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0. Introduction
As is well-known, in Old Spanish and Old Catalan contrastive focus, see (1), obtains whenever a word or a constituent is moved to the left, to the Specifier of Contrastive Focus Phrase, bringing about subject-verb inversion. This type of focus fronting has been widely attested in Old Spanish.²:

(1) a. Bien sepa el abbat que buen galardon dello pendra [Çid, v.:386]
   well know the abbot who good award of-it take
   ‘The abbot has to know well that he will have good award for it’

   b. Si del campo bien salides, grand ondra auredes vos [Çid, v.:3565]
   if from the field well go-out, great honour will-have you
   ‘If you come out of the battlefield well, you will be honoured to the highest degree’

   c. Mas poc profitara si érem enseyzat e no érem reemutz [CICA: Vides de Sants Rosselloneses. Segle XIIIb: 14]
   but little will-benefit if were taught and not were redeemed
   ‘However, we would have little benefit if we were taught and not redeemed’

   d. E dix la dita Johana: "e on és?", e respòs Jacme: "a Sexona l’ é lexat, mas esta nit hic serà ... " [CICA: Llibre de Cort de Justícia d’Alcoi (1263-65). Segle XIIIB: fol. 3r] and said the mentioned Joan: and where is he?, and answered James: in Sexona him have left, but this night here (he)will-be
   ‘And the mentioned Joan said: And where is he?, and James answered: In Sexona have I left him, but tonight he will be here’

The data in (2) show that contrastive focus clearly differs from clitic left dislocation, which exhibits a resumptive pronoun:

(2) a. Alos de myo Çid ya les tuellen el agua [Çid: v. 661]
   to-the of myo Çid by-now them take-away, the water
   ‘By now those that go with myo Çid have been taken the water away’

   b. ...allò no u atorga la comunitat [Eiximenis, Dotzè: 1a part, Vol. I, 134]
   that not it give the community
   ‘That is not given by the community’

Old Spanish and Old Catalan display another focalization strategy which gives as a result a weak or unmarked focus. Both contrastive focus and unmarked focus cause subject-verb inversion, but they can be clearly told apart by the divergent intonation patterns they exhibit. Benincà (2004) supplies wide evidence for unmarked focus among medieval Romance, as illustrated in (3). Besides, several recent works show that some Modern Romance languages still have an unmarked focalization pattern available, as in Sicilian (see Cruschina 2008, 2009...

(3) a. Autre chose ne pot li roi trouver [Mort le roi Arta: c. 1230, 101; Benincà (2004)] OLD FRENCH another thing not can the king find ‘The king cannot find any other thing’

b. Mal cosselh donet Pilat [Venjansa de la mort de Nostre Señor, 106; Benincà (2004)] OLD PROVENÇAL bad advice gave Pilate ‘Pilate gave bad bad advice’

c. Con tanta paceença sofria ela esta enfermidade [Diálogos de Sao Gregório; Benincà (2004)] OLD PORTUGUESE with so-much patience suffered her this disease ‘She endured this disease with huge patience’

d. Bon vin fa l’uga negra [Bonvesin da la Riva, 1280; Benincà (2004)] OLD MILANESE good wine makes the grape black ‘Black grapes make good wine’

e. Ciò tenne il re a grande maraviglia [Il Novellino, II, 1300; Benincà (2004)] OLD FLORENTIN this has the king as a great wonder ‘The king regards this as a great wonder’

In addition to prosodic evidence, there are clear semantic differences between both types of phenomena. Thus, on interpretive terms, weak focus does not necessarily entail a contrastive reading, whereas contrastive focus “identifies by contrastive exclusion the complement of the focus within the set of alternatives”. (Cruschina 2009: 24, f. n. 13).

The structure of this chapter is as follows. The first section is devoted to the study of the nature and properties of weak or unmarked focus and its vitality in Old Spanish and Old Catalan. In the second section we examine the behaviour of these constructions in Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan, and we conclude that both languages pattern differently in this aspect. On the basis of this evidence, we claim that there has been a grammatical change concerning weak focus from Old Catalan to Modern Catalan. Finally, in the last section, we explore the asymmetry between Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan and provide an explanation to account for this asymmetry and also for the grammatical change undergone by Modern Catalan, which we relate to the properties of the polarity node.

