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1. Introduction

The main goal of this work is to provide the reader with a diachronic comparative descriptive analysis of two apparently similar Old Spanish and Old Catalan configurations: mesoclisis (i.e., analytic futures and conditionals), in (1), and participle preposing, in (2).

(1) INFINITIVE + CLITIC + AUX: dezir lo an, dezir lo yan
   
   tell it will, tell it would
   
   'they will tell it, they would tell it'

(2) PARTICIPLE + CLITIC + AUX: dicho lo an, dicho lo avian

   told it have, told it had
   
   'they have told it, they had told it'

Catalan weak focus fronting (Batllori-Hernanz 2010) has shown that these two structures display certain parallelisms, given that they can occur without clitic pronouns, are attested in main clauses and also in the subordinate clauses that seem to be transparent for root transformations or to pattern with main clauses (in terms of Haegeman 2007, 2010a, and 2010b). Crucially, however, they display a different behavior with reference to their occurrence with the negative marker no/non.

This investigation relies on the following methodological and theoretical concepts:

1. The Theory of Left Periphery posed by Rizzi (1997), and subsequent developments for medieval Romance languages (by Benincà 2004 and Poletto 2006), which put forward the following sentence structure:

   (3) \texttt{\text{\text{FORCEP}} \text{\text{TOPICP}} \text{\text{\text{\text{\text{CONTRASTIVE FOCUSP}}} \text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{UNMARKED FOCUSP}}} \text{\text{FINP}}} \text{\text{}}} \text{\text{}}} \text{\text{}}} \text{\text{}}} \text{\text{}}}

2. The FinP internal hierarchy of sentential adjuncts, on the one hand, and tense, aspect, modality and mood functional projections, on the other, proposed by Cinque (1999):

   \textbf{FIG. 1. Functional hierarchy (Cinque 1999)}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
MoodP & speech act & MoodP & evaluative & MoodP & evidential & MoodP & epistemic & TP & past & \hline
TP & future & MoodP & tense & ModP & aetheic-necessity & ModP & aetheic-possibility & ModP & volition & \hline
ModP & obligation & ModP & ability/permission & AspP & habitual & AspP & repetitive(I) & \hline
AspP & frequentative(I) & AspP & celerative(I) & TP & anterior & AspP & terminative & AspP & continuous & \hline
& AspP & perfect & AspP & retrospective & AspP & proximative & AspP & durative & AspP & progressive & \hline
AspP & prospective & AspP & completive & AspP & completive & VoiceP & AspP & celerative(II) & \hline
& AspP & repetitive(II) & AspP & frequentative(II) & AspP & completive(II) & vP & VP & \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}


The departure point of the analysis put forward is the idea that participle preposing configurations are weak or unmarked focus fronting structures, whereas mesoclitic constructions do not display left-peripheral focalization, as has generally been assumed. Instead, it is argued that they either express modality or mood and, therefore, that mesoclitic periphrases in Old Spanish and Old Catalan could be used as speech act mood modals (i.e., as imperatives; when giving instructions, for instance), evidential modals\(^1\) and also epistemic modals. That is, they were high modal expressions.
Accordingly, this work is structured in 5 sections, including this introduction. Section 2 is devoted to the description of the hierarchical sentence structure exhibited by Latin, on the one hand, and to provide empirical evidence to support the idea that Old Spanish and Old Catalan displayed the same sentence structure as Latin, with different syntactic requirements (which gave rise to a VO unmarked order), on the other. Section 3 focuses on the syntactic analysis of participle preposing in Old Spanish and Old Catalan, and offers an explanation for its absence in some types of embedded clauses that is consistent with the theory of derivation of adverbial clauses posed by Haegeman (2010b, and previous works), which attributes main clause phenomena constraints to intervention effects. In section 4, I give an analysis for mesoclisis in agreement with the syntactic behavior and the semantic values displayed by these configurations in Old Spanish and Old Catalan, and also account for the fact that they are not found in central adverbial clauses either, due to intervention effects. Section 5 provides the concluding remarks.

2. Hierarchical sentence structure and word order: from Latin to Old Spanish and Old Catalan

Regarding Latin word order and information structure, Devine-Stephens (2006) and Danckaert (2011:51), from an exhaustive analysis of Latin data, adequately and independently justify a hierarchical sentence structure with different Topic and Focus projections, both in the high and in the low (vP) left periphery, as well as a middle field Scrambling projection.

