In this talk, I point out some empirical problems with a well known generalization in Spanish regarding reconstruction in clitic left dislocation structures (CLLD) and I try to revise the generalization in (1), reported in Spanish by Zubizarreta (1998: 114-115, ex. 38):

(1) **Asymmetry pre/postverbal subjects with respect to CLLD**

“A clitic left dislocated object can reconstruct below the preverbal subject, but not below the postverbal subject.”

In the paradigm below, the pronoun *su* contained in the accusative CLLD can be bound by the QP subject in preverbal position (see (2)a), but not by the QP subject in postverbal position (see (2)b), suggesting reconstruction of the dislocated DP in the first situation, but not in the second situation:

(2) a. *A su hijo, cada madre_1 deberá acompañar=lo_1 el primer día de escuela.*

“Each mother must accompany her child on the first day of school.”

b. ?*El primer día de escuela, a su hijo deberá acompañar=lo_1 cada madre_1.*

However, the acceptability of these structures seems to be affected by several factors such as the use of generic tense and modals with *cada* as a binder, the role of the type of verb involved and the quality of the QP binder/the bindee.

Empirically, the generalization in (1) requires a more careful examination in light of the recent discussion in the field about the syntax of preverbal and postverbal subjects. With respect to the nature of preverbal subjects, recent work by Suñer (2003), and Beas (2007) have claimed that preverbal subjects in Spanish correspond to two different patterns: a canonical pattern and a dislocation pattern. The table in (3) summarizes the salient properties of each type:

(3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1: Canonical Pattern</th>
<th>Type 2: Dislocation Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subjects move to its surface position to get Nominative Case.</td>
<td>1. Subjects do not receive Nominative in its surface position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subjects need not be specific</td>
<td>2. Subjects must be specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wide/narrow scope of subjects with QPs in object position and modals</td>
<td>3. Only wide scope of subjects with respect to polarity particles (<em>sí, no</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Located at [Spec, TP] below modal adverbials</td>
<td>4. Presumably located within the CP-system, higher than modal adverbials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crucially, the position of postverbal subjects has been claimed to correspond to the canonical type. Beas (2007) following the original insights of Zubizarreta (1994) has provided evidence from the distribution of lower adverbs to claim for a unified analysis of these two types. He argued that a postverbal subject in a VSO sequence and a canonical subject in preverbal position as in the sequence SVO are located in the [Spec, TP].

Given that the claim that preverbal subjects must be dislocated is subject to revision too, the generalization in (1) needs to be reformulated because we seem to have several preverbal subject positions, each with different associated properties.
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