1. Introduction

In Spanish emphatic affirmative sentences like (1a), as opposed to their neutral counterparts in (1b), normally consist of the positive word sí (“yes”) followed by the tensed verb:

(1)  a. Pepito sí come pasta.
    Pepito yes eats pasta
    ‘Pepito does eat’
    b. Pepito come pasta.
    ‘Pepito eats pasta’

As has been observed by Laka (1990), among other authors, the example in (1a), rather than counting as the positive equivalent of the negative sentence in (2), is interpreted as a marked affirmative sentence:

---
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The goal of this paper is to address the study of a particular type of emphatic positive marker in Spanish, the particle *bien* (literally, “well”), which may appear either in a preverbal position or followed by the complementizer *que* (“that”), as illustrated in (3a) and (3b), respectively:

(3)  

   ‘But Pepito eats pasta’

b. *Bien que* come pasta Pepito.  
   ‘But Pepito indeed eats pasta’

Despite their interpretive differences, the examples in (1a) and (3) share a relevant property, namely, they qualify as emphatic affirmative sentences in Spanish. Moreover, as we will see below, the emphatic value conveyed by *bien* also extends to the cases where it is used as a degree-modifier, as in (4):

(4)  

Pepito es *bien* listo.  
   ‘Pepito is really smart’

In this paper I will argue for a comprehensive analysis of the syntax of *bien*, focusing specially on the alternation between *bien* and *bien que*. The main claim I make is that *bien* is an assertive operator whose contribution to the semantic interpretation of the sentence is reminiscent of its scopal domain. In order to capture both sides of the nature of *bien*—i.e., its positive value and its emphatic import—it will be suggested that, besides the low functional phrases (*DegreeP*, *PolP*) hosting *bien*, a higher functional projection in the left periphery of the sentence, *FocusP*, is involved. On the other hand, the (slight) contrast exhibited by the examples in (3) clearly suggests that the complementizer plays a relevant role in the alternation *bien/bien que*, as well as in other emphatic constructions where a similar pattern arises. In this connection, it will be shown that the complementizer in (3b) is associated with an echoic value that is lacking in (3a). This behavior parallels that of echoic negation in a significant way, which provides strong support for the view that some crucial properties of negative sentences may hold across the whole paradigm of (negative and positive) polarity.
This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I present a general overview of the behavior of *bien*, and I examine the emphatic positive value of this adverb, mainly its connection to both negative markers and the positive polarity marker *sí* (“yes”). In section 3, I turn to the distribution of *bien*, and I show that it may surface in three structural positions. The status of *bien* in the CP domain is addressed in section 4, where I discuss a number of data suggesting that the syntax of *bien*-sentences shares salient properties with that of *wh*-sentences, and I argue as well that *bien* targets *FocusP* in order to check its emphatic value. In section 5, I revisit the alternation *bien/*bien que*, and I propose that the presence of the complementizer *que* (“that”) may be taken as evidence for postulating that a further projection, *ForceP*, in the left periphery of the sentence is activated. Finally, section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Characterizing *bien*: from manner value to assertive value

2.1. Preliminary remarks: the polyvalence of *bien*  
Spanish, as well as other Romance languages, makes use of *bien* in a variety of constructions in which the meaning of this adverb has shifted from its original value as an adverb of manner (equivalent to English “well”) to an assertive value. The two kinds of *bien* are illustrated in (5):

(5)  
a. Pepito ha comido bien.
    ‘Pepito has eaten well’
b. Bien ha comido Pepito.1
    Well has eaten Pepito
    ‘But Pepito has eaten’

As the English glosses show, *bien* takes a manner reading in the example (5a). By contrast, *bien* is used in (5b) to emphasize the positive value of the sentence, which is interpreted as a confirmation that “Pepito has really/
indeed eaten”. Setting aside the manner interpretation of bien, 2 what is relevant for the purposes of this study is the contrast between (5b) and its neutral counterpart in (6), an issue I address in the following sections:

(6)  Pepito ha comido.
     ‘Pepito has eaten’

2.2. The emphatic positive import of bien

Turning now to the contrast illustrated so far, observe that both (6) and (5b) assert the same thing, namely that “Pepito ate”. However, they sharply differ on syntactic and semantic grounds. As already noted, while the former qualifies as an unmarked affirmative sentence, the latter is interpreted as an emphatic positive statement. In other words, bien is used to indicate that the event denoted in the sentence really took place. Accordingly, (5b), contrary to (6), is oriented to positive polarity. Empirical support for this claim comes from the fact that bien is systematically precluded in negative sentences: 3

(7)  a. *Bien no ha comido Pepito.
         Well has not eaten Pepito
 b. *Bien nunca habla francés Pepito.
         Well never speaks French Pepito
 c. *Bien nadie fue al cine ayer.
         Well nobody went to the cinema yesterday

The ill-formedness of the examples in (7) clearly suggests that bien, having a positive import, is incompatible with negative words such as no, nunca, nadie, etc. 4 By the same token, it also cannot co-occur with the affirmative marker sí (“yes”):

2 In this study I disregard the manner interpretation of bien, and I mainly concentrate on its assertive value. See Hernanz (2006a) for a more detailed discussion of the differences between the former and the latter reading.
3 The same pattern is attested in other Romance languages, in which the equivalent of Spanish bien (i.e., Italian ben, French bien, Catalan ben/bé) is also banned from negative sentences. See Belleti (1990), Vinet (2000), and Hernanz (2006a).
4 It goes without saying that the ungrammaticality of the examples in (7) (trivially) parallels the pattern illustrated in (i), where the affirmative adverb sí fails to co-occur with no, nunca:

(i)  a. *No sí ha comido Pepito.
    b. *Sí nunca habla francés Pepito.
(8)  a. *Bien sí ha comido Pepito.
    Well yes has eaten Pepito
   b. *Bien sí habla francés Pepito.
    Well yes speaks French Pepito

Given my claim that *bien is an emphatic positive marker, the ungrammaticality of (8) comes as no surprise. It is the result of the competition of two mutually exclusive elements for the same position in the sentential structure. I will return to this issue shortly. However, before we close this section, note that the positive import of *bien is further confirmed in that it is banned from emphatic sentences denoting an extreme-degree quantification, such as those in (9):

(9)  a. *Bien es extremadamente listo Pepito.
    Well is extremely smart Pepito
   b. *Bien es listísimo Pepito.
    Well is very smart Pepito

Under the assumption that extreme-degree quantification, being emphatic in nature, behaves as a positive polarity marker, the ungrammaticality of the examples in (9) is expected, as it follows, like in (8), from the collision of two elements that are mutually incompatible.

On the basis of the data discussed above, I assume that *bien, due to its positive import, must be attributed a syntactic representation which shares relevant properties with that of the negative marker *no. I follow Laka’s (1990) proposal that both negation and affirmation may be subsumed under a single abstract category which is underspecified for either negative or positive value. That is, the category encoding the polarity of the sentence, Pol, may be viewed as comprising two alternative semantic heads, [NEG] and [POS] (see Cormack and Smith (1998)). Accordingly, I argue that *bien (like *sí) occurs in a functional projection Pol(arity)P. More precisely, when

---

5 See, in this respect, González (2004: 48ff). According to this author, the positive value of extreme-degree quantification is attested by the fact that it is precluded in negative sentences. This is shown in the examples in (i), which are ungrammatical unless they are given an echoic interpretation:

(i)  a. *Pepito no es extremadamente listo.
   b. *Pepito no es listísimo.

6 I assume, following much of the existing literature, that this abstract category is higher than IP (see Laka (1990) and Zanuttini (1997), among others).
PolP takes a positive value, the Spec position of PolP may be filled by bien, as shown in (10):\footnote{Belletti (1990: 40) proposes a similar analysis to account for the positive adverb ben in Italian.}

\[(10) \quad [CP \ldots [PolP \textbf{bien} [Pol' [Pol^0 [IP \ldots ]]]]]\]

The representation in (10) is consistent with the assumption that there is contrast between neutral positive sentences—see (1b), (5a) (6)—in which the phonetic effect of [POS] is null, and marked positive sentences—see (1a), (3), (5b), in which an overt marker appears.