**FIG. 2. Latin Sentence Structure (see Danckaert 2011:51)**
It has been generally assumed that Latin was an SOV language. Most works consider that the change from OV to VO took place within Latin (Vincent 1977:56-58, Danckaert 2011:334-337, etc.). Besides, Devine-Stephens (2006:133) add that the process of transition from OV to VO was sensible to the semantic and pragmatic status of the object. And, more to the point, Danckaert (2011:342) mentions that the first postverbal objects attested were focalized non referential nouns that denoted abstract entities. It could be stipulated, then, that in the process of language acquisition by Early Romance learners, Latin sentence structure is maintained, in spite of the fact that lexical insertion and feature checking differs significantly, mainly due to reanalysis. In this process, postverbal [+marked] objects may have been reanalyzed as [unmarked] objects generated in a different projection. 

When Adams (1987) and (1989), Roberts (1993) and Vance (1997), among others, established that Old French was a V2 language, there was a tendency to extend this consideration to the other Medieval Romance languages (see Fontana 1993, for Spanish, for instance). However, this idea has been largely debated and abandoned nowadays because these languages display V1, which is not possible in canonical V2 languages such as Modern German:

(4) a. Dixoles empos esto a sos disciplos.
    said.them after this to his disciples
    'Then he said this to his followers'

    OLD SPANISH

c. Fem-vos saber que nós som sans e alegre
    make.you know that we are sound and happy
    'We let you know that we are sound and happy'

    [CICA: 1251, Carta del comanador de Vilamur al bisbe d’Urgell; Moran i Rabella (2001: 119-122)] OLD CATALAN

This favors the view according to which the information structure distribution of Old Romance languages was richer and more complex than the one most of them exhibit nowadays (see Cruschina 2011, for Italo-Romance, Martins 2011, for Portuguese, Sitaridou 2011, for Spanish, and Batllori-Hernanz 2010, for Spanish and Catalan). Topicalizations and fronting of constituents to different high left peripheral projections conveyed discursive information, emulating V2 orders.
As for the vP field, empirical evidence seem to support the claim that Old Romance displayed a low left periphery (with a low FocusP or FocusvP projection), inherited from Latin, which provides us with an adequate account for object preposing structures (5a) and also for the left periphery of infinitives (5b):

(5) a. ed ha’mi la cosa molte volte ridetta

and has.me the thing many times retold

'and he has retold me this thing many times'

[BG, Tratt.: 131; Poletto (2006:275)] OLD ITALIAN

b. ca menester les era [FINP de [FOCvP consejo [vP tomar]]

because need them was of advice take

'because they needed to take advised'

[CORDE: Libro de Alexandre] OLD SPANISH

Danckaert (2011:288), following Devine-Stephens (2006), regards Latin low FocusvP projection as a presentational focus (in contrast with the high left peripheral identificational one) and, as will be shown below, Old Romance low FocusvP clearly conveys the same presentational value.

As a result of the previous remarks, we should expect that Old Romance linear word order may either be due to information structure distribution according to the new discursive requirements concerning old and new information or presupposition, for instance, or be the reflex of a tendency to stick to the Latin/archaic OV order, without any informational function. Castillo Lluch (2011) shows that the language used in Old Spanish charters (which generally exemplify a discursive tradition with a highly archaic core) can:

► either display an OV word order that aims to focalize the object. For example, having OV in the title of the law (6a)-(7a) and VO in the rest of the law (6b)-(7b):

(6) a. 231. Qui uvas cogiere o fructa.

who grapes catch SUBJUNCTIVE or fruits

'Who caught grapes or fruit'

b. Qui entrare en biña e

who enter SUBJUNCTIVE in vineyard and

cogiere uvas o fructa, peche ...V moravidis
catch\textsubscript{FUT\_SUBJUNCTIVE} grapes or fruits, pay ... V maravedis

'Who went into a vineyard and caught grapes or fruits, should pay V maravedis'

\textit{[Fuero Viejo de Alcalá: 231; Castillo Lluch (2011)] OLD SPANISH}

(7) a. 293. Todo omne que \textit{omne \textit{matare} e se fuere.}

All man that man \textit{kill\textsubscript{FUT\_SUBJUNCTIVE} and CL go}.

Anyone who killed somebody and went away'

b. Todo omne que \textit{matare omne e ...}

All man that kill\textsubscript{FUT\_SUBJUNCTIVE} man and ...'

\textit{[Fuero Viejo de Alcalá: 293; Castillo Lluch (2011)] OLD SPANISH}

\> or be an example of \textit{variatio}, without any informational function, sticking to the Latin pattern.

This would account for the word order variation attested in the Old Spanish charters studied in detail by Castillo Lluch (2011) and would be also in accordance with Kroch proposals concerning syntactic variation in Old texts.

