one participant only accepted the D-
construction and CLLD when embedded; and one participant accepted the D-construction, CLLD and FF, but not HTLD when embedded.

**Figure 10.** Percentage of participants who accepted CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction in embedded contexts

![Bar chart showing percentage of participants who accepted each construction in embedded contexts.]

Taken as a whole, all the seven participants that accepted the D-construction when embedded, also accepted the CLLD when embedded, three also accepted HTLD when embedded, and three also accepted FF when embedded. According to the findings for the participants in this study, the D-construction seems to pattern more with CLLD than HTLD in embedded contexts.

6.2.5. Recursivity

Figure 11 presents the percentage of participants who accepted each construction in recursive contexts. Eleven out of 21 participants (52%) accepted recursive CLLD items, four out of 21 participants (19%) accepted recursive HTLD items, and four out of 21 participants (19%) accepted recursive FF items. Only one participant out of 21 (5%) accepted recursive instances of the D-construction. This participant also accepted all the CLLD, HTLD, and FF included to test for recursivity. Of the 11 participants that accepted recursive CLLD, four also accepted recursive FF, three also accepted recursive HTLD, and one also accepted the recursive D-construction.

**Figure 11.** Percentage of participants who accepted CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction in recursive contexts

![Bar chart showing percentage of participants who accepted each construction in recursive contexts.]

In the literature, CLLD is recursive, but FF and HTLD are not. Therefore, these findings confirm that a majority of the participants’ preferences conform to the literature in terms of recursivity in that CLLD was accepted in this context, but not the other constructions. Additionally, 20 out of 21 participants (95%) rejected recursive instances of the D-construction, signaling that this is not a syntactic property of the construction and, thus, differentiating it from an instance of CLLD, which does permit recursion.

6.2.6. Sensitivity to syntactic island constraints

Figure 12 presents the percentage of participants who accepted each construction in a selection of island contexts. Fourteen out of 21 participants (67%) accepted CLLD when the fronted element related to a position within a wh-island. Moreover, 15 out of 21 (71%) participants accepted CLLD when the fronted element related to a position within a Complex NP. Both of these findings signal a general acceptance of CLLD within weak island contexts. In addition, three out of 21 participants (14%) accepted CLLD when the fronted element related to a position within a relative clause, and five out of 21 participants (24%) accepted CLLD when the fronted element related to a position within an adjunct. Therefore, most participants accepted instances of CLLD in weak island contexts and rejected CLLD in strong island contexts.

Considering HTLD in island contexts, 11 out of 21 participants (52%) accepted HTLD when the fronted element related to a position within a wh-island, and 15 out of 21 (71%) participants accepted HTLD when the fronted element related to a position within a Complex NP. Moreover, two out of 21 participants (10%) accepted HTLD when the fronted element related to a position within a relative clause, and four out of 21 participants (19%) accepted HTLD when the fronted element related to a position within an adjunct. Therefore, unlike what has been reported for the HTLD within the literature, HTLD within our study demonstrated similar selective island sensitivity as CLLD.

For instances of FF in island contexts, nine out of 21 participants (43%) accepted FF when the fronted element related to a position within a wh-island, and nine out of 21 (43%) participants accepted FF when the fronted element related to a position within a Complex NP. Furthermore, one out of 21 participants (5%) accepted FF when the fronted element related to a position within a relative clause, and four out of 21 participants (19%) accepted FF when the fronted element related to a position within an adjunct. While more participants accepted FF in weak island contexts than anticipated, less than half of the participants accepted FF in any island context. Therefore, the construction appears to be sensitive to all syntactic islands in our study, which conforms with the findings from the literature.

Finally, regarding the D-construction in island contexts, 13 out of 21 participants (62%) accepted the D-construction when the fronted element related to a position within a wh-island, and 13 out of 21 (62%) participants accepted the D-construction when the fronted element related to an island created by the Complex NP Constraint (CNPC). In addition, two out of 21 participants (10%) accepted the D-
construction when the fronted element appeared in a context of RC extraction, and eight out of 21 participants (38%) accepted the D-construction when the fronted element related to a position within an adjunct island.

Figure 12. Percentage of participants who accepted CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction in four island contexts: wh-islands, CNPC, RC extraction, and adjunct islands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLLD</th>
<th>HTLD</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>D-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) wh-island</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) CNPC</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) RC extraction</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Adjunct island</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken as a whole, the D-construction seems to pattern like CLLD within the literature, and both CLLD and HTLD within our study, in that it demonstrates sensitivity to strong, but not weak, islands.