2.3. \textit{Bien} vs. \textit{sí}: \textit{the illocutionary force of bien}

Given my claim that bien stresses the positive polarity of a sentence, the question arises as to whether it patterns like another adverb that encodes an emphatic positive meaning in Spanish, namely \textit{sí} (“yes”).\footnote{The emphatic nature of \textit{sí} has been discussed in Laka (1990).} Consider, in this respect, the examples in (11) and their counterparts with \textit{bien} in (12):

\[(11) \begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{Sí come pasta Pepito.} \\
& \quad \text{Yes eats pasta Pepito} \\
& \quad \text{‘Pepito does eat pasta’}
\end{align*}\]
\[(12) \begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{Bien come pasta Pepito.} \quad = (3a) \\
& \quad \text{Well eats pasta Pepito} \\
& \quad \text{‘But Pepito indeed eats pasta’}
\end{align*}\]

The sentences in (11) are as emphatic as those in (12). However, their interpretation sharply diverges. In Hernanz (2006a), it is argued that the differences stem from their illocutionary force: bien encodes a presuppositional value that is lacking in sí. Thus, besides its emphatic positive meaning, bien adds a subjective implicature which cancels an implicit negative expectation. By contrast, \textit{sí} merely denies an explicit...
negative statement. In order to provide a more precise characterization of the contribution of *sí* and *bien* to the semantic interpretation of a sentence, let us return to the contrast between (11a) and (12a). The former example, as opposed to the latter, qualifies as an appropriate response to the negative sentence in (13a):

(13) a. Pepito no come pasta.
   ‘Pepito does not eat pasta’

   b. *Sí* come pasta Pepito. = (11a)

   c. #*Bien* come pasta Pepito. = (12a)

The example in (13b) is a perfectly good response to (13a), since this sentence provides an overt negation to anchor the emphatic value of *sí*. By contrast, (13c) is quite infelicitous when uttered as a response to (13a). As observed above, rather than contradicting an explicit negative statement, *bien* cancels an implicit and hence not overtly formulated negative expectation. Therefore, what rules out (13c) is that the state of affairs “to not eat pasta” is directly formulated in (13a). On the other hand, unlike (13b), (13c) does qualify as an suitable response to examples such as those in (14), which, rather than asserting that “Pepito does not eat pasta”, can be taken as an appropriate *pragmatic* background from which to make this inference (that is, if Pepito is very thin, or Pepito hates Italian cooking, it is expected that Pepito would not eat pasta):

---

9 A general picture of the distribution of *sí* in Spanish is beyond the scope of this work. A close examination of the data suggests, though, that the occurrence of *sí* rather systematically correlates with a previous negative context, regardless of whether it takes a “denial” interpretation as in (13b), or not (i):

(i) a. “Chirac *no* ha dado detalles de su dolencia. El hospital *sí* ha señalado que Chirac no podrá volver a volar en seis meses” (recorded oral speech).
   ‘Chirac has not revealed details of his medical problem. However, the hospital has indicated that Chirac will be unable to fly again for six months.’

b. “[...] Aunque EEUU *no* participe en Montreal, en la primera conferencia de los países firmantes del protocolo de Kyoto, *sí* interviene en las negociaciones de la undécima conferencia de cambio climático [...]” (La Vanguardia, 5/12/05).
   ‘Though the US is not taking part in Montreal at the first meeting in Montreal of countries that have signed the Kyoto protocol, it *is* participating in negotiations at the Eleventh Conference on Climate Change.’

10 See Hernanz (2006a), for a more extensive account of the presuppositional value of *bien*. 

111
(14)  a. Pepito está muy delgado.
      ‘Pepito is very thin’

      b. Pepito detesta la cocina italiana.
      ‘Pepito hates the Italian cooking’

      c. Bien come pasta Pepito.
      ‘But Pepito eats pasta(!)’

      d. Sí come pasta Pepito.

In light of these data, it can be concluded that bien and sí behave alike in that both adverbs stress the positive polarity of a statement. However, they widely diverge regarding their illocutionary force: contrary to the latter, the former has a semantic import that is clearly presuppositional in nature. More precisely, the sentence headed by bien is always associated with a subjective value, that is, it is interpreted as denoting a statement from the perspective of the speaker’s responsibility. This asymmetry can be accounted for under the familiar assumption, within the minimalist program, that a lexical item may consist of a bundle of features (see Chomsky (1995)). I thus propose that sí is endowed with the semantic features [+Affirmative] and [+Emphatic], whereas bien bears an additional feature [+Presuppositional]. This is schematized in (15):

(15)  Sí:  [+Affirmative, +Emphatic]
      Bien:  [+Affirmative, +Emphatic, +Presuppositional]

The feature system proposed in (15) gives rise to three kinds of affirmative sentences in Spanish, as seen in (16):

(16)  a. Ha llovido en Barcelona.
      ‘It has rained in Barcelona’

      b. Sí ha llovido en Barcelona.
      Yes has rained in Barcelona
      ‘It has rained in Barcelona’

      c. Bien ha llovido en Barcelona.
      Well has rained in Barcelona
      ‘It has indeed rained in Barcelona’

The example (16a) is an unmarked affirmative statement. By contrast, (16b), with an overt mark carrying a positive meaning, must be regarded as an emphatic affirmative statement. Accordingly, unlike (16a), it does not merely count as the neutral positive counterpart of the negative sentence No ha llovido en Barcelona (“It has not rained in Barcelona”). Finally, (16b)
EMPHATIC POLARITY AND C IN SPANISH

contrasts with (16c), since *bien*, rather than contradicting an assertion, cancels an expectation.

To sum up, the paradigm illustrated in (16) can be taken as evidence that allows us to postulate that the markers of affirmative polarity in Spanish come in three varieties: a null affirmation marker, an affirmation marker *sí*, and the presuppositional marker *bien*, which, besides its emphatic reading, encodes an added illocutionary value. 11 As a tentative hypothesis to be explored throughout section 4, I would like to suggest that the feature system proposed in (15) is mainly responsible for the movement of both *sí* and *bien* from their basic position in PolP (see (10)) to a high functional projection, FocusP, in the CP domain. But before moving on to this issue, let us turn our attention to the distribution of *bien*.

3. Three positions for *bien*

As already mentioned, *bien* reinforces the positive value of the sentence containing it. In this section I will provide evidence that *bien* may surface in three structural positions. My basic aim is to argue that the core analysis for *bien* sketched so far applies to the whole distribution of this particle.

3.1. *Bien* as a preverbal particle

I begin by considering those cases in which *bien* occurs in a preverbal position, as in (3a), (5b), (12) and (16c). Note that *bien*, like the pre-verbal negative marker *no*, must precede the finite verb, be it a main verb or an auxiliary. Compare, in this respect, the examples in (17) with those in (18):

(17)  
   a. *Bien viene* a verme cuando me necesita. 12  
       Well (he/she) comes to see+CLACC when (he/she) CLACC needs  
       ‘But (s)he visits me when (s)he needs me’
   b. *Bien* me gustaría ayudarte, pero no puedo.  
       Well CLDAT would please to help+ CLACC you, but (I) can’t  
       ‘I would really like to help you, but I can’t’

11 The asymmetry between *bien* and *sí* with respect to their illocutionary value is amenable to a rather similar parallelism involving the pattern of negative polarity. In this regard, Zanuttini (1997:99) pointed out that the paradigm of negative markers splits into two classes: non-presuppositional negative markers (like Italian *no*) and presuppositional negative markers (like Italian *mica*). While the latter negate a proposition that is assumed in the discourse, the former negate a proposition with no particular discourse status. See also Cinque (1976).

12 The example in (17a) is from Moliner (1975), s.v. *bien*. 
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c. Bien se ha molestado cuando se lo han dicho.
   Well (he/she) CL has got upset when (they) CL\textsubscript{DAT} CL\textsubscript{ACC} have said
   ‘But (s)he has got really upset when they told him/her’

d. Bien podrías haberme llamado.
   Well (you) could have+ CL\textsubscript{ACC} called
   ‘But you could have called me’

(18)  a. *Viene bien a verme cuando me necesita.
   b. *Me gustaría bien ayudarte, pero no puedo.
   c. *Se ha bien molestado cuando se lo han dicho.
   d. *Podrías bien haberme llamado.

The distributional pattern of bien given in (17) diverges from that of its (approximate)\textsuperscript{13} counterparts in Romance languages, which surface in a lower position, namely to the right of the finite verb. The following examples illustrate this situation in the case of Catalan ben:\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13} Although Spanish bien and its Romance equivalents share a relevant property, namely their emphatic positive import (see Vinet (1996), Vinet (2000) and Belletti (1990) among other authors), they differ in their semantic interpretation. More precisely, Spanish bien encodes a nearly concessive value that is lacking in its Romance counterparts (see section 3.2).

\textsuperscript{14} As shown in (i)-(ii), a similar picture arises in French and Italian:

(i)  a. Je suis bien arrivé à l’heure. \hspace{1cm} (Vinet, 2000:137)
   I am indeed arrived on time
   ‘I did indeed arrive on time’
   b. Je voudrais bien vous inviter.
   I would like indeed CL\textsubscript{ACC} to invite
   ‘I would indeed like to invite you’

(ii) a. Gianni avrà ben risposto. \hspace{1cm} (Belletti, 1990:39)
   Gianni will have indeed answered
   b. Maria parlava ben di lui.
   Maria spoke indeed of him

Despite the similarities illustrated in the above examples, a closer look at the data reveals that the distribution of bien / ben in French, Italian and Catalan is far from homogeneous. I will not go into the intricacies of this phenomenon here.
(He/she) CL has really got angry when (they) to him/her it have said  
‘(S)he got really angry when they told him/her’
b. T’ho pots ben creure.  
(You) CL it can indeed believe  
‘You can indeed believe it’

Examination of the relative ordering of bien and pronominal clitics reveals the existence of a further parallelism between this adverb and pre-verbal negative markers. Note that bien, like no, has to precede all clitics, as shown in (17b)-(17c) and (20)-(21):

(20) a. Bien se lo dije.  
(I) well CL_DAT CL_ACC said  
‘I indeed told him/her’
b. *Se lo bien dije.