\textbf{Fig. 3. Word order variation in Old Spanish charters (Castillo Lluch 2011)}
Hence, I take the above mentioned facts to be evidence enough to establish that Old Spanish, at least (and, in my belief, Old Romance in general), inherits Latin hierarchical sentence structure. It diverges from it, though, with respect to the lexicon properties of its lexical categories and the rules to generate syntactic representations.

As for the high left periphery, several scholars have posed that Old Romance languages have more than one left peripheral Focus projection. In Benincà's (2004:251) words: '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’). Thus, in accordance with Benincà (2004: 256), Old Romance left periphery is as follows:

\[(8) \{\text{TOPIC} \ldots [\text{CLLD}] \ldots \} \{\text{FOCUS} \ldots [\text{ContrastFocus}] \ldots [\text{UnmFocus}] \ldots \}\]

In the same line, Batllori-Hernanz (2010) show that Old Spanish and Old Catalan display weak or unmarked focus fronting (and that weak focus, to use Gallego's 2007 term, is clearly different from contrastive focus), which gives as a result the following left peripheral structure for these medieval Romance languages:

\[(9) [\text{FOCP} [\text{TOPIC} [\text{Contrastive FocusP} [\text{Unmarked FocusP} [\ldots [\text{FINP}]\ldots ]]]]]\]
3. Participle preposing

There is quite general agreement in that participle preposing, which gives rise to the configuration in (2) above, is a type of unmarked focus fronting, different from contrastive focus (Batllori-Hernanz 2010 and Rodríguez Molina 2011), that shows a considerably low frequency.

**Table. 2. Frequency of participle preposing in Rodríguez Molina's corpus**

(see Rodríguez Molina 2010:1515)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AUXILIARY-PARTICIPLE</th>
<th>PARTICIPLE-AUXILIARY</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800-1140</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140-1252</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253-1295</td>
<td>3548</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1296-1369</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1370-1454</td>
<td>3442</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1455-1499</td>
<td>2220</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12118</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides, there is evidence that in Old Spanish and Old Catalan it is a main clause phenomenon, (10a) and (11a), and that, otherwise, it occurs in those embedded sentences that allow for root phenomena (Haegeman 2007 and following works): that is, peripheral adverbial sentences (10b) and (11c) and subordinate sentences depending on assertive verbs, (10c) and (11d), for instance. Octavio de Toledo (2011) states that his corpus shows a 30% of participle preposing occurrences in embedded clauses (and 70% in matrix clauses).

(10) a. *Poblado ha* myo Çid el puerto de Alucant

Settled has my Çid the harbour of Alucant

'Çid has settled the harbour of Alucant'

[Çid: v. 1087] OLD SPANISH

b. ¡Maldito seas! *Que hecho me has reyr*, lo que no pensé
Damned be! that had me have laugh it that not thought

'Be damned! Because you have made me laugh more than I would have thought'

[Celestina: p. 94; ed. D. Severin] OLD SPANISH

c. que non pueda dezir que estos morauedis avidos & that not can say that these maravedis had and

recebidos non aya received not have

'that he could not say that he hasn't got and received these maravedis'

[1274, Murcia, DLE, 370; Rodríguez Molina (2010: 1399)] OLD SPANISH

(11) a. Hoït ho hé dir - responguí jo -, mas ara no ho crech

Heard it have say -answered I-, but now not it believe

'I have heard it -I said-, but I do not believe it now'

[Bernat Metge, Lo somni: 58; Par (1923: p. 518)] OLD CATALAN

b. E soplicà ... que pus aquel dit Matheu a él pagar

and begged that as that said Matheu to him pay

no volia ni pagat no l’avia, que li degués donar not want nor paid not him.had, that him should give

licència de vendre lo dit cavayl.

licence to sell the said horse

'And he begged him that since the mentioned Matheu did not want to pay and had not paid him, that he should permit him to sell the previously mentioned horse'

[CICA: Clams i crims a la València medieval. I: 83] OLD CATALAN

c. qual és stada la causa de la vostra sobtosa mort?

which is been the cause of the your sudden death?

car oït hé dir que sobtosament moris

because heard have say that suddenly died
'Which has been the cause of your sudden death? Because I have heard that you died suddenly.'

[Bernat Metge, *Lo somni*: 122; Par (1923: 1126, 518)] OLD CATALAN d. Bé •m recorda -digu jo- que dit havies que en una

indeed.CL remind -said I- that said had that in a

fort alta muntanya era la entrada d'imfern

very high mountain was the entrance of hell

'And I said: I remember indeed that you have said that in a very high mountain there was the entrance of hell'


It is worth noticing that participle preposing is attested without clitics, as Old Spanish (10a) and Old Catalan (11c)-(11d) illustrate, so that this configuration is not dependent on clitic placement requirements. And whenever a clitic interferes between the participle and the auxiliary it is due to proclisis, either triggered by the fronting of the participle, or by the presence of the negative marker *no/non*, as exemplified in (11b). Moreover, regarding the position of clitics, Rodríguez Molina (2010: 1448) finds a few examples in which the participle is preceded by the clitic pronoun.

(12) a. pedio les ... que [pues tanto mal *le fecho auyan*],

    asked them that as so-much evil him done had,

    que le quisiessen dar por emienda los dos fíjos de Ector

    that him wanted give for amendment the two sons of Ector

    'As they had done so much harm, Elenus asked the Greek to give him Ector's two sons to compensate him'

    [VRT, 164r, 344; Rodriguez Molina (2010: 1448)] OLD SPANISH

b. Ovol poruentura: el infanf a uer / desque lo uisto uo:

    had.him by chance the infant to see since him seen had no s le pudo asconder

    not CLPASSIVE him could hide

    'the infant saw him by chance / once he had seen him, he could not be hidden'

    [Alex, 181b O; Rodriguez Molina (2010: 1448)] OLD SPANISH
c. E entraron ... en el arca por miedo del agua del dilubio...

and entered in the ark for fear of the water of the Flood

segund que lo mandado avía el Señor

according what it ordered had the Lord

'And (Noah, his sons, his wife and his sons' wives) went into the ark, as the Lord had ordered them, because they were afraid of the Flood'

[BYF, 8ra; Rodriguez Molina (2010: 1448)] Old Spanish

Hence, this configuration is independent of clitic placement constraints.

At this point, the question arises why it is not possible with all kinds of embedded clauses. An explanation for this distribution follows if we take into account Haegeman (2007), (2010a), and (2010b) hypothesis concerning the derivation of central adverbial clauses (particularly, temporal and conditional adverbial clauses) as free relatives, with wh-movement of an operator to the left periphery (to ForceP), as figure 4 illustrates. According to Haegeman (2010b: 605), the operator originates in Cinque (1999:88)’s MOOD\textsubscript{IRREALIS}P and moves to ForceP.

**FIG. 4. Movement derivation for central adverbial clauses**

In her analysis, central and peripheral adverbial clauses will be derived differently. The former can be considered to modify the nuclear event (roughly the predicate and its arguments, say the vP phase), while the latter are related to the speaker and the speech act. Thus, she makes the distinction illustrated in figure 5.
Peripheral adverbial clauses are base generated in the left periphery, above Unmarked FocusP, so that they allow for participle preposing. Central adverbial clause derivation by operator movement to ForceP, however, brings about intervention effects with any other movement from the VP to the left periphery, as exemplified in figure 6.

**FIG. 6. Intervention effects with unmarked focus fronting**

Notice, though, that there are two types of data that could be regarded as possible counterexamples for this proposal. On the one hand, in a very small number of cases, participle preposing is attested in restrictive relative clauses such as the one in (13):
(13)  el danno que les hecho auian  
the harm that them done had

'the harm they had done'

[VRT, 70v, 147; Rodríguez Molina (2010: 1448)] OLD SPANISH

On the other hand, as the only example I found shows, it is compatible with WH- elements:

(14)  ¡O quién visto vos oviese!  
Oh who seen you had

'Oh, I wish I had seen you!'

[CORDE: c. 1438-1456, Juan de Mena, Poesía menor] OLD SPANISH

Before commenting on the previous data, however, it is also important to pay attention to the fact that negation does not block participle preposing, as you can see in the examples in (15):

(15)  a. lo que en muchos días acabado non as  
it that in many days finished not have

'what you have not finished in many days'

[Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita, Buen Amor: 579] OLD SPANISH

b. E soplicà ... que pus aquel dit Matheu a él pagar  
and begged that as said Matheu to him pay

no volia ni pagat no l'avia, que li degués donar  
not want nor paid not him.had, that him should give

licència de vendre lo dit cavayl.  
licence to sell the said horse

'And he begged him that since the mentioned Matheu did not want to pay and had not paid him, that he should permit him to sell the previously mentioned horse'

[CICA: Clams i crims a la València medieval. I: 83] OLD CATALAN = (11b)
The data from (13) to (15) sheds light on the derivation of participle preposing. In (13), the participle cannot have moved to the high left peripheral Unmarked FocusP, because left peripheral foci and WH-elements are incompatible (Batllori-Hernanz 2010), so that I take it to remain in the low FocusP projection. In contrast, the examples in (15) show that it cannot always be analyzed as remaining in the low left periphery, because negation occurs between the participle and the auxiliary verb. Thus, it must have moved higher than NegP, see figure 7.

**FIG. 7. Old Spanish and Old Catalan Sentence Structure**

![Diagram showing sentence structure](image)

This is sufficient evidence to me to put forward an analysis according to which participle preposing is an XP movement derived by a first focalization within the low periphery and, generally, a second movement towards the high periphery to get the informational or unmarked focus feature value (Beninca 2004) provided by the high Unmarked FocusP projection. The participle of the examples in (13) and (14), however, would not undergo the latter movement and, therefore, would convey a different value.²

3. Mesoclisis in Old Spanish and Old Catalan

Mesoclisis is neither obligatory in Old Spanish, (16), nor in Old Catalan, (17), since in both of them either enclisis or proclisis, whenever licensed, are equally valid.

(16) a. Adelino por Castiella Minaya Albarfanez
took-way to Castiella Minaya Albarfanez

_Dexare_ *nos* las posadas, non las quiero contar.

leave you the stops, not them want explain

²
Demando por Alfonso, do lo podrie fallar.

Asked for Alfonso, where him could find

'Minaya Albarfanez went towards Castiella. I will not tell you anything about the stops, because I do not want to. He asked where he could find Alfonso'

[Çid: vv. 1309-1311; ed. R. Menéndez Pidal] OLD SPANISH

b. Quien menos las practicare, farále Dios

who less them practice, will-do-him God
merçed señalada.
favor remarkable

'God will remarkably favor the ones that practice them less'

[CORDE: 1438, Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, Arcipreste de Talavera (Corbacho): 158] OLD SPANISH

(17) a. Atorgaras ho e callare

Agree-will (on) it and be-quiet-will (I)

'Agree on it and I will be quiet'

[Bernat Metge: 3387; Par (1923: 475)] OLD CATALAN

b. e per aytal ençercament porás-lo atrobar e conexer.

and for such search will-be-able-it find and know

'and you will be able to find it and know it by looking for it in such a way'

[Llull, Virtuts e Pecats: 169] OLD CATALAN

c. En a cap de .II. o .III. jorns pendràs-ho tot, so és, los

And at after of 2 or 3 days will-take-it all, that is, the
présechs e lo axerop, e ferr-o-às bolir .II. o .III.
peaches and the syrup, and make-it-will boil 2 or 3
buyls. E après, fet asò, si no és prou estret

times. And after, done this, if not is sufficiently thick
lo axerop, treurets-lo del pot - lo
the syrup will-take-out-it from-the saucepan - the
dit axerop- e fer-l’yès bolir fins tant
mentioned syrup - and make-it-will boil until so-much
sia fet que fassa fills.
be done that make threads
'And after 2 or 3 days you will take it all, that is the peaches and the syrup, and you will make it boil 2 or 3 times. And after this has been done, if the syrup is not thick enough you will take it out of the saucepan and you will make it boil until you get threads'

[CICA: Sent Soví: 281. m. XV] OLD CATALAN

Notice that the examples in (16) and (17) are not related to biblical Latin translations, so that, in my belief, the hypothesis put forward by Bouzouita (Ms.), according to which enclisis in examples such as (18a) is a result of a syntactic calque or loan translation from biblical Latin of the Vulgate, should be revised. Besides, they are also attested in biblical Hebrew translations, as (18b) illustrates.

(18) a. mostrare les mi mano. e mi fuerça
    will-show them my hand and my strength
    'I will show them my hand and my strength'
    [Je 16: 21; Bouzouita (Ms.: 1)] OLD SPANISH

b. darvos an autezas de casa de plata
    Give-you-will have noble-treatment of house of silver
    e de oro e pordeslas sobre vuestras fijas
    and of gold and will-put-them on your daughters
    e toldredeslas a los Egiptos
    and will-take-off-them from the Egyptians
    'They will present you with silver and gold and you will put them on your daughters and will take them away from the Egyptians'
    [Fazienda: 63; ed. M. Lazar] OLD SPANISH
However, whenever there is a clitic, mesoclisis is the most general pattern attested. Table 3 shows the percentages of futures and conditionals in the *Cantar de Myo Çid*. It must be pointed out that synthetic futures always occur when there is no clitic intervening, except for the example given in (16a). Thus, there are 64 instances of analytic future against 1 single case of synthetic future.

**Table 3. Futures and conditionals in *Cantar de Myo Çid***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic future</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>81,8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic future</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18,2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic conditional</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>89,2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic conditional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10,8 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite this, it is still worth considering it because it plays a particular role, because the jongleur’s addresses the audience and tells them that he is not going to give any more details about the places where Minaya stopped. He abandons the narrative presentational style to address the audience in a more colloquial style.

Concerning Old Spanish, Fernández Ordóñez (2008-2009) explains that it is used to address a potential reader, sometimes preceded by a topicalized constituent, marked as [TOP] by her.

(19) a. [TOP Agora] *dezirvos emos* de una laguna que fallaron

    Now say-you-will of one lake that found
    'Now we will tell you about a lake that they found'


    b. E rey Nabucodonosor ... [FOC Agora] *te diremos* otrosí

    and king Nabucodonosor ... Now to-you will-tell also
    lo que quiere dezir
    it that wants mean
    'And king Nabucodonosor ... Now we will also tell you what this means'

    [GE4: 259; Fernández Ordóñez (2008-2009)] OLD SPANISH
She also states that mesoclisis cannot coexist with a focalized constituent, bracketed as [FOC] by her. At this point, the example in (20) is highly relevant and can shed light on the analysis of these structures, since mesoclisis is attested with a WH-element. This would rule out the possibility to consider mesoclisis a left peripheral focalization of the infinitive because, as is well known, WH-elements are incompatible with other types of left-peripheral foci, both in Spanish and Catalan, see (20b) and (20c), respectively:

(20) a. ¿quién dextram’á e tomará los ricos navíos ...?
   who leave-me-will and will-take the rich ship
   'Who will leave me and will get on the rich ship'
OLD SPANISH
b. *¿Quién LA CARNE comió? (y no las patatas)
   who THE MEAT ate (and not the potatoes)
c. * Qui LA CARN s'ha menjat? (i no les patates)
   who THE MEAT ate (and not the potatoes)

Additionally, as mesoclitic configurations are NEVER attested with the negative marker no/non, I take them not to be related to left peripheral focalization. From this standpoint, however, if they are neither related to contrastive focus nor to left peripheral unmarked focus, and are always found in root clauses, then two questions arise: Why is mesoclisis a main clause phenomenon? Doesn't it appear in any type of embedded clauses?

The examples in (21) illustrate its occurrence in two particular kinds of subordinated sentences. In (21a) the embedded sentence is subcategorized by the verb of perception vedes 'to see' and in (21b) the subordinate causal sentence does not relate to the predicate, but to the whole statement enunciated in the main clause (i.e., it is a peripheral adverbial clause).

(21) a. Ya lo vedes que partir nos emos en vida,
   already it see that go us will in life
   Yo yre & uos fincaredes
   I will-go and you will-stay
'You can already see that we must separate in life. I will go and you will stay'

[Cid: vv. 278-281; ed. R. Menéndez Pidal] OLD SPANISH

b. non temades del rey de Babilonia que amarvos a

not be afraid of the king of Babilon that love-you-will

e fervos a bien

and do-you-will good'

'Don't be afraid of the king of Babilone, because he shall love you and do you good'

[Fazienda: 168; ed. M. Lazar] OLD SPANISH

As already stated by Company (1985-1986), mesoclisis is generally used in main clauses of TOPIC-COMENT configurations, where the topic is an adverbial clause, as the Old Spanish examples in (22), and the Old Catalan ones in (23) illustrate.

(22) a. Si yo biuo, doblar uos he la soldada.

If I live, doble-you-will the salary

'If I live, I shall pay you double'

[Cid: v. 80; ed. R. Menéndez Pidal] OLD SPANISH

b. Et porque en este libro no esta escrito

and because in this book not is written

este enxiemplo, contarvoslo he aquí

this example, tell-you-it will here

'And as this example is not written in this book, I shall tell you it here''

[Lucanor: 294; Company (1999)] OLD SPANISH

(23) a. si era axí com vós deïts, seguir-se'n hia contradicció

If it were as you said, follow-CL-of-it had contradiction

'If it were as you said, there should be a contradiction'

[CICA: 1325_1349. Llull, Disputació dels cinc savis: 97] OLD CATALAN

b. Empero per tal que mils ho entenes declarar to he

but for such that better it understand tell you-it will
'But for you to understand it better, I shall tell you it briefly'

[Bernat Metge: 275; Par (1923: 289)] OLD CATALAN

Nevertheless, the Old Catalan and Old Spanish data in (24) show that it is not compulsory in these contexts, either.

(24) a. Sin demanes la companya ... te diran que

If-of her ask the company ... to-you will-tell that

filla es de Dionis
daughter is of Dionis

'If you ask whose daughter she is, they will tell you that she is Dionis's daughter'

[Bernat Metge: 2838; Par (1923: 476)] OLD CATALAN

b. sil serveys te sabra be remunerar

if-him serve to-you will-know well remunerate

'If you serve him, he will know how to reward you'

[Bernat Metge: 181; Par (1923: 476)] OLD CATALAN

c. si ben cerques les histories antigues veuras ho

if well-of-it search the histories old will-see it clearly

'if you look for the old histories, you will see it clearly'

[Bernat Metge: 3398; Par (1923: 477)] OLD CATALAN

d. Et puesto qu'el león non me pensase mal,

and owing that-the lion not to-me think badly

usando con él los malos consejeros, avriales de

using with him the bad advisors, would-have-them of escuchar
'And to avoid the lion being suspicious of the fact that I could make use of bad advisors, I would have to listen to them'


Hence, mesoclisis is attested in matrix clauses and in those embedded clauses that allow for main clause phenomena, otherwise it is excluded. Notice that, in contrast with participle preposing, mesoclisis is even excluded from restrictive relative clauses. Again, an explanation for this distribution follows if we take into account Haegeman (2007), (2010a), and (2010b) hypothesis concerning the derivation of central adverbial clauses as free relatives, with wh-movement of an operator to the left periphery (to ForceP). As mentioned above and shown in figure 5, the operator originates in Cinque’s MoodIRREALIS P and moves to ForceP. This analysis predicts the incompatibility of central adverbial clauses with main clause phenomena and also with modal expressions located higher than MoodIRREALIS P (i.e., expression of speech act mood, evaluative mood, evidential mood, and epistemic modality). In fact, Haegeman states that the operator merged in MoodIRREALIS P shares relevant features with high modal expressions (speech act, evidential, evaluative or epistemic). That is, they belong to the same class of expressions. Therefore, central adverbial clauses will exclude high modal expressions (and, thus, mesoclisis) on the bases of intervention effects. They should not be possible either in clausal complements of factive predicates, restrictive relatives, among other derived structures, or subjunctive clauses.

On the contrary, the operator won't have intervention effects with low deontic modals because it (the operator) is base generated in a position above Cinque’s low modals (IrrealisP) and below high modals. Moreover, there won't be intervention effects with peripheral adverbial clauses, because they have an operator in the CP domain that is merged directly as the specifier of the head that hosts the connective.

To sum up, the intervention account could provide us with an explanation for 'main clause - embedded clause' asymmetries and also for the incompatibility of high modal expressions with central adverbial clauses. If we consider mesoclisis a high modal expression, the explanation of its absence in central adverbial clauses follows.

Hence, the previous considerations seem to favor those analyses that regard mesoclisis as modal structures (Octavio de Toledo 2011), rather than focused future and conditionals. Along these lines, Octavio de Toledo considers these analytic constructions to be part of a system of modal periphrases. In my opinion, they can have several different modal meanings throughout the medieval
period, one of which would be evidential modality, which is clearly the case of (25). As is well known, evidential modals are used when the speaker is absolutely sure of the facts (as it happens with the evidential modality uses of English will, for instance).³

(25)  
et  porque  sé  que  lo  queredes, fablarvos  he  

and because know that it want, talk-to-you will

daquí adelante  essa  misma  materia

will  from-here-onwards  this  same  matter

'and since I know that you want it this way, from now on I will tell you about the same subject'

[CORDE: 1325 - 1335, Juan Manuel, El Conde Lucanor, ed. de G. Serés] OLD SPANISH

Besides, the examples in (26) show that mesoclitic structures can also have an epistemic modal value:⁴

(26)  
a.  &  se  aueran  enuidia.  &  quiça  se  mataran.  

and  CL  have  envy  and  perhaps  CL  will-kill

'And they will be jealous of each other and perhaps they will kill each other'


b. estonce significa que aura  y  roydo.  

then  means  that  will-be  there  noise

&  quiça  leuantar  sa  alguno

and  perhaps  get-up-CL-will  someone

'Then it means that there will be noise and perhaps someone will wake up'


Similarly, Old Catalan mesoclitic configurations behave as high modal expressions as the examples in (17) show, and particularly (17c) where it is used for giving cooking instructions (i.e., as speech act imperative mood). More to the point, Riera-Casanellas-Puig examine a series of analytic futures that appear in the Èxode and Levitic of a XIV century Bible and regard many of them as examples
of future imperatives, for instance: *alepidar-me-han* [Ex.: 17, 4P], *ajustar-l'ha* [Ex.: 22, 8E], *anadir-hi-ha* [Lv. 27, 31C], etc.

As known, the origin of mesoclitic constructions must be traced back to spoken Latin periphrasis of obligation. According to Yllera (1973: 92), it already expressed ability and possibility in Cicero's letters of youth. One century latter, in Seneca the Old, it meant necessity. HABERE usually preceded the infinitive when it expressed possibility and could precede or follow it when it expressed necessity. In Tertullian, HABERE+infinitive meant possibility and infinitive+HABERE, necessity. This was the usual correspondence order-meaning from then onwards. Therefore, under Cinque's (1999), the Latin auxiliary was already merged either in Mod_OBLIGATION_P or in Mod_NECESSITY_P. Further diachronic developments of this periphrasis follow from upward reanalysis in line with Roberts and Roussou (1999, 2002 and 2003) and Roberts (2007). So that, on the bases of the preceding data, I pose that the different values conveyed by mesoclisis obtain via lexical insertion of the auxiliary in the corresponding functional projection (Mod_OBLIGATION, Mod POSSIBILITY or Mod_NECESSITY, in Late Latin or Early Romance, and Mod_EPISTEMIC, Mod_EVIDENTIAL or Mood_SPEECH_ACT in Old Spanish and Old Catalan, as exemplified in figure 8 below).

**FIG. 8. Adverbs and functional projections (Cinque 1999)**
The consequent movement of the infinitive, as an XP, from inside the vP, through the FocusvP, to the specifier position of the corresponding Modal or Mood functional projection that hosts the auxiliary head, so as to check the relevant features, conveys a presentational meaning and brings about clitic left adjunction to the auxiliary head, as sketched in (27).

(27)

This derivation accounts for its incompatibility with central adverbial clauses, since it is a 'high modal expression' which creates intervention effects, in terms of Haegeman analysis, and it also implies movement of the infinitive, which blocks the central adverbial clause operator movement.

**FIG. 9. Intervention effects with high modal expressions**

As for the temporal value of synthetic futures and the mood of synthetic conditionals, they obtain by left adjunction of the infinitival head to the \( T_{\text{FUTURE}} \) or \( \text{Mood}_{\text{IRREALIS}} \) auxiliary head, respectively, which do not interfere with XP movement of the central adverbial clause operator.

5. Conclusion

This work examines two Old Spanish and Old Catalan structures which are apparently similar: participle preposing and mesoclitic configurations. It shows that neither of them are obligatory, and
also that they are marked and display a considerably low frequency. After establishing some basic aspects of Old Spanish and Old Catalan hierarchical sentence structure, it poses that participle preposing corresponds to unmarked focus fronting to the high left periphery (to Unmarked FocusP), whereas mesoclisis can be taken as movement through low peripheral FocusvP, within the vP field, towards any of the projections that express the speaker point of view modality (mood speech act, mood evaluative, mood evidential, mod epistemic) where the auxiliary has previously been merged. Accordingly, it shows that the incompatibility of participle preposing and mesoclisis structures with central adverbial clauses can be attributed to intervention effects, in terms of Haegeman, because the former implies movement to the high left periphery (but for the few cases in which it remains in the FocusvP) and the latter are high modal expressions derived via XP movement, which interferes with the central adverbial clause operator movement.
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1 In many languages a verbal affix, or a (modal) auxiliary, or a particle is used to express the type of evidence the speaker has for his/her assertion. Some languages have quite elaborate evidential systems, making as many as five or six distinctions, according to whether the speaker has visually witnessed the situation described, has had only auditory evidence, or sensory evidence of some other kind; has heard someone else's report, had "revelative" evidence (a dream), has evidence from his own previous experience, etc. ... Other languages simply make a distinction between direct evidence (usually unmarked) and "reported" or "hearsay" evidence ("quotative" evidentiality). This is the case of the Danish modal *skulle* ... and the German modal *sollen* ... In Romance, the
"conditional mood" can have a similar "quotative" usage ... In those languages lacking evidential affixes, modals, or particles, the same basic distinctions can be expressed by periphrasis (it is said that ..., etc.), or by evidential adverbs, which I take to be generated in the specifier position of Evidential Mood Phrase.' [Cinque (1999:85-86)]

2 I leave the investigation on this semantic value and its syntactic effects for future research.

3 Palmer (1986) says that the whole purpose of evidentials is to provide an indication of the degree of commitment of the speakers: he/she offers a piece of information but qualifies its validity for him/her in terms of the type of evidence he has. Here I take the wide conception of the term "evidential" linguistic items that indicate the speaker's type of evidence for his/her claim and/or the degree of its reliability, probability or certainty.

4 According to Cinque (1999:86), 'epistemic modality expresses the speaker's degree of confidence about the truth of the proposition (based on the kind of information he/she has ... The lack of confidence on the part of the speaker can also be expressed by such "speaker-oriented" or "epistemic" adverbs as probably, likely, presumably, supposedly, and so on'.
