

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation? [max 250 words]

This paper examines, with quantitative and qualitative data, whether Spanish also exhibits a fourth type of left-peripheral construction (so-called D-Construction), which has been studied in European Portuguese and Galician in more depth. After discussing the proposed properties of these four constructions (and their alleged differences), the author goes on to analyze the grammaticality of the D-Construction in Spanish with an Acceptability Judgement Task. The data gathered in Spanish provide evidence for the existence (and properties) of this fourth type of construction in Spanish (not just in Western Iberian Romance languages such as Galician and European Portuguese), and how to tease it apart from the other three left-peripheral constructions (namely, Hanging Topics, Clitic Left-Dislocation, Focus-Fronting), thus contributing both empirically and theoretically to the syntactic field.

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]

The data gathered is presented very clearly. My only concern is the length of the survey (40+minutes) and how the people surveyed were controlled for exhaustion. Some minor mistakes:

- After (72): CLD or CLLD?
- Review translation of (75) and (76)
- The sentence in (100) is grammatical (imo), and the translation should be "he trusted" (not "I trusted")

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]

The D-Construction and how it differs from other more studied phenomena (e.g., Focus Fronting, Clitic Left-Dislocation, or Hanging Topic) is very well argued and presented. The assumptions (e.g., whether movement or base-

generation, case connectivity, etc.) are well discussed (in the context of islands and how the findings match the general literature on these types of constructions). The theoretical assumptions are well established and argued with the findings from the data gathered.

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.

I believe the author would benefit from taking a look at Benincà and Poletto (2004). Full reference here:

Benincà, P., & Poletto, C. (2004). Topic, focus, and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In L. Rizzi (ed.), "The Structure of CP and IP" (pp.52-75). Oxford University Press

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]

No

If you accept the paper with minor revisions, please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper) [max 500 words]

Regarding (28), how do we tease this construction out of a HT? In fact, Ordóñez and Treviño (1999) argue that non-quantified preverbal subjects in Spanish are instances of CLLD (either resumed by a pro, as represented in (28), or by the *strong morphological features of the verb licensing T's EPP), also argued for European Portuguese (see Barbosa 1995 and subsequent work).

Turning to (45), I do not find this structure ungrammatical (as the other already found in the data collected). Here are other data to consider:

- (1) Ramón dice que María, nadie puede confiar en ella
- (2) Juan piensa que ese imbécil, nadie debería creer una palabra suya.
- (3) Estoy seguro (de) que este libro, nadie habló de él durante la presentación.

My main comment comes from Focus constituents. Regarding these – e.g., (48), Benincà and Poletto (2004) argue that these constitute a Field in which two different types may be found – and in that order if both elements are present:
a. Contrastive, and

b. Informational

An example from B&P is the following:

(4) A GIORGIO, questo libro, devi dare

In Spanish, a similar sentence could be the following:

(5) [Context: Speaker A assumes Speaker B read a particular book; Speaker B promises Speaker A that this is not true by saying:]

Yo nunca ese libro leí

“Nunca” would be the contrastive focus (a negative element, preverbal, and contrasting with Speaker A’s belief), and “ese libro” would be the informational focus (part of the common ground, and not resumed by a clitic, thus clearly a “focus-like” constituent).

Also, I do not find (47) ungrammatical, as “Juan” could be an instance of a HT, and “el libro” a CLLD (as the clitic indicates).