1. Weak focus in Old Spanish and Old Catalan

1.1. Old Spanish

Weak focus involves leftward fronting of a constituent with different functions: arguments and adjuncts. This is shown in (4) and (5), respectively:

- **OBJECT PREPOSING**

(4) a. *Los quinientos marcos* dio Minaya al abbat [Çid: v. 1422] the 500 marks gave Minaya to-the abbot ‘Minaya gave the abbot the 500 marks’

b. *este logar* mostro dios a abraam [GE, I. fol. 62v; Fontana (1993)]
this place showed God to Abraham
‘God showed Abraham this place’

- ADJUNCT PREPOSING
(5) a. *en mano* traen desnuda el espada [*Cid: v. 471]*
   In had brings uncovered the sword
   ‘He has the uncovered sword in his hand’
   b. *De Ebrón* enbió Jacob so fijo Josep a Sychem por veer sos ermanos [Fazienda: 43]
   From Ebron sent Jacob his son Joseph to Sychem to see his brothers
   ‘Jacob sent Joseph, his son, from Ebron to Sychem to see his brothers’

Weak focus fronting applies also to different categories, as adjectives (6), past participles (7), or quantifiers (8):

- ADJECTIVE PREPOSING
(6) a. *Alegre* es doña Ximena & sus fíjitas amas [*Cid: v. 1801; Batllori (1993)]
   happy is lady Ximena and her daughters both
   ‘Lady Ximena and both her daughters are happy’
   b. Non podían beber de las aguas [...] que *amargas* eran [Fazienda: 72; Batllori (1993)]
   not could drink of the waters that sour were
   ‘They could not drink that water because it was sour’
   c. *Vivo* es e sano [Fazienda: 56; Batllori (1993)]
   alive is and sound
   ‘He is alive and well’

- PAST PARTICIPLE PREPOSING
(7) a. *betatu* lo atay [Glosas Silenses: 295; Batllori (1993)]
   vetoed it has forbade
   (that he) has forbidden it
   b. lo que en muchos días acabado non as [Buen Amor: 579; Batllori (1993)]
   it that in many days finished not have
   ‘what you have not finished in many days’
   c. *Benedicto* sea Abraam de Dyos [Fazienda: 44; Batllori (1993)]
   blessed be Abraham by God
   ‘Let Abraham be blessed by God’
   d. las puertas de mi casa aviertas las tenía [BerCEO, Mil.: 639c; Batllori (1993)]
   the doors of my house open them I had
   ‘I had the doors of my house open’

- QUANTIFIER PREPOSING
(8) a. *Fazerlo* he; más *mucho* me pesará si os bien non fuere [CORDE: c. 1400-1498, Anónimo, El baladro del sabio Merlin con sus profecías]
   Do-it-have1ST.SG; but much me upset3SG.FUTURE indicative if you well not go3SG.FUTURE subjunctive
   ‘I will do it, but it will greatly upset me if you did not succeed’
   b. & por esto *poco* se mesclaua con la multitud [CORDE: 1379-1384, Juan Fernández de Heredia, Traducción de Vidas paralelas de Plutarco, III]
   and for this little reason he hardly mixed with the crowd
   ‘And for this reason he hardly mixed with the crowd’
c. omes & mugieres que algo tienen de lo mio o que algo me deuen en Villa nueva
[CORDE: C. 1218, a 1300. Anónimo, Carta de nombramiento]
men and women that something have\textsubscript{3RD.PL} of the mine or that something to-me
owe\textsubscript{3RD.PL} in Villanueva
‘(there are) men and women that have something mine or that owe me something in
Villanueva’

1.2. Old Catalan
Old Catalan examples show exactly the same behaviour as their Spanish counterpart.\textsuperscript{4} Focus
fronted elements can also be arguments, as in (9), or adjuncts, as in (10):

• Object preposing
(9) a. Los chamins e les charreres popличes fa trenrar e clodir [1190-1210. Greuges dels
the paths and the roads public makes\textsubscript{3RD.SG} destroy and close
‘He makes destroy and close the public paths and roads’

b. D’aquesta misèria de la comunitat parla la Escriptura en molts lochs [Eiximenis,

Dotzè: la part, Vol. I, 180]
Of this misfortune of the community talks\textsubscript{3RD.SG} the Holy-Scriptures in many places
‘The Holy Scriptures tell us about this community misfortune in many places’

• Adjunct preposing
(10) a. Declarades aquestes .iii. causes, en lo sermó será gran doctrina al poble per conecer e
amar virtuts e per conecer e a desamar pecats [Llull, Virtuts e Pecats.: 8]

stated these four causes, in the sermon will-be great doctrine to-the people for know and
love virtues and for know and to loose-affection sins
‘Once these four causes have been stated, the sermon will provide people with fine
understanding to recognize and favour virtues and to identify and reject sins’

b. En semblant manera no porás forçar que sies just per justicia [Llull, Virtuts e Pecats.: 13]
in similar manner not can\textsubscript{2SG.FUTURE} force that be\textsubscript{2SG.SUBJUNCTIVE} fair for justice
‘In a similar way you will not be able to force you to be fair on rightness’

