

# CLS 24

Papers from the  
24th Annual Regional Meeting of the  
Chicago Linguistic Society

Part One: The General Session

Chicago Linguistic Society  
1988

*edited by*

Lynn MacLeod

Gary Larson

Diane Brentari

## Functional Load, Prosody, and Syntax: Left-detachment in Catalan and Spanish\*

Enric Vallduví  
University of Pennsylvania

### References

- Cadière, L. 1958. *Syntaxe de la langue vietnamienne*. Paris: Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. 'On WH Movement.' In P. Culicover, Thomas Wasow and Adrian Akmajian, eds., *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press. 71-132.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Clark, Marybeth. 1974. 'Passive and Ergative in Vietnamese.' In Nguyễn Đăng Liêm, ed., *South-East Asian Linguistic Studies*, Series C, No. 31. Canberra: The Australian National University. 75-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974b. 'Submissive Verbs as Adversatives in Some Asian Languages.' In Nguyễn Đăng Liêm, ed., *South-East Asian Linguistic Studies*, Series C, No. 31. Canberra: The Australian National University. 89-109.
- Du-ong Thanh Binh, 1971. *A Tagmemic Comparison of the Structure of English and Vietnamese Sentences*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Emeneau, Murray B. 1951. *Studies in Vietnamese (Annamese) Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jones, Robert B. 1957. *Introduction to Spoken Vietnamese*. Washington, DC: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1986. 'Ukemiibun no Imi.' *Nihongogaku* 4:70-87
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1979. 'On Japanese Passives.' In G. Bedell, E. Kobayashi and M. Muraki eds., *Explorations in Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Kazuko Inoue*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha. 305-347.
- Lê Duy Tâm. 1976. 'Vietnamese Passives.' In Salikoko S. Mifwene, Carol A. Walker, and Sanford B. Steever, eds., *Papers from the 12th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*. 438-449.
- Nguyễn Đăng Liêm. 1969. *Vietnamese Grammar: a Combined Tagmemic and Transformational Approach*. Canberra: The Australian National University
- Nguyễn Đình Hòa. 1972. 'Passivization in Vietnamese.' In Jacqueline M.C. Thomas and Lucien Bernot eds., *Langues et techniques, nature et société*. Paris: Klincksieck. 1:179-87.
- Perlmutter, David and Paul Postal. 1983. 'Towards a Universal Characterization of Passivization.' In David Perlmutter, ed., *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1-25.
- Thompson, Laurence. 1965. *A Vietnamese Grammar*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Truitner, Nga. 1972. 'Passive Sentences in Vietnamese.' In Paul Peranteau, Judith Levi, and Gloria Phares, eds., *Papers from the 8th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 368-378.
- Truong Văn Chính. 1970. *Structure de la langue vietnamienne*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1979. 'Are Grammatical Categories Vague or Polysemous? (The Japanese 'Adversative' Passive in a Typological Context)' *Papers in Linguistics: The International Journal of Human Communication* 12:111-162.

### 0. Introduction.

The existence of syntactic constructions with left-detached constituents is a well-known fact that has received a good deal of attention in the literature from both a syntactic and a pragmatic point of view. From the syntactic perspective, left-detachment has been traditionally subdivided into two types: left-dislocation (LD), where the lefthand XP is coreferential with a pronominal element in the clause, and topicalization (TOP), where the lefthand XP binds a gap in the clause to its right.<sup>1</sup> Since these two constructions represent semantically equivalent propositions, any differences in their distribution in discourse must reflect differences in their (non-truth-conditional) discourse functions.

In Spanish, as in other Romance languages,<sup>2</sup> one finds both left-detachment configurations: TOP (1a) and LD (1b)

- 1.a. *Dinero*; no tengo [e].  
'Money; I don't have [e].'
- b. *La-cartera*; no la; encuentro.  
'The-wallet; I don't find it.'

From a syntactic point of view, left-detachment constructions have been studied by Contreras 1976, Jaeggli 1982, Rivero 1978, 1980, among others, while Bolinger 1954, Hatcher 1956, and Silva-Corvalán 1983, for instance, have studied their discourse functions. However, it seems that the distribution of these two constructions in Spanish is still not totally clear, or at best, unsatisfactorily explained.

It is the purpose of this paper to argue that these unsatisfactory accounts are the result of an inability to tease apart different syntactic and pragmatic phenomena. The case of Spanish LD and TOP is used to show that pragmatic and prosodic information can be crucial in distinguishing phenomena which under certain conditions appear to be structurally identical. This example illustrates the intimacy of syntactic structure, prosodic structure and functional load.

This paper is divided into two distinct parts. The first part provides a comparative functional typology of left-detachment in Catalan and Spanish, where a distinction is made between focal and non-focal constructions. On the one hand, we see that focal constructions have a TOP configuration in both languages. On the other hand, in Catalan, non-focal constructions always have an overt pronoun clitic in the clause, which is coreferential with the lefthand element (LD). In contrast, Spanish non-focal constructions have both an overt pronoun and a gap in alternation, thus apparently showing both a LD and a TOP configuration.

The second part focuses on Spanish non-focal constructions and gives evidence for the following: a) Only bare (specifierless or quantified) N' undergoes TOP. Any other NPs undergo LD, showing a complementary distribution. b) Catalan has a distinct clitic element precisely for this class of indefinites, while the Spanish clitic system shows a gap precisely for this class. c) The relationship between the gap and the detached NP does not seem to clearly obey subadjacency. Some problems in Rivero's 1980 analysis of TOP can be dealt with by taking these facts and the focal/non-focal distinction into account.