6.3. Summary of the findings

In sum, our findings for the syntactic properties of the D-construction showed clear tendencies for some properties and inconclusive patterns for others. Specifically, the findings were inconclusive for the properties of case connectivity and the category of the left-dislocated element. We found that some participants accepted the D-construction with subject-verb order, indicating that subject-verb inversion is not required. D-construction items were generally rejected when the fronted element related to an embedded context, and when recursive or in strong island contexts. Thus, D-construction items tended to demonstrate the same selective island sensitivity as CLLD and HTLD in this study, and as CLLD in the literature.

CLLD items within this study were generally accepted by all participants in their basic form, where the fronted element demonstrated case connectivity features and clitic doubling when relevant, and subject-verb inversion was not required. Participants in this study generally accepted CLLD items in embedded contexts and
with recursivity. Moreover, participants tended to accept CLLD items within weak island contexts and reject them in strong island contexts. In general, the findings for CLLD in its basic form and within embedded, recursive and island contexts corroborated the properties posited within the previous descriptions of CLLD in Spanish referenced throughout Section 3.

About half of the participants within this study accepted HTLD in its basic form, where the fronted element appeared in a default, nominative form with clitic doubling, and subject-verb inversion was not required. Participants tended to reject HTLD in embedded and recursive contexts. Moreover, they demonstrated selective island sensitivity for HTLD items, which was not expected. In general, the findings for HTLD in its basic form, a left-dislocated construction which is more marked in Spanish than in Germanic languages like English, were not surprising. The fact that HTLD could not be embedded or recursive agreed with the literature, unlike the findings for island sensitivity. For this property, HTLD items in this study patterned more like CLLD than the insensitivity to all island constraints that was expected for HTLD. We will get back to this in the discussion.

About half of the participants within this study accepted FF in its basic form, where the fronted element demonstrated case connectivity features, no clitic doubling, and subject-verb inversion was required. The fronted element for these items appeared in CAPS to denote contrastive stress, which will be discussed further in Section 7. In terms of the more complex features, FF items could not be embedded, were non-recursive and sensitive to both weak and strong island constraints. The findings for recursivity and island sensitivity conform to the literature, unlike the findings for embedding which do not. FF was considered felicitous in embedded contexts like CLLD in the literature, but the participants in this study tended to reject FF in embedded contexts (unlike CLLD).

To conclude this section, Table 3 summarizes the findings for the syntactic properties of CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction in Spanish.

Table 3. Summary of the syntactic properties of CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction in Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLLD (Spanish)</th>
<th>HTLD (Spanish)</th>
<th>FF (Spanish)</th>
<th>D-Construction (Spanish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Any XP can be left-dislocated</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Resumptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Resumptive elements are required</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strong pronoun resumptives are permitted</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Demonstrates case connectivity with its original</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

In this paper, we reported on the results of a study examining the properties of an understudied dislocated construction in Spanish, the D-construction. First, we revisit the research questions individually and discuss the extent to which the findings from the acceptability judgement task corroborated our hypotheses. Then, we discuss the theoretical implications of our findings and potential avenues of investigation for future studies.

Regarding RQ1 (To what extent do Spanish speakers accept the D-construction?), eleven out of twenty-one participants accepted the D-construction in its basic form. This is similar to the acceptance rate for HTLD, but lower than those for CLLD and FF. A possible explanation for the relatively low rating of HTLD and the D-construction is that a preference for CLLD and FF may be tied to a general preference for DP case connectivity. That is, participants may have favored CLLD and FF because they contained a (whether DOM or dative) before objects that semantically require it in Spanish. Along the same vein, ‘hanging topics’ may be more acceptable in languages like English and Portuguese, which lack this feature.

In order to respond to RQ2 (Which syntactic features characterize the D-construction? Does this construction in Spanish pattern similarly to its Portuguese/Galician counterpart identified by de Andrade (2018)?), Table 4 juxtaposes the properties of the Galician/Portuguese D-construction as discussed by de Andrade (2018) (repeated here from Table 1) with the properties of the Spanish D-construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>position in the verbal argument</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Requires subject-verb inversion</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) May appear in embedded contexts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Is recursive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Demonstrates sensitivity to island constraints</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Discussion

In this paper, we reported on the results of a study examining the properties of an understudied dislocated construction in Spanish, the D-construction. First, we revisit the research questions individually and discuss the extent to which the findings from the acceptability judgement task corroborated our hypotheses. Then, we discuss the theoretical implications of our findings and potential avenues of investigation for future studies.