Apart from their functional status, focus fronted elements can belong to different categories,
that is, adjectives, as in (11), past participles, as in (12), or quantifiers, as in (13):

• Adjective preposing
(11) a. si fas lo contrari, injust e imprudent serás [Llull, Virtuts e Pecats.: 52; Batllori (1993)]

if you-do the opposite, unjust and imprudent you-will-be
‘if you do the opposite, you will be unfair and careless’

b. foyl es home glot [Llull, Virtuts e Pecats.: 251; Batllori (1993)]

fool is man greedy
‘The greedy man is fool’

• Participle preposing
(12) a. Mostrats avem dones los secrets [Llull, Virtuts e Pecats: 175; Batllori (1993)]

Shown we-have so the secrets
‘So we have shown the secrets’
   promised him it have\textsubscript{1ST.PL}
   ‘we have promised it to him’

• QUANTIFIER PREPOSING

(13) a. Mon senyor e lo meu bé, molt me enuja la vostra partida [\textit{CICA}: s. XVb, \textit{Curial e Güelfa}.]
   My lord and the my good, much to-me annoy\textsubscript{3RD.SG} the your departure
   ‘My lord and my dear, your departure annoys me a lot.’

b. E ell testis dix: ... que massa vianda m’avets dada, la qual ne volria haver gitada, no que me’n donets més [1374-1377. \textit{Un matrimoni desavingut i un gat metzinat: procés criminal barceloni del segle XIV}; J. A. Rabella (1998:30)]’and the witness said: ... that too-much food to-me have\textsubscript{2ND.PL} given, the-that of-it would-like have thrown-up, not that to-me of-it give\textsubscript{2ND.PL} more.
   ‘and the witness said: ... that you have given me too much food, which I would rather had thrown up than that you had given me more.’

c. aquells qui poch ho han a tenir ne són pus cruels, arrancant-ne ço que poden, ne’s curen de la justícia pensant que poch ho han a tenir [Eiximenis, \textit{Dotzè}: 1a part, vol I: 191]
   those who little it have\textsubscript{3RD.PL} to have not are more cruel, tearing-out not this that can\textsubscript{3RD.PL} not REF.PRON care for the justice thinking that little it have\textsubscript{3RD.PL} to have.
   ‘those who will scarcely have it are neither crueler by tearing out what they can nor avoid judgement by thinking that they will not quite have it’

1.3. Further properties of weak focus

In addition to the properties discussed so far, there is crucial evidence to show that weak focus fronted constituents pattern as focal elements. Notice in this respect that adjacency is required between the fronted element and the finite verb. Consequently, the subject (when lexically realized) appears in a postverbal position, as illustrated in (14):

(14) a. [\textit{SX De Ebrón} enbió Jacob so fijo Josep a Sychem =\textit{(5b)}
   b. [\textit{SX Alegre} es doña Ximena =\textit{(6a)}
   c. dix que [\textit{SX fleuma} era e que [\textit{SX mala vianda} eren los blets
   d. Mon senyor e lo meu bé, [\textit{SX molt} me enuja la vostra partida

Furthermore, no resumptive pronoun occurs in object fronting constructions, which rules out an analysis along the lines of clitic left dislocation. This is shown in (15):

(15) a. [\textit{SN Los quinientos marcos} dio Minaya al abbat =\textit{(4a)}
   b. [\textit{SN este logar} mostro dios a abraam =\textit{(4b)}
   c. [\textit{SN Los chamins e les charreres publices}] fa trencar e elodir

=(9a)
Given the assumption that the constructions under study are focal in nature, we would expect them to only occur in matrix clauses. However, a potential problem arises with the examples in (16), which show that WFF is also attested in embedded sentences:

(16) a. Juro ego ... che ... treva et paz tenré et a mos òmens tener la mannaré [XII. Jurament de pau i treva del comte Pere Ramon de Pallars Jussà al bisbe d’Urgell (1098-1112), Moran-Rabella (2001: 64-65); Batllori-Iglésias-Martins (2005: 165)]
    Swear I ... that ... truce and peace will-have and to my men have it will-order ‘I swear that I will keep truce and peace and that I will order my hosts to keep them, too’

b. dit m’an que clams volets fer a la cort d’aquest mal fet que ma filla n’Anthònia vos ha fet [1374-1377. Un matrimoni desavingut i un gat metzinat: procés criminal barceloní del segle XIV; J. A. Rabella (1998:32)]
    said to-me have3RD.PL that claims want2ND.PL (to) make to the court of this bad act that my
dughter the Antoinette youCL have3RD.SG made
    ‘They told me that you want to make claims to the court because of the evil things that
my daughter Antoinette did to you’

c. De la reyna Dona Maria, nostra mare, volem aytant dir que, si bona dona havia e’l món,
que ela ho era en tembre e en honrar Déu e en altres bones costumes que en ela eren
[CICA: Jaume I, Llibre dels fets del rei en Jaume (1325-1349): fol 4r]
    Of the queen lady Mary, our mother, want1ST.PL such say that, if good woman
have3RD.SG,IMPERSONAL in the world, that she it was in fear and in honour God and in other
good habits that in here were3RD.PL
    ‘Concerning our mother, lady Mary, the queen, we want to say that if there were
a perfect woman in the world, it would be her because she fears and honours God and has
other good habits’

d. e dix-li que li retés l’arcènich que venut li h[avi]a, cor mal li estava que ell, qui son
amich era, lo aportàs [a perill] de perdre lo cors e’l haver [1374-1377. Un matrimoni desavingut i un gat metzinat: procés criminal barceloní del segle XIV; J. A. Rabella
(1998:47)]
    and said to-him that him returned the arsenic that sold him had, because bad him were
that he, who his friend was, him brought to danger of loosing the body and the assets
    ‘And he told him to give back the arsenic he had sold him, because he considered it
dreadful that he, who was his friend, had put him in danger to the point of loosing his
body and his assets’

e. Non podian bever de las aguas [...] que amargas eran [Fazienda: 72; Batllori (1993)]
    not could drink of the waters that sour were
    ‘They could not drink that water because it was sour’

Nevertheless, it must be taken into account that the kind of subordinate sentences that host weak focus exhibit properties of root sentences. That is, they instantiate cases of embedded clauses depending on verbs that select indicative like jurar “to swear” (16a), dir, “to say” (16b), peripheral adverbial clauses (16c, 16e), and non restrictive relative clauses (16d).

Now, returning to the examples in (14), some authors, paying attention to the O-V-S order, concluded that medieval Romance displayed V2 properties and that medieval Romance languages were similar to Germanic ones in this respect:

(17) [SPEC IP este lugar, [I mostró] [VP Dios [V [v t v t] a Abraham]]]]
    [Fontana (1993:73)]
Consistent with the cartographic approach developed from Rizzi (1997) onwards— that supplied a split CP domain to give an adequate explanation of the relationship between the syntactic representation of the sentence and its pragmatic and information structure—, several scholars have regarded the examples under study as cases of focalization which can correspond to different types of foci: 6

‘The hypothesis that the Focus Field can host various kinds of Foci is relevant in particular for medieval Romance languages. This area appears to be more easily activated in those languages than in modern Italian, so that we find there not only contrastive Focus or wh elements, but also less ‘marked’ elements (an identificational, informational or ‘unmarked’ focus, an anaphoric operator, or even elements with the pragmatic characteristics of a topic ‘put in relief’) [Benincà (2004: 251)]

This view, applied to Fontana’s example, would give the following representation: 7

\[(18) \quad \begin{align*}
a. & \left[\text{FORCEP} \left[\text{TOPICP} \left[\text{FOCUSP} \ldots \left\{\text{UNMARKED FOCUS} \left[\text{SPEC} \text{este lugar}, \left[\text{UFOCUS} \left[\text{UFOCUS mostró}]]\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]\right] \left[\text{FNP} \ldots \left[\text{VP} \text{Diós} \left[\text{V'} \left[\text{V'} \text{t} \left[\text{Abraham}]]\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]
b. & \left[\text{FORCEP} \left[\text{TOPICP} \left[\text{FOCUSP} \ldots \left\{\text{UNMARKED FOCUS} \left[\text{SPEC} \text{d’auqestà misèria de la comunitat}, \left[\text{UFOCUS} \left[\text{UFOCUS parla]]}\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]\right]\right] \left[\text{FNP} \ldots \left[\text{VP} \text{la Escriptura} \left[\text{V'} \text{tv t}]]\right]\right]\right]\right]
\end{align*}\]

The analysis in (18) expresses the fact that this pattern of focus fronting obtains by the leftward movement of unmarked non-focal (or mildly focal) elements that would end up in a left peripheral functional category hierarchically lower than contrastive focus.