Based on this evidence, it is suggested that these gaps are not wh-traces but rather, behave like null pronominal elements, paralleling the constructions with non-focal lefthand definite NPs. It is concluded, then, that Spanish non-focal left-detachments are actually LD, despite showing a TOP representation, generalizing that Catalan and

Spanish behave alike in always marking non-focal left-detachments with LD.

### 1. Functional Typology of Left-detachment.

In this section I will, first, briefly describe and define the pragmatics of left-detachment and, second, analyze Silva-Corvalán's (1983) Spanish data and my own Catalan data in the light of these functional primitives.

The pragmatics of LD and TOP in English are treated in some detail in Prince (1981, 1984, 1986) and Ward & Prince (1986) (see also Gundel 1974). Prince further subdivides the syntactic configuration TOP into three different pragmatic constructions: Yiddish-Movement (YM), Focus-Movement (FM) and (Proper) Topicalization (PT).<sup>3</sup> The only formal differentiation these pragmatic constructions show is a prosodic one:

- 2.a. PT *Macadamia nuts I can't afford.*  
 b. FM *Macadamia nuts I think they are called.*  
 c. YM *Macadamia nuts I should buy yet.*  
 (Prince's (1981) ex.5)

However, they further differ in the kind of information the lefthand constituent represents. These discourse conditions are summarized in 3:

- 3.a. PT: the entity represented by the preposed constituent must be related, via a salient partially ordered set (poset) relation, to one or more entities already evoked in the discourse model, where a partial ordering relation R on a set B is a relation on B such that, for all  $b_1, b_2, b_3, \dots$  belonging to B, either  
 (i) R is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive, or  
 (ii) R is irreflexive, asymmetric, and transitive.<sup>4</sup>  
 (Ward & Prince 1986)
- b. FM: the tonically stressed element within the preposed constituent represents the value of an attribute and it is new in the discourse.  
 (Prince 1981)
- c. YM: the tonically stressed preposed constituent represents new or, in the case of rhetorical redundancy, given information.  
 (Prince 1981)

In addition, the three constructions must represent the instantiation of a salient open proposition presupposed in the previous discourse (Prince 1981, 1986, Ward 1985).<sup>5</sup> Presupposed open propositions are propositions which contain a variable; in other words, they contain an element within the proposition which is not presupposed along with the rest. Proper Topicalization, Focus-Movement, and Yiddish-Movement are constructions that mark such open propositions as presupposed. In turn, in Focus-Movement and Yiddish-Movement the lefthand element represents the instantiation of the variable in the presupposed open proposition. The fact that the lefthand element instantiates the variable constitutes new information. Focus-Movement and Yiddish-Movement, consequently, place new information to the left of old information.

On the other hand, LD, as in 4, is studied in Prince 1984, where she suggests that the discourse function of LD (henceforth FLD) is just the marking of the lefthand NP as being related through a salient poset relation to one or more entities already evoked in the discourse model. We see, then, that FLD has one of the two functions of PT, as seen above under 3.<sup>6</sup> FLD and PT place old information before new information (the canonical order in English):

4. There were two things I promised to talk about.

The-first-thing, I looked at it, with care. The second...

(salient poset: IT-IS-A-MEMBER-OF. Prince 1984 ex.28.b)

Here we will concentrate only on the functional marking of the lefthand constituents, and, for the purposes of this paper, Prince's functional typology will be redefined in terms of focal constructions versus non-focal constructions, as shown in 5:

- 5.a. FOCAL CONSTRUCTIONS (FM & YM): lefthand constituent is the tonically stressed element in the sentence, and constitutes the focus of new information in a presupposed open proposition.  
 b. NON-FOCAL CONSTRUCTIONS (FLD & PT): lefthand constituent is not the tonically stressed constituent in the sentence, and is in a poset relation with another element already evoked in the discourse model.

Silva-Corvalán (1983), in a study of OV constructions in (Chilean) Spanish, points out that this language also possesses three intonation contours (for OSV sentences): a) informational, unmarked and corresponding to Prince's PT;<sup>7</sup> b) focal, Prince's FM contour, and c) contrary to expectation, corresponding to YM. We see that Silva-Corvalán's typology captures the distinction between preverbal objects that receive tonic stress on the one hand, and preverbal objects under an informational contour on the other (our focal and non-focal, respectively). The first group consists of objects representing 'unexpected' or 'surprising' referents or attributes (with contrary-to-expectation contour), and constituents with referents that constitute the new information in the sentence (with focal contour). The second group is distinguished by constituents the referent of which 'is a center of attention in the discourse because it is either a focus of contrast, or the topic of a discourse passage, or an important entity in the discourse' (1983:139). It is not the subject-matter of this paper to analyze Silva-Corvalán's discourse primitives, but it is interesting to note that her 'new' and 'unexpected' correspond more or less to what we have been calling focal, and that topichood, contrastiveness, and entity importance seem to be non-focal in nature (cf Prince 1984, Chafe 1976, Gundel 1985).

The example in 6 illustrates Silva-Corvalán's informational-contoured preposed object (clearly non-focal; salient poset relation: is-equal-to), while 7 and 8 illustrate her contrary-to-expectation-contoured preposed objects and her focal-contoured preposed objects, respectively (focal: stressed constituent and new (or rhetorically new) information):<sup>8</sup>

6. Él tenía dos carretas con bueyes  
 y las-dos-carretas-con-bueyes; las; PERDIÓ.  
 'He had two oxcarts and the-two-oxcarts; he-lost them.'  
 (S-C. 1983 ex.9.o)

7. E: Me hicieron seis puntos.  
 I: A sangre fría?  
 E: A sangre fría. SEIS-PUNTOS; me hicieron [e].  
 'They gave me six stitches.  
 In cold blood?  
 In cold blood. SIX-STITCHES; they gave me [e].'  
 (S-C. 1983 ex.29)

8. A. Cuántos cigarrillos quería?  
 B. *UNO*<sub>i</sub> no más quería [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
 'How many cigarettes did he want?'  
 Just *ONE*<sub>i</sub> he wanted [e]<sub>i</sub>.'