Regarding RQ1 (To what extent do Spanish speakers accept the D-construction?), eleven out of twenty-one participants accepted the D-construction in its basic form. This is similar to the acceptance rate for HTLD, but lower than those for CLLD and FF. A possible explanation for the relatively low rating of HTLD and the D-construction is that a preference for CLLD and FF may be tied to a general preference for DP case connectivity. That is, participants may have favored CLLD and FF because they contained a (whether DOM or dative) before objects that semantically require it in Spanish. Along the same vein, ‘hanging topics’ may be more acceptable in languages like English and Portuguese, which lack this feature.

In order to respond to RQ2 (Which syntactic features characterize the D-construction? Does this construction in Spanish pattern similarly to its Portuguese/Galician counterpart identified by de Andrade (2018)?), Table 4 juxtaposes the properties of the Galician/Portuguese D-construction as discussed by de Andrade (2018) (repeated here from Table 1) with the properties of the Spanish D-construction.
As shown in Table 4, the D-construction in Spanish clearly patterns like its Portuguese/Galician counterpart in that it does not require subject-verb inversion, cannot be embedded and is non-recursive.

De Andrade (2018) determined that the fronted element within the D-construction (similar to HTLD and our D-construction) was a hanging topic (i.e., restricted to DPs only) without connectivity. Participants’ preferences varied for PPs and DPs appearing at the left edge for the D-construction in our study. Similarly, rating tendencies for items testing for case connectivity between this fronted constituent and its argument within the main clause were inconsistent, demonstrating that there may be interspeaker variation for both properties of the D-construction.

Within this study, the D-construction in Spanish displayed selective island sensitivity (i.e., sensitivity to strong but not weak islands). Sensitivity to the four island constraints used for this study were not included in de Andrade’s (2018) analysis. Rather than consulting data from island contexts, de Andrade (2018) used evidence from clitic requirements to argue for movement vs. base-generation of the left-dislocated elements. Here they were included to help us compare the D-construction to similar constructions in Spanish.

In response to RQ3 (To what extent does the D-construction in Spanish pattern like an instance of CLLD, HTLD and/or FF?), the results provided in Table 3 presented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic property</th>
<th>EP/Galician (D-construction)</th>
<th>Spanish (D-construction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Any XP can be left-dislocated</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Resumptives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Resumptive elements are required</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Strong pronoun resumptives are permitted</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Demonstrates case connectivity with its original position in the verbal argument</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
<td>× / ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Requires subject-verb inversion</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) May appear in embedded contexts</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Is recursive</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Demonstrates sensitivity to island constraints</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The D-construction in Spanish

The properties of CLLD, HTLD and FF (embedding, recursivity and sensitivity to island constraints) and compared them with the Spanish D-construction. As represented in Table 3, the D-construction differs (syntactically) from CLLD in terms of embedding and recursivity. Moreover, the D-construction can be distinguished from FF in terms of resumptive elements and subject-verb inversion. Also, the D-construction features a left-dislocated topic constituent, not a focus constituent, so it also has a clear pragmatic difference with FF. Finally, the D-construction is distinct from HTLD in that it is not strictly restricted to DPs only for all participants and requires a coreferential clitic in the main clause. It is worth noting that the findings for the CLLD, HTLD and FF items designed to test for the properties of embedding and recursivity agreed with the literature, but the selective island sensitivity typically associated with CLLD (sensitivity to strong islands, adjunct islands and relative clause extraction, but not weak islands, like wh-islands or complex NPs) was found for all constructions, including the D-construction.27 Although the D-construction patterns like each construction in some ways, these key differences reinforce our claim that the D-construction represents a unique instance of left dislocation that carries its own set of syntactic properties.

Taking a step back, the current study offered experimental data for a newly identified left-dislocated construction, while providing more data for the syntactic properties of CLLD, HTLD and FF in Spanish. At the same time, due to the limited number of participants and items included in this study, this investigation acts as a starting point for the analysis of the D-construction in Spanish. Now that we have some evidence that native Spanish speakers accept the D-construction, we can continue to determine the extent to which its properties differ from other left-dislocated topic and focus constructions in Spanish.

Once its syntactic properties are more established, a future study could be designed to address its pragmatic uses in Spanish. Although the items in this study were purposefully designed to have a neutral connotation, it is possible that the D-construction would be more acceptable in exaggerated contexts, whether overly positive or overly negative. This is based on intuition data from native speakers in a pilot study and from more casual conversations with native speakers regarding the construction.