2. Weak Focus in Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan

2.1. A preliminary overview to the data

The general picture sketched in the preceding section exhibits a regularity which sharply contrasts with the one offered by a comparison of Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan data, which shows that weak focus is more restrictive in the latter than in the former. The following examples illustrate that, whereas Modern Spanish still allows these configurations (19), most of them are ungrammatical in Modern Catalan (20):

\[(19) \quad \begin{align*}
a. & \text{Mucho me temo que la crisis no ha tocado fondo} \\
& \quad \text{‘I am afraid that the crisis has not finished yet’}

b. & \text{Sus razones tendrá para actuar de este modo} \\
& \quad \text{her reasons them, CLITIC, ACCUSATIVE, FEM,PL, will-have to act in this way} \\
& \quad \text{‘There must be an explanation for such behaviour’}

c. & \text{Eso mismo pienso yo} \\
& \quad \text{‘So believe I’}

d. & \text{Buena tierra es esta} [Leonetti & Escandell (2008)] \\
& \quad \text{‘This is a fertile land’}
\end{align*}\]

\[(20) \quad \begin{align*}
a. & \text{*Molt has matinat tu avui} \\
& \quad \text{‘you woke up really early today’}

b. & \text{*Els seus motius deu tenir per haver-se enfadat} \\
& \quad \text{‘There must be some reason for being so upset’}

c. & \text{*Això mateix penjo yo} \\
& \quad \text{‘So believe I’}
\end{align*}\]
d. *Bona terra és aquesta
   ‘This is a fertile land’

It should be observed, though, that the examples in (21), in which the fronted constituent is a QP, are well formed in Catalan:

(21)  a. Algú hi trobarem, a la Rambla
      ‘at the Rambla, you will find somebody’ [apud Quer (2002: 256)]

  b. Gaires estudiants no deu haver aprovat, aquest professor
      ‘There may not be many students who passed this teacher’s exam’

  c. Molts diners no han costat, aquestes arracades
      ‘They did not cost a lot of money, these ear rings.’

Interestingly enough, the examples in (21) are grammatical not only in Catalan, but also in other Romance varieties in which WFF in general is not possible. Cruschina (2009: 22) considers that ‘existing analyses and new empirical data from other Romance languages show that, contrary to traditional assumptions, non-contrastive FF is widespread in Romance, especially with quantifiers and quantified expressions (i.e. QP-Fronting)’. Benincà (1988: 141-142) gives the following examples:

(22)  a. Niente concluí, stando in questo buco
      nothing conclude2ND.SG staying in this hole
      ‘You are not getting anywhere, staying in this hole!’

  b. A nessuno nuoce, col suo comportamento
      to nobody harm3RD.SG with his behaviour
      ‘He’s not hurting anyone with his behaviour’

We will examine this issue more extensively in section 3.

2.2. Properties of weak focus in Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan: a comparative view

Weak focus fronting (WFF) has been regarded as a productive phenomenon in Italian (see Cinque 1990), Portuguese (see Ambar 1999) and Catalan (see Quer 2002). However, WFF does not follow a homogenous pattern within Modern Romance languages, which becomes obvious by the comparison of the data given in (19) to (20).

Before taking into consideration the contrast between the above examples in (19) and (20), it is worth summarizing the main properties of unmarked focalization in Spanish:

I. Unmarked focalizations are incompatible with resumptive clitics (i.e., they diverge from topicalizations):

(23) *Sus razones las tendrá para actuar de este modo
    her reasons themCLITIC,ACCUSATIVE,FEM,PL will-have to act in this way
    ‘There must be an explanation for such behaviour’

II. Subject-verb inversion is compulsory:

(24) *Algo estos niños estarán tramando
    Something these children will-be plotting
III. There cannot be more than one unmarked focus, but they can cooccur with topicalized constituents:

(25) a. *En alguien mucho confía Juan
    on somebody much relies John
   
   b. A este enfermo, pocas esperanzas le han dado los médicos
    To this patient, little hope have given the doctors

IV. Contrastive focus and unmarked focus are mutually exclusive:

(26) a. *JULIA poco confía en los médicos (y no Pepe)
    Julia little relies on the doctors (and not Pepe)
   
   b. *Poco JULIA confía en los médicos (y no Pepe)
   
   c. *Poco confía JULIA en los médicos (y no Pepe)

V. WFF is incompatible with emphatic polarity markers as si, bien.

(27) a. *Tiempo si / bien habrá para pensar en esto
    Time yes / well there will be to think on this
    'Indeed, there will be time to think about this'
   
   b. Sí / bien habrá tiempo para pensar en eso
    yes / well there will be time to think on eso
    'Indeed, there will be time to think about this'

