Appendix: Topic-marking properties of topicalization

In this appendix, I examine the discourse function of three left-dislocation constructions in Greek: topicalization, Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) and focus-fronting. More specifically, I consider a number of phonological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties which are standardly associated with topic-marking, in order to test the three left-dislocation constructions for topichood. As Table 1, below, illustrates, topicalization, like CLLD and unlike focus-fronting sentences, shows all the topic-marking properties listed therein, providing further support to the conclusion of section 2.1, that topicalization is a true topic-marking construction.

Property	CLLD	Topicalization	Focus Fronting
Old information	√	√	X
Separate intonational phrases	√	√	X
Multiplicity	√	√	X
Focus-fronted XP > dislocated XP	X	X	–
Dislocated XP > focus-fronted XP	√	√	–
Contrastive Topic interpretation	√	√	X
[TOPIC [COMMENT]]	√	√	X

The first two properties in Table 1 are discussed in the main text, thus the discussion below starts from the third property of the table.

Property 3: The left periphery can host multiple CLLDed/ topicalized phrases: Tsimpli (1995) among others has shown that there can be multiple CLLDed phrases in the left periphery as in (1a). This however does not hold for focus-fronted phrases, since multiple focus-fronting is not leads to ungrammaticality (1b). See Rizzi (1997) for similar observations in Italian. Crucially, (1c) demonstrates that topicalization aligns with CLLD in this respect, since multiple topicalization does not cause any problems.

(1)   a. [Ta luludhja],   [tu   koritsiou],   tu.ta=edhose   o Kostas.
          the flowers-ACC the   girl-DAT   it=them=gave-3SG   the Kostas
          'Kostas gave the flowers to the girl.'

      b. *[TA   LULUDHJA] [TU   KORITSIOU] edhose   o Kostas.
         the   flowers-ACC the   girl-DAT   gave-3SG the Kostas
      'Kostas gave the flowers to the girl.'

      c. [Luludhja],   [enos koritsiou], edhose   o Kostas.
         flowers-ACC a   girl-DAT gave-3SG the Kostas
         'Kostas gave the flowers to the girl.'

Against this background, here is a simple syntactic test that keeps focus-fronted and topic-marked phrases apart. Multiple focus-fronting is not allowed (1b), hence a focus-marked adverbial phrase in the left-periphery excludes additional focus-fronted phrases. This accounts for the ungrammaticality of the sentence in (2a) below. On the other hand, a focus-fronted adverbial phrase may freely co-occur with topic-phrases, thus the CLLD sentence in (2a) and the topicalization sentence in (2c) are perfectly fine.

(2) a. [To palto] [HTES]   to=aghorase o Kostas.
         the coat   yesterday bought-3SG   the Kostas
         'Kostas bought the coat YESTERDAY.'

     b. *[PALTO] [HTES]   aghorase   o Kostas.
          coat   yesterday bought-3SG   the Kostas
        '*Kostas bought A COAT YESTERDAY.'

     c.[Palto], [HTES]   aghorase   o Kostas.
        coat   yesterday bought-3SG   the Kostas
        'Kostas bought a coat YESTERDAY.'

Property 4: CLLDed/ Topicalized phrases may not follow a focus-fronted phrase. In Tsimpli (1990), it is shown that a CLLDed phrase may not follow a focus-fronted phrase (2a). This pattern is also found in topicalization. The sentence in (2b), with a topicalized phrase following the focus-fronted phrase *sti Maria* is degraded. Note that as we saw above, multiple focus-fronted phrases are excluded. This does not allow us to check for any ordering restrictions between two focus-fronted phrases.

(3) a.??[STI   MARIA]   [ta ghramata],   ta=estile   o Kostas.
          to-the   Mary   the letters   them= gave-3SG the Kostas
          'Kostas sent the letters TO MARY.'

     b. ??[STI   MARIA]   [ghramata],   estile   o Kostas.
           to-the   Mary   letters   gave-3SG   the Kostas
          'Kostas sent the letters TO MARY.'

Property 5: A CLLDed/ topicalized phrase may precede a focus-fronted phrase. Sentence (4a) shows that a CLLDed phrase may appear to the left of a focus-fronted phrase. This also holds true for topicalized phrases, as illustrated by (4b).

(4) a. [Ta ghramata],   [STI   MARIA]   ta=estile   o Kostas.
         the letters   to-the Mary   them=gave-3SG   the Kostas
         'Kostas sent the letters TO MARY.'

     b. [ghramata],[STI   MARIA]   estile   o Kostas.
         letters   to-the Mary   gave-3SG   the Kostas
         'Kostas sent the letters TO MARY.'

Putting together *Property 4* and *Property 5*, when a CLLDed/topicalized phrase co-occurs with a focus-fronted phrase, the former must precede the latter. This is reminiscent of the crosslinguistic generalization that topics may precede but may not follow foci (topic > focus, *focus > topic) (see

Neeleman & Vermeulen 2012: 4). This suggests that CLLDed and topicalized phrases in Greek are true topic-phrases.

Property 6: CLLD/Topicalization may express Contrastive Topic (C-TOP) interpretation: The presentation of a formal theory of C-TOP (e.g., Büring 2003) will take us too far afield. Here I restrict myself to the presentation of a specific C-TOP context and the investigation of the pragmatic effects of felicitous C-TOP sentences in this context. Here I focus on question-answer pairs with a *set-subset* relation, as in (5) which involves a question about a set of furniture while B's CLLD-answer is restricted to a subset of the furniture, to a set of chairs (*partial topics* in Büring (2003)). The following examples give rise to C-TOP interpretation which is associated with the presence of non-excluded alternative propositions (or speech acts, for Tomioka (2010)) which in turn give rise to a "pragmatic effect of uncertainty, non-finality, and/or incompleteness" (Tomioka 2010: 115). Indeed, B's CLLD-answer is felicitous with a C-TOP reading, which is compatible with an uncertainty, non-finality effect, expressed by the continuation in the brackets.

(5)   A: Pjos aghorase ta epipla? ('Who bought the furniture?')
        B: Tis karekles, tis=aghorase   i   Maria.
           the chairs   them=bought-3SG   the   Kostas
           'Mary bought the chairs.' ('I don't know who bought the table and the couch.')

How does focus-fronting behave in question-answer pairs in a set-subset relation? Does it trigger a C-TOP reading? This is examined in (6):

(6)   A: Pjos aghorase ta epipla? ('Who ate the furniture?')
        B: #TIS   KAREKLES   aghorase   i   Maria.
           the   chairs   bought-3SG   the   Mary
           'Mary bought THE CHAIRS.' (not the table or the couch.)

As it stands, B's answer with focus-fronting is infelicitous. The C-TOP reading which normally arises in set-subset question-answer pairs is not available in (6). As a matter of fact, focus-fronting in (6B) presupposes that someone has claimed that Mary has bought something other than chairs (i.e., *contrastive focus*). However no such claim seems to exist (at least explicitly) in the preceding discourse.
    Now consider (7), a pair with a question and a topicalization answer. As can be seen in (7), the topicalization sentence with a C-TOP reading is a felicitous answer in this context. As a conclusion, topicalization aligns with CLLD in allowing C-TOP readings in contexts with question-answer pairs in a set-subset relation.

(7) A: Pjos aghorase ta epipla? ('Who bought furniture?')
    B: Karekles, aghorase   i   Maria.
       chairs   bought-3SG   the   Kostas
       'Mary bought chairs.' (I don't know who bought the table and the couch.)

Property 7: CLLD/Topicalization involves a [TOPIC [COMMENT]] information structure: To start with, Rizzi (1997: 285), building on Reinhart (1981), argues that topic-marking maps sentences to the information structure [TOPIC [COMMENT]], while focus-fronting sentences are mapped to the information structure [FOCUS [PRESUPPOSITION]]. Restricting our attention to the comment/presupposition distinction, according to Rizzi (1997: 296-297) comment-domains allow

new information, while the presupposition-domain, as its name indicates, contains only information which is already part of the discourse. Witness (8) with a multiple wh-question and a CLLD-answer which is probably part of a longer pair-list answer. Crucially, the CLLD sentence, being a topic-marking sentence, is divided into the topic-phrase and the comment domain. Accordingly, there is no problem for the comment domain in (8B) to contain a phrase with new information (*sti Maria*), thus the sentence is pragmatically felicitous.

(8)   A: Ti edhose o Kostas se pjon? ('What did Kostas give to whom?')
        B: [TOPIC   To palto], [COMMENT to=edhose   sti   Maria.]] (ke ti bluza stin Eleni)
                    the coat   it=bought-3SG   to-the Mary
            'He gave the coat to Mary (and the T-shirt to Helen).'

Now consider a focus-fronting sentence in the same context. As (9) demonstrates, the result is infelicitous. According to what was said above, the source of the infelicity of (8B) is the presence of a phrase with new information (*sti Maria*) within the presupposition-domain.

(9)   A: Ti edhose o Kostas se pjon? ('What did Kostas give to whom?')
        B: #[FOCUS   TO PALTO], [PRESUPPOSITION   edhose   sti   Maria.]]
                      the coat   bought-3SG   to-the Mary
            'He gave THE COAT to Mary.'

Given the clear contrast between the two information structures in the context of multiple wh-questions in (8) and (9), I now turn to the information structure that underlies topicalization. (10B) is a pragmatically appropriate answer to the multiple question in (10A). This means that the presence of the discourse-novel phrase in the domain YP does not cause any discourse-related problems. It is thus concluded that the YP-domain in (10B) must be a comment-domain rather than a presupposition-domain. Consequently, topicalization involves the topic-marking information structure [TOPIC [COMMENT]].

(10)   A: Ti edhose o Kostas se pjon? ('What did Kostas give to whom?')
        B: [XP Lefta],   [YP edhose   sti   Maria.]] (kai pehnidhja stin Eleni)
               money   gave-3SG to-the Mary
            'He gave money to Mary (and toys to Helen).'

To conclude, the data presented above confirm the view that Greek topicalization, like CLLD, is a topic-marking strategy (see Alexopoulou & Folli 2019). Moreover, there are phonological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic (at the level of information structure) reasons to keep topicalization and focus-fronting apart, despite the lack of clitics in both constructions.