(S-C. 1983 ex.32)

We see from the data in 6 that non-focal left-detachment shows a coreferential pronominal in the clause and that the focal left-detachments in 7-8 do not. In other words, on syntactic grounds 6 looks like a LD and 7-8 like a TOP.<sup>9</sup> However, the only structural difference that Silva-Corvalán considers is intonational. It is possible that she neglected the syntactic distribution due to the existence of TOP representing non-focal constructions:

9. *Padrastr*<sub>i</sub> TENGO [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
 '(A) *stepfather*<sub>i</sub>; I HAVE [e]<sub>i</sub>.'  
 (S-C. 1983 ex.2)
10. *Dinero*<sub>i</sub> dicen que NO TIENE [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
 'Money<sub>i</sub>; they say (he) doesn't HAVE [e]<sub>i</sub>.'  
 (Rivero 1980 ex.9)

The evidence in 9-10 presumably did not allow her to correlate the presence or absence of a pronoun clitic with the marking of non-focal and focal lefthand constituents. We see then that, although focal constructions always show a TOP configuration, non-focal constructions show both TOP and LD.

Let us now turn to Catalan (we will return to Spanish in section 2). Consider the naturally-occurring data under 11-12:

11. [written on an aerogramme; first line on the extra space overleaf]  
*Amb-aquest-tros-de-paperet*<sub>i</sub> ja no hi<sub>i</sub> COMPTAVA.  
 with-this-little-piece-of-paper<sub>i</sub> I wasn't on-it<sub>i</sub> COUNTING  
 'This-little piece-of-paper<sub>i</sub>; I wasn't counting on it<sub>i</sub>.'  
 [PC 02-87]
12. [A is addressing C. B is present]  
 A. Hòstia! S'hem acabat la botella, eh! Que som... que som...  
 B. Les dues botelles ja!  
 A. *DUES-BOTELLES*<sub>i</sub>; s'hem polit [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
 'A. My god! We finished the bottle! We are... we are...  
 B. The two bottles already!  
 A. *TWO-BOTTLES*<sub>i</sub>; we polished off [e]<sub>i</sub>.'  
 [QM 10-85]

In the non-focal left-detachment in 11 (parallel to Spanish example 6), the lefthand constituent (here a PP) is not the tonically stressed element in the sentence, and it represents an entity that it is already in the discourse model (it is situationally evoked). Example 12, on the other hand, is a focal left-detachment: the lefthand element holds the intonational peak, and it instantiates the value of an attribute in a presupposed open proposition (*we polished off n bottles*). Again, we see that, as in 6-8, the focal constructions show a TOP configuration, while the non-focal constructions show a LD configuration. That the importance of this syntactic marking of focal vs. non-focal in Catalan is crucial is seen in minimal pairs like 13-14:

13. [J mentions that he had talked to X about X's life, but cannot remember what exactly X told him. J then asks E about X to try to recall what it was]  
 E. ... i va anar a treballar en una emissora de ràdio.  
 J. *AIXÒ*<sub>i</sub> ens havia explicat [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
 'E. ... and she went to work in a radio station.  
 J. *THIS*<sub>i</sub> (X) had told us [e]<sub>i</sub>.'

[JV 12-86]

14. [A is telling C different stories; this is one of them]  
 A. Me van xafar el morro, l'altre dia.  
 B. *Això*<sub>i</sub>; no ho<sub>i</sub> SAPS.  
 A. *Això*<sub>i</sub>; no t'ho<sub>i</sub> EXPLICICO.  
 'A. They smashed my snout, the other day.  
 B. *This*<sub>i</sub>; you don't KNOW it<sub>i</sub>.  
 A. *This*<sub>i</sub>; I'm not EXPLAINING it<sub>i</sub> to you.' [you=C]  
 [PC 10-85]

In 13 the focus is the detached NP; in 14 it is in the clause. This pragmatic difference is reflected by separate syntactic representations: non-focal left-detached XPs are in LD configurations, while focal left-detached XPs are in TOP configurations.<sup>10</sup>

But what about the Catalan equivalents of 9-10? As shown in 15-16, they are LD, and not TOP, contrary to the Spanish examples.<sup>11</sup>

15. (*De* *padrastr*<sub>i</sub> en<sub>i</sub> TINC.  
 '(A) *stepfather*<sub>i</sub>; I HAVE him<sub>i</sub>.'  
 16. (*De* *diners*<sub>i</sub> diuen que no en<sub>i</sub> TÉ.  
 'Money<sub>i</sub>; they say (he) doesn't HAVE it<sub>i</sub>.'

We have to conclude, then, that Catalan always shows LD configurations for non-focal constructions and TOP configurations for focal constructions in a one-to-one fashion. In other words, the pragmatic distinction FM/YM vs. PT/FLD is not only marked prosodically but also syntactically. Spanish, however, although consistent in marking focal left-detachments across the board with TOP, seems to use both LD and TOP for non-focal constructions. This situation is represented in 17:

	focal (FM/YM)	non-focal (Eng. PT/FLD)
Catalan	TOP	LD
Spanish	TOP	LD, TOP

Finally, it is worth mentioning that Catalan FM is not limited to the instantiation of attributes, but, as seen in 13, can also contain a referential NP. This could be due to the fact that FM and YM are indistinguishable from one another in Catalan and Spanish. My feeling, however, is that 13, if uttered in an English discourse, would be an it-cleft (also a focal construction). Although the issue will not be addressed here, possibly Catalan (and plausibly Spanish) FM/YM perform the functional task of English it-clefts as well.