Even though unmarked focus shares several properties with contrastive focus in Modern Spanish, as shown in the preceding examples, it lacks the contrastive value displayed by canonical focalization. As illustrated in (28), unmarked focus poco “little”, unlike its contrastive counterpart POCO, precludes the occurrence of a tag with the converse meaning:

(28) a. Poco comió María ayer (# y no mucho)
    Little ate Mary yesterday (and not a-lot)
    ‘Mary did not eat much yesterday’
   
   b. POCO comió María ayer (y no mucho)
    Little ate Mary yesterday (and not a-lot)
    ‘Little did Mary eat yesterday’

Consequently, the above contrast provides crucial evidence that both kinds of focus must be told apart.

Now, addressing the comparison between Modern Catalan and Modern Spanish, a closer examination of the data suggests that they behave quite differently concerning WFF. Notice, first of all, that in Modern Catalan—as illustrated in (19)-(21)- WFF is constrained to Quantifier Phrases (QP). Moreover, Catalan sentences with weak fronted foci convey an added presuppositional value, which establishes a contrast with the preceding context. This implies that the examples in (21) do not count as neutral statements; rather, they cancel a negative expectation that can be inferred from the previous discourse.

Finally, Modern Catalan structures require emargination of postverbal elements, as noticed by Quer (2002:265):

(29) a. Algú hi trobarem, a la Rambla = (21a)
    ‘at the Rambla, you will find somebody’
According to this author, emargination prevents postverbal elements from being assigned nuclear stress: in case they were assigned it there would be a potential conflict with the focal value of the fronted QP.

Crucially, in Modern Spanish there is no requirement for the emargination of postverbal elements in WFF and, what is more, (31) and (32) prove that it makes no difference with regard to the grammaticality of the sentence. This poses a problem for Quer’s analysis, because it erroneously predicts the ungrammaticality of the examples in (31a) and (32a), which lack emargination:

(31)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Poco se imaginaba María lo sucedido  
\begin{itemize}
\item little Mary imagined what happened
\end{itemize}
\item b. Poco se imaginaba, María, lo sucedido
\end{enumerate}

(32)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Algo estarán tramando estos niños  
\begin{itemize}
\item something will-be plotting these children
\end{itemize}
\item b. Algo estarán tramando, estos niños
\end{enumerate}

The contrasts given in (31) and (32) are relevant empirical evidence to sustain the hypothesis that elements submitted to WFF occupy different positions in Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan left periphery. Our claim is that the requirement for emargination is related to the presuppositional differences between Catalan and Spanish data. More precisely, Catalan requires emargination because the right dislocated element interpreted as topic is the one that allows the further partition of the informative structure of the sentence, which gives rise to its presuppositional value.

Next section will examine the homogeneity between Old Spanish and Old Catalan in contrast with the asymmetry between Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan to find out the nature of the grammatical change that took place from Old Catalan to Modern Catalan in relation to WFF structures.

3. Weak focus fronting and polarity

3.1. Towards an explanation for the asymmetry between Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan

On the basis of the data discussed so far, we are in a position to claim that Modern Spanish still maintains an unmarked focus position which is hierarchically lower than contrastive focus and which serves as landing site for WFF constituents. See Benincà (2004: 256):

\{Topic…[CLLD]…\} \{Focus…[ContrastFocus]…[UnmFocus]…\}

In order to account for the asymmetry between Modern Catalan and Modern Spanish with regard to WFF, we hypothesize that the syntactic change that has taken place from Old to
Modern Catalan can be grasped as the loss of the unmarked focus position within the focus domain:

\[ \text{[FORCEP \ TOPEP \ CONTRASTIVE FOCUSP [UNMARKED FOCUSP \[ FNP \]]]]} \]

Therefore, information structure is a source of variation between Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan, while it was not the case between Old Spanish and Old Catalan.

Under the assumption that a syntactic projection for unmarked focus is no longer available in Modern Catalan, the following question arises: what position do the fronted elements submitted to WFF target? In view of the presuppositional interpretation displayed by constructions like (21), we postulate that the projection where these elements move to in Modern Catalan is PolP, as (36) illustrates:

\[ \text{[FORCEP \ TOPEP \ CONTRASTIVE FOCUSP [UNMARKED FOCUSP [POLP \[ FNP \]]]]} \]

This hypothesis offers an explanation for the ungrammaticality of the Modern Catalan examples in (20) and the grammaticality of those in (21). More precisely, the contrast between (20) and (21) clearly suggests that a “stronger” trigger is needed in order to license WFF in Modern Catalan. Notice in this respect that examples in (21) would turn out to be clearly inadequate if they were expressed “out of the blue”, this is, in absolute discourse initial position, being independent of a previous context.