Along the same vein, a future study could explore the prosodic features of each construction in more detail. As suggested by de Andrade (2018) for Portuguese and Galician, the presence or absence of an intonational break between the fronted element and the main clause along with changes in pitch accent could further distinguish these constructions. A production study could be run to explore the prosody used by native speakers when producing the D-construction orally, similar to Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl’s (2007) study on topic, based on recorded conversations between friends. This option could provide additional evidence for use of the D-construction in spontaneous production, as well as pragmatic and prosodic insights. In line with recent

27 For wh-islands, only slightly over 50% of the participants accepted HTLD, suggesting it may pattern more similarly to FF in our study in this context.
studies of CLLD, HTLD and FF in the field of second language acquisition (Hoot, 2016; Hoot et al., 2020; Slabakova et al., 2012), a future study could administer the acceptability judgment task aurally to explore whether the ratings would be more favorable. This type of task would also allow us to consider participant sensitivities to the presence or absence of emphatic stress on the fronted element or a pause between the fronted element, its d-pronoun resumptive, and the main clause.

As a whole, future analyses of the D-construction should consider data from more participants. The online modality of this survey made it easy to distribute, but its length deterred some participants from rating all the items. Administering the survey in-person may ensure that more participants complete the acceptability judgment task in its entirety. Additionally, either a wide range of varieties should be represented in the participant pool, or regional variation should be controlled for in future studies (i.e., by selecting participants from the same community).

Regarding the formal implications for our findings, we posit the derivation in Figure 13. Within this derivation, we argue that (a) Elena in Spec TopP represents a CLLD-ed/hanging topic (depending on the speakers’ preferences for case-connectivity, perhaps), while its corresponding d-pronoun resumptive a esa (in a lower Spec TopP) is connected to a covert DP through an A’-chain akin to that of CLLD (Cinque 1990; see Figure 1). This would explain why this element seems to require the appearance of certain case agreement features that are typically indicative of movement (e.g., DOM). Additionally, this derivation could explain why the D-construction demonstrated sensitivity to strong islands only (like CLLD)—indicating that the configuration may contain movement-like syntactic properties due to the presence of this A’-chain, though no movement ever took place.

(102) Spanish
(A) Elena, a esa la vi ayer.
  DOM Elena DOM DEM ACC.3SG.F saw:1SG yesterday
  ‘Elena, I saw (her) yesterday.’
The fact that some participants accepted the D-construction with case connectivity (like CLLD) and others without (like HTLD) demonstrated that a fronted d-pronoun may appear (in addition to a CLLD-ed or HTLD-ed topic) to communicate a contrastive interpretation. That is, rather than classifying the D-construction as a definitive unit with a hanging topic (as was the case in de Andrade (2018)), it seems that the construction may accompany any type of fronted element (i.e., whether it be an instance of CLLD or HTLD). In either case, based on de Andrade’s (2018) analysis, the d-pronoun which characterizes the D-construction was determined to be a resumptive unit which occupies a peripheral position behind another topic to communicate some sort of contrast.

A reviewer pointed out another possible interpretation for the D-construction findings. Rather than being a completely different construction, it could be considered a combination of two constructions that may not always be distinguishable: one similar to Germanic CLD, and another one that is more similar to HTLD I. Prosodic information and future studies testing less properties at once may shed more light on this option.
8. Conclusion

In sum, this study explored the syntactic characteristics associated with the D-construction in Spanish. An acceptability judgment task was constructed to collect data on instances of CLLD, HTLD, FF and the D-construction which had been designed in terms of a selection of syntactic properties: the role of the dislocate, case connectivity, subject-verb order, embedding, recursivity and sensitivity to syntactic islands. Based on a comparison of these constructions in their most basic forms, a consistent acceptance of the D-construction in Spanish was prevalent in some speakers, though questions remain open regarding aspects of this construction based on the presence of individual variation in their preferences.

In general, the empirical nature of this study verified the existence of an understudied left-dislocated topic configuration available in Spanish. With a unique design, this study demonstrated that it is possible to systematically analyze speaker preferences for a syntactic construction in terms of its properties using an acceptability judgment task administered in an online format. Questions remain related to the particular details of the D-construction such as its prosodic features, whose answers may provide further evidence for its syntactic derivation. Future studies may extend this approach to defining the syntactic properties of information structure to more languages. In addition, an acceptability judgment task that considers fewer properties may be administered to a larger sample of participants using an aural modality to explore the D-construction or similar configurations further.
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