We shall now examine the Spanish non-focal constructions more closely.

## 2. Spanish Non-focal Constructions.

As mentioned above, Silva-Corvalán (1983) makes no reference to the occurrence or non-occurrence of pronominal clitics along with the preverbal objects she studies. However the variation between TOP and LD has been noticed before (cf. Rivero 1978, 1980, Jaeggli 1982). These authors believe that TOP is limited to indefinite left-detached NPs. Rivero 1980, for instance, states that 'the process [TOP] is limited to

indefinite NPs in most cases, while left-dislocation is not constrained as to the definiteness of the NP in TOP position' (1980:376).<sup>12</sup> She illustrates this with the following examples:

- 18.a. *Libros*<sub>i</sub> dicen que LEE [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
'Books<sub>i</sub> (they) say that (he) reads [e]<sub>i</sub>.'  
b. \**Los-libros*<sub>i</sub> dicen que LEE [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
\*\**The-books*<sub>i</sub> (they) say that (he) reads [e]<sub>i</sub>.'  
(Rivero 1980 ex.38)

However, while this is true, the definiteness criterion is not explanatorily adequate in accounting for the distribution of LD and TOP in Spanish. As Rivero herself indirectly suggests, indefinite NPs can be detached with a LD configuration.<sup>13</sup>

- 19.a. *Una-entrevista-informal*<sub>i</sub> la<sub>i</sub> soportaría mejor.  
'An-informal-interview<sub>i</sub> (I) would-deal-with it<sub>i</sub> better.'  
b. *Algunas-personas*<sub>i</sub> no las<sub>i</sub> puedo ni ver.  
'Some-people<sub>i</sub> (I) can't even stand them<sub>i</sub>.'

Therefore, a different criterion that would show that TOP and LD are in complementary distribution would be more desirable. Again, a comparison of the Spanish data with the Catalan data sheds some light on the question:

- 20.a. *Els-llibres*<sub>i</sub> diu que els<sub>i</sub> pot llegir.  
the-books<sub>i</sub> 3s-say that them<sub>i</sub> 3s-can read  
b. *Uns-llibres*<sub>i</sub> diu que els<sub>i</sub> pot llegir.  
some-books<sub>i</sub> 3s-say that them<sub>i</sub> 3s-can read  
c. *(De)-llibres*<sub>i</sub> diu que en<sub>i</sub> pot llegir.  
de-books<sub>i</sub> 3s-say that them<sub>i</sub> 3s-can read  
21.a. *Los-libros*<sub>i</sub> dice que los<sub>i</sub> puede leer.  
the-books<sub>i</sub> 3s-say that them<sub>i</sub> 3s-can read  
b. *Unos-libros*<sub>i</sub> dice que los<sub>i</sub> puede leer.  
some-books<sub>i</sub> 3s-say that them<sub>i</sub> 3s-can read  
c. *Libros*<sub>i</sub> dice que puede leer [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
books<sub>i</sub> 3s-say that 3s-can read [e]<sub>i</sub>  
20-1.a. '*the-books*<sub>i</sub> (she) says that (she) can read them<sub>i</sub>.'  
b. '*some-books*<sub>i</sub> (she) says that (she) can read them<sub>i</sub>.'  
c. '*books*<sub>i</sub> (she) says that (she) can read {them<sub>i</sub>/[e]<sub>i</sub>}.'

As we have already noted, both definites and indefinites show a clitic copy in the clause, in both Catalan and Spanish (20a, 20b, 21a, 21b). But while Spanish 21c has a gap, Catalan also shows a LD configuration in 20c: the clitic copy here, however, is of a different morphophonemic type. It is not an *l*-clitic, like the ones we have seen so far, but an *n*-clitic (also cf. 15, 16 above). The *n*-clitic in Catalan appears in two types of environments: a) representing PPs introduced by the preposition *de* 'of, from', which can be genitive (22a), locative of origin (22b), or merely selected by the verb (22c); b) representing the N' in quantified NPs (23a) and determinerless NPs (23b) (see Häik 1981 for a similar, but slightly different, distribution of the *n*-clitic in French):

- 22.a. Cal veure la catedral *de Girona*.  
Cal veure 'n la catedral.  
'One must see {Girona's/its} cathedral.'

- b. Sóc *de Girona*.  
En sóc.  
'I am {from Girona/from-there}.'  
c. Em ric *de tot*.  
Me'n ric.  
'I laugh {at everything/at-it}.'

- 23.a. Bec molta *aigua*.  
En bec molta.  
'I drink a-lot-of {water/it}.'  
b. Xollo *bens*.  
En xollo.  
'I shear {sheep/them}.'

Leaving aside the pro-PP function of the *n*-clitic (since it is not directly relevant here) and focusing on its pro-N' function in 23, we see that it is precisely in this environment that Spanish shows a TOP configuration (cf 21c). In other words, it is only bare N' (sometimes called 'partitives') that, when left-detached, have no coreferential copy in the adjacent clause. We can establish, then, the equation in 26:<sup>14</sup>

- 24.a. *(De)-sucre*<sub>i</sub> no en<sub>i</sub> tinc gaire.  
de-sugar<sub>i</sub> not it<sub>i</sub> 1s-have much  
b. *(De)-pare*<sub>i</sub> no en<sub>i</sub> tinc.  
de-father<sub>i</sub> not it<sub>i</sub> 1s-have  
c. *(D')-amics*<sub>i</sub> no en<sub>i</sub> tinc.  
de-friends<sub>i</sub> not them<sub>i</sub> 1s-have

- 25.a. *Azúcar*<sub>i</sub> no tengo [e]<sub>i</sub> mucho.  
sugar<sub>i</sub> not 1s-have [e]<sub>i</sub> much  
b. *Padre*<sub>i</sub> no tengo [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
father<sub>i</sub> not 1s-have [e]<sub>i</sub>  
c. *Amigos*<sub>i</sub> no tengo [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
friends<sub>i</sub> not 1s-have [e]<sub>i</sub>

- 24-5.a. '*Sugar*<sub>i</sub> (I) don't have much {(of)-it<sub>i</sub>/[e]<sub>i</sub>}.'  
b. '*(A)-father*<sub>i</sub> (I) don't have {him<sub>i</sub>/[e]<sub>i</sub>}.'  
c. '*Friends*<sub>i</sub> (I) don't have {them<sub>i</sub>/[e]<sub>i</sub>}.'