The presuppositional import of WFF structures in Modern Catalan cannot be extended to their counterparts in Modern Spanish, which in some cases do not allow a contrast with the preceding discursive context. This can be shown by examining the minimal pair in (37). Whereas (37a) can be expressed without previous reference to the activity developed by the subject (the children), (37b), as already said, refute or rectify an affirmation uttered earlier about Lola:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(37) a. \textit{Algo} \text{ estarán tramando estos niños}} &= \text{(32a)} \\
\text{something will-be plotting these children} \\
\text{b. \textit{Algun error} haurà comès, la Lola} \\
\text{some mistake will-have made, Lola}
\end{align*} \]

Our proposal connects with the analysis given to WFF structures by Leonetti and Escandell (2009: 155), who claim that this type of focalization, which they label \textit{Verum Focus Fronting} (VFF), “triggers association of focus with sentence polarity”. According to them, “in Spanish the most natural paraphrase of a VFF consists in a construction in which the propositional content is embedded under the affirmative particle \textit{sí} ‘yes’ or under the adjectives \textit{seguro} ‘sure’ or \textit{cierto} ‘true’”. They illustrate all this with the following paraphrases:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(38) a. \textit{Algo} has visto} &\rightarrow \{\text{Sí / seguro}\} \text{ que has visto algo} \\
\text{something have-seen} &\rightarrow \{\text{yes / sure}\} \text{ that have-seen something} \\
\text{‘You have seen SOMETHING’} &\rightarrow \text{‘Yes / surely you have seen something’} \\
\text{b. \textit{A alguien} encontrarás} &\rightarrow \{\text{Sí / seguro}\} \text{ que encontrarás a alguien} \\
\text{to someone will-find} &\rightarrow \{\text{yes / sure}\} \text{ that will-find to someone} \\
\text{‘You will find someone’} &\rightarrow \text{‘It’s sure that you will find someone’} \\
\text{c. \textit{Miedo} me da pensarlo} &\rightarrow \{\text{Sí / es cierto que me da miedo pensararlo} \\
\text{fear \textit{CLITIC.DATIVE.gives think it} to} &\rightarrow \{\text{yes / is true}\} \text{ that \textit{CLITIC.DATIVE.gives fear think it} \textit{Afraid as I am to think so}’} \\
\text{‘Afraid as I am to think so’} &\rightarrow \text{‘Yes / It’s true I’m afraid to think about it’}
\end{align*} \]
Leaving aside the grade of adequacy\textsuperscript{10} of the paraphrases adduced in (38), they offer an explanation that fits with a picture where WFF properties crucially rely on polarity.

The analysis proposed in (36) is also supported by diachronic evidence. Configurational changes undergone by medieval languages correlate with changes in the Polarity node.\textsuperscript{11} Both Old Spanish and Old Catalan displayed double negation. Spanish lost this option by the XVth century, while Catalan still has it:

(39) Que los descabecemos nada non ganaremos [Çid: v. 620]

that them cut-head nothing not win\textsubscript{1ST,PL}

‘Even if we cut their heads, we are not going to win anything’

(40) en nula guisa porà, e si fer-ô volrà, res no valrà [CICA: Segle XIIIa. Usatges de Barcelona]

In no manner will-be-able, and if do-it will-want, thing no be-worth\textsuperscript{3SG,FUT}

‘He won’t be able to do it anyway, and if he wanted to do it, it won’t be worth doing it’

Furthermore, the possibility to attribute the syntactic change we are considering to the properties of the Polarity node in Modern Catalan is supported by an important diachronic fact: Catalan has shown a high tendency to grammaticalize fronted elements as polar markers. Adverbs and adjectives such as poc ‘little’, pla ‘flat’, prou ‘enough’, and bé ‘well’ behave like negative and positive emphatic polarity markers nowadays. In contrast, in Modern Spanish the only element that has grammaticalized as an emphatic polarity marker is bien:

(41) a. En Pere prou que ho deia → sí que ho deia

The Peter enough that it said → yes that it said

‘Peter said it indeed’

b. Poc ho farà la Maria → no ho farà

Little it will-do the Mary → not it will-do

‘Mary won’t do it’

c. La Maria pla que ho farà → no ho farà\textsuperscript{12}

The Mary flat that it will-do → not it will-do

‘Mary won’t do it’

d. Bé hi ha anat a la biblioteca. No l’has trobat? → sí que hi ha anat

Well there have gone to the library. Not him have met? → yes that there have gone

‘He has gone to the library indeed. Didn’t you meet him?’

