# Word order and information structure in Old Spanish*

## Ioanna Sitaridou

University of Cambridge. Queens' College
is269@cam.ac.uk

**Abstract**

In this article it is claimed that in Old Spanish the discourse-sensitive field is exclusively the preverbal one. Focusing on object preposing, it is shown that the object can: (i) either be linked to a topic reading (England 1980, 1983; Danford 2002); or (ii) an information focus reading (cf. Cruschina and Sitaridou 2011) –the latter only available as the rightmost element in Modern Spanish (cf. Zubizarreta 1998, *inter alios*); or (iii) a contrastive focus reading; or (iv) *verum focus* reading (cf. Leonetti & Escandell-Vidal 2009). Given all these different discourse readings which are linearized as verb second syntax, the testing hypothesis is that the verb second orders are an epiphenomenon of the organisation of information structure (cf. Wanner 1989; Bossong 2003; Sitaridou 2006, 2011 *pace* Fontana 1993; Cho 1997; Danford 2002; Fernández Ordóñez 2009; Molina 2010) rather than structural as in the Germanic languages.

**Keywords**: Old Spanish; Topicalisation; Focus Fronting; OV; V2.

## Table of Contents

## 1. Introduction

The central goal of this article is to investigate the interaction between information structure and word order in Old Spanish[1] and, ultimately, to shed light on: (i) the evolution of word order from Old Spanish to Modern Spanish; and (ii) the triggers, as well as the mechanism, changing the interaction/mapping between information structure and syntax. Seeking to answer this last question could also potentially enable us to better understand the nature of this interaction namely whether it takes the shape of specialised positions for information structure-categories (namely the cartographic approach, see Rizzi 1997, Frey 2004, Aboh 2004, *inter alios*); or, rather, syntactic options are exploited at the interfaces (namely, the mapping approach, see Haider & Rosengren 1998, Neeleman et. al. 2009, *inter alios*); and whether or not, diachronically, a system whose interaction places more of the labour onto pragmatics can change into a system whereby the division of labour is more costly for syntax; if this proves to be the case then this could be just another instance of grammaticalisation whereby discourse properties become functionalised —in this case this would mark the emergence (or activation) of new discourse-related functional projections, or the reanalysis of existing ones so that they are specialised for different discourse roles.[2] However, addressing the interaction between syntax and discourse is notoriously difficult when we are dealing with the historical record (see Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2009, Ferraresi & Lühr 2010), which is, precisely, the task we are confronted with in this paper.[3]

More specifically, we set out to analyse the historical record of Old Spanish in order to investigate whether XP preposing: (a) can be related to either a topic or focus reading (see Sitaridou 2006, 2012); and (b) if so, whether XP preposing has distinct syntactic reflexes according to each encoded discourse reading; for instance, clitic left dislocation (CLLD) in the case of topic as in Modern Spanish; strict adjacency between verb and focalised element in the case of informational focus–unlike what we find in Modern Spanish today which has informational focus to the right of the verb; sensitivity to islands, weak crossover effects, and absence of resumptive clitics in the case of contrastive focus (for an elaborate discussion of focalisation in Old

---

1. We use the term 'Old Spanish' heuristically in order to refer to properties shared by all Old Spanish varieties without however, intending to imply that a single such variety ever existed.
2. In either case we are dealing with some sort of syntacticisation (term originally coined by Givón 1979) of discourse (in the sense of Cinque & Rizzi 2010; see Haegeman & Hill 2011) as, for instance, when discourse topics turn into grammatical subjects in a language. Consider (i) from Brazilian Portuguese:

   (i) O   relógio estragou       os ponteiros        (Brazilian Portuguese/*European Portuguese)
       the clock   damaged.3SG the hands
       'The hands of the clock broke down.'
       (Costa & Galves 2002: 5)
3. Given the existing methodological difficulties when dealing with the historical record, we do not consider here any of the prosodic correlates of focus and topic marking albeit there must have definitely played a significant role. We leave this issue open to future investigation.

Ibero-Romance, taking into account intonation contour as well, see Eide and Sitaridou, in prep.).[4]

In this article, by means of empirical evidence derived from *General Estoria*, it is claimed that in Old Spanish the discourse-sensitive field is exclusively the preverbal one which can host both topics and foci, including *verum foci* and informational foci – the latter only available as the rightmost elements in Modern Spanish (see Zubizarreta 1998, *inter alios*). The concentration of all this discourse-sensitive material to the left of the verb creates an epiphenomenal verb second syntax, which is however, unlike the one found in the Germanic languages (see Sitaridou, 2006 2012).

The article is organised as follows: In section 2.1 we outline the methodology used whereas in 2.2 there is a brief overview of the major empirical facts regarding word order in Old Spanish and the various approaches that exist to account for word order. The analysis of information structure in section 3 comprises the following sections: In section 3.1 we present the major assumptions regarding information structure in Modern Spanish –our departure point for the discussion on topicalisation and focalisation in Old Spanish in sections 3.2 and 3.3 respectively. In section 4 we sketch the articulation of the left periphery in Old Spanish and discuss the syntactic implications of this proposal for the transition from Old to Modern Spanish. Finally, we conclude our findings in section 5.

## 2. Word order in Old Spanish

Within the generative tradition, the discussion on word order and information packaging in Old Spanish is very much inspired by the literature on Old Romance which is, to a certain extent at least, expected and plausible, yet could be misguided if we were to adopt the position that all Old Romance languages have to exhibit a uniform behaviour. The two main camps in Old Ibero-Romance word order are essentially mirroring the same divisions found in discussions in favour and against a structural verb second (V2) analysis of Old French and Old Venetian syntax. The more mainstream approaches which consider Old Spanish to have a V2 rule are: Fontana (1993, 1997), Cho (1997), Danford (2002), Fernández Ordóñez (2009), Rodríguez Molina (2010) for Old Spanish; Ribeiro (1995) for Old Portuguese. The opposite view namely that Old Ibero-Romance did not exhibit a V2 syntax is advocated by: Wanner (1989), Bossong (2006), Sitaridou (2006, 2012) for Old Spanish; Martins (2002), Fiéis (2003), Eide (2006), Rinke (2007) for Old Portuguese. For the discussion in this paper we essentially follow the

---

4. Although there exists no sole definition of a topic (traditionally referred to as *thème*) and focus (traditionally referred to as *rhème*) –mostly because of their multi-interface nature between syntax, phonology pragmatics, and semantics– broadly speaking, we assume that: (i) *topic* is the old information conveyed in the sentence, and, as such, there can be more than one topic per sentence; (ii) *informational focus* marks new information among a set of alternatives and as such it cannot be exhaustive; (iii) *contrastive focus* (or *identificational focus*) restricts a contextually presupposed set to a restricted subset and is linked to exhaustivity, uniqueness, contrastivity, or instances of corrective focus; (iv) *verum focus* (also referred to as *emphatic fronting*, *quantificational fronting*, and *mild focalisation*) is a type of narrow (=quantificational) focus which conveys emphasis.

argumentation in Sitaridou (2006, 2012) outlining the findings, which are only pertinent to Old Spanish word order, whilst also presenting some additional arguments against the structural V2 hypothesis[5] for Old Spanish.

## 2.1. Methodology

For the purpose of exemplifying core word order patterns in Old Spanish and how they map out on discourse, we used *General Estoria*.[6] Throughout the article we tried to draw all the examples uniquely from this text given that, methodologically, it is better suited for a discussion on word order and information structure to approach a single text rather than several ones since differentiation in terms of genre or stylistics may influence word order and information structure packaging (i.e., hyperbaton constructions in poetic texts inducing various types of splitting (e.g., DP, *wh*) not found in prose, see Mathieu & Sitaridou 2005). The only times we are deviating from the rule of a single text is when we need to assess claims made by other authors who have used texts other than *General Estoria* –although most often we refer to works of Fernández Ordóñez (2009) and Rodríguez Molina (2010) who both analysed GE1 and GE4 texts so that we stay true to the principle of one text–, or when we do not have relevant examples in our corpus. Finally, we only analyse the discourse function within matrix clauses because, as it is known, matrix and embedded clauses may instantiate the same discourse role differently.[7]

## 2.2. Evidence against the V2 status of Old Spanish

First, evidence against the V2 hypothesis derives from the *Glosas Emilianenses* (see Bossong 2006) –the earliest non-poetic attestation (yet in the form of fragments rather than continuous prose) of Spanish (ca. 1000-1100). It is interesting to observe that it does not show V2 but, instead, an overwhelming majority of VSO (1-2).

5.  When we use the term V2 and unless otherwise stated we always intend to convey structural V2 triggering T-to-C movement (see discussion in Sitaridou 2012). It should be noted that many authors in the Spanish bibliography do not use the term V2 consistently and, quite often, it is intended to convey linear V2.
6.  There exist important philological reasons why *scriptorium alfonsí* is more suited for a linguistic analysis: «Los manuscritos originales del scriptorium alfonsí surgen así como piedras miliares que nos permiten referenciar con seguridad nuestro camino de reconstrucción histórica» (Fernández-Ordóñez 2009: 1). [The original manuscripts of the Alfonsian tradition prove to be milestones, which allow us to safely infer the trajectory for historical reconstruction.] Furthermore, these texts satisfy other criteria too: (i) they are originals, not copies; (ii) with a fairly precise chronology (ca. 1280); (iii) unfortunately, they do not satisfy the criterion of a single author since they were not written by Alfonso X, but by the members of the *scriptorium alfonsí*.
7.  In this paper we focus exclusively on the study of word order and information structure in the matrix domain alone because differences exist between the matrix and embedded domains. For instance, Zubizarreta (1998: 252) notes that focus movement in embedded clauses is restricted according to whether the embedded clause is assertive or presupposed. Also, in Modern Greek, embedded VOS is more restricted in its focusing possibilities than matrix VOS (Sifaki, forth.).

(1)  Latin OV becoming VO in Old Spanish:
    a. Stantes                              in eclesia. audite              lectiones diuinas
       stand.PART.PL.FEM.NOM in church  hear.IMPER.2PL lessons   divine
                                                    (GlEm, 70r in Bossong 2006: 538)

    b. in  eclesia stantes.                          lectiones diuinas audite
       in  church stand.PART.PL.FEM.NOM lessons   divine  hear.IMPER.2PL
       'standing in church; listening to divine lessons'
                                    (reconstructed classical Latin in Bossong 2006: 538)

(2)  Latin SV becoming VS in Old Spanish:[8]
    a. multiplicabitur              abaritia; et  apparebit           multus aurus
       multiply.FUT.PASS.3SG avarice; and appear.FUT.3SG much   gold
       super terram […] et   petiebunt       mulieres sibi          uiros.
       on     earth.ACC and ask.FUT.3PL women   REFL.3SG men.ACC.
       Et   non obserbabuntur            pactus.
       and not  respect.FUT.PASS.3SG pacts
       Et   apparebunt       jn celo multa signa.
       and appear.FUT.3PL in sky  many signs
                                              (GlEm, 64r-65r in Bossong 2006: 539)

    b. multiplicabitur              abaritia; et   aurus multus apparebit
       multiply.FUT.PASS.3SG avarice; and gold   much   appear.FUT.3SG
       super terram […] et   mulieres sibi         petiebunt       uiros.
       on     earth.ACC and women   REFL.3SG ask.FUT.3PL men.ACC.
       Et   pactus non obserbabuntur.
       and  pacts   not respect.FUT.PASS.3SG
       Et   multa signa apparebunt        jn celo.
       and many signs appear.FUT.3PL in sky
       'Avarice shall be multiplied; and much gold will appear on earth and the
       women will ask the hand of the men. And the pacts shall not be respected.
       And many signs shall appear in the sky.'
                                    (reconstructed classical Latin in Bossong 2006: 539)

Given that our principal text of study in the present article namely, *General Estoria*, was composed between 1270 and 1284 (see Fernández Ordóñez 2006: 6) and the *Glosas Emilianenses* at least 200 years earlier it seems improbable that V2 arose and declined within the space of 200 years. Or, we would need to explain why *Glossas Emilianenses* do not exhibit any V2.

Second, there is a frequency argument against a V2 analysis (Sitaridou 2006, 2012). Table 1 summarises the main word order patterns in *General Estoria*:[9]

---

8.   The VS status of Old Spanish, always according to Bossong (2006), does not reflect the end-state grammar namely, Modern Spanish in which there is reversion to an SV order. We do not consider this change here (but see section 4).
9.   The first 297 matrix verbs from GE1 [fol. 5r] onwards.

**Table 1.** Word order in matrix clauses in *General Estoria* (based on Rainsford 2006 in Sitaridou 2012)

| | |
|---|---|
| V1 | 20.3% |
| V2 | 68% |
| V3 | 10.8% |

As can be seen in Table 1, V2 clauses are the most frequent type of clauses. They represent 68% of all sentences (203). 10.8% of the matrix clauses are V3, V4, and even V5 clauses where two or more constituents are preceding the finite verb. Furthermore, Table 1 shows that in 20.3% of the cases the finite verb appears in first position –one of the highest V1 percentages among a comparative survey of Old Romance languages (see Sitaridou 2012).

Third, there are qualitative arguments against a V2 analysis of Old Spanish (see Sitaridou 2006, 2012):

(a) The quest for an unambiguous cue for setting the V2 parameter in the child's grammar leads to an exclusion of word orders, which, although perfectly grammatical in a V2 grammar, are also grammatical in non-V2 grammars. This line of thought essentially rules out: SVO and XP-V-S whereby the subject is lexical since both orders are found in non-V2 grammars. The most unambiguous cue for a V2 grammar is argued to be XP-V-S whereby the subject is pronominal, and which is exemplified from German in (3) –a prototypical V2 language:

(3)  Am Morgen  liest      er Bücher                              (German)
     in   morning read.3SG he books
     'He reads books in the morning.'

Old Spanish also exemplifies the word order in (3), as shown in (4):

(4)  Estonce dixo      ella que …                    (GE1 6V, 1, 20)
     then       said.3SG she that
     'Then she said that …'

Although the word order in (4) is attested in Old Spanish, crucially, it is found in a very low frequency in our corpus –consider Table 2.

**Table 2.** XP-V-S (S=pronominal) in Old Spanish (*General Estoria*)

| XP-V-S (S=pronominal) | Occurrences/out of total number of sentences/out of total V2 | Percentage out of total number of sentences/ percentage out of V2 |
|---|---|---|
| Old Spanish | 8 / 295 / 203 | 2.7% / 3.94% |

Although the word order XP-V-S, whereby the subject is lexical, has been very stable in the history of Spanish (5b) (see Zubizarreta 1998), the word order

XP-V-S whereby the subject is pronominal (5a), is odd in Modern Spanish unless the postverbal pronominal subject bears a contrastive/disambiguating reading:[10]

(5) a. ??Ayer      presentó      ella  su renuncia.           (Modern Spanish)
        yesterday presented.3SG she her resignation
        'She presented her resignation yesterday.'

   a'. ? Ayer      ella presentó       su renuncia.
        yesterday she  presented.3SG her resignation
        'She presented her resignation yesterday.'

   b.   Ayer      presentó      María su renuncia.
        yesterday presented.3SG Maria her resignation
        'Mary presented her resignation yesterday.'

   c. ?*presentó       María su renuncia.[11]
        presented.3SG Maria her resignation
        'Mary presented her resignation.'

The low percentage of the word order XP-V-S whereby the subject is pronominal in Old Spanish does not seem to be out of line with the marked acceptability of this

10. It is hardly surprising that neither (5a) nor (5a') are perfectly grammatical given that both Old and Modern Spanish are null-subject languages and therefore, overt pronominal subject realisation is always a marked option. Note however, that (5a), albeit worse than (5a'), becomes acceptable in Modern Spanish under a specific reading (ii):
  (i) Se        acababan  de pelear         porque no estaban  de acuerdo (Modern Spanish)
     REFL.3PL ended.3PL of quarrel.INFIN because not were.3PL of accord
     en la  manera de afrontar    aquel problema.
     in the way  of deal.INFIN this   problem
     El jefe le     dio    la razón a él y    entonces presentó
     the boss he-DAT gave.3SG the reason to he and then       presented.3SG
     ella        su renuncia sin     dudarlo        ni un minuto.
     she.NOM her  resignation without doubt.INFIN.it not one minute
     'They just quarreled because they didn't agree on how to deal with that problem.
     The boss agreed with him and she presented her resignation without doubting it for a minute.'
  The word order XP-V-S whereby the subject is pronominal in (ii) is fine because an overt pronominal subject is needed for switching reference, or the subject of *presentó* 'presented' would be understood to be either *el jefe* 'the boss', or the third person involved in the discourse (although the meaning would prevent this, the syntax would induce coreferentiality with either the boss or the third person; hence the need for an overt pronominal subject). Therefore, it is by no means a non-marked word order. In fact, in all null-subject languages, including Modern Spanish, overt pronominal subjects are by defninition emphatic or contrastive or disambiguating –otherwise, a null subject would be triggered.
11. Although (5c) sounds very odd, it could not be totally ruled out in embedded clauses, such as (i), possibly because there is an overt complementiser:
  (i) Nunca hubiera              imaginado que presentara          (Modern Spanish)
     Never have.IMPERF.SUBJ.1SG imagined  that present. IMPERF.SUBJ.3SG
     María su renuncia    en aquellas condiciones.
     Mary her resignation in these     conditions.
     'I have never imagined that Mary would present her resignation under such conditions.'

order in Modern Spanish. Regardless of whether this order can be claimed to be the trigger of V2, what remains intriguing about the word order in (5c) is why there is a need for a fronted XP when there is subject-verb inversion (5b) (we briefly return to this issue in section 4).

(b) In Old Spanish there is plenty of V-XP-S without strict verb-subject adjacency (6). The same occurs in Modern Spanish (7). Note that this is impossible in a V2 grammar like German (8):

(6) a. e    come<n>çara            la  a  poblar un nieto    dulixes …
                                                (GE1 5V, 1, 39)
       and start.IMPERF.SUB.3SG her to  inhabit a   nephew of-Ulysses
       'and Ulysses' grandson had started to inhabit it.'

    b. E    depues q<ue> troya fue      destroyda.        (GE1, 3v, 30)
       And after  that   Troy  was.3SG destroyed.FEM
       salieron ende       dos hermanos.
       left.3PL from-there two brothers
       'And after Troy was destroyed the two brothers left.'

(7) Ayer      presentó     su renuncia María.      (Modern Spanish)
    yesterday presented.3SG her resignation Maria
    'Mary presented her resignation yesterday.'

(8) *Am Morgen liest  Bücher Johan.                    (German)
      in   morning reads books  Johan
      'John reads books in the morning.'

To recapitulate so far, although the majority of evidence points towards a non-V2 analysis of Old Spanish word order, there is still the need to explain the subject-verb inversion in contexts with a fronted XP, as in (5b). Crucially, the subject-verb inversion cannot be due to a residual V2 syntax (à la Germanic) since the latter would require strict verb-subject adjacency, which is not the case in Old Spanish, as proved by the grammaticality of (7).

## 3. The encapsulation of information structure in Old Spanish

In this section we focus mainly on object preposing in matrix clauses and the discourse roles assumed by the direct object. It is generally believed that VO is the predominant order in Old Spanish (see England 1979, 1980, 1983: Danford 2002; Company Company 2006: 511-512; Bossong 2006: 535, *inter alios*). However, numerous instances of object preposing, either with or without Clitic Doubling (CD), are observed in the historical record, a fact already pointed out in the relevant literature –see Table 3.

**Table 3.** Object preposing in the history of Spanish (based on Danford 2002: 120/145)

|  | Fronted Direct Object (with Clitic Doubling) | Fronted Direct Object (no Clitic Doubling) | Total number of Direct Objects |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13th | 9 (1.3%) | 21 (3%) | 702 |
| 14th | 5 (1%) | 18 (3.4%) | 523 |
| 15th | 8 (1.3%) | 38 (6.3%) | 605 |
| 16th | 8 (1.6%) | 38 (7.7%) | 492 |

**Table 4.** Object preposing in *General Estoria*

|  | DO-V | IO-V |
|---|---|---|
| 13th | 6.1% (18/295) | 6.4% (19/295) |
| Total number of preposed objects | 18.5% (37/295) |  |

Our figures in Table 4, although not fully comparable –due to methodological issues– with the figures in Table 3, seem however, to confirm the relatively high percentage of object preposing in Old Spanish.

Both Tables show that preposing of the direct object ranges from 4.3% (1.3% plus 3% of objects in 13th century) to 6.1%. In the next sections we show that a preverbal object in Old Spanish can: (i) either be linked to a topic reading (see England 1980, 1983; Danford 2002; Sitaridou 2006, 2012); or (ii) an information focus reading (see Cruschina & Sitaridou, 2009); or (iii) a contrastive focus reading (see Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009; Rodríguez Molina 2010); or (iv) a *verum focus* reading. Given all these different discourse readings, which are linearised as OV, and therefore, place the verb in second position, the testing hypothesis is that the V2 orders are an epiphenomenon of the organisation of information structure (a hypothesis already put forward in Sitaridou 2006, 2012).

### 3.1. Assumptions on the information structure in Modern Spanish

In the discussion of information structure in Old Spanish we depart from standard assumptions regarding information packaging in Modern Spanish.[12] These assumptions are (cf. Contreras 1976, Silva-Corvalán 1981, Vallduví 1990, Zubizarreta 1998, Leonetti & Escandell-Vidal 2009, *inter alios*): (i) Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) (9), Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD) (10) and Clitic Right Dislocation (CLRD) (11) receive a topic reading; (ii) Fronting to the left (12) receives a contrastive focus interpretation; (iii) Clitic Doubling (CD) can be involved in both a topic reading (11) and an informational focus reading (13), thus making it irrelevant for distinguishing between the two; (iv) Informational focus

---

12. Methodologically, working backwards creates an anchoring point because of the availability of robust grammaticality judgments in Modern Spanish, of which we can never be certain when discussing information structure in a dead language like Old Spanish.

falls on the rightmost element in the sentence (14);[13] (v) Fronting may also be associated to *verum focus* which is merely conveying emphasis, and is therefore, different from either informational or contrastive focus interpretation (15):[14]

(9)  A Pedro, le      dio        Juan  una manzana.        (Modern Spanish)
     to Peter, he.dat gave.3SG John  an   apple
     'John gave an apple to Peter.'

13. It is possible –albeit marginal– to express informational focus by leftward movement in Modern Spanish, see (ib):

   (i)  a. — ¿Y  qué  te       han       traído   a  ti?              (Modern Spanish)
              and  what  you.ACC  have.3PL  brought  to  you
              'And what did they bring to you?'
        b. — Unos cigarillos  me  han       traído.
              some  cigarettes  me  have.3PL  brought
              'They brought me cigarettes.'
        c. — *Los cigarillos  me  han       traído.
              the    cigarettes  me  have.3PL  brought
              'They brought me the cigarettes.'

   However, although the fronted phrase in (ib) is new information and does not express any contrast, it is still a marked way to convey that the fronted material not only is it a new piece of information, but also it is surprising or unexpected which also explains the ungrammaticality of (ic) because *los cigarillos* 'the cigarettes' is a DP and therefore, forms part of the background assumptions; hence no element of surprise. Nevertheless, we can still construe a context where (ic) would be rendered felicitous —consider (ii).

   (ii) Context: Two brothers asked their parents to bring them something from Cuba. When the parents came back, one brother says to the other:
        a. —Yo  les      había       pedido una botella de ron y             (Modern Spanish)
             I    them  had.1SG  asked  a    bottle  of  rum and
             me  traen       un botijo típico.    ¿Y  a  ti   qué  te      han      traído?
             me  bring.3PL  a  jag   traditional. And to  you  what you have.3P brought
             'I have asked them to bring me a bottle of rum and they brought me a traditional jag.
             And what did they bring to you?'
        b. —Los  cigarrillos  me  han       traído.
             The  cigarettes  me  have.3PL  brought.
             ¿Acaso    dudaste     en algún momento de que me  los    trajeron?
             by-chance doubted.2SG in any    moment  of that me them brought.3PL
             'They brought me the cigarettes. Did you doubt for a moment that they would?'

   (iib) is felicitous, despite the DP which does not create the effect of surprise because the element of surprise establishes at the level of inferencing namely, it is surprising that one brother got what he wanted whereas the other brother did not.

14. According to Leonetti & Escandell-Vidal (2009), these constructions seem to have "mixed" properties. On the one hand, they resemble clitic dislocations in that the fronted constituent does not bear any emphatic stress, but, at the same time, like in contrastive focalisation, the construction does not include any resumptive clitic. The main difference between contrastive focus and *verum focus* seems then to be that in the former an element should be singled out from a discourse set of competing alternatives, whereas in the latter it cannot co-occur with an explicit mention of the discarded alternative, thus amounting to emphasis without a contrastive interpretation.

(10) Pedro, lo        vi.                                    (Modern Spanish)
    Peter   he.ACC  saw.1SG
    'I saw Peter.'

(11) Juan le      dio        una manzana, a  Pedro.        (Modern Spanish)
    John he.dat gave.3SG an  apple,     to Peter
    'John gave an apple to Peter.'

(12) a. A  PEDRO, dio        Juan una manzana (no A PAULO).
                                                    (Modern Spanish)
       To Peter    gave.3SG John an  apple     not to Paul
       'John gave an apple TO PETER.'

    b. *A Pedro, dio        Juan una manzana.
       To Peter, gave.3SG John an  apple
       '*John gave an apple TO PETER.'

(13) Juan le      dio        una manzana A PEDRO (no a  Paulo).
                                             (Modern Spanish)
    John he.dat gave.3SG an  apple      to Peter    (not to Paul)
    'John gave an apple TO PETER.'

(14) Juan come   MANZANAS.                              (Modern Spanish)
    John eat.3SG apples
    'John eats APPLES.'

(15) a. Dije       que terminaría      el  libro,          (Modern Spanish)
       said.1SG  that finish.COND.1SG the book
       y   EL LIBRO he         terminado
       and the book    have.1SG finished
       'I said that I would finish the book, and finish the book I did.'
                       (Leonetti & Escandell-Vidal 2009: 157)

    b. —¡Qué silencio! ¿Qué estarán haciendo los niños?
       what silence   what are.3PL doing    the kids
      —ALGO      estarán tramando, no paran   quietos
       something are.3PL plotting    not stop.3PL still
      y   siempre están    pensando en hacer     travesuras.
      and always are.3PL thinking   in do.INFIN pranks
      '—How quiet! What are the children doing?
      —They are plotting something,
      they never stand still and they are always plotting pranks.'

Leaving aside conceptual issues regarding the division of labour between different components of the grammar in yielding information structure, in the remainder of the paper we focus on identifying the mapping between syntax and discourse in Old Spanish. In particular, we concentrate on identifying the aforementioned discourse

roles (i.e., topic, information focus, contrastive focus, and *verum focus*). A more detailed discussion of discourse roles –for instance distinguishing between about-ness topics and contrastive topics on the one hand, and *verum focus* and contrastive/informational focus on the other– in a dead language like Old Spanish, on the information structure of which little is known within the generative tradition would be too perilous an enterprise at this stage –especially in the absence of a robust corpus annotated for morphosyntactic structure as well as information structure.[15]

### 3.2. Topicalisation in Old Spanish

Topicalisation comes in three distinct syntactic configurations in Old Spanish. First, object preposing often receives a topic reading (16).[16] [17]

(16)  e    fue      / natural duna   cibdat q<ue> dixeron    fenis […]  (GE1, 4V, 1, 19)
      and was.3SG/ native of-one city   which called.3PL Fenis
      Y   esta cibdat *poblo*        fenis fijo dagenor…
      and this city    inhabited.3SG Fenis son of+Agenor
      'And he was from a city which was called Fenis…
      and this city was inhabited by Fenis, son of Agenor.'

      Contrast (16) with its modern counterpart in (17):

(17) Y   esta ciudad la   pobló…                        (Modern Spanish)
     and this city    her inhabited.3SG
     And this city was inhabited…'

It follows that (16) would be ungrammatical in Modern Spanish under a topic reading since in Modern Spanish topics to the left are trivially rendered in a CLLD construction (17).

Importantly however, in Old Spanish there were also CLLDs in which the constituent that occurs at the leftmost periphery is interpreted as a topic, and is co-referential with the resumptive clitic which can appear either enclitically (18a) or proclitically (18b):

---

15. CORDE and *Corpus del Español* are, of course, robust corpora without however, the appropriate annotation for such task. However, such a corpus is currently under preparation, see: *Information Structure and Word Order Change in Germanic and Romance Languages* (http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/research/projects/iswoc/).

16. In sections 3.2 and 3.3, in the Old Spanish examples the verb appears in italics and the fronted constituent is underlined. We do not use the convention of capital letters to indicate focalised constituents because, in the absence of grammaticality judgments, attribution of discourse roles becomes more subjective and therefore, we would not want to bias the reader against forming different evaluations on the discourse role of the underlined constituents from the ones assumed here.

17. «Un evidente motivo de estrategia discursiva: el concepto al que se refiere el sustantivo en cuestión ya ha sido evocado en una frase anterior» (Eberenz 2000: 191). [An obvious pattern of discourse strategy: the concept to which the noun in question refers to is already mentioned in the preceding phrase.] .

(18) a. quando uio      <u>las letras</u> *fizo*      las      ayuntar    en uno    (GE1, 5v, 1)
      when   saw.3SG the letters made.3SG them join.INFIN in one
       'when he saw the letters, he made them put them together.'

   b. E   <u>los reis</u>   <u>a estos tales</u>   no los   *pueden*  matar…
     and the kings to these such not them can.3PL kill.INFIN
     'And the kings couldn't kill these …'
     (GE4: 35 in Fernández Ordóñez, 2008-2009: 6)

The observation that resumptive clitic pronouns in Old Spanish appear in dislocation structures is noted as early as in *Poema del mio Cid* (12/13th century) (see Gabriel & Rinke 2010, and the references therein). There is agreement that when doubling occurs as a discourse strategy, it marks the doubled entity as a topic. However, Bouzouita (2011, forth.) points out that CLLDs are not always associated with old information, but may also convey new information depending on how much weight one wants to give to pragmatic inferencing. She proposes that the interpretation of CLLD and HTLD structures ranges on a cline, the extremes of which represent known and new information.[18] Compare CLLDs constructions from *Fazienda de Ultra Mar*, (19a) conveying new information and (19b) conveying old information:

(19) a. Al    tercer anno que regno       Joachim,
     in-the third   year  that reigned.3SG Joachim
     rey  de Judea, vino       Nabucodonosor,
     king of Judea  came.3SG Nabucodonosor
     el  rey  de Babilonia [a] Jherusalem e    prisola.
     the king of Babylon  to Jerusalem    and captured.3SG.her
     E   dio       el  Nuestro Sennor en sue mano al rey   Joachim,
     and gave.3SG the Our     Lord   in his hand  to king Joachim
     e   <u>los basos que eran</u>      en la  casa   del    Criador *aduxo*los
     and the cups   that were.3PL in the house of-the Creator  brought.3SG.them
     a  tierra de Sennor, a  casa   de tesoro  de su  ydola.
     to land  of Lord     to house of treasure of his idol
     'In the third year of Joachim's reign as king of Judea, N., the king of Babylon, came to Jerusalem and conquered it. And Our Lord handed Joachim over to him, and he brought the cups that were in the house of the Creator to the land of the Lord, to the treasure house of his idol.'
     (Faz.: 174 in Bouzouita 2011: 11)

18. Despite our efforts here to present a neat picture (and this is because, at the same time, we want to introduce a methodology of investigating information structure in the historical record which starts backwards (from end-state grammar to initial state grammar, for lack of grammaticality judgments in the latter) and proceeds in steps (from establishing basic discourse roles before establishing more intricate ones)), the notion of a cline is hardly surprising given that in the literature it has already been claimed that: (i) topics may convey contrastivity (see Molnár 2002); or (ii) newness of information and contrastiveness are not mutually exclusive properties of phrases (see Paoli 2011).

b. todo  lo que y      era         de oro  e    de plata  e    de arambre,
   all   the that there was.3SG of gold  and of silver and of copper
   todo  lo levaron
   all   it took.3PL
   'Everything of gold, silver and copper that was there, they took it all.'
   (Faz.: 161 in Bouzouita 2008a: 86)

What all the authors seem to agree upon is that CLLD is relatively rare in 13th cen-
tury Spanish and that the percentage of CLLD increases diachronically (Company-
Company, 2003: 230, *inter alios*).[19]

Third, Old Spanish also had Hanging Topic Left Dislocations (HTLD), in which
an «orphaned» constituent is base-generated in a discourse position to the left of
the verb (Bouzouita 2008a, 2008b, 2011, and references therein). Consider (20):

(20) E   <u>sobre las razones de la trasmigración</u>
     and on   the reasons of the transmigation
     <u>por cuyos años van     las cuentas  de las primeras estorias d'  este libro</u>
     of  those years go.3PL the episodes of the first       stories  of his book
     dizen    los sabios  en sus crónicas    que…
     say.3PL the savants in their chronicles that
     'and as for the reasons for the transmigration of those years, of which the episodes
     of the stories of this book refer to, the savants say in their chronicles that…'
     (GE4: 6 in Fernández Ordóñez 2009: 4)

HTLDs are difficult to distinguish syntactically from either topic without CLLD
or CLLD given the lack of consistent *a*-marking for the [+animate] direct object
in CLLD which essentially makes CLLD indistinguishable from HTLD (see
Bouzouita 2011, forth.).[20] Also, there seems to be no difference between HTLD and
CLLD in terms of clitic placement either, since they both trigger enclisis (unless
the left-peripheral constituent consists of the quantifier *am(b)o(s)* 'both' or *todo(s)*
'all' in which case proclisis is triggered).

Overall, we observe that all three strategies, namely topics without CLLD,
CLLD, and HTLD, are available over the same period, and despite subtle pragmatic
differentiation among them, all the constructions generally encode old information.
Furthermore, these strategies also share some syntactic properties, for instance
subject-verb inversion and enclisis (the latter not exclusively so). It remains open
as to whether these constructions were in free variation prior to generalisation of
CLLD and decline of topic without CLLD.

---

19. The data analysed by Fontana (1993) only contain two attestations of doubling in the 13th century
    (6.6%) and two occurrences in the 15th century (10%). In his 16th century data, however, the number
    of tokens jumps to an overall total of 7 out of 26 (26%). Fontana assumes that these numbers, although
    too small to be used reliably to substantiate any claim, may indicate a diachronic tendency towards
    increased doubling, which, according to him, becomes the norm in the 17th and 18th centuries.
20. Bouzouita (2011, forth.) argues that *a*-marking is not a diachronically viable criterion for distin-
    guishing CLLD from HTLD as the preposition *a* has not always been used as an accusative case
    marker in the history of Spanish: e.g. even in the 15th c. only 35% of DO common nouns with
    human referents appear with this preposition (Calderón Suárez 1994: 34 in Bouzouita 2011, forth).

### 3.3. Focalisation in Old Spanish

In this section we discuss contrastive focus on the one hand, and informational focus on the other, whereas *verum focus* is only briefly considered.[21] Let us start by considering contrastive focus since both Old Spanish and Modern Spanish seem to behave on a par given that, at both stages of the language, fronting of the object may yield a contrastive focus interpretation –in the case of Modern Spanish, in particular, this is the only reading, other than *verum focus*, under which an OV order can be tolerated. Consider (21):

(21) E   <u>aquel ídolo</u> *avié*   derribado
    And this   idol    had.3SG destroyed
    d'aquel logar ó     estudiera
    of this   place where stay.IMPERF.SUBJ.3SG
    un so alcaide   del   rey Nabucodonosor e   echaral
    a  his governor of-the king Nabucodonosor and throw.IMPERF.SUBJ.3SG.it
    en el agua del   Nilo
    in the water of-the Nile
    'and that idol had been destroyed in the place where a governor of the King Nabuchodonosor had been and had thrown it in the water of the Nile.'
    (GE4: 174 in Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009: 17)

The observation that focalised elements trigger proclisis and subject verb inversion enjoys global consensus (cf. Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009[22]; Batllori & Hernanz, forth., *inter alios*) (22).[23]

---

21. This is because of the difficulty to make fine-grained distinctions of discourse roles, which are difficult to tease apart.
22. «Como puede observarse, pueden ser foco los sujetos, los objetos, los adverbios y los adjetivos y participios en posiciones predicativas. Todos ellos se anteponen cuando tienen valor focal» (Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009: 12). [As it can be observed, subjects, objects, adverbs, adjectives, and participles in their predicative function, can all be focalised. When they are focalised they are all preposed.] However, it should be noted that for us some of the cases discussed by Fernández Ordóñez are not cases of contrastive focus, but, rather, information focus; crucially, the author makes no distinction between the two.
23. Some interesting cases of pseudo-clefting are also attested in Old Spanish. Although a study of these constructions lies outside the scope of the present paper, the existence of this additional focalisation strategy adds to the complexity of the information structure in Old Spanish:
    (1) Dixol       el rey: –Estonce, ¿qué son     moros?
        said.3SG.him the King: –so,      who are.3PL Moors?
        Respuso     Jeremías: –Señor, pueblo es     que creerá       en est omne
        replied.3SG Jeremias: –Sir,    peope is.3SG that create.FUT.3SG in this man
        que vos     digo,    que se      fará           profeta entr' ellos.
        that you.ACC say.1SG that REFL.3SG make.FUT.3SG prophet between them
        'The king said to him: –So, who are the Moors?
        Jeremias replied: –Sir, they are people who will believe in this man,
        that I have been telling you, who will become a prophet among them.'
        (GE4: 91 in Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009: 14)

(22) Si del      campo bien salides,    <u>grand ondra</u> *auredes*        vos
     if  from-the field    well go-out.2PL great  honour have.FUT.2PL you
     'If you come out of the battlefield well, you will be honoured to the highest
     degree.'
     (Çid, v.: 3565 in Batllorí & Hernanz, forth.: 1)

Let us now consider information focus in Old Spanish on which little or no
attention is given, and where the most interesting differentiation is observed
–always in relation to the packaging of new information in Modern Spanish, which,
essentially, requires new information to be the rightmost element in the sentence.
Cruschina & Sitaridou (2009) argued that in Old Romance preverbal constituents
can also convey informational focus (see also Benincà 2004, Sitaridou 2012). This
operation is dubbed focus fronting (FF) and is different from contrastive focus
movement since: (i) a contrastive interpretation of the focus constituent is not
necessary; (ii) there is strict adjacency between the fronted constituent and the
predicate especially in cases where the predicate is the verb «be» or «have» (for
a discussion of informational focus commonly appearing within the left periphery
in the Romance languages, especially Italo-Romance, but not exclusively so, see
Bentley 2007, Cruschina 2008 for Sicilian; Jones 1993, Cruschina & Remberger
forth., for Sardinian; Sitaridou & Kaltsa forth., for Pontic Greek). This is precisely
what is argued for Old Spanish, namely focus fronting yields information focus.
It occurs in a variety of syntactic contexts with different categories being fronted.
First, let us start by considering object fronting (23):

(23) a. <u>Bretanna</u> *poblo*          brutho                          (GE1, 3V, 12)
        Britany   populated.3SG Brutus
        'Brutus populated Britany.'

     b. <u>Fuerça</u> *fizieron*    los sabios  e    los altos  omnes        (GE1, 143v)
        force    made.3PL the savants and the high  men
        en el  nombre d' esta cibdad
        in the  name   of this city
        'The savants and the men of high standing imposed power in the name of
        the city.'

The claim that object preposing relates to an informational focus interpretation is
further corroborated by Rodríguez Molina's (2010) data (24):[24]

24. «Así, en la lengua alfonsí la posición de Foco puede recibir constituyentes sin valor focal enfático
    o contrastivo, si bien en muchos casos este es aún el valor que corresponde a los elementos
    preverbales que no pueden identificarse como Tópicos (Fernández-Ordóñez 2008-2009). Y, a tenor
    del uso que traslucen los textos, la proporción de elementos preverbales en [Espec, SFlex] parece
    haber sido un mecanismo sintáctico muy productivo en la lengua medieval, y este fenómeno
    puede explicarse sin más identificando como focos informativos a los elementos que ocupan dicha
    posición» (Rodríguez Molina 2010: 1336). [Therefore, in the language of Alfonso the position of
    Focus can host constituents without emphatic or contrastive focal value, although in many cases
    this is nevertheless the value which corresponds to preverbal elements which cannot be identified

(24)  E    <u>todo esto</u> *fazién*              él  e     sos fijos
      and all    this  do.IMPERF.3SG  he  and  his sons
      por la  tierra ó     seyé       ell  arca,
      for the  land  where was.3SG  the  arc
      non se          osando  allongar    d'  ella, como escarmentados por miedo
      not REFL.3SG daring  stray.INFIN from her  as     scarred        by  fear
      de venirles            aun  otro       diluvio
      to return.INFIN.them  yet  another  flood
      'And all this he and his sons did for the land where the arc was, not daring to
      stray from this land, scarred by the fear that yet another flood would return.'
      (GE1, 15v in Rodríguez Molina 2010: 1336)

It has been claimed (Cruschina 2008) that for focus fronting to occur strict adja-
cency is required between the fronted element and the verb. This is clearly exem-
plified by the data in (23-24)[25] and could be the only syntactic difference between
contrastive and informational focus since otherwise they both trigger proclisis.

   Second, consider focus fronting with predicatives, as shown in (25):

(25)  &   los qui se          gozaron       con  el to derribamiento  (GE4, 106r)
      and the  who REFL.3PL enjoy.FUT.3PL with  the your fall
      <u>penados</u> *seran*        por ello.
      punished  be.FUT.3PL  for this
      'And those who rejoice with your fall they will be punished for that.'

   Focus fronting of predicatives is further corroborated by additional data from
*General Estoria* analysed by Fernández Ordóñez (2008-2009: 12) in (26a) and
Rodríguez Molina (2010: 1434) in (26b-c):[26]

-----------

as topics … And according to the use which the texts reveal, the proportion of preverbal elements
in Spec-AgrS seems to have been a very productive mechanism in the medieval language, and this
phenomenon can be explained as attributing informational focus to the elements in said position.]

25. Interestingly, a similar observation is made by Danford (2002: 118) who observes that in
    declaratives in all cases in which a preverbal direct object appears and which is not reduplicated,
    it immediately precedes the verb, although it is not clarified what the discourse role of the
    object is.

26. It is interesting to point out that Modern Spanish preserves some flexibility regarding preposing
    of predicatives where a contrastive focus interpretation is not always obtained. Compare (ia)
    with (ib):
    (i) a. Feliz  estoy,    pero también me falta     María                (Modern Spanish)
           happy am.1SG but  also     me miss.3SG Maria
           'I am happy, but I also miss Maria.'
        b. FELIZ estoy     (y  no  triste)
           happy am.1SG and not sad
           'I am happy (not sad).'

(26) a. E    llamó        Daniel a  grandes vozes, ca        allí   estava,
        and called.3SG Daniel to great    voices because there stand.IMPERF.3SG
        e    dixo:
        and said.3SG
        —¡<u>Libre</u> *só*       yo de la  sangre e    de la   muerte d' esta mugier,
           free   am.1SG I  of the  blood  and of the  death   of this  woman
        e    non quiero aver          ý part!
        and not  want   have.INFIN it part
        'and he called Daniel in a loud voice, and said: I am free of the blood and the
        death of this woman and I don't want anything to do with it!.'
        (GE4: 293 in Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009: 12)

     b. Diz      el. Sennora. <u>cansado</u> *estó*      de muy luengo camino
        said.3SG he Lady      tired     am.1SG of very long     way
        que  e         andado que  me    non puedo    mandar (GE4, 20v)
        which have.1SG gone    which I.ACC not can.1SG send.INFIN
        'He said: Lady, I am tired of the long trip which I have gone and I cannot
        leave.'

     c. Cuando esto oyó          Isaac <u>espantado</u> *fue*       fieramientre
        when    this listened.3SG Isaac frightened  was.3SG fiercely
        'Isaac got very frightened when he listened this.'
        (GE1, 79v in Rodríguez Molina 2010: 1331)

   Third, consider focus fronting with participles (27):

(27) a. <u>Dexado</u>  *ha*       heredades e    casas  e    palaçios
        abandoned has.3SG lands       and houses and palaces
        'He has abandoned lands, houses and palaces'
        (PMC.115 in Fontana 1993: 66)

     b. <u>Desterrados</u> *son*       e   a  los infiernos descendieron …
        exiled        are.3PL and to the hell       descended.3PL
        'They were exiled and descended to hell …'
        (GE4: 434 in Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009: 12)

Constructions like the ones in (27) have been dubbed calques («arcaísmo sintác-
tico», see Martínez-Gil 1989: 907, Stengaard 2007, Rodríguez Molina 2010) and
it is claimed that they are often obtained when they are preceded by an object or
an adjunct:

(28) <u>De Asia e    de Africa oydo</u> *auedes*    ya
     of  Asia and of Africa heard  have.2PL already
     en otros libros quamannas son
     in other books how-large  are.3PL
     'About Asia and Africa you have already heard in other books how large they
     are …'
     (Primera Crónica General, cap. 2, in Stengaard 2007: 838)

At this stage it is important to stress the optionality of the focus fronting operation. Given that this syntactic operation is associated with new information it is expected that it will not always be obtained. Indeed this is trivially the case in our corpus since focus fronting does not always occur. Consider (29) which shows no fronting of the participle:

(29) E    *avie*     scripta en la   palma                                      (GE1 5R, 19)
    and had.3SG written on the palm tree
    'And he had written on the palm tree.'

    Fourth, focus fronting in other Old Romance languages can appear with quantifiers. However, in our corpus focus fronting with quantifiers was not encountered (30), but it does indeed occur (31):

(30) a. E   *fizo*-les             mucha onra                              (GE1 6V, 8)
      and caused.3SG.them much  honour
      'And it caused them much honour.'

    b. A ella *plogo*-l      mucho                                   (GE1 6V, 49)
      to her  liked.3SG.it much
      'She liked it very much.'

    c. E   *fallo*       en una montana  muchos ossos          (GE1 7R 35)
      and found.3SG in a    mountain many     bears
      'And he found in a mountain many bears.'

(31) Mucho se          *maravilló*       estonces el  rey  Nabucodonosor…
    much  REFL.3SG marveled.3SG then        the king Nabucodonosor
    'King Nabuchodonosor then marvelled a lot.'
    (GE4: 265 in Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009: 13)

    Finally, let us consider *verum focus* in Old Spanish. In order to do so, we depart from Modern Spanish for which *verum focus* is claimed to be quantificational (no CLLD, sensitivity to islands, WCO), triggering subject-verb inversion, and strict adjacency between the fronted material and the verb (for instance, unavailability of a 'sandwiched' subject between fronted material and the verb). Categories undergoing this type of fronting are: indefinite NPs, demonstratives, direct object NPs, adverbials, etc. Let us now consider how the discourse role of emphasis manifests itself in Old Spanish:

(32) a. Esto fiz      el  por aguardar   se        dotras   yentes (GE4, 6v, 1, 5)
        this made.3SG he  for wait.INFIN REFL.3SG of-other people
        'This is what he did in order to wait for other people.'

   b. estas       fizieran    dos hermanos fijos  dun Rey      (GE1, 7r, 2, 3)
      these.FEM made.3PL two brothers    sons  of-a king
      'Two brothers, sons of a King, made these.'

   c. & esto *fue*      en macedonia.              (GE4, 211v, 53)
        this  was.3SG  in Macedonia
      '(speaking of a dream he had) this happened in Macedonia.'

## 4. Diachronic implications for information structure packaging in Spanish

To summarise our empirical generalisations regarding the information structure packaging of objects in Old Spanish, consider Table 5.

Table 5 shows that: (i) The discourse values of both topic and focus are expressed to the left of the verb thus generating many OV orders which crucially do not constitute structural OV, or V2, but an epiphenomenal V2 motivated by discourse considerations; (ii) The syntactic reflexes of topic and focus are often indistinguishable given that both trigger VS (which is the default order in Old Spanish, see Bossong 2006, *inter alios*); (iii) The most reliable diagnostic to distinguish between topics and foci is enclisis vs. proclisis –topics are mostly found with enclisis whereas foci trigger proclisis (see Fernández Ordóñez 2008-2009, *inter alios*); (iv) Although CLLD is clearly distinguished from a focalised object, by virtue of duplication of the DP by a clitic, it can also trigger proclisis and may carry new information as well thus blurring the line between old and new information (see Bouzouita 2008); (v) Information focus cannot always be syntactically distinguished from contrastive focus albeit there is evidence for a strict adjacency between the fronted material and the verb in the case of informational focus.

On the basis of these observations, it is proposed that the hierarchy of discourse-sensitive functional heads in Old Spanish is the one in (33) (see Cruschina and Sitaridou 2009, Sitaridou 2012, Sitaridou and Kaltsa, forth., for a similar analysis of information structure in Pontic Greek):

(33) ForceP > TopP > FocusP$_{contrast}$[27] > FinP > FocusP$_{info}$ > TP > vP

The proposal in (33) is couched within the cartographic framework (see Belletti 2008, Rizzi 1997).[28] Essentially, we resort to a criterial analysis whereby there is a structural constraint on Spec-Head relations where the Specifier has an operator feature shared with the Head in a bi-unique feature checking relation

---

27. Contrastive focus subsumes *verum focus* (following Höhle 1992).
28. The clause architecture in Old Spanish in (33) is more detailed than the one proposed by Fernández Ordóñez (2008-2009: 3) in (i):
    (i) [Topic [XP [Complementiser [Focus [Negation [VSO]]]]]].

**Table 5.** information structure packaging of objects in Old Spanish

|  | Discourse values | Word Order |
|---|---|---|
| Focus | Informational | OVS |
|  | Contrastive | OVS (Clefting) |
|  | *Verum focus* | OVS |
| Topic | Familiarity | CLLD (OVS) |
|  |  | OVS |
|  |  | CLRD (VSO) |
|  |  | HTLD (OVS) |

(Brody 1990, 1995, Rizzi 1997). The operator feature in question is [focus]. The verb is the bearer of the relevant discourse (focus) feature, and for this reason it must move to the head of the functional projection for the local Spec-Head criterial configuration to be met; thus feature checking triggers focus movement V-to- FocusP$_{contrast}$ whereas in the case of informational focus fronting to V-to-FocusP$_{info}$ takes place.

Having dispelled a V2 analysis in section 2 and having advocated a criterial one in this section, the question at this point is whether the latter is superior to a Long Head Movement (LHM) analysis or not. Consider the structure in (34) which seems to support a LHM analysis in Old Spanish (see Rivero, 1993):

(34) <u>Otorgado</u> gelo     *avie*     el  abbat de grado
    granted   he.DAT.it  had.3SG the abbot of grade
    'The abbot granted it to him gladly.'
    (Cid, 261 in Rodríguez Molina 2010: 1369)

According to an LHM analysis, the word order in (34) namely, (non-finite)V-CL-Aux-XP can be subsumed by the criterial analysis proposed here because (i) in the configuration, the verb could provide support to second position clitics hence no need for LHM; (ii) LHM cannot co-occur with any other fronted constituent simply because the non-finite V (a past participle in this case) is already focalised. Additional evidence for the discourse-sensitive nature of the fronted non-finite V comes from (35) which, albeit from *Quijote* and therefore, methodologically anachronistic given that *Quijote* is early 17th century, shows beyond doubt that *perseguidome* 'persecuted-me' is focalised when fronted:

(35) <u>Perseguido</u>me *han*       encantadores, encantadores me persiguen
      persecuted-me have.3PL enchanters       enchanters       me persecute.3PL
      y    encantadores me perseguirán          hasta dar           conmigo y
      and enchanters    me persecute.FUT.3PL until  give.INFIN with-me and
      con  mil       altas caballerías en el  profundo abismo del    olvido
      with thousand  tall   chivalry    in the profound abyss   of-the oblivion
      'Enchanters have persecuted me, enchanters persecute me still, and enchanters
      will continue to persecute me until they have sunk me and my lofty chivalry
      in the deep abyss of oblivion.'
      (Cervantes, *Quijote*, II, 32, 896 in Rodríguez Molina 2010: 1354)

Second, according to Rivero (2009: 224-225), 'Within root contexts, the environments for LHM are more limited than those for V2, because LHM applies as a last recourse rule'. If LHM is an optional operation this indicates that it is not obtained for the elimination of features which are non-interpretable; otherwise, it would be operative at all times.

    Let us now consider the implications of this analysis for the recent history of Spanish. For this purpose, consider the changes between Old and Modern Spanish as presented in Table 6.

    As Table 6 shows, the major change[29] from Old to Modern Spanish concerns the encapsulation of informational focus which, following our analysis, must be due to the unavailability of preverbal $FocusP_{info}$ in Modern Spanish (see Batllorí & Hernanz, forth., for a similar conclusion in Old Catalan). According to Roberts & Roussou (2003: 7), «language change consists of some change in the realization/ attraction property of functional heads, that is, a change in the lexicon». Functional heads can be activated by merge (lexical insertion) or move (material from elsewhere is moved to the functional projection according to its attraction property). Change occurs when the experience for triggering a parameter setting has become obscure or ambiguous to the learner. In the case of the data discussed in this article we have seen that during the same period (that is 13th century) different discourse values linearised the same hence creating ambiguity for children. In particular, there is intense variation with regards to: (i) CLLD which appears to trigger both enclisis and proclisis; and could convey new information; (ii) CLLD and HTLD. The functional projection $FocusP_{info}$ was activated in Old Romance via movement of XP to its specifier position and movement of the verb to its head (to meet the Criterial configuration). Although the precise mechanics remain to be worked out, in Modern Spanish the left peripheral $FocusP_{info}$ has lost its attraction property and, as a consequence, informational focus stays in situ.

---

29.  Although it lies outside the scope of the present article to investigate word order change from Vulgar Latin to Old Spanish, it could be hypothesised that FF is a residual reflex of a previous OV grammar. It is well known that the initial state grammar, Latin, was both OV and V-final. If so, children acquiring a VO grammar may have reanalysed the structural OV of the previous generation as a discourse marked word order and therefore, reanalysed structural OV as FF. If this line of thought is on the right track it would match what Roberts and Roussou (2003: 36) discuss about reanalysis being always 'upwards'.

**Table 6.** Changes in information structure packaging in the history of Spanish

|  | Topic | Contrastive Focus | Information Focus | Verum Focus |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CLLD | OS/MS | – | – | – |
| Preposed object | OS | OS/MS | OS | OS/MS |
| CLRD | OS/MS | MS | – | – |
| Clefting | – | OS/MS | – | – |
| In situ | – | – | MS | – |

A concatenated change to the unavailability of FocusP$_{info}$ in the left periphery may have been the change from VS to SV from Old to Modern Spanish without however, intending to argue that SV was not possible in the relevant period. However, subjects in Old Spanish, when preverbal, could trigger enclisis which indicates that their structural position was not Spec-TP, but higher, possibly occupying an A´- position, such as, Spec-TopicP or Spec-FocP. In Old Spanish, the EPP in Spec-TP could be satisfied by any element which was undergoing further movement to one of the discourse-related projections (assuming that movement is step-wise), but could not serve as a landing site for subjects. Crucially, in Modern Spanish Spec-TP has become the landing site for subjects (*contra* Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998, see Ortega Santos 2008) and some restricted number of adverbs (see Zubizaretta 1988).

## 5. Conclusion

In this article it was argued that in Old Spanish preposed objects could receive different discourse values without however, them being accompanied by distinct syntactic reflexes. In particular, in 13th century Spanish there is evidence for various constructions competing for the same discourse value or (superficially) the same structure receiving distinct discourse values, thus creating ambiguity to the learner who resorted to the reorganisation of the information structure in the grammar. The most notable change was that informational focus was no longer encoded in the left periphery leading to the Modern Spanish grammar whereby informational focus is the rightmost element. A related change to this was claimed to be the change from VS to SV.

## Primary Text Sources

GE1: *General Estoria. Primera parte*
GE4: *General Estoria. Cuarta parte*

*Electronic Texts of Alfonso X*: *The Electronic Texts of the Prose Works of Alfonso X, el Sabio*, ed. de Ll. Kasten, J. Nitti y W. Jonxis-Henkemans, Madison, Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1997 (CD-ROM). Antes parcialmente publicado como *Concordances and Texts of the Royal Scriptorium Manuscripts of Alfonso X, el Sabio*, ed. de Ll. A. Kasten y J. Nitti, Madison, Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1978 (microfichas).

## Bibliography

Alexiadou, A.; Anagnostopoulou, E. (1998). «Parametrizing AGR: Word order, V movementand EPP checking». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16: 491-539.

Batllorí, M.; Hernanz, M.-L. (forth.). «Weak focus and polarity: Asymmetries between Spanish and Catalan». In: Biberauer, T.; Walkden, G. (eds.), *Syntax over Time: Lexical, Morphological and Information-Structural Interactions*. Oxford: OUP.

Belletti, A. (2008). *Structures and Strategies*. New York: Routledge.

Benincà, P. (1983/84). «Un' ipotesi sulla sintassi delle lingue romanze medievali». *Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica* 4: 3-19; Reedition in Benincà, P. (1994). *La variazione sintattica. Studi di dialettologia romanza*. Bologna: Il Mulino, pp. 177-194.

Bossong, G. (2006). «La sintaxis de las Glosas Emilianenses en una perspectiva tipológica». In: Girón Alconchel, José Luis; de Bustos Tovar, José Jesús (eds.). *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua española* (Madrid, 29 de septiembre-3 octubre 2003). Madrid: Arco/Libros, Vol. 1., pp. 529-544.

Brody, M. (1990). «Some remarks on the focus field in Hungarian». UCL Working Papers in *Linguistics* 2: 201-225.

Brody, M. (1995). *Lexico-logical form: a radically minimalist theory*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bouzouita, M. (2008a). The Diachronic Development of Spanish Clitic Placement. PhD dissertation, King's College London.

Bouzouita, M. (2008b). «At the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface: Clitics in the History of Spanish». In: Cooper, R. & Kempson, R. (eds.). *Language in Flux: Dialogue Coordination, Language Variation, Change and Evolution*. London: College Publications, pp. 221-263.

Bouzouita, M. (2011). «Las dislocaciones a la izquierda: una perspectiva histórica». Talk given at the 18. Deutscher Hispanistentag, 26th of March 2011. Passau (Germany).

Bouzouita, M. (forth.). «Left Dislocation Phenomena in Old Spanish». In: Dufter A.; Octavio de Toledo, Alvaro S. (eds.). *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish: Diachronic, Variationist and Typological Perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Calderón Suarez, P. (1994). *Estructura y evolución del objeto directo animado en el español medieval*. PhD dissertation, México, UNAM.

Cho, E. (1997). La topicalización y sus restricciones sintácticas en la Primera Crónica General de España de Alfonso X. PhD dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

Cinque, G.; Rizzi, L. (eds.) (2010). *Mapping Spatial PPs. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures* 6. New York: OUP.

Costa, J.; Galves, C. (2002). «External subjects in two varieties of Portuguese: evidence for a non-unified analysis». In: Beyssade, C.; Bok-Bennema, R.; Drijkoningen F; Monachesi, P. (eds.). *Proceedings of Going Romance 2000*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 109-125.

Cruschina, S. (2008). Discourse-related features and the syntax of peripheral positions. A comparative study of Sicilian and other Romance languages. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Cruschina, S.; Sitaridou, I. (2009). «From modern to old Romance: The interaction of Information Structure and word order». Paper given at the XI Diachronic Generative Syntax (DiGS), Universidade de Campinas, 20-22/08/2009.

Danford, R.K. (2002). Preverbal Accusatives, Pronominal Reduplication, and Information Packaging: A Diachronic Analysis of Spanish. PhD dissertation, Ohio State University.

Eide, K. (2006). Word order structures and unaccusative verbs in Classical and Modern Portuguese. The reorganisation of information structure. PhD dissertation, University of Oslo.

Eide, K.; Sitaridou, I. (in prep.). «Contrastivity in the Diachrony of Ibero-Romance: Quantificational vs. Non-quantificational Focus». Ms., University of Oslo & University of Cambridge.

England, J. (1980). «The Position of the Direct Object in Old Spanish». *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 5/1: 1-23.

England, J. (1983). «Word order in Old Spanish prose: The Indirect Object». *Neophilologus* 67: 385-394.

Fiéis, A. (2003). Ordem de Palavras, Transitividade e Inacusatividade. Reflexão Teórica e Análise do Português dos Séculos XIII a XVI. PhD dissertation, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.

Fernández Ordóñez, I. (2006). «La Historiografía medieval como fuente de de datos lingüísticos. Tradiciones consolidadas y rupturas necesarias». In: de Bustos Tovar, José Jesús; Girón Alconchel, José Luis (eds.). *Actas del VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española* (*Madrid, UCM, 29 de septiembre-3 de octubre de 2003)*. Madrid: Arco/Libros, vol. II, pp. 1779-1807.

Fernández Ordóñez, I. (2008-2009). «Orden de palabras, tópicos y focos en la prosa alfonsí». *Alcanate*, VI: 139-172.

Ferraresi, G.; Lühr, R. (2010). «The Role of Information Structure in Language Change: Introductory Remarks». In: Ferraresi, G.; Lühr, R. (eds.). *Diachronic Studies on Information Structure Language Acquisition and Change*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, pp. 1-14.

Fontana, J.M. (1993). Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Fontana, J.M. (1997). «On the integration of second position phenomena». In: van Kemenade, A.; Vincent, N. (eds.). *Parameters of morphosyntactic change*. Cambridge: CUP, pp. 207-249.

Gabriel, C.; Rinke, E. (2010). «Information packaging and the rise of clitic doubling in the history of Spanish». In: Ferraresi, G.; Lühr, R. (eds.). *Diachronic Studies on Information Structure Language Acquisition and Change*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, p. 55-77.

Givón, T. (1979). *On Understanding Grammar.* (Ch. 5, Syntactization). New York: Academic Press.

Haegeman, L.; Hill, V. (2011). The syntacticization of discourse. Ms., Ghent University and University of New Brunswick-SJ.

Haider, H.; Rosengren, I. (1998). *Scrambling*. Sprache und Pragmatik 49. Lund.

Hinterhölzl, R.; Petrova, S. (eds.) (2009). Information Structure and Language Change. New Approaches to Word Order Variation in Germanic. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Höhle, T. (1992). «Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen». In: Jacobs, J. (ed.). *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 112-141.

Leonetti, M.; Escandell-Vidal, V. (2009). «Fronting and Verum-Focus in Romance». In: Dufter, Andreas; Jacob, Daniel (eds.). *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 155-204.

Martins, A.M. (2002). «The loss of IP-Scrambling in Portuguese: Clause structure, word order variation and change». In: Lightfoot, D. (ed.). *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 232-248

Martínez-Gil, F. (1989). «Las inversiones del orden de las palabras en el *Romancero*». *Hispania* 72: 898-905.

Mathieu, E.; Sitaridou, I. (2005). «Split *wh*-Constructions in Classical and Modern Greek: A Diachronic Perspective». In: Batllori, M.; Hernanz, M.-L.; Picallo, C.; Roca, F. (eds.). *Grammaticalization and Parametric Change*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 236-250.

Molnár, V. (2002). «Contrast –from a contrastive perspective». In: Hallelgard, H.; Johansson, Stig; Behrens, Bergljot; Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine (eds.). *Information Structure in a Cross-LinguisticPerspectiv*e. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, pp. 147-161

Neeleman, A.; Titov, E.; van de Koot, H.; Vermeulen, R. (2009). «A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast». In: Craenenbroeck, J. Van (ed.). *Alternatives to Cartography*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 15-51.

Ortega Santos, I. (2008). Projecting subjects in Spanish and English. PhD dissertation, University of Maryland.

Paoli, S. (2011). «Contrastiveness and New Information: a new view on Focus». *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 34: 137-161.

Ribeiro, I. (1995). «Evidence for a verb-second phase in Old Portuguese». In: Battye, A.; Roberts, I. (eds.). *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 110-139.

Rinke, E. (2007). *Syntaktische Variation aus synchronischer und diachronischer Perspektive: Die Entwicklung der Wortstellung im Portugiesischen*. Frankfurt am Main/ Madrid: Vervuert.

Rizzi, L. (1997). «The fine structure of the left periphery». In: Haegeman, L. (ed.). *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281-339.

Rivero, M.-L. (1993). «LHM vs V2 and null subjects in Old Romance». *Lingua* 89: 217-245.

Rodríguez Molina, J.R. (2010). La gramaticalización de los tiempos compuestos en español antiguo: Cinco cambios diacrónicos. Phd dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

Sifaki, E. (forth.). VOS in Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics*.

Sitaridou, I. (2006). «A comparative study of word order in Old Romance». Ms. University of Hamburg and University of Cambridge.

Sitaridou, I. (2012). «A comparative study of word order in Old Romance». In: Carlier, Anne; Lamiroy, Béatrice; De Mulder, Walter (eds.). «The pace of Grammaticalisation in Romance». *Folia Linguistica*, Special Issue 46(2).

Sitaridou, I.; Kaltsa, M. (forth.). «Information structure in Pontic Greek». *Lingua*.

Stengaard, B. (1994). «El auxiliar pospuesto (V-aux) en el español antiguo». Edición digital a partir de *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*. Tomo I. Madrid, Pabellón de España, 1992. Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, pp. 831-840.

Wanner, D. (1987). «Le latin vulgaire comme documentation du protoroman. Latin vulgaire - latin tardif». In: Herman, J. (ed.). *Actes du Ier colloque international de latin vulgaire et tardif (Pécs, Hungary 1985)*, pp. 215-234. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Zubizarreta, M.L. (1998). *Prosody, Focus and Word Order*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.