Clitic Left Dislocation is Contrastive Topicalization*

Karlos Arregi

1 Introduction

A well-known restriction on Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) in Romance is that it cannot apply to certain QPs (see, among others, Rizzi 1986, 1997, Cinque 1990). In Spanish, while definite descriptions (1a) and indefinites like *algunos libros* 'some books' (1b) can be CLLD-ed, the indefinite *algo* 'something' cannot (2):

(1) a. Estos libros, Juan los leyó ayer.
these books Juan them read yesterday
'These books, Juan read yesterday.'
b. Algunos libros, Juan los leyó ayer.
some books Juan them read yesterday
'Some books, Juan read yesterday.'

(2) *Algo, Juan lo leyó ayer.
something Juan it read yesterday
'Something, Juan read yesterday.'

In certain contexts, left dislocation of *algo* is possible, but without a clitic (Cinque 1990, 73-76):[1]

(3) Algo, Juan sí (*lo) comió.
something Juan yes it ate
'Something, Juan did eat.'

*I am grateful to Noam Chomsky, Danny Fox, Irene Heim, Sabine Iatridou and David Pesetsky for very helpful comments and suggestions. This paper also benefitted from comments by Paul Elbourne, Kai von Fintel, Anthony Kroch, Luigi Rizzi, Michael Wagner, Alexander Williams, and the audiences at PLC 26 in Philadelphia and LSRL 32 in Toronto. I am also grateful to Ikuska Ansola-Badiola and Cristina Cuervo for their Spanish judgments. All errors are mine.

[1]The fact that (3) involves fronting of an XP without a clitic might suggest that this sentence involves focus-fronting. I argue at the end of §2 that this is not the case. In this paper, I shall refer to the constructions exemplified in the above (including CLLD) as left dislocation, and will have nothing to say about focus fronting.

In this paper, I provide an account of these properties of left dislocation in Spanish which relies on two hypotheses: (i) left dislocated phrases are interpreted as contrastive topics, and (ii) the clitic in CLLD is interpreted as a variable ranging over individuals.

2 Contrastive Topics and CLLD

The main discourse function of CLLD in Romance is to topicalize the dislocated phrase. In this section, I argue that CLLD involves a particular type of topicalization, namely *contrastive topicalization* (CT), and that this plays a crucial role in the explaining the facts mentioned in the introduction.

A contrastive topic is used in each of the partial answers to a multiple question, and corresponds to one of the *wh*-phrases in the question. In English, contrastive topics are marked by a characteristic intonation pattern which is different from that of the focused phrase (for details, see Jackendoff 1972, Büring 1997 and references cited there):

(4) Q: Who ate what?
A: $[\textit{Fred}]_{CT}$ ate [the BEANS]$_F$, and $[\textit{Bill}]_{CT}$ ate [the POTATOES]$_F$.

One can view the multiple question in (4) as a request to match members of a contextually salient set with members of a different set, giving a list of pairs. The contrastive topic in each partial answer (*Fred* and *Bill* in 4) denotes a member of the first one of these sets, and the focused phrase (*the beans* and *the potatoes* in 4) denotes a member of the other set. Each of the sentences in (4A) are partial answers to the question, i.e. each one is an answer to the question *What did x eat?* where *x*, the contrastive topic, is a member of some salient set of people. A consequence of this definition of CT is that the context needs to provide *contrast set* for a CT, i.e. a set of salient alternatives to the denotation of the CT.

In Spanish, a multiple question can be answered rather naturally with a sentence in which a CLLD-ed phrase is interpreted as a contrastive topic:

(5) Q: ¿A quién le diste qué regalo?
to who him you-gave which gift
'Who did you give which gift?'
A: A Juan, le di la moto, y a Pedro, le di el libro.
to Juan him I-gave the bike and to Pedro him I-gave the book
'Juan, I gave the bike, and Pedro, I gave the book.'

Furthermore, interpreting a CLLD-ed phrase as a CT seems to be obligatory. Consider the question in (6) and two possible answers to it:

(6) Q: ¿Qué le diste a Juan?
what him you-gave to Juan
'What did you give to Juan?'

A: Le di un libro (a Juan).
him I-gave a book to Juan
'I gave him/Juan a book.'

A': A Juan, le di un libro.
to Juan him I-gave a book
'Juan, I gave a book.'

While answer A is simply a complete answer to the question, answer A', which involves CLLD of *Juan*, in addition, presupposes that there are other people the speaker gave things to. That is, the speaker presupposes that Juan belongs to a set of individuals *x* for whom the question *What did you give x?* is relevant. This is precisely what we expect if CLLD-ed phrases are interpreted as CTs.

Consider the contrast between *algo* 'something' and *algunos libros* 'some books' in this light. As we saw in the introduction, the former cannot undergo CLLD, and the latter can:

(7) a. *Algo, Juan lo leyó ayer.
something Juan it read yesterday
'Something, Juan read yesterday.'

b. Algunos libros, Juan los leyó ayer.
some books Juan them read yesterday
'Some books, Juan read yesterday.'

Since CLLD-ed phrases are interpreted as CTs, they need a contrast set. In (7b), this set is a salient set of books, and *algunos libros* denotes a subset of this set.[2] I would like to propose that this is precisely what makes CLLD of *algo* in (7a) unacceptable. Independently of CLLD, *algo* cannot be used with reference to a salient set of individuals, as exemplified in (8):

(8) Q: ¿Quién quiere estos libros?
who wants these books
'Who wants these books?'

[2]Note that this means that the indefinite *algunos libros* is interpreted as a (plural) individual. See §3 for details.

A: Juan quiere algunos libros / algunos / #algo.
Juan wants some books some something
'Juan wants some books/some/something'

In the question in (8), *estos libros* 'these books' makes some set of books salient in the discourse. In the answer, *algunos (libros)* 'some (books)' can be used to refer to a subset of those books, but *algo* 'something' cannot. This explains why CLLD of *algo* in (7a) is not acceptable.

If this is the right explanation for the contrast in (7), we predict that left dislocation of *algo* should be possible, as long as we can provide a suitable contrast set for it. This prediction is borne out, as exemplified in (9):[3]

(9) A: Juan no comió nada.
Juan not ate anything
'Juan didn't eat anything.'
B: No; algo, Juan sí (*lo) comió, pero no mucho.
no something Juan yes it ate but not much
'No; Juan did eat something, but not much.'

In this example, the linguistic context provides a contrast set for the left dislocated quantifier which contains other quantifiers, i.e. *nothing* and *much*. Since this is an appropriate contrast set for *algo*, the sentence is felicitous. It is also important to note that the sentence containing the left dislocated quantifier has a *verum* focus interpretation, which is marked by the particle *sí* 'yes'. This also contributes to the felicity of the sentence: as we saw above (cf. 4-6), all sentences with a contrastive topic also contain some other constituent which is focused.[4]

[3]That left dislocation of quantifiers like *algo* is possible is noted by Cinque (1990, 73–76), but he does not provide a description of what kinds of contexts make it felicitous.

[4]In principle, given the right context, any other type of focus, not just *verum* focus, should be sufficient to make left dislocation of *algo* felicitous. For instance, focus on *Juan* in (9B) should be acceptable in a context in which the speaker is requested to match the members of the contrast set of *algo* with members of a set of people. Although this seems to be the case, examples involving *verum* focus sound more natural. Thus, there seems to be something special about *verum* focus, as opposed to other types of focus, which makes left dislocation of quantifiers like *algo* easier. At this moment, I cannot find a completely satisfactory answer to this question, and I leave it for future research.

Sentence (9B) also brings us to the second question being addressed in this paper. As can be seen in this example, left dislocation of *algo* cannot be accompanied by doubling of the left dislocated element by a clitic. This is in sharp contrast with more standard cases of left dislocation in Romance, in which doubling by a clitic is obligatory. In fact, this might lead one to think that the two constructions are different, and that left dislocation of *algo* in (9B) involves focus-fronting, which, as is well-known, cannot be accompanied by doubling by a clitic (see, among others, Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997). However, left dislocation in (9B) has every phonological, syntactic and semantic property of CLLD (except for the absence of the clitic) which make it different from focus fronting. Phonologically, *algo* is pronounced with the same intonation pattern as a CLLD-ed phrase, which means, among other things, that *algo* does not have focus accent. By contrast, focus fronted phrases always bear focus accent. In addition, left dislocation in (9B), just like CLLD, does not involve subject-auxiliary inversion, which is obligatory in focus fronting (see Laka 1990, 127-130, and references cited there). Finally, as I showed above, *algo* in (9) is interpreted as a contrastive topic, not as a focused phrase. To conclude, left dislocation of *algo* in (9B) is the same as CLLD, except that it does not involve a clitic.

In the next sections, I address the question of what determines the distribution of the clitic in left dislocation. What we have seen so far is that certain indefinites are doubled when left dislocated, and some are not. The following sections provide a characterization of the two kinds of indefinites and provide an account for their differing behavior with respect to the distribution of the clitic in left dislocation.[5]

3 CLLD and the Interpretation of Indefinites

In the previous section, I suggested that CLLD-ed *algunos libros* in (7b) denotes a subset of some salient set of books, i.e., in this context, the indefinite denotes a plural individual. In this section, I provide a more detailed characterization of the class of indefinites that can undergo CLLD, arguing that they are indefinites for which unrestricted wide scope readings are possible, and that

[5]Note that this question should be kept separate from the fact that the clitic is available in left dislocation only if it is more generally available in the language. Left dislocation of subjects and PPs cannot involve a clitic, since there are no such clitics. All the examples discussed in this paper involve left dislocation of objects, and the distribution of the clitic has to do with specific semantic properties of the left dislocated elements, not with their syntactic category or their grammatical function.

this captures the intuition that CLLD-ed indefinites like *algunos libros* denote individuals. Before presenting the arguments in §3.2, in §3.1 I provide a brief necessary discussion on unrestricted scope indefinites.

3.1 The Scope of Indefinites

It is well-known that certain indefinites can have unrestricted wide scope readings (see Fodor and Sag 1982, Reinhart 1997, Kratzer 1998). More specifically, there are cases in which indefinites (as opposed to universal quantifiers) can have wide scope readings which, in a QR account, would involve movement out of strong islands. This is exemplified in (10-11) (taken from Reinhart 1997):[6]

(10) John gave an A to [every student who recited *a difficult poem by Pindar*]
(11) [If *three relatives of mine* die], I will inherit a house.

In both sentences, the italicized indefinite can apparently be interpreted with scope outside the island that contains it: a relative clause in (10) and a conditional adjunct clause in (11). For instance, (11) is true if there are three particular relatives of mine such that if all of them die I inherit a house.

Since accounting for these apparent wide scope readings in terms of QR would entail allowing QR to cross strong islands to movement, the authors cited above have proposed that these readings are not the result of QR. Rather, indefinite DPs with this property have a non-quantificational reading which can account for this apparent wide scope. For the purposes of this paper, I shall refer to these indefinites as *unrestricted scope* indefinites.

In Reinhart's (1997) analysis of unrestricted scope indefinites, they are analyzed in terms of *choice functions*. A choice function applies to a set, i.e. a predicate, and yields a member of that set. In this account, an indefinite like *three relatives of mine* has the following denotation:

(12) $[\![\text{three relatives of mine}]\!] = f(\lambda X.|X| = 3 \;\&\; \text{relatives-of-mine}'(X))$
'the individual picked by the choice function f from the set of (plural) individuals whose cardinality is 3 and which are relatives of mine'

[6]The examples in (10-11) have been chosen so that the wide scope reading of the indefinite does not entail its narrow scope reading. The wide scope reading in these examples cannot be explained as a subcase of the (surface) narrow scope reading, which constitutes evidence that this reading is real (see Reinhart 1997, 340-342, and references cited there, for discussion).

In (12), the DP contains the predicate *three relatives of mine* and a variable over choice functions f which is bound by existential closure. The DP as a whole denotes the individual picked by f from the set denoted by the predicate.

In this account, a sentence like (11), repeated below as (13) has the interpretation in (14):

(13) [If *three relatives of mine* die], I will inherit a house.

(14) $\exists f[\mathrm{CH}(f)\ \&\ (f(\text{three relatives of mine})\ \text{die} \rightarrow \text{I will inherit a house})]$
'There is a choice function f such that, if the three relatives of mine picked by f die, I will inherit a house.'

The indefinite appears to have wide scope because it is, in essence, interpreted as a variable which is bound by existential closure. Since existential closure can apply arbitrarily far away from the choice function variable (this relation is not created through movement), the 'scope' of the indefinite can be arbitrarily wide. What is important to note about this analysis of unrestricted scope indefinites is that the indefinite DP is interpreted as the individual picked by the choice function. As I argue in the next subsection, this plays an important role in characterizing the class of indefinites that can undergo CLLD.[7]

3.2 Indefinites and CLLD

In §2, it was hypothesized that a DP headed by *algunos* can be interpreted as a (plural) individual, and that this is the crucial difference between *algunos* and *algo* that allows the former and not the latter to be CLLD-ed. In §3.1, it was noted that unrestricted scope indefinites are interpreted as individuals in the choice function analysis. Taken together, these two hypotheses make the prediction that the indefinites that can undergo CLLD are unrestricted scope indefinites, while those which undergo left dislocation without a clitic are not.

Initial support for this prediction comes from the fact that *algunos* can have scope outside an island that contains it, and *algo* cannot, as exemplified with conditional adjunct islands in (15).

(15) a. Si Juan lee algo, su madre no se enfadará.
if Juan reads something his mother not REFL will-get-angry
*'There is something such that, if Juan reads it, his mother won't get angry.'

[7] The specific details of the analysis of unrestricted scope indefinites are not important for the purposes of this paper. For instance, nothing would change in the analysis if we adopted Kratzer's (1998) version of the choice function account.

b. Si Juan lee algunos libros, su madre no se enfadará.
if Juan reads some books his mother not REFL will-get-angry
√'There are some books such that, if Juan reads them, his mother won't get angry.'

Thus, we can conclude that indefinites that are doubled by a clitic when left dislocated are unrestricted scope indefinites, and that those are not doubled do not have an unrestricted scope reading.

Further support for this hypothesis comes from left dislocation of other indefinites. Modified numerals, such as *more than three*, and other comparative indefinites, such as *too many*, are known to not be able to have unrestricted scope readings, as exemplified in (16). As predicted, they cannot be CLLD-ed (17), but they can be left dislocated without a clitic (18).

(16) a. Si leo más de tres libros, Juan no se enfadará.
if I-read more than three books Juan not REFL will-get-angry
*'There are more than three books such that, if I read them, Juan won't get angry.'

b. Si leo demasiados libros, Juan no se enfadará.
if I-read too many books Juan not REFL will-get-angry
*'There are too many books such that, if I read them, Juan won't get angry.'

(17) a. *Más de tres libros, Juan los leyó ayer.
more than three books Juan them read yesterday
'More than three books, Juan read yesterday.'

b. *Demasiados libros, Juan los leyó ayer.
too many books Juan them read yesterday
'Too many books, Juan read yesterday.'

(18) a. Más de tres libros, Juan sí leyó.
more than three books Juan yes read
'More than three books, Juan did read.'

b. Demasiados libros, Juan sí leyó.
too many books Juan yes read
'Too many books, Juan did read.'

On the other hand, DPs headed by unmodified numerals such as *three* can have unrestricted scope readings, and, accordingly, they can be CLLD-ed:

(19) a. Si Juan lee tres libros, su madre no se enfadará.
if Juan reads three books his mother not REFL will-get-angry

√'There are three books such that, if Juan reads them, his mother won't get angry.'

b. Tres libros, Juan los leyó ayer.
three books Juan them read yesterday
'Three books, Juan read yesterday.'

In a choice function analysis of unrestricted scope indefinites, they denote individuals, i.e. they are of the semantic type e. Furthermore, definite descriptions, which can also undergo CLLD, are also of type e. On the other hand, indefinites which cannot have unrestricted scope readings are not of type e (if they did, they *would* have unrestricted scope readings). Rather, they are interpreted as generalized quantifiers, i.e. of type $\langle\langle e,t\rangle, t\rangle$. Thus, it seems natural to connect all these observations into the following hypothesis:

(20) *Left Dislocation and Clitics (Version I)*
Left dislocation of XP involves doubling of XP iff XP is of type e.

This correctly predicts that definite descriptions and unrestricted scope indefinites, which are of type e, can undergo CLLD, and that other indefinites, which are of type $\langle\langle e,t\rangle, t\rangle$, do not involve a clitic when left dislocated.

Note that this is, in essence, the proposal made in Rizzi (1986) (see also Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997). He proposes that CLLD does not involve quantification, and that CLLD-ed DPs are not quantificational. The evidence provided in this paper shows that this is indeed true for indefinites: the ones that undergo CLLD are interpreted as individuals, not as quantifiers. However, (20) also predicts that all DPs which can undergo CLLD can be interpreted as of type e. This makes the wrong prediction for universal quantifiers such as *cada* 'each':

(21) Cada libro, *(lo) leyó Juan, y cada revista, *(la) leyó Pedro.
each book it read Juan and each magazine it read Pedro
'Each book, Juan read, and each magazine, Pedro read.'

As exemplified in (21), left dislocation of a DP headed by *each* obligatorily involves a clitic. Since a DP headed by *each* is of type $\langle\langle e,t\rangle, t\rangle$, not of type e, (20) cannot be the right hypothesis about the distribution of the clitic in left dislocation.[8]

[8]Evidence that DPs headed by *each* cannot be of type e is provided by the fact that this quantifier, like other universal quantifiers, cannot have unrestricted wide scope

4 Left Dislocation and Reconstruction

In the previous section, I argued that the distribution of the clitic in left dislocation is not related to the (non-)quantificational nature of the dislocated XP. Although this hypothesis seems to make the right prediction in the domain of indefinites, it makes wrong predictions with respect to universal quantifiers. I would like to propose that the distribution of the clitic is determined by the interpretation of the clitic itself:

(22) *Left Dislocation and Clitics (Final version)*
In left dislocation, the clitic is interpreted as an individual variable.[9]

(22) seems to be well-motivated, since, independently of CLLD, pronominal clitics in Romance are always interpreted as individual variables.[10]

This hypothesis predicts that, in left dislocation of an indefinite without a clitic, the variable which is bound by the dislocated phrase is not interpreted as ranging over individuals. In the remainder of this section, I argue that certain reconstruction facts provide evidence for this conclusion.

In Zubizarreta (1993) and Cecchetto (2000), it is argued that CLLD-ed phrases cannot reconstruct below a postverbal subject. This is exemplified in (23), where a pronoun in a CLLD-ed object cannot be bound by a postverbal subject QP:

---

readings, as discussed in the literature on indefinites cited in §3.1. This shows that *each* cannot be analyzed in terms of choice functions. However, it is possible that an alternative account could be developed in which DPs headed by *each* are of type e and still not be able to have unrestricted scope readings. However, I have not been able to find any independent evidence that this might be the case.

[9]This assumes that it is the clitic itself that is interpreted as the variable bound by the left dislocated phrase. However, it could easily be reformulated so that what is bound is a covert pronoun which is licensed by the clitic. Likewise, the account developed in this section is also compatible with analyses of left dislocation which involve movement (e.g. Cecchetto 2000) and those that do not (e.g. Cinque 1990, Iatridou 1995).

[10]This is true of the pronominal clitics discussed in this paper. However, this is probably not the case for some uses of other Romance clitics such as French *en* or Italian *ne* (which are not available in Spanish). At this point, it is not clear to me whether the analysis defended in this paper has anything to say about these clitics or about CLLD involving them. I leave this as a question for future research.

(23)*A su_1 hijo, deberá acompañarlo cada $madre_1$.
to her son will-have to-accompany-him each mother
'Her_1 son, each $mother_1$ will have to accompany.'

Scope facts also support the same conclusion: the CLLD-ed object in (24) has obligatory wide scope with respect to the postverbal subject:

(24) Cada libro, lo leyeron menos de tres estudiantes.
each book it read less than three students
√each > less than 3: 'For each book *x*, there are less than three students that read *x*.'
*less than 3 > each: 'There are less than three students that read every book.'

For instance, (24) is not true in a situation in which some book was read by four students. This would only be possible under the ungrammatical reading.

On the other hand, when left dislocation does not involve a clitic, it seems that the reconstructed reading is actually the only possible one:

(25) Menos de tres libros, sí leyó cada estudiante.
less than three books, yes read each student
√each > less than 3: 'For each student *x*, there are less than three books that were read by *x*.'
*less than 3 > each: 'There are less than three books that were read by every student.'

For instance, (25) would not be true in a context in which some student read four books. It seems that (obligatory) reconstruction of the left dislocated object is the only way in which we can explain this reading. In particular, it cannot be explained by assuming that the subject can QR over the left dislocated phrase. If this were possible, we would expect (25) to be ambiguous, since QR is optional. Furthermore, this would also predict wide scope for the subject in the CLLD example in (24), which is not the case. It seems that the only possible conclusion is that left dislocation without a clitic, as opposed to CLLD, reconstructs obligatorily.

However, binding tests suggest the opposite conclusion:

(26) Un libro suyo, sí leyó cada estudiante.
a book his yes read each student

Possible reading: each > a; 'his' is not bound by 'each student'
√'For each student x, there is a book of John's that x read.'
Impossible reading: each > a; 'his' is bound by 'each student'
*'For each student x, there is a book of x's that x read.'

In this example, the left dislocated indefinite has narrow scope with respect to the subject. However, binding of the pronoun in the object by the subject is still not possible. In other words, left dislocation without a clitic displays scope reconstruction effects, but no binding reconstruction effects.

What is puzzling about these facts is that they cannot be accounted for by using standard syntactic means of explaining reconstruction effects. For instance, if one assumes Chomsky's (1993) Copy Theory of movement, reconstruction effects can be obtained by deleting the higher copy of the moved phrase. However, this results in both scope and binding reconstruction effects, so this is not a possible explanation for the facts discussed above.

Lechner (1998), after noting reconstruction asymmetries in scrambling in German which are very similar to those discussed in this section, proposes that they can be accounted for by *semantic*, rather than syntactic, reconstruction. As argued in Cresti 1995 and Rullmann 1995, a moved QP has a reconstructed scope reading if its trace is of the same type as the QP, i.e. $\langle\langle e,t\rangle, t\rangle$, rather than type e. Leaving a trace of a higher type has the effect of 'undoing' the movement with respect to scope. Under this analysis, the narrow scope reading of the left dislocated object in (26) would be obtained as follows (ignoring, for now, the interpretation of the pronoun):

(27) $[\![$[[a book of his]$_1$ [each student$_2$ [$t_{1,\langle\langle e,t\rangle,t\rangle}$[VP t_2 read $t_{1,e}$]]]]$]\!] = 1$ iff
$[\lambda Q.\forall x[x \text{ is a student} \rightarrow Q(\lambda y.x \text{ read } y)]]\,([\![\text{a book of his}]\!]) = 1$ iff
$\forall x[x \text{ is a student} \rightarrow \exists y[y \text{ is a book of his } \& \; x \text{ read } y]]$

The trace of the left dislocated indefinite, $t_{1,\langle\langle e,t\rangle,t\rangle}$, is interpreted as the variable Q, which is of type $\langle\langle e,t\rangle, t\rangle$.[11] This has the effect of lambda-converting the indefinite back into the position of the trace. This way of achieving reconstruction effects is termed 'semantic', since it only uses semantic means; it does not involve any syntactic operation such as lowering or deleting the higher copy.

[11]Note that this trace is adjoined to VP and binds a trace of type e in the base position of the object. I assume that this is the result of the left dislocated object having moved first to this intermediate position. This assumption is necessary, given that something of type $\langle\langle e,t\rangle, t\rangle$ cannot be interpreted in object position.

A crucial property of semantic reconstruction is that it cannot derive binding reconstruction effects, since lambda conversion is not possible if a variable (*his* in 27) gets bound as a result of the operation. Thus, we can obtain the right results if we assume that left dislocation without a clitic involves semantic reconstruction, i.e. the trace of the dislocated trace is of type $\langle\langle e,t\rangle,t\rangle$.[12] This is precisely what is predicted by (22). Left dislocation in this case cannot involve a clitic because the variable is not of type e.

In sum, there is a correlation between reconstruction effects and the distribution of the clitic. As predicted by (22), phrases which are doubled by a clitic when left dislocated do not display semantic reconstruction effects, and those that are not doubled do display semantic reconstruction effects. As argued above, in left dislocation, indefinites without unrestricted scope readings reconstruct obligatorily, and other DPs do not reconstruct,[13] and the distribution of the clitic reflects this fact.

5 Conclusion

I have argued in this paper that left dislocated phrases in Spanish are interpreted as contrastive topics, and that this explains why left dislocation of certain indefinites requires special contexts. Furthermore, I have presented evidence that these indefinites are those which cannot have unrestricted scope readings. Finally, in order to explain why left dislocation of these indefinites cannot involve clitic doubling, I proposed that they reconstruct semantically, and that clitics can only be interpreted as variables ranging over individuals.

References

Büring, Daniel. 1997. *The meaning of topic and focus: the 59th Street bridge accent.* New York: Routledge.

[12]As noted in Lechner (1998), the reconstruction patterns discussed here constitute evidence that both semantic and syntactic reconstruction are necessary. In particular, while there are cases discussed in the literature which can only be accounted for in terms of syntactic reconstruction, the data discussed here and in Lechner (1998) can only be accounted for in terms of semantic reconstruction. This provides evidence against attempts to eliminate either semantic reconstruction (Fox 2000, Romero 1997) or syntactic reconstruction (Sternefeld 1997).

[13]Note that this difference between the two kinds of DPs remains unexplained. I leave this as a question for future research.

Cecchetto, Carlo. 2000. Doubling structures and reconstruction. *Probus* 12:93–126.
Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20*, ed. Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of Ā-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Cresti, Diana. 1995. Extraction and reconstruction. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:79–122.
Fodor, Janet, and Ivan Sag. 1982. Referential and quantificational indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5:355–398.
Fox, Danny. 2000. *Economy and semantic interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press and MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
Iatridou, Sabine. 1995. Clitics and island effects. In *Proceedings of PLC 19*, 11–30. Philadelphia: Penn Linguistics Club.
Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Kratzer, Angelika. 1998. Scope or pseudoscope? Are there wide scope indefinites? In *Events and grammar*, ed. Susan Rothstein, 163–196. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Laka, Itziar. 1990. Negation in syntax: On the nature of functional categories and projections. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Lechner, Winfried. 1998. Two kinds of reconstruction. *Studia Linguistica* 52:276–310.
Reinhart, Tanya. 1997. Quantifier scope: How labor is divided between QR and choice functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20:335–397.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. On the status of subject clitics in Romance. In *Studies in Romance linguistics*, ed. Osvaldo Jaeggli and Carmen Silva-Corvalán, 391–419. Dordrecht: Foris.
Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative syntax*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Romero, Maribel. 1997. The correlation between scope reconstruction and connectivity effects. In *Proceedings of WCCFL XVI*, 351–365. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
Rullmann, Hotze. 1995. Maximality in the semantics of *wh*-constructions. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 1997. *The semantics of reconstruction and connectivity*, volume 97 of *Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340*. Universität Stuttgart and Tübingen.
Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 1993. The grammatical representation of topic and focus: Implications for the structure of the clause. In *Cuadernos de lingüística 2*. Madrid: Instituto Universitario Ortega y Gasset.

4088 Foreign Language Building
University of Illinois
707 South Matthews Avenue
Urbana, IL 61821-3625
karlos@alum.mit.edu