Following Battlori and Hernanz (2008), we assume that the elements alluded to are base-generated in PolP, as illustrated in (42):

(42) […[FOCUSP bien\textsubscript{i} \sim bé\textsubscript{i} , prou/ poc\textsubscript{i} , pla\textsubscript{i} [POLP t\textsubscript{i} [FNP-...]]]]\textsuperscript{13}

Further evidence that Modern Catalan displays a strong polarity projection is provided by the examples in (43), where two positions for negation are attested. As discussed in Hernanz (2007: 128), this possibility is totally banned in Modern Spanish.

(43) No que no ha vingut la Lola

not that not has come the Lola

‘But Lola did not come’
These divergent properties of PolP bring about leftward fronting phenomena which fall under different paradigms in each language.

3. 2. Diachronic Romance and the node Polarity
Bearing in mind the preceding evidence, it can be stated that polarity is an important source of diachronic and synchronic variation between Spanish and Catalan.

In this section, on the bases that in both medieval languages polarity shared the same properties (i.e., it was strong), we are going to summarize the way they encoded the different values (polar and non polar) of WFF sentences.

1. WFF in Old Catalan

• WFF with polar value:

(44) Do[n]cs bè podem saber qe negù om no escaparà qe ·l Diable no·l exag [CICA: Homilies d’Organyà XIIIa]
so well can1ST,PL know that noone man not escape2ND,PL,3RD,SG that the devil not him tried
‘So we can know well/ indeed that no one will escape without having been tested by the devil.’

(45) \[\text{ForceP \{TopicP \{Contrastive FocusP \{Unmarked FocusP \{PolP \{FinP \}}\}}\}}\]

• WFF without polar value:

(46) D’acò creu que molt n’agatz liget e oít [Eiximenis, Cartes autògrafes: 247]
of this think2ND,SG that a-lot of-it have2ND,PL,SUBJ read and listened
‘Be sure that you have read and listened much of this’

(47) \[\text{ForceP \{TopicP \{Contrastive FocusP \{Unmarked FocusP \{PolP \{FinP \}}\}}\}}\]

2. WFF in Old Spanish

• WFF with polar value:

(48) CELESTINA: Señora, este es otro y segundo punto, [el qual] si tu con tu mal sufrimiento no consientes, poco aprovechara mi venida, y si como prometiste lo sufris, tu quedaras sana y sin deuda, y Calisto sin queya y pagado. [Celestina: 243]
CELESTINA: Madam, this is another and second point, [the which] if you with your bad suffering not consent, little benefit my arrival, and if as promised it suffers, you remain2ND,PL,3RD,SG healthy and without debt, and Calisto without complaint and paid.
‘Celestina: Madam, this is another point, a second one, if you do not consent with your distressing suffering, little will you take advantage of my arrival, and if you suffer it as you promised, you will be healthy and with no debt, and Calisto will not complain and will be satisfied.’

(49) \[\text{ForceP \{TopicP \{Contrastive FocusP \{Unmarked FocusP \{PolP \{FinP \}}\}}\}}\]

• WFF without polar value:

(50) ¿Eres muerto o vivo? Cierto, mucho me maravillo de ti [CORDE: c. 1400-1498, Anónimo, El baladro del sabio Merlin con sus profecias]
are dead or alive? Certainly, a lot I_{CLITIC,DATIVE} wonder of you
‘Are you dead or alive? Indeed, I admire you a lot


Conclusion
This paper explores the homogeneous pattern of Old Spanish and Old Catalan with respect to WFF and examines the asymmetry between Modern Spanish and Modern Catalan with respect to this phenomenon. Whereas Modern Spanish still exhibits WFF, Modern Catalan only allows QP Fronting, the licensing of which is directly related to a presuppositional interpretation. Additionally, Modern Catalan displays double negation, has grammaticalized many adverbs as emphatic polarity markers (either negative or affirmative), and allows for two negations (no que no). This leads us to put forward that the above mentioned asymmetry is related to a deeper generalization linked to the behaviour of both languages. More precisely, we pose that Modern Catalan QP Fronting is hosted by PolP, which is ‘strong’ enough to attract quantifiers, and also that the syntactic change that took place from Old Catalan to Modern Catalan concerns the loss of the Unmarked Focus Projection.

Corpus
[CORDE] Corpus Diacrónico del Español: http://www.rae.es
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