26. Catalan: *n*-clitic = Spanish: *zero*-clitic

However, if this equation is to be considered valid, it should hold not only in TOP configurations, but in every environment where bare N' can be pronominalized. And, indeed, this prediction is borne out (notice that the b sentences all require an overt pronominal):

- 27.a. Q. Tienes padre<sub>i</sub>? A. No, no tengo [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
'Q. Do you have (a)-father<sub>i</sub>? A. No, I don't have [e]<sub>i</sub>.'  
b. Q. Tienes el-libro<sub>i</sub>? A. No, no {lo<sub>i</sub>/(\*[e]<sub>i</sub>)} tengo.  
'Q. Do you have the-book<sub>i</sub>? A. No, I don't have {it<sub>i</sub>/(\*[e]<sub>i</sub>}.'

- 28.a. Me prometieron que encontraría apartamento,  
y te juro que encontré [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
'They promised me I would find (an)-apartment,  
and I swear I found [e]<sub>i</sub>.'

- b. Me prometieron que encontraría el-hotel<sub>i</sub>  
y te juro que {lo<sub>i</sub>/\*[e]<sub>i</sub>}) encontré.  
'They promised me I would find the-hotel<sub>i</sub>  
and I swear I found {it<sub>i</sub>/\*[e]<sub>i</sub>}.'

- 29.a. Mi hermanita ve fantasmas<sub>i</sub> por todas partes.  
Mi hermanita ve [e]<sub>i</sub> por todas partes.  
'My little sister sees {ghosts<sub>i</sub>/[e]<sub>i</sub>} all over the place.'

- b. Mi hermanita vio los-dibujos-animados-de-ayer<sub>i</sub>.  
Mi hermanita {los<sub>i</sub>/\*[e]<sub>i</sub>}) vio.  
'My little sister saw {yesterday's cartoons<sub>i</sub>/{them<sub>i</sub>/\*[e]<sub>i</sub>}}.'

Given the facts under consideration, the status of constructions with 'partitive' NPs such as 1a, 9, 10, 18a, 21c and 25 becomes clearer: they do not seem to pattern like TOPs. At least, they are not TOPs in the sense that they do not behave like English TOPs. In the latter (30a), one finds a gap in an argument position that in any other environment must be phonologically filled (30b). Spanish 'partitive' objects, in contrast, if pronominalized, are always dropped (31) (also 27-29):

- 30.a. Forks<sub>i</sub> I brought [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
b. Did you bring forks<sub>i</sub>? Yes, I brought {( \*[e]<sub>i</sub> )/them<sub>i</sub> }.

- 31.a. Tenedores<sub>i</sub> traje [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
'Forks<sub>i</sub> I brought [e]<sub>i</sub>.'  
b. Trajiste tenedores<sub>i</sub>? Sí, sí traje [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
'Did you bring forks<sub>i</sub>? Yes, I brought [e]<sub>i</sub>.'

In other words, the gap is there not because the structure of the TOP configuration requires its presence, but because, with 'partitive' objects, the gap is found across the board. In fact, Campos 1986 deals with what he dubs 'indefinite object drop', although he carefully remarks that he refers to 'direct objects that appear with no specifiers' and also that, if they appear, 'quantifiers cannot be omitted' (fn.1). This is precisely the domain of occurrence of the Catalan pro-N' *n*-clitic, as seen above.<sup>15,16</sup>

Next, we will look at Rivero's (1980) analysis of TOP in Spanish. Rivero does not note the distinction focal/non-focal. She, then, has a number of 'non-partitive'-left-detached elements she has to deal with as exceptions to her definiteness constraint (cf. fn.12 above). Her solution is to argue that some verbs are 'bridges' for topicalization of definite NPs (*deserve, give, want, desire, etc.*), while some other verbs (like *have, know, etc.*), the definite object of which is a referring expression, block it (1980:376). Therefore, according to Rivero, while 32a is grammatical, 32b is out, because the object becomes a referring expression:

- 32.a. La-reina-de-las-Españas<sub>i</sub>; te mereces [e]<sub>i</sub>, hermoso.  
the-queen-of-the-Spains<sub>i</sub>; refl. 2s-deserve [e]<sub>i</sub>, beautiful  
'The-Queen-of-the-Spains<sub>i</sub>; you deserve [e]<sub>i</sub>, you beautiful one.'

(Rivero 1980 ex.40.a)

- 32.b. \*La-reina-de-las-Españas<sub>i</sub>; tienes [e]<sub>i</sub>, hermoso.  
the-queen-of-the-Spains<sub>i</sub>; 2s-have [e]<sub>i</sub>, beautiful  
'The-Queen-of-the-Spains<sub>i</sub>; you have [e]<sub>i</sub>, you beautiful one.'

(Rivero 1980 ex.41)

For me, however, both are grammatical if uttered as a focal left-detachment, with the tonic stress on the lefthand NP, and both are ungrammatical if uttered as a non-focal left-detachment construction. In the latter case they require a clitic pronoun instead of a

gap.<sup>17</sup>

Rivero suggests a COMP-to-COMP movement analysis of TOP in Spanish. Her movement into COMP, however, is not empirically adequate. Plann (1982) shows that the topicalized phrases that Rivero argues are in COMP (to the right of the *that*-complementizer), are actually located in the embedded topic slot to the left of the embedded COMP. Rivero points out, too, that, although this transformation is highly move-wh-like, it violates the wh-island constraint, and, therefore, it cannot be identified with wh-movement. The evidence is in 33:

- 33.a. Dinero<sub>i</sub> te pregunta (que) [ por-qué no tiene [e]<sub>i</sub> ].  
money<sub>i</sub> 3s-ask you (that) why not 3s-have [e]<sub>i</sub>  
'Money<sub>i</sub> (she) asks you [ why (she) doesn't have [e]<sub>i</sub> ].'  
(Rivero 1980 ex.47.b)

- 33.b. Dinero<sub>i</sub> preguntan (que) [ quién tiene [e]<sub>i</sub> ].  
money<sub>i</sub> 3pl-ask (that) who 3s-have [e]<sub>i</sub>  
'Money<sub>i</sub> (they) ask [ who has [e]<sub>i</sub> ].'  
(Rivero 1980 ex.48.b)

However, she argues that the Complex NP Constraint (CNPC) holds in Spanish TOP, although she acknowledges sentences like those in 34:

- 34.a. Libros<sub>i</sub> resulta que [ alguien que tiene muchos [e]<sub>i</sub> ] no quiere ni  
recibirnos.  
'Books<sub>i</sub> (it) happens that [ someone who has many [e]<sub>i</sub> ] doesn't even  
want to see us.'

(Rivero 1980 ex.61)

- 34.b. Dinero<sub>i</sub> dicen que cree que tiene [ ganas de ahorrar [e]<sub>i</sub> ].  
Money<sub>i</sub> (they) say that (he) believes that (he) has [ the desire  
to save [e]<sub>i</sub> ].'

(Rivero 1980 ex.55.a)

In order to have the CNPC hold despite these sentences, she argues that, in 34b, *ganas* 'desire' does not dominate the gap (she assigns this particular sentence the structure [NP *ganas*][S' *de ahorrar*]), and that 34a is actually a left-dislocation with a full NP instead of a clitic in the clause, and with a deletion-under-identity of *libros* 'books' in the embedded clause.

In sum, then, we see that Rivero, first, fails to identify the exact domain of TOP in Spanish because she does not note the focal/non-focal distinction, and, second, posits a movement transformation for TOP in Spanish despite the problems she encounters: violation of the wh-island constraint, unclear status of CNPC, and difficulties in arguing for a movement-into-COMP analysis. We saw above, however, that the gap in 'partitive' non-focal structures is found across the board, and that there is no need to argue for a trace-like gap in TOP for that reason. In fact, all the distributional evidence presented in this section points towards treating 'partitive' non-focal TOPs as LD, with a null pronominal instead of an overt clitic, thus capturing the generalization that all non-focal left-detachments in Spanish are LD, something clearly very attractive from a functional point of view. Even the facts presented by Rivero, when looked at from another perspective, point toward an analysis of this kind: 'partitive' TOP gaps do not behave like traces, and 'partitive' non-focal TOPs do not behave like TOPs. As a last example consider 35b:

- 35.a. Q. Te gustaría saber la solución para ganar el premio, verdad?  
A. El premio no me importa, pero te juro que  
la-solución<sub>i</sub>; envidia [ la gente que {la<sub>i</sub>/\*[e]<sub>i</sub>} tiene ].'



'Q. You'd like to know the answer to win the prize, wouldn't you?

A. I don't care about the prize, but I swear that  
*the-solution*; I envy [ the people that have {it<sub>i</sub>/(\*[e]<sub>i</sub>)} ].'

35.b. Q. Te gustaría tener fe para poder ganar el cielo, verdad?

A. Ganar el cielo no me importa,  
pero te juro que *fe*; envidia [ la gente que tiene {e}<sub>i</sub> ].'

'Q. You'd like to have faith to be able to reach heaven, wouldn't you?

I don't care about reaching heaven,  
but I swear that *faith*; I envy [ the people that have {e}<sub>i</sub> ].'

Here the gap is within a relative clause.<sup>18</sup> If {e}<sub>i</sub> in 35b was to behave like a pronominal it should behave like *la*<sub>i</sub> in 35a, and it does.<sup>19</sup>

### 3. Conclusion.

In this paper we have shown that focal and non-focal constructions are syntactically represented by TOP and LD, respectively, in both Catalan and Spanish, contrary to English, for instance, where the only obvious formal distinction between the two types is prosodic. In turn, this has shown that the use of prosodic and functional information can help us discover syntactic phenomena and, as in the case of Spanish left-detachment, help provide, along with purely syntactic, distributional, and comparative facts, a more accurate explanation of the distribution of TOP and the syntactic shape of left-detachment.

It is then concluded that Spanish 'partitive' non-focal TOP behaves distributionally, and apparently also formally, not to mention functionally, like LD. And since the gap in 'partitive' NPs is an across-the-board phenomenon, present in all the environments where 'partitive' N is pronominalized, there is no reason to posit a TOP structure for 'partitive' non-focal TOP. Thus focal left-detachments are represented throughout by a TOP configuration, while non-focal left-detachments are represented throughout by a LD configuration. We see that, by looking at a subset of the data, we can assign fairly clear and distinct discourse functions to TOP and LD in Spanish and Catalan. Then, by considering the rest of the data, we find evidence for a modified syntactic analysis; one which is more adequate on syntactic grounds for explaining the sentences in question and which also accounts for the distribution in discourse.

### NOTES

\*. I am indebted to Jack Hoeksema, Claudia Mazzie, and Ellen Prince for commenting on a draft of this paper, and Tony Kroch for discussing some aspects of it with me. I especially want to thank Ellen Prince for her instruction and helpful criticism. Any errors of fact or interpretation, though, are my own responsibility.

1. There are, of course, other topicalization-type constructions, at least in English, that will not be dealt with here: epitomization (Ward 1984), VP-preposing (Ward 1985), and Locative Adverb Preposing (Green 1980). See also fn.6 for a further distinction between two types of LD.

2. See Hirschbüler 1974, 1975, Larsson 1979, Lambrecht 1981, and Barnes 1985 for French; Cinque 1977, Belletti 1979, and Duranti & Ochs 1979 for Italian, and Votre 1982 for Portuguese.

3. Prince calls it TOP. I choose PT for the functionally-defined construction to keep it distinct from TOP, the syntactically-defined construction.

4. Salient means appropriately in the hearer's consciousness at that point in the construction of the discourse model (cf. Chafe 1976 and consequent work). As for details on the poset formalism and its linguistic relevance, see Hirschberg 1985. The notion of poset allows us to rank discourse entities (or for that matter, attributes, time, place, etc.) as elements in a set. An example of (i) is 'is-as-tall-or-taller-than' and an example of (ii)

is 'is-taller-than.'

5. For Yiddish-Movement, saliency is not required; 'shared knowledge' suffices.

6. Prince (1984) argues that, in the case of LD, there is actually constructional homonymy. A subset of the LD data, LD-1 (our FLD), behaves like PT, as pointed out here. The complement of that set, LD-2, has a totally different discourse function: introducing out-of-focus entities. LD-2 could be plausibly related to what Cinque (1977) calls 'hanging topics', while trying to syntactically distinguish them from 'genuine' LD. For detailed discussion on 'hanging topics' vs. 'genuine' LD see Vat 1981. LD-2 is not relevant for our discussion and will not be considered in this paper.

7. Silva-Corvalán's informational contour and Prince's TOP (PT) contour are not prosodically equivalent; both have two peaks, but in Chilean Spanish the primary peak can be sentence-initial or sentence-final, while in English it is always in the clause to the right of the lefthand NP. Both, though, are significantly different from focal or contrary-to-expectation contours.

8. In all the examples, the detached element is italicized and the stressed element (if relevant) capitalized. The detached constituent and the coreferential element in the clause are coindexed. I use this notation throughout, even in examples borrowed from other authors, for the sake of consistency.

9. I am aware of the controversial status of clitics in Romance. However, whatever their nature, they seem to follow a clear pattern in both Spanish and Catalan.

10. It is perhaps significant that Barnes (1985) also arrives at the conclusion that, in French, FM is always represented by TOP.

11. The preposition *de* is optional in LD. It is mandatory in right-dislocation, however.

12. The 'in most cases' in the quote is because of examples like (i). Here the lefthand NP is definite and the syntactic configuration is TOP. Despite the lack of intonational and contextual information, it is safe to assume that (i) is a focal construction. See section 2.

i. *El-sol-y-la-luna*; te daría {e}<sub>i</sub>, vida mía.

'The-sun-and-the-moon; I'd-give you {e}<sub>i</sub>, my love.'

(Rivero 1980 ex.40.b)

13. In section 2, stressed elements are not capitalized, since no non-focal lefthand XPs are tonically stressed.

14. Provençal, French, and Italian pattern with Catalan, while Portuguese and Rumanian pattern with Spanish (cf. Campos 1986). From a diachronic perspective, we see that Old Spanish patterned along with Catalan until the fifteenth century, when *en-ende* (<*inde*), along with the locative *y* (< *ibi*; Cat *hi*), slowly disappeared from the language, thus causing Spanish to drift away from the central Romance dialects. For a detailed study of these facts see Badia i Margarit 1947.

15. The *n*-clitic also appears as a pro-N' subject of ergative verbs (cf. Picallo 1984).

16. In fact, Campos (1986:fn.6) points out that languages with *n*-clitics do not show 'indefinite object drop'. He does not use this evidence, analyzing Spanish 'indefinite object drop' in the way Raposo (1986) and Huang (1984) analyze generalized object drop in Portuguese and Chinese, respectively. Campos identifies the gap in sentences like 27-29 and 31 with a variable bound by a null operator that moves in the syntax. This proposal is radically opposed to the view presented here. However, his analysis is not free from problems (cf. his own footnotes 2, 3, 4, and 5 with exceptions to his constraints).

17. It is true that the most natural reading of 32a is as a focal construction, and that the most natural reading for 32b is as a non-focal construction, which automatically makes it ungrammatical due to the lack of pronoun in the clause. The reason for this seems to involve pragmatic and semantic factors as well as extralinguistic assumptions about the world. These facts (which we cannot study here) are probably what led Rivero

to her judgments.

18. It is hard to come up with examples like 35. Examples of the type in (i) are easier to find or think of. However, verbs like *know/see/remember* plus an indefinite head of the relative are known to weaken the CNPC in many languages (Tony Kroch, p.c.).

- i. *Gusanos*<sub>i</sub> conozco [ un tío que come [e]<sub>i</sub> ].  
'Worms<sub>i</sub> (I) know [ a guy that eats [e]<sub>i</sub> ].'

19. What we have not addressed so far is the question of the nature of focal TOP: is it the result of movement from canonical position, since there is never a coreferential pronominal cooccurring with the lefthand element? The standard diagnostic tests for wh-movement indicate that focal left-detachments are not subject to subjacency. In (i) we have a violation of the wh-island constraint, and in (ii) a violation of the CNPC:

- i.a. *FRUITA*<sub>i</sub> em van dir (que) [ si volia [e]<sub>i</sub> ]. No gelat.  
b. *FRUTA*<sub>i</sub> me dijeron (que) [ si quería [e]<sub>i</sub> ]. No helado.  
'*FRUIT*<sub>i</sub> (they) asked me (that) whether (I) wanted [e]<sub>i</sub>. Not ice-cream.'
- ii.a. *LES-CLAUS*<sub>i</sub> sempre tinc [ por de perdre [e]<sub>i</sub> ]. No la cartera.  
b. *LAS-LLAVES*<sub>i</sub> siempre tengo [ miedo de perder [e]<sub>i</sub> ]. No la cartera.  
the-keys<sub>i</sub> always I<sub>s</sub>-have fear of lose [e]<sub>i</sub>. not the wallet  
'*THE-KEYS*<sub>i</sub> I'm always afraid of losing [e]<sub>i</sub>. Not the wallet.'

## REFERENCES

- Badia i Margarit, A.M. 1947. *Los complementos pronominalo-adverbiales derivados de ibi e inde en la península Ibérica*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Barnes, B.K. 1985. *The pragmatics of left-detachment in Spoken Standard French*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Belletti, A. 1979. Sintagmi nominali quantificati e costruzioni dislocate a sinistra. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* IX.4.1525-68.
- Bolinger, D. 1954. English prosodic stress and Spanish sentence order. *Hispania* 37.152-6.
- Campos, H. 1986. Indefinite Object Drop. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17.354-9.
- Chafe, W. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In C. Li, ed. *Subject and topic*. NY: AP. Pp. 25-55.
- Cinque, G. 1977. The movement nature of left-dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.397-412.
- Contreras, H. 1976. *A theory of word order with special reference to Spanish*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Duranti, A. & E. Ochs. 1979. Left-dislocation in Italian conversation. In T. Givón, ed. *Discourse and syntax (Syntax & Semantics 12)*. NY: AP. Pp. 377-418.
- Green, G. 1980. Some wherefores of English inversions. *Language* 56.582-601.
- Gundel, J. 1974. *The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory*. University of Texas Ph.D. dissertation.
- Gundel, J. 1985. 'Shared knowledge' and topicality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9.83-107.
- Häik, I. 1981. On clitic *en* in French. *Journal of Linguistic Research* 2.63-87.
- Hatcher, E. 1956. Theme and underlying question: two studies in Spanish word order. Word 12 (Monograph no.3).
- Hirschberg, J. 1985. *A theory of scalar implicature*. University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. dissertation.
- Hirschbühler, P. 1974. La dislocation à gauche comme construction basique en Français. In C. Rohrer & N. Ruwet, eds. *Actes du Colloque Franco-Allemand de Grammaire Transformationnelle*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. Pp. 9-17.
- Hirschbühler, P. 1975. On the source of lefthand NPs in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 6.155-65.
- Huang, J. 1984. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.531-74.
- Jaeggli, O. 1982. *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Lambrecht, K. 1981. *Topic, antitopic and verb agreement in Non-Standard French*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Larsson, E. 1979. *La dislocation en Français: étude de syntaxe generative*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Picallo, M.C. 1984. The Infl node and the null subject parameter. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.75-103.
- Plann, S. 1982. Indirect questions in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13.297-313.
- Prince, E.F. 1981. Topicalization, Focus-Movement, and Yiddish-Movement: a pragmatic differentiation. *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Pp. 249-64.
- Prince, E.F. 1984. Topicalization and Left-dislocation: a functional analysis. In S.J. White & V. Teller, eds. *Discourses in Reading and Linguistics. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. v.433.213-25.
- Prince, E.F. 1986. On the syntactic marking of presupposed open propositions. In A. Farley et al., eds. *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory at the 22nd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*. Pp. 208-22.
- Raposo, E. 1986. On the null object in European Portuguese. In O. Jaeggli & C. Silva-Corvalán, eds. *Studies in Romance Linguistics (LSRL 14, 1984)*. Dordrecht: Foris. Pp. 373-89.
- Rivero, M.L. 1978. On topicalization and wh-movement in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9.513-17.
- Rivero, M.L. 1980. On left-dislocation and topicalization in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11.363-93.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. 1983. On the interaction of word order and intonation: some OV constructions in Spanish. In F. Klein, ed. *Discourse perspectives on syntax*. NY: AP. Pp. 117-40.
- Vat, J. 1981. Left-dislocation, connectedness, and reconstruction. *GAGL* 20.80-103.
- Votre, S. 1982. Left-dislocation and topicalization in Spoken Portuguese. Ms.
- Ward, G. 1984. A pragmatic analysis of Epitomization: Topicalization it's not. *Papers in Linguistics* 17.145-61.
- Ward, G. 1985. *The semantics and pragmatics of preposing*. University of Pennsylvania



Ph.D. dissertation.

Ward, G. & E.F. Prince. 1986. On the topicalization of indefinite NPs. Paper presented at 1986 LSA Annual Meeting. New York.

## Language Index

Alutiiq	Rice
Catalan	Dallduví
Czech	Janda
Dakota	Sietsema
Danish	Tajima & Arimura
English	Abeillé; Barnes; Legendre; Levin & Rapoport de Reuse
Eskimo (Yupik)	Abeillé; Deane; Geluykens; Keenan; Kuno; Levin & Rapoport; Oh; Tajima & Arimura
French	Joseph
Greek	Breen
Italian	Selkirk & Tateishi; Tajima & Arimura
Japanese	Bashir
Kalasha	Bashir
Khowar	Ahn; Gerdt & Youn; Oh
Korean	Gorecka
Polish	Darden
Russian	Carreira; Dallduví
Spanish	Subramanian
Tamil	Bashir
Tibetan	Thomas
Vietnamese	