(21) a. No se lo dije.  
(I) not CL_DAT CL_ACC said  
‘I did not tell him/her’
b. *Se lo no dije.

Under the assumption that pronominal clitics attach to the I head (see Kayne (1989)), it can easily be concluded that bien, on a par with no, has to occur in a functional projection above IP, as proposed in (10).

To sum up: the distributional data just discussed provide relevant evidence that the parallelisms between bien and preverbal negative marker no are in fact quite tight. Both elements surface in a high position above IP and take sentential scope. This pattern contrasts with the behavior of its Romance equivalents such as Catalan ben (as well as French bien and Italian ben), which occupy a lower position in the hierarchical structure.

3.2. Bien as a degree-modifier

Besides its regular use as a pre-verbal emphatic positive marker, bien may also appear in a low position and take scope over a single constituent rather than over the whole sentence:
In (22) *bien* expresses a high-degree quantification over the properties denoted by either an adjective (22a) or an adverb (22b)-(22c). In spite of this, *bien* is by no means semantically and syntactically equivalent to its approximate counterpart, the degree modifier *muy* (“very”).\(^\text{15}\) That is, the examples in (22) clearly differ from those in (23):

(23) a. La habitación estaba *muy* sucia.
    ‘The room was very dirty’
 b. El jefe trató *muy* duramente a Pepito.
    ‘The boss treated Pepito very harshly’
 c. Han comido *muy* poco.
    ‘They have eaten very little’

Unlike those in (23), the examples in (22) do not merely convey a neutral statement expressing a high degree property. They rather denote a high degree property from the perspective of the speaker’s attitude. In fact, they

\(^{15}\text{It should be observed that the meaning of }\textit{bien} \text{ in (22) cannot be rendered by the class of adverbs that denote an extreme-degree quantification such as }\textit{extremadamente} \text{ (“extremely”) and the like. While the latter place the element they modify at the very top of a scale, }\textit{bien} \text{ reinforces the assertion made in the sentence with regard to the property denoted by the constituent (AP, AdvP) over which it takes scope. Relevant evidence that }\textit{bien} \text{ and extreme-degree quantifiers do not pattern alike comes from the fact that the latter, contrary to }\textit{bien}, \text{ may be compatible with negation in certain contexts:}

    I am tired – though (I am) not really tired
 b. Estoy cansada – aunque no (estoy) *extremadamente / enormemente* cansada.
    I am tired – though (I am) not extremely/enormously tired

For an extensive account of adjective modifiers in Spanish, see Bosque (1999), Rodríguez-Ramalle (2003), and González (2004), among other authors.
are usually interpreted by Peninsular Spanish speakers, like the examples in (17), as emphatic sentences with a *subjective* flavor. Crucial evidence supporting the parallelism between preverbal *bien* in (17) and degree-*bien* in (22) is provided by the fact that the latter, like the former, is incompatible with both negative and positive markers:

(24)  
   a. *La habitación no estaba bien sucia.*  
       The room was not well dirty  
   b. *El jefe sí trató bien duramente a Pepito.*  
       The boss yes treated well harshly Pepito

It is worth noting, in this respect, that if it were the case that *bien* and *muy* patterned alike, we would expect the examples in (25) to be ill-formed alongside those in (24), contrary to what is the actual case:

(25)  
   a. La habitación no estaba *muy* sucia.  
       ‘The room was not very dirty’  
   b. El jefe sí trató muy duramente a Pepito.  
       The boss yes treated very rudely Pepito  
       ‘The boss did treat Pepito very harshly’

Moreover, *bien* and *muy* also differ in that the former, as opposed to the latter, may trigger movement to CP. This property is mainly responsible for the contrast in (26):

(26)  
   a. ¡*Y bien* bonito que era el barco!17  
       And well nice that was the ship!  
       ‘But the ship was really nice!’
   b. *¡Y muy* bonito que era el barco!  
       And very nice that was the ship!

The example in (26a) shows that *bien* shares relevant properties with *wh*-words. This pattern is reminiscent of the well-known behavior of exclamative pronouns like *qué* ("what") and emphatic neuter article *lo*18 in Spanish, as illustrated in (27):

---

16 In some varieties of American Spanish, *bien* has undergone a process of grammaticalization, as a consequence of which its original lexical meaning is lost. In these varieties, *bien* behaves as a degree-word nearly equivalent to *muy* ("very").

17 This example is from Seco (1999), s.v. *bien*.

18 For a study of the emphatic uses of the neuter determiner *lo* in Spanish, see Bosque and Moreno (1990), Brucart (1993), and Gutiérrez-Rexach (1999).
(27) a. ¡Qué bonito que era el barco!
   How nice that was the ship!
   ‘How nice the ship was!’

b. ¡Lo bonito que era el barco!
   LO nice that was the ship!
   ‘How nice the ship was!’

So far we have presented evidence that *bien*, when used as a degree-word, clearly diverges from its approximate counterpart *muy*. In contrast, a significant parallelism can be drawn between preverbal *bien* and degree-*bien*, namely that they are both oriented to positive polarity. On the basis of this crucial property, it would be tempting to formulate a unified account which conflates the two instances of *bien* into a single category. I tentatively assume that this is the case and thus propose that in the examples in (22) *bien* behaves as an emphatic positive degree-word generated into the Spec position of a *DegreeP*, as in (28):

\[
\text{(28) } \left[\text{DegreeP } \text{bien} \left[\text{Degree'} \left[\text{Degree0 [AP sucia]}\right]\right]\right]
\]

19 It is worth noting, in this respect, that a similar situation seems to obtain when comparing emphatic affirmative marker *sí* (“yes”) with evaluative degree-words like *extraordinariamente* (“extraordinarily”), *realmente* (“really”), *increíblemente* (“incredibly”), etc., which also have been claimed to be oriented to positive polarity. That is, as observed by Rodríguez-Ramalle (2005:517), a sentence like (i.a) is not semantically equivalent to (i.b); instead, it may be (roughly) paraphrased by means of (i.c):

(i)  a. Julia está *extraordinariamente* preocupada.
   Julia is extraordinarily worried
   ‘Julia is very worried’

b. Julia está *muy* preocupada.
   ‘Julia is very worried’

c. Sí, Julia está *muy* preocupada.
   ‘Yes, Julia is very worried’

See also what is observed in footnote 24.

20 Note that the analysis sketched in (28) does not explain how the emphatic positive value of *bien* is licensed. In order to obtain this result, some mechanism of Agree must be postulated which assures that the inherent features {affirmative, emphatic} of degree-*bien* (see (15)) are checked in the relevant functional category, namely *PolP*. Alternatively, it could be assumed, along the lines of González’s (2004:39ff, 53ff) work, that emphatic affirmative degree-modifiers are licensed in *DegreeP* (see footnote 24). I leave this question open for future research.
Setting aside a more in-depth account of degree-words, what it is interesting for the purposes of this work is the fact that by postulating the analysis in (28), we advocate the existence of two distinct hierarchical positions involved in the derivation of bien: a low position for degree-bien, and a high position for preverbal bien (see (10)). If this claim is on the right track, we would expect that both elements exhibit differences in scope, as suggested above. This expectation is fulfilled, as shown by the minimal pairs in (29) and (30):

(29)  a. La soprano está bien enfadada.  
    The soprano is well angry  
    ‘The soprano is really angry’  
  b. Bien se ha enfadado la soprano.  
    Well CL has got angry the soprano  
    ‘But the soprano has indeed got angry’

(30)  a. Chomsky ha escrito libros bien importantes.  
    Chomsky has written books well important  
    ‘Chomsky has written really important books’  
  b. Bien ha escrito libros importantes Chomsky.  
    Well has written books important Chomsky  
    ‘But Chomsky has indeed written important books’

The examples in (29)-(30) are all interpreted as speaker-oriented statements which take on an emphatic positive reading. However, (a) and (b) in both (29) and (30) sharply diverge in their semantic interpretation. In order to illustrate this contrast, consider the pair in (29). What is stressed in (29a) is the property denoted by the past participle enfadada, implying that the state of “being angry” is noteworthy in some way. By contrast, in (29b) bien focuses on the whole sentence; in other words, it serves to indicate that the denoted event of “getting angry” really took place. As a consequence, (29b) adopts a contrastive value—nearly a concessive meaning—that is lacking in (29a). And the same holds, mutatis mutandis, for (30).

Further evidence confirming that scopal differences are at the root of the interpretive contrast shown in (29)-(30) is provided by the examples in (31):

---

21 The structure in (28) may be refined along the lines of recent studies on degree adverbs. See, in this respect, Corver (2000), among others. Regarding the structure of DegreeP in Spanish, see Brucart (2003), Rodríguez-Ramalle (2003), and González (2004). I do not pursue this issue here, as it is not crucial for the purposes of this work.

22 See Hernanz (2006a) for a more detailed account of the concessive value of preverbal bien.
(31) a. *Nôtre-Dame de Paris es bien gôtica.
    Nôtre-Dame of Paris is well Gothic
b. Bien es gôtica Nôtre-Dame de París.
    ‘But Nôtre-Dame of Paris is truly/indeed Gothic’

Given that preverbal bien occupies a structural position higher than degree-bien, the asymmetry in (31) follows in a natural way. That is, the latter, being a degree word, is incompatible with non-scalar adjectives such as gothic; hence, (31a) is ruled out. As for (31b), no incompatibility arises, since preverbal bien takes scope over the whole sentence (see (10)) rather than merely over the AP.

The preceding discussion seems to suggest that an interesting parallelism may be drawn between the distribution of “high” and “low” bien on the one hand, and its semantic interpretation on the other. If this supposition is correct, it should be expected that (preverbal) bien exhibits a different semantic behavior than its Romance counterparts, which surface in a low position (see examples in (17)-(19)). This expectation is supported by empirical evidence from Catalan. In this language, the two varieties of the bien counterpart are instantiated by means of two distinct lexical items—ben and bè (“well”)—which fall under different distributional and semantic patterns. The relevant contrast is given in (32):

(32) a. S’ha _ben_ enfadat quan li ho han dit. = (19a)
    (He/she) CL has really got angry when (they) to him/her it have said
    ‘(S)he got really angry when they told him/her’
b. Bé s’ha _bé_ enfadat quan li ho han dit.
    (He/she) well CL has got angry when (they) to him/her it have said
    ‘But (he/she) indeed got angry when they told him/her’

Setting aside a closer examination of the paradigm of _ben/bè_ in Catalan, what is relevant for the purposes of this work is that the contrast in (32) is reminiscent of the asymmetry illustrated in (29)-(30). More precisely, the example in (32b), on a par with those in (29b) and (30b), in which bé/bien surface in a high position, signals a high degree of speaker’s commitment to the whole content expressed in the proposition. On the other hand, in (32a), as well as in (29a) and (30a), the bulk of the emphatic assertion focuses on a single constituent (i.e., enfadat /enfadada /importantes), which turns out to be interpreted as implying that the property it denotes is somehow salient or

---

quantified in a high degree. If we take this view, it comes as no surprise that
*ben, like degree-bien (see (31a)), is incompatible with non-gradable
predicates, whereas bé, similarly to (preverbal) bien, may freely appear in a
sentence regardless of the nature of the predicate. Compare, in this respect,
(33) with (31):

(33) a. *La soprano s’ha ben comprat un llibre.
   The soprano CL DAT has indeed bought a book
b. Bé s’ha comprat un llibre la soprano.
   ‘But the soprano bought a book’

To summarize, several conclusions may be reached from the data examined
so far. First, emphatic positive marker *bien may be viewed as splitting into a
high and a low variety (i.e., preverbal and degree-bien), which scope over
the whole sentence or a single constituent, respectively. Second, the
interpretive contrasts between the two instances of bien may be attributed to
their different focal properties.24 Finally, the same holds in other Romance
languages such as Catalan, where a rather similar semantic parallelism is
attested between bé and ben, the former arising in a more prominent
structural position than the latter.

3.3. Bien in pre-Comp position

In parallel with the constructions discussed in the preceding subsections,
Spanish also displays sentences in which the emphatic affirmative word bien
surfaces to the left of the complementizer que (“that”).25

24 Interestingly enough, a similar pattern has been claimed to exist in the case of emphatic
affirmative marker sí (“yes”), on the one hand, and evaluative words denoting extreme degree
quantification, on the other (see footnote 19). According to González (2004: 53), both ΣP
(FocusP, in my analysis) and DegreeP host an emphatic affirmative feature, the only
difference consisting of its scope: while the former focuses on the whole sentence, the latter
merely takes scope over the property denoted by the adjective.

25 It is worth noting that Catalan bé—contrary to ben—patterns like Spanish bien in that it is
also compatible with the complementizer que, as seen in (i):

(i) a. Bé que s’ha enfadat la soprano.
   Well that CL got angry the soprano
   ‘But the soprano got really angry’
b. *Et ben que prometo que ho faré.
   (I) CLDAT really promise that (I) CLACC will do
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This is shown in (34):26

(34) a. “He aprendido el valseo y las habaneras. ¡Vaya!... ¡Y bien que me gustan!”
   (I) have learnt the valseo and the habaneras. Go! And well that (they) CLDAT please!
   ‘I have learnt the valseo and the habaneras [folkdances]. Imagine! And I do indeed like them!’

b. “Pues sí que tiene argumentos... Y bien que los muestra”
   So yes that ((s)he) has arguments... And well that ((s)he) CLACC show
   ‘She certainly does have arguments. And you can bet she uses them!’

c. A. ¿Por qué te has enfadado tanto?
   ‘Why did you get so angry?’
   B. ¿Y tú me lo preguntas? Pues bien que lo sabes!
      And you CLDAT CLACC ask? So well that (you) CLACC know
      ‘Are you really asking me? You know very well why!’

The examples in (34) may be regarded, *prima facie*, as nearly equivalent, on interpretive grounds, to those in (5b), (12), and (17), in which the complementizer *que* does not show up. In fact, they all share an emphatic affirmative meaning that derives from the core value of *bien* proposed in (15). A closer look at the data reveals, though, that despite their similarities, *bien* and *bien que* do not pattern alike. To begin with, it should be noted that sentences headed by *bien que* qualify as stronger assertions than those containing *bien*. More precisely, the function of *bien* when preposed to C is to focus on the truth of the whole assertion rather than just the event denoted in the proposition. Thus, (34a) reflects the speaker’s emphatic claim that (s)he likes the *valseo* and the *habaneras*, despite the fact that the interlocutor could suspect otherwise. Similarly, *bien que* is used in (34c) to express a strong degree of confidence on the part of the speaker about the truth of the proposition (that is, “You know why I got so angry”), even though from the question raised in the previous discourse precisely the opposite could be inferred, namely, that the hearer does NOT know why the speaker got so angry.27

The contrast illustrated in (i) provides further support for our claim that Romance equivalents of Spanish *bien* may be viewed as comprising a “high” and a “low” variety.

26 The examples in (34a) and (34b) are from the data base: http://www.corpusdelespanol.org
27 Recall that *bien (que)*, due to its presuppositional import, cancels an implicit—hence not overtly formulated—negative expectation (see section 2.3). Accordingly, (34c) cannot qualify
In light of the preceding observations, it seems plausible to assume that the alternation between *bien* and *bien que* is constrained by discursive factors. The ill-formed examples in (35) show that this is effectively the case:

(35)  
   a. He aprendido el valseo y las habaneras. ¡Vaya!... *??Y bien me gustan!
   b. Pues sí que tiene argumentos... *??Y bien lo muestra.
   c. A. ¿Por qué te has enfadado tanto?
      B. ¿Y tú me lo preguntas? *Pues bien lo sabes!

The contrasts illustrated in (34)-(35) provide evidence that *bien* is precluded in a variety of cases where *bien que* is permitted. By the same token, it should be expected that some contexts compatible with *bien* prohibit the occurrence of *bien que*. The following examples confirm this expectation:

(36)  
   a. A. ¿Qué hora es?
      ‘What time is it?’
   b. B. No sé, *bien podrian ser las seis.
      (I) not know, well could be six o’clock
      ‘I don’t know, but it could well be six o’clock’
   c. B. *No sé, *bien que podrian ser las seis.

(37)  
   a. A. ¿Qué tiempo hace hoy?
      ‘What is the weather like today?’
   b. B. Está muy nublado, *bien podría llover.
      (It) is very cloudy, well could rain
      ‘It is very cloudy, it could well rain’
   c. B. *Está muy nublado, *bien que podría llover.

The examples in (36c) and (37c) are clearly ill-formed. The explanation for this comes from the fact that *bien que* carries a strong assertive value which, contrary to what happens in (34), cannot be anchored in the previous as a felicitous response to a previous sentence such as (ia), which corresponds to its negative counterpart:

(i)  
   a. No sé por qué te has enfadado tanto.
      ‘I don’t know why you got so angry’
   b. #Pues *bien que lo sabes!*

And the same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to (34a) and (34b).
context. Consider, in this respect, (36). When saying (36a), the speaker A is actually asking what time it is, with no further subjective implicature; hence, this utterance qualifies as a neutral question, from which it is not inferrable that the speaker suspects that it may not be true that it is six o’clock. As a consequence, the sentence headed by bien que in (36c) is interpreted in this case as an inappropriate response, since it vacuously cancels—so to speak—an implicit negative statement which bona fide cannot be attributed to the interlocutor.

Additional support for the assumption that bien que focuses on the truth of the proposition comes from the fact that the examples in (34) allow (approximate) paraphrases such as those in (38), where bien takes scope over epistemic predicates like verdad (“truth”), cierto (“certain”), etc.:

(38)  a. Bien es verdad que me gustan.
       Well is truth that (they) CL-DAT please!
       ‘It is indeed true that I like them!’
    b. Bien es cierto que lo sabes.
       Well is certain that (you) CL-ACC know
       ‘You know very well!’

Interestingly enough, bien que, as opposed to bien, cannot co-occur with verdad and cierto, which clearly suggests that the semantic content of the former, since it has to do with the truth value of the proposition, clashes with the modal value encoded by the predicates alluded to, and, as a result, the sentence is ruled out:

(39)  a. *Bien que es verdad que me gustan.
    b. *Bien que es cierto que lo sabes.

Having established that discursive factors are at the root of the contrasts discussed in (34)-(37), we are in a position to provide a more precise analysis of the behavior of bien que. My claim is that when uttering a sentence with bien que the speaker implicitly evokes an assertion which is in some sense its negative counterpart, and reverses its polarity by reinforcing the truth value of the proposition containing it. According to this view, it seems plausible to suggest that the use of bien que is associated with a somehow echoic flavor that is mainly responsible for the semantic interpretation of the sentence.

---

28 See Etxepare (1997) for a detailed account of la verdad constructions.
It is worth noting, in this respect, that the case under consideration is reminiscent of an often observed phenomenon, namely the behavior of a number of particles closely related to emphatic polarity such as the enclitic form -tu in Quebec French (see Vinet (2000)), and the sentence-initial affirmative word kyllä (“yes”) in Finnish (see Kaiser (2006)). More specifically, let us hypothesize, along the lines of Cormack and Smith’s (1998) proposal, that there are two polarity positions in the sentential structure: an internal position corresponding to the functional projection PolP, and an external position in the CP domain—a position that these authors labeled Echo(ic)—whose scope encompasses the whole sentence. This is illustrated in (40):

\[(40) \text{[CP \textbf{Echo} \ldots \text{[PolP Pol[IP \ldots]]]\ldots]}\]

Extending the parallelism between positive and negative polarity we discussed above to the case of Echo, we therefore assume two possible values [POS] and [NEG] for this node, as argued by Cormack and Smith (1998:28). Furthermore, similarly to bien, which has been claimed to behave as the positive emphatic counterpart of negative markers hosted in PolP (see (10)), I will take bien que to correspond to the positive version of the Echo position in (40). As a first approximation, to be modified throughout the following sections, let me tentatively propose the structure in (41), where bien is merged in a higher PolP position in the C domain and que fulfills the head of this projection:

\[(41) \text{[CP \text{PolP}_1 \text{bien \ldots \text{[PolP}_2 \text{IP \ldots]]\ldots]}\ldots]}\]

The existence of a special relation between polarity words and the head of CP is further attested by the case of the Spanish affirmative word sí (“yes”), which may also occur left-adjacent to the complementizer que (“that”):

\[(42) \text{a. \textit{Sí} ha venido. \quad (Etxepare, 1997:124)}
\quad \text{‘He did come’}
\b. \textit{Sí que} ha venido.
\quad \text{Yes that (he) has come}\]

As has been observed by Etxepare (1997), the examples in (42) diverge in their communicative import. According to this author, “[42b] but not [42a] is felicitously uttered only if there is a previous assertion putting into question or denying that a given person is coming. The communicative import of
[42b] is then to counter that assertion by claiming that the relevant person is indeed coming” (see Etxepare (1997:125)). Setting aside an in-depth study of the alternation between sí and sí que in Spanish, what is relevant for the purposes of this discussion is the fact that the latter is also compatible with not-denying contexts, as illustrated in (43). This seems to suggest that sí que, on a par with bien que, rather than merely stressing that the event denoted in the proposition did take place, serves to emphasize the truth value of the proposition:

(43) a. “Los niños vienen sin libros de instrucciones. Esto sí que es un milagro!”
   The children come with no books of instructions. This yes that is a miracle!
   ‘Children come without instruction manuals. That’s really a miracle!’

b. “¿No decías que no te gustaban las bebidas de soja? Pues chica, he probado Puleva, y ésta sí que está buenísima!”
   Didn’t you say that you didn’t like soy beverages? So, girl, (I) have tried Puleva, and it yes that is truly delicious!
   ‘Didn’t you say that you didn’t like soy beverages? Well, honey, I tried Puleva and it was truly delicious!’

c. “Carrefour le ofrece este fin de semana precios de vértigo... Esto sí que es un aniversario!”
   Carrefour CL_DAT offers this end of week prices of vertigo... This yes that is an anniversary!
   ‘This weekend Carrefour is offering incredibly low prices! Now, that’s a real anniversary!’

Now let us return to the representation in (41), where two polarity positions are categorically distinguished: the higher one is situated in the CP field, while the lower one precedes the IP domain. Given this distribution, we

---

29 For a comparative analysis of sí que and their equivalent in other Romance languages, see Martins (2006).
30 I differ from Etxepare (1997) in finding (42b) quite acceptable when uttered as a response to a previous sentence like (i), from which it cannot effectively be inferred that Juan is not coming:

(i) ¿Ha venido Juan?
   ‘Did Juan come?’

31 The examples in (43) are advertisements taken from advertising campaigns.
would expect both categories to have a distinct morphological realization. The examples in (44) confirm this prediction:

(44) a. Pepito *sí que no* come pasta.
     Pepito yes that not eats pasta
     ‘Of course Pepito doesn’t eat pasta, I’m positive’
     b. Hoy *sí que no* hace frío.
     Today yes that (it) is not cold
     ‘It is certainly not cold *today*’

The above examples are perfectly acceptable sentences in Spanish, despite the presence of two mutually exclusive polarity markers, namely *sí* and *no*, which, being in complementary distribution, fail to co-occur in the same sentence, as in (45):

(45) a. *Pepito *sí* no* come pasta.
     Pepito yes not eats pasta
 b. *Hoy *sí* no* hace frío.
     Today yes it is not cold

The sharp contrast between (44) and (45) clearly shows that *sí que*, contrary to *sí*, does not compete with *no* for the same position in the sentence. This leads us to conclude, as proposed in (41), that there are two Pol nodes available in Spanish, the higher one hosting external polarity markers which focus on the truth value of the proposition. This approach is in agreement with the fact that *sí que*, rather than reversing the negative orientation of the events denoted in (44) (i.e., “Pepito does not eat pasta”, “It is not cold”), serves to reinforce the positive value of the whole assertion.

Finally, the assumption that *bien* and *sí*, when followed by *que*, behave as external affirmative markers is further substantiated by the pattern of negation, which has also been claimed, as widely known, to split into an external (or metalinguistic) negation and an internal one.32 Without embarking on a more detailed analysis of this issue, it is worth noting that Catalan provides compelling evidence to support the representation in (40). Consider, in this respect, the examples in (46),33 where two positions for negation are attested:

---

33 It should be observed that Spanish sharply diverges from Catalan in precluding the *no que* strategy, as seen in the examples in (i), which are the counterparts of those in (46):
(46) a. *No que no ha vingut la Lola.
   ‘But Lola did not come’

   b. *No que no ballarà la Maria avui.
   ‘But Maria is not going to dance today’

As expected, the examples in (46) are by no means equivalent to their counterparts in (47), where a single Pol position is filled:

(47) a. No ha vingut la Lola.
   ‘Lola did not come’

   b. La Maria no ballarà avui.
   ‘Maria will not dance today’

Like sí que in Spanish, the no que strategy in Catalan is used to focus on the polarity of the whole assertion.34 More precisely, preposed negation is not used in (46) to negate the denoted event of Lola’s coming or Maria’s dancing. Instead, it serves to contradict a previous affirmative assertion that is old information due to contextual reasons.35

Summing up: in the preceding sections I have shown that there exist three distinct “spaces” for the emphatic affirmative marker bien in Spanish, namely, a low position (degree-bien), a high position (preverbal bien), and an “upper” position (pre-C bien). I also claimed that, due to their different scopal properties, each of these positions is associated with a different semantic interpretation. Finally, using data from the distributional behavior of both bien and sí with respect to the complementizer que, I argued for two polarity positions: echoic and sentential.

Having provided empirical evidence that emphatic polarity words such as bien (and sí) may precede que (“that”) in the CP system (see (41)), the question arises as to whether the left periphery is also activated when preverbal bien is generated in the canonical PolP position (see (10)). I will turn to this issue in the next section.36

(i) a. *No que no ha venido Juan.
   b. *No que no bailará María.

34 On external negation in Catalan, see Espinal (2002).
35 See Kaiser (2006) for further discussion of fronted negation in Finnish, which exhibits striking similarities with the no que pattern in Catalan.
36 In the remainder of this work, for reasons of space, I will disregard degree-bien and concentrate on the contrast between preverbal bien and bien que.
4. Syntactic analysis of bien

As mentioned at the outset of this work, bien is an affirmative marker which may be attributed the syntactic representation in (10), repeated here:

(10) \[ CP ..... \text{[PolP bien [Pol’ [Pol0 [IP ...]]]]} \]

The analysis in (10) is motivated by the fact that bien shares a number of salient properties with negative words. However, this is not all that can be said of this adverb. A closer examination of the data reveals, on the one hand, that bien, despite its polarity import, sharply diverges from negative markers in many relevant ways. On the other hand, there is compelling evidence suggesting that bien behaves like a wh-element: a pattern that cannot be captured by the analysis given in (10).

In this section, I will study both issues in some detail. Firstly, some asymmetries between bien and the negative adverb no will be examined. Secondly, I will discuss a variety of striking similarities holding between bien-sentences and wh-sentences. Finally, on the basis of such a parallel, I will argue that bien targets a high position in the Comp-layer, namely the Specifier of FocusP (see Rizzi (1997)):

(48) \[ \text{[ForceP [TopicP [FocusP bien i [PolP t [IP ...]]]]]} \]

4.1. Bien vs. no: some puzzling asymmetries

Beyond the common properties discussed in section 3.1, bien and no show a number of distributional differences. Firstly, note that quite generally bien, unlike negative adverb no, is restricted to main clauses. That is, bien is banned from complement-tensed clauses (49), as well as embedded infinitives and gerunds (50):

(49) a. Le aconsejaron que {*bien / no} fumara.
    They advised him {well / not} to smoke

b. Lamento que {*bien / no} sean ricos.
    I regret that they {well are/ are not} rich

37 It should be noted that bien is allowed in indicative embedded clauses selected by the class of predicates belonging to the paradigm of declarative and epistemic predicates. This fact can be accounted for in a rather natural way under the largely motivated assumption that indicative dependent clauses seem to constitute independent assertions (see Torrego and Uriagereka (1992), Etxepare (1997) and Gallego (2004)).
(50)  a. Es necesario {bien / no} decir la verdad.
    It is necessary {well / not} to tell the truth
   
   b. {Bien / no} diciendo la verdad, no le convencerás.
    By {well / not} telling the truth, you will not convince him

And the same holds for adverbial clauses, as in (51):

(51)  a. Como Julia {bien / nunca} fuma, siempre se está quejando.
    Since Julia {well / never} smokes, she is always complaining
   
   b. Cuando Pepe {bien / no} trabaja, ve la televisión.
    When Pepe {well / not} works, he watches television

Secondly, in contrast with no, bien cannot appear in Root Infinitive constructions like (52), as illustrated in (53):

(52)  Julia comprar un Volkswagen?! No me lo puedo creer!
    Julia buy-INF a Volkswagen?! NEG CLDAT CLACC can believe!
    ‘Julia buy a Volkswagen?! I can’t believe it!’

(53)  a. *Julia bien comprar un Volkswagen?!
    Julia well buy a Volkswagen?!
   
   b. No comprar nadie un Volkswagen?!
    ‘Nobody buy a Volkswagen?!’

The data in (52)-(53) constitute clear evidence that bien and negative adverbs no and nunca sharply diverge on syntactic grounds. The point at issue here is the structural hierarchy of these polarity markers. To begin with, let me concentrate on the examples in (49)-(50). Suppose that subordinate clauses—along the lines of recent proposals (see Haegeman (2002))—may differ in the internal structure of their CP. As is well-known, Force is taken to encode the illocutionary value of the sentence (see Rizzi (1997)). Consequently, it seems plausible to suggest that, since they are dependent on the matrix force, complement clauses have an impoverished CP-structure, in which the top domain, including Force and Focus, does not project. If this suggestion is on the right track, the ill-formedness of the examples in (49)-(50) is predicted, as it comes from the fact that there is no functional projection FocusP to host bien in the embedded clauses. By the same token, we expect the contrast involving adverbial clauses illustrated in (51). Moreover, adverbial clauses provide additional support for the analysis I am proposing. It is common knowledge that these clauses do not constitute
a homogeneous group. In this regard, Haegeman (2002), (2003:21) observes that they fall into two patterns in terms of their internal structure: i) central adverbial clauses, like those in (51), which lack the Force field, and ii) peripheral adverbial clauses, which pattern as root sentences in that they contain a full Force domain. Under this approach, we could expect bien to freely appear in the latter clauses, since they have a fully articulated CP-structure. This prediction is borne out, as illustrated by the minimal pair in (54a)-(54b), involving a central and a peripheral causal clause, respectively:

(54) a. *Julia no ha ido a trabajar porque bien estaba enferma.
    Julia not has gone to work because (she) well was ill
    ‘Julia must not be ill, because indeed she went to work’

b. Julia no debe de estar enferma, porque bien ha ido a trabajar.
    Julia not must be ill, because (she) well went to work

Further evidence supporting the distributional asymmetry between negative and positive markers is provided by Root Infinitives in (53). These constructions have been argued to exhibit a deficient structure in the Comp-layer (see Grohmann and Etxepare (2003)). This hypothesis, combined with my claim that bien targets FocusP, easily accounts for the fact that bien, unlike no, is precluded in these constructions.

4.2. The status of bien as a wh-operator

In this section, I will examine a number of salient syntactic properties of sentences headed by bien, and I will show that they can be accounted for under the assumption that bien, being a focal adverb, behaves like a wh-word.

To begin with, recall that bien must precede the finite verb (see section 3.1.). Note, in this respect, that examples like (55), where the subject intervenes between bien and V, are systematically ruled out:

(55) a. *Bien Juan podría ayudarme.
    Well Juan could help+CLACC

As is widely known, central causal clauses differ from peripheral causal clauses in terms of their logical and syntactic relationships. Thus, while in (54a) the subordinate clause expresses the cause that triggers the event denoted by the main clause, in (54b) the subordinate clause expresses the reason why the event denoted by the main clause is asserted.
b. *BIEN Julia se ha molestado cuando se lo han dicho.
   Well Julia CL has got upset when (they) CLDAT CLACC have said

The ungrammaticality illustrated in (55) clearly suggests that adjacency
between bien and V is required. As is well-known, the same restriction holds
for wh-elements in both interrogative (56) and exclamative sentences (57):

(56) a. *¿Qué la soprano dijo?
   What the soprano said?
   ¿Qué dijo la soprano?
   What said the soprano?
   ‘What did the soprano say?’

(57) a. *¡Qué cosas la soprano dice!
   What things the soprano says!
   ¡Qué cosas dice la soprano!
   ‘What things the soprano says!’

The paradigm in (55)-(57) may be taken as evidence allowing us to postulate
that bien, like wh-elements, triggers V-to-Comp movement. I will turn to
this issue later on.

Secondly, the view that bien and wh-elements pattern alike in significant
ways is also supported by the distribution of topicalized constituents. Notice
that clitic left dislocated elements may freely occur in front of bien, as
illustrated in (58):

(58) a. La carta bien la escribimos ayer.
   The letter, (we) well CLACC wrote yesterday
   ‘But we did write the letter yesterday’
   b. La carta, a Pepe bien se la escribimos ayer.
   The letter, to Pepe (we) well CLDAT CLACC wrote yesterday
   ‘But we did write the letter to Pepe yesterday’

The examples in (58) parallel interrogative sentences, which also allow for
topicalized phrases to precede the wh-element:

(59) a. La carta, ¿quién la escribió?
   The letter, who CLACC wrote?
   ‘Who wrote the letter?’
   b. La carta, a Pepe, ¿quién se la escribió?
   The letter, to Pepe, who CLDAT CLACC wrote?
   ‘Who wrote the letter to Pepe?’
Note that an alternative order in which topicalized constituents appear between bien and V is, however, excluded:

(60) a. *Bien la carta la escribimos ayer.
   Well the letter (we) CL\textsubscript{ACC} wrote yesterday
b. *Bien la carta, a Pepe se la escribimos ayer.
   Well the letter, to Pepe (we) CL\textsubscript{DAT} CL\textsubscript{ACC} wrote yesterday

As is well-known, the same restriction holds for wh-words.\(^{39}\)

(61) a. *¿Quién, la carta, la escribió?
   Who, the letter, CL\textsubscript{ACC} wrote?
b. *¿Quién, la carta, a Pepe, se la escribió?
   Who, the letter, to Pepe, CL\textsubscript{DAT} CL\textsubscript{ACC} wrote?

Given my claim that bien falls under the paradigm of wh-elements, the word order illustrated in (58) and (60) is predicted, as it is reminiscent of a more general pattern involving the distribution of Wh operators and Topics (see Rizzi (1997:291)):

(62) \textsc{Topic} – \textsc{Wh}  
*\textsc{Wh} – \textsc{Topic}

A third piece of evidence suggesting that bien behaves as a wh-element comes from the fact that bien is banned from (standard) constructions submitted to wh-movement. That is, bien is incompatible with interrogative and exclamative clauses. This is seen in (63) and (64), respectively:

(63) a. ¿Qué ha comido Julia?
   What has eaten Julia?
   ‘What did Julia eat?’
b. *¿Qué \textit{bien} ha comido Julia?
   What well has eaten Julia?

(64) a. ¡Qué casa se ha comprado Julia!
   What house CL\textsubscript{DAT} has bought Julia!
   ‘What a house Julia has bought!’

\(^{39}\) See Hernanz and Brucart (1987:chapter 3) for a more detailed analysis of this issue in Spanish.
b. *¡Qué casa bien se ha comprado Julia!
   What house well CL_DAT has bought Julia!

And the same prohibition also extends to sentences with a preposed constituent bearing focal stress, as in (65):

(65) a. UNA CASA se ha comprado Julia (y no un apartamento).
   A HOUSE CL_DAT has bought Julia (and not an apartment)
   ‘It’s a house that Julia has bought, not an apartment’

b. *UNA CASA bien se ha comprado Julia (y no un apartamento).
   A HOUSE well CL_DAT has bought Julia (and not an apartment)

The contrasts illustrated in (63)-(65) provide support for the view that bien enters the paradigm of wh-elements. If bien and wh-operators behave alike, targeting a unique structural position, it comes as no surprise that they are in complementary distribution. Putting it differently, the illformedness of the examples in (63b), (64b) and (65b) is consistent with the assumption that only a single focus projection is available in a sentence (see Rizzi (1997: 290)).

4.3. The position of the subject

A further parallelism between bien and wh-elements is provided by word order. Going back to the examples discussed at the outset of this work, note that bien (like sí) triggers the inversion of the subject. Compare (66a) with (66b):

(66) a. Pepito ha comido pasta.

b. Bien ha comido pasta Pepito.

Given that subjects in Spanish can easily appear in post-verbal position, (66b) could be regarded as a case of free inversion, similar to (67):

(67) Ha comido pasta Pepito.

However, a closer look at the data shows that this parallelism cannot be maintained. As widely assumed, post-verbal subjects in Spanish are interpreted as the focus of the sentence; hence, the DP Pepito counts as

40 See Contreras (1978) and Zubizarreta (1999), among other authors.
41 Following Zubizarreta (1999:4233), I assume that word order VOS is obtained from a rule that rearranges the constituents [S] and [VO], as schematically represented in (i):
new information in (67). This pattern, though, does not extend to *bien*-sentences. Contrary to what happens with (67), in (66b) the underlined subject is interpreted as old information rather than as a focal constituent. The need to make a distinction between the two post-verbal positions in (67) and (66b) is shown by the following contrast:42

\[(68)\]
\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. Ha comido pasta } \text{Pepito, y no Julia.} \\
\quad \text{Has eaten pasta Pepito, and not Julia} \\
\quad \text{‘It was Pepito that ate pasta, not Julia’}
\end{array}\]
\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{b. *Bien ha comido pasta } \text{Pepito, y no Julia.}
\end{array}\]

Given my claim that the informative status of post-verbal subjects clearly diverges in both unmarked declarative sentences and *bien*-sentences, the contrast in (68) is expected. Namely, it comes from the fact that the negative conjunct \textit{y no Julia} (“and not Julia”), conveying a contrastive reading, is only compatible with a focal subject, as in (68a).

Setting aside the controversial issue of the position of the subject in Spanish,43 what is relevant for the purposes of this discussion is the fact that post-verbal subjects in *bien*-sentences do not qualify as a case of free inversion, as the contrast between (68a) and (68b) is intended to show.

A potential problem for the claim that *bien*-sentences do not behave like declarative sentences with respect to subject word order is given in (69). This example, when compared to (66b), might indeed suggest that subject inversion is putative rather than compulsory in *bien*-sentences:

\[(69)\]  \textit{Pepito bien ha comido pasta.}

My contention is that, although it precedes the V, the underlined DP in (69) occupies not a subject position, but rather a topic position, as illustrated in (70). This assumption is substantiated by the fact that \textit{TopicP}44 is an available position in front of \textit{FocusP} (see Rizzi (1997)):

\[(i)\] \[
[[r S] [V O]] \quad [[V O] [r S]]
\]

---

42 Additional support for this claim is provided by intonational factors. Thus, in the examples in (66b), in contrast to those in (67), postverbal subjects are set off from the rest of the sentence by a slight pause.

43 See, on this question, Ordóñez (1998).

44 Note, in this connection, that \textit{Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD)} is clearly attested in *bien*-sentences, as shown in (i):
Strong evidence against the assumption that subject position is available for preverbal DPs in bien-sentences comes from quantified DPs. As is widely known, bare quantifiers (all, nobody, etc.), as well as non-specific quantified NPs, are banned from topic position. Accordingly, if the underlined DP in (69) were in the canonical subject position, one would expect that it could be replaced by a quantified DP. This expectation is not fulfilled, as shown in (71):

(71) a. Todo el mundo (*bien) comió pasta.
    Everybody (well) ate pasta
b. Poca gente (*bien) ha comido pasta.
    Few people (well) ate pasta

Further evidence supporting the analysis given in (70) comes from superlatives. Note that superlative-DPs cannot be dislocated, as shown in (72):

(72) a. Las dudas, Julia no las soporta.       (Villalba, p.c.)
    ‘Julia can’t stand not knowing for sure’
    Doubts, Julia does not CLACC stand
b. *La más pequeña duda, Julia no la soporta. (Villalba, p.c.)
    The most little doubt Juan does not CLACC stand

Again, bien-sentences where a superlative DP emerges in preverbal position are ruled out, as predicted by my analysis:

(i) La carta bien la escribimos ayer.
    The letter, (we) well CLACC wrote yesterday
    ‘But we did write the letter yesterday’

46 This is shown in (i):

(i) a. *Nessuno, lo conosco in questa città. (Rizzi, 1986:395)
    Nobody, I know him in this city
b. *Tutto, lo dirò alla polizia.
    Everything, I will say to the police

See also Belletti (1990), Rizzi (1997), and Haegeman (2000), among other authors.
(73)  a. La más pequeña duda le pone nervioso.
   The most little doubt CL-ACC makes him upset
   ‘The slightest doubt upsets him’
   b. *La más pequeña duda bien le pone nervioso.

To sum up, the data discussed so far lead us to conclude that *bien*, being an emphatic affirmative marker, is quantificational in nature; hence, it shares relevant properties with *wh*-elements: i) it must appear left-adjointed to the verb; ii) it is incompatible with focal operators; iii) it may co-occur with topicalized constituents in the fixed order {TOP-bien}; and iv) it triggers subject inversion. Furthermore, the approach presented here is consistent with the observed parallelism between the syntax of Negative Inversion and that of *wh*-sentences (see Haegeman (2000)). As already noted, negation and affirmation have been argued to belong to a more abstract category (*PolP*) that encodes the polarity of the sentence (see Laka (1990)). Consequently, we would expect that some syntactic properties holding for negative sentences may hold across the whole paradigm of negative and positive polarity, as seems to be the case.

4.4. *Bien* in the articulated CP domain

I would now like to turn to the syntactic analysis proposed in (48). Recall that *bien*, being a positive marker, merges with *PolP* (see (10)), and from this category moves to a higher syntactic position. In a theory assuming an articulated CP-structure along the lines of Rizzi (1997), the question arises as to which node in CP triggers movement of positive polarity to the CP-domain. I claim that it is *FocusP*, which has been conceived as a category subsuming both contrastive focus and focused polarity, that does it. That is, *bien* (like *sí*) targets *FocusP* in order to express emphatic affirmation, as schematized in (48). More precisely, I propose that *bien* is attracted to [Spec, *FocusP*] in order to check off an interpretable feature [+EMPH(atic)] (see

47 It is worth emphasizing in this regard that *bien*-sentences parallel English Negative Inversion in many significant ways (see Haegeman (2000)). That is, both constructions pattern alike in that they trigger subject-auxiliary inversion, they are incompatible with *wh*-inversion, and they allow for the preposing of topicalized constituents:

(i)  a. On no account will I read e-mail. (Haegeman, 2000)
    b. *On no account where should I go?
    c. During my sabbatical, on no account will I read e-mail.

48 See Holmberg (2001) for a detailed account of this issue.
(15)), this movement being required by the FOCUS-criterion (see Rizzi (1997)). Following Rizzi (1997:325), I assume that “All instances of preposing to the left periphery must be triggered by the satisfaction of a Criterion”. The FOCUS-criterion is conceived in Rizzi (1997:299) as comprising both the Wh-criterion and the NEG-criterion (see Haegeman (2000:23)).

The hypothesis that the FOCUS-criterion is at work in the case under study is supported by the fact that bien-sentences have a distinctive emphatic character, which suggests that the focus layer of the left periphery is indeed activated.

In accordance with the view that bien moves from PolP to FocusP on the left periphery, the facts illustrated in (55)-(68) follow in a rather natural way. Let us examine this issue in some detail. Consider, first, subject inversion, illustrated in (55)-(57). I suggest that the impossibility of (55), similarly to the ill-formedness of (56)-(57), comes from a violation of the FOCUS-criterion, which has to be satisfied by moving the finite verb to the head of FocP, in order to create a specifier-head configuration between the EMPH-feature on T and the focus operator. This movement yields the adjacency effect between bien and V observed above.

As for the distribution of bien with respect to topics, it seems plausible to postulate that the paradigm discussed in (58)-(62) follows from the ordering constraints holding for Topic and Focus in the left periphery (see Rizzi (1997:297)).

Finally, going back to the examples in (63)-(65), the contrasts between (a) and (b) can be accounted for by claiming, as suggested above, that the ill-formedness of the examples in (b) is the result of a collision between two quantified elements: that is, the [+ EMPH] feature competes with the [+Wh-] feature in Spec of Focus—see Rizzi (1997:325).

The partial structure for bien-sentences is given in (74):
EMPHATIC POLARITY AND C IN SPANISH

(74) \[[\text{ForceP} \ [\text{FocusP} \text{ bien}, \ [\text{Foc} \ [\text{Foc0 ha comido}]] [\text{PolP} \ t_1, \ [\text{Pol} \ [\text{IP} \text{ Pepito} \ t]])]]\]

The analysis proposed accounts for the fact that bien is barred in a variety of constructions undergoing wh-movement. As observed, this incompatibility follows from the fact that no more than one operator can occur in bien-sentences since only one of them can be in Spec of FocusP. Moreover, under the assumption that bien targets the CP domain, some further effects are predicted, which suggests that this particle interacts with a variety of operators conveying the illocutionary force of a sentence. I will turn to this issue in the next section.

4.5. A final remark: bien and directive speech acts

Now I will briefly explore a further relation between bien and modality. It concerns the fact that bien is precluded in a number of constructions introducing directive speech acts. Let us consider a set of data which illustrate this point.55

To begin with, note that bien is incompatible with imperative sentences (75), as well as with deontic futures, which mean an impositive order (76):

(75) a. ¡Hacedme caso de vez en cuando!
   ‘Pay attention to me from time to time!’
   b. *¡Bien hacedme caso de vez en cuando!

(76) a. ¡Harás lo que te diga!
   (You) will do what (I) CLDAT tellSUBJ
   ‘You will do what I will tell you!’
   b. *Bien harás lo que te diga.

Secondly, bien is also prohibited in subjunctive sentences expressing either an attenuated order (77) or a desiderative content (78):

(see Hernanz (2003)), that the presuppositional value of bien is checked in ForceP, the locus of illocutionary force.

55 The facts considered in this section sharply parallel the paradigm of anti-directive polarity discussed in Bosque (1994).
(77)  a. ¡Que tengas suerte!
That (you) have luck!
‘May you have good luck!’
b. *¡Que bien tengas suerte!

(78)  a. ¡Ojalá cantara la soprano!
OJALÁ would sing the soprano!
‘If only the soprano would sing!’
b. *¡Ojalá bien cantara la soprano!

Thirdly, auxiliary modal poder (“may”), when used in its deontic reading of “to be allowed”, is also incompatible with bien. As the following contrast shows, bien and the “permission” meaning of bien in (79b) are mutually exclusive:

(79)  a. Puede usted sentarse.  poder = “to be allowed”
May you sit down
‘Sit down, please’ ‘You may sit down’
b. *Bien puede usted sentarse.  poder ≠ “to be allowed”

Finally, an additional piece of evidence which points in the same direction, namely that bien is banned from constructions qualifying as directive speech acts, is provided by the behavior of this particle with predicates such as ordenar (“to order”), pedir (“to ask”), prometer (“to promise”), etc. Note that the presence of bien is incompatible with the illocutionary reading of these predicates as verbal actions, which is attested by the ill-formed examples in (80):

(80)  a. *Bien te ordeno que te calles.
Well (I) CL_DAT order that (you) CL remain silent
b. *Bien te pido que sales de aquí.
Well (I) CL_DAT ask that (you) leave
c. *Bien te prometo que todo se arreglará.
Well (I) CL_DAT promise that everything will be all right

The examples in (80) contrast with those in (81), where the predicates alluded to do not fulfill all the necessary requirements for the performative reading (that is, they are inflected in past tense and take subjects other than a first pronominal person). As a result, they do not render the illocutionary force of a directive speech act; rather, they are interpreted as statements allowing for bien to freely appear:
(81) a. Bien le ordenaron que se callara.
   Well (they) CL\textsubscript{DAT} ordered that (s/he) CL remain silent
   ‘But they did order him/her to remain silent’

b. Bien te han pedido que salgas de aquí.
   Well (they) CL\textsubscript{DAT} have asked that (you) leave
   ‘But they did ask you to leave’

c. Bien te prometí que todo se arreglaría.
   Well (I) CL\textsubscript{DAT} promised that everything would be right
   ‘But (I) did promise you that everything would be right’

Given the analysis I am proposing, the ungrammaticality of the examples discussed in this section is expected, as it follows from the fact that bien, being quantificational in nature, is ruled out in syntactic structures where the CP domain is filled by a variety of modality markers which have been claimed to occur in a high position in the sentence. Formulated in intuitive terms, what goes wrong in (75b), (76b), (80), etc. is the fact that they entail a rather contradictory modal value, so to speak. That is, one cannot order an action, or promise something, etc., while at the same time stressing the positive value of a propositional content. In order to illustrate this point in a more precise way, let us concentrate on impositive sentences like those in (75)-(76). I assume, along the lines of Zanuttini’s (1997) proposal, among other authors,\textsuperscript{56} that imperative clauses are subject to the syntactic requirement that the functional domain expressing the illocutionary force of the sentence, namely the CP field, must be filled. As is well-known, imperative verbs have been argued to move to Force\textsuperscript{0}, in order to check an [IMPERATIVE] mood feature hosted in Force\textsubscript{P} (see Rizzi (1997)). In such a situation, it may be claimed that bien is prohibited due to an intervention effect. In other words, in the ungrammatical examples alluded to, bien counts as a harmful intervener which prevents the trace of the moved imperative from binding. I will not engage in a more detailed account of this issue here.

5. From bien to bien que: on the status of C

In the preceding sections, I have shown that Spanish has two options to stress the affirmative value of an assertion, namely, the bien strategy and the bien que strategy. I have also provided evidence supporting the claim that both options, as they convey an emphatic meaning to the sentence, activate the domain of the left periphery. I will now concentrate on the role played by

\textsuperscript{56} See also Rivero (1994), and Rivero and Terzi (1995).
the complementizer *que* (“that”) when it emerges in emphatic sentences, and I will explore two possible ways to address this issue: *que* may be viewed as the head of *Focus*, or, alternatively, as the head of *Force*. I will argue that the alternation between *bien* and *bien que* can only be accounted for under the second approach. Let us consider both possibilities in turn.

5.1. **Alternative I: que heads FocusP**

In accordance with the view that *bien* targets *FocusP*, it would be tempting to suggest that the alternation between *bien* and *bien que* falls under the general pattern exhibited by exclamative sentences, which also activate the Focus layer. Consider, in this respect, the examples in (82):

(82) a. ¡Qué guapa está Julia!
   What beautiful is Julia!
   ‘How beautiful Julia is!’

b. ¡Qué guapa que está Julia!
   What beautiful that is Julia!
   ‘How beautiful Julia is!’

Assuming, along the lines of Rizzis’s (1997) proposal, that movement of wh-phrases such as *qué guapa* to the left periphery is required by the FOCUS-Criterion, I take the sequence *qué guapa que* in (82b) to instantiate a case of “Doubly-filled Comp”. That is, the construction in (82b) includes both a wh-phrase and a subordination particle *que*, the former targeting the [Spec, FocusP] position, and the latter located in the head of FocusP, as in (83):

(83)  

Extending the analysis given in (83) to the case under study, it could be suggested that the alternation between *bien* and *bien que* is amenable to the alternation between null C and overt C in exclamative sentences:
Attractive as it may seem, this analysis is not tenable. Recall that the alternation between bien and bien que is by no means semantically innocuous, as already discussed (see section 3.3). This pattern clearly contrasts with the paradigm of exclamative sentences, in which the complementizer que is semantically inert. That is, (82a) and (82b) are in fact synonymous in Spanish, as the English glosses show. Consequently, the two kinds of constructions cannot be subsumed under the same syntactic representation.

Further evidence against alternative I comes from the fact that sí and (marginally) bien, when followed by que, are compatible with negation, as illustrated in (44), repeated here as (85), and (86):

(85) a. Pepito sí que no come pasta.
   Pepito yes that not eats pasta
   ‘Of course Pepito doesn’t eat pasta, I’m positive’
   b. Hoy sí que no hace frío.
   Today yes that (it) is not cold
   ‘Certainly, it is not cold today’

(86) Bien que no fuma Pepito.
Well that not smokes Pepito
‘Pepito does not smoke’

Given that, as noted above (see (7) and (45)), bien and si fail to co-occur with negative markers in the same sentence, the well-formedness of the examples in (85) and (86) clearly indicates that these particles, when followed by que, do occupy a structural position higher than FocusP. This

---

57 See Brucart (1993) for a more detailed account of the nature of que in Spanish exclamatives. For further discussion about the properties of exclamatives in Romance, see also Villalba (2003).
means that the structure in (84) must be discarded, since it cannot capture the fact that \{bien/sí\} and \{bien/sí que\} do not merge in the same position.

5.2. Alternative II: *que* heads ForceP

In this section I would like to argue that the sequence *bien que* is obtained by merging *bien* in ForceP, as seen in (87):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ForceP} \\
\quad & \text{Spec} \quad \text{Force'} \\
\quad & \text{bien} \quad \text{Force}^0 \quad \text{TopicP} \\
\quad & \quad \text{que} \quad \text{FocusP}
\end{align*}
\]

This approach is consistent with the largely motivated assumption that *Force* is the syntactic domain that expresses assertion and which provides the structure to host modality operators. In this connection, I would like to suggest that *bien que* exhibits appealing similarities with the so-called *of course*-type adverbs (i.e., *desde luego, la verdad*, etc.), which have been claimed to behave as truth operators (see Etxepare (1997:50)). Note, in this respect, that the adverbs alluded to, as well as evidential adverbs such as *ciertamente* ("certainly"), *obviamente* ("obviously"), *evidentemente* ("obviously"), etc., may also co-occur with *que*:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(88) a.} & \quad \{\text{Evidentemente / ciