Clitic Left Dislocation is Contrastive Topicalization

It is a well-known fact that 'bare' quantifiers, as opposed to lexically restricted ones, cannot undergo Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) in Spanish (Rizzi 1986, Cinque 1990):

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

b. Algunas cartas, las recibimos ayer.
some letters, them we-received yesterday
Some letters, we received yesterday.

I propose that CLLD-ed elements are interpreted as Contrastive Topics (CT), and that this accounts for the contrast in (1). As I show below, a CT presupposes a *contrast set*, i.e. a set of elements which are possible alternatives to the referent denoted by the CT. Thus, CLLD is felicitous only if the context provides such a set for the CLLD-ed element, or if such a context can be easily accommodated. The contrast in (1) follows from the fact that, while it is difficult to provide a contrast set for a bare Q such as *algo*, it is much easier to provide one for lexically restricted Qs.

1. Contrastive Topics. CTs are used in answers to multiple questions (Jackendoff 1972, Büring 1997):

(2) A: Who ate what?

B: *Fred* ate the BEANS. *John* ate the POTATOES.

A multiple question is a request to provide a pairing between elements contained in two different salient sets. In each of the propositions which constitute the answer, the element belonging to the first set receives CT intonation (in italics in 2b), while the element belonging to the other set receives focus accent (in upper case in 2b). Hence, a CT can be thought of as providing part of the answer to a multiple question, and thus presupposes the existence of a set of alternatives to the denotation of the CT, i.e. a *contrast set*.

2. CLLD and Contrastive Topics. I propose that CLLD-ed phrases are CTs. A multiple question can be answered naturally with sentences involving CLLD. The CLLD-ed element is a CT:

(3) A: ¿A quién le diste qué regalo?
to who him you-gave which gift
Who did you give which gift?

B: *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.

Further evidence for this hypothesis is provided by the different interpretations assigned to the two answers in (4) below. While in (i) B is simply giving a complete answer to the question asked by A, in (ii), B presupposes that there are other individuals he gave gifts to (see Vallduví 1995).

(4) A: ¿Qué le diste a Juan?
what him you-gave to Juan
What did you give to Juan?

B: i. Le di UN LIBRO (a Juan).
him I-gave a book to Juan
I gave him/Juan a book.

ii *A Juan*, le di UN LIBRO.
to Juan him I-gave a book
Juan, I gave a book.

In particular, (ii) is a request to consider a different question, i.e. *Who did you give what?* and the answer in this case is a partial answer to this implicit question. Thus, by making *Juan* into a CT, B presupposes that *Juan* belongs to a set of individuals x for whom the question *What did you give x?* is relevant. This supports the hypothesis that CLLD-ed phrases are interpreted as CTs.

3. CLLD and 'Bare' Quantifiers. Consider the QPs involved in the contrast in (1). In (1b), the CLLD-ed QP is an existential quantifier whose restriction is the set of letters. Since, by hypothesis, it is interpreted as a CT, the sentence presupposes that there is a set of alternative letters. Thus, (1b) is only felicitous if there is a contextually salient set of letters over which *some* can quantify. On the other hand, the QP in (1a), *algo* 'something', cannot be used to quantify over a contextually salient set:

(5) A: ¿Quién quiere las cartas?
who wants the letters?

B: Juan quiere algunas cartas / #algo.
Juan wants some letters something

Therefore, the contrast in (1) is explained by the impossibility of using *algo* in reference to a contrast set. In fact, this analysis makes the correct prediction that, in contexts in which a contrast set can be provided to a bare quantifier, CLLD should be possible:

(6) A: Juan no comió nada.
Juan not ate anything
Juan ate nothing.

B: No; *algo*, Juan sí comió, pero no mucho.
no something Juan yes ate but not much
No; Juan did eat something, but not a lot. [Contrast set: $\{nothing, a\ lot\}$]

(6) provides a suitable contrast set whose members are quantifiers. Note that left dislocation in this case does not involve a clitic, even though it has all the other relevant features that CLLD has (i.e. characteristic intonation and requirement of a contrast set). I propose that the appearance of the clitic is dependent on the semantic type of the members of the contrast set: a clitic is required if they are individuals, and it is not allowed if they are quantifiers.

4. Conclusion. The hypothesis that CLLD involves contrastive topicalization explains why a QP cannot be CLLD-ed if it cannot be provided with a contrast set. In previous analyses (e.g. Rizzi 1986), it was proposed that CLLD does not involve quantification, and that while bare QPs can only be interpreted as quantifiers binding a variable, lexically restricted QPs need not. On the other hand, the present analysis does not need these stipulations, and offers an explanation in which all QPs are always treated as quantifiers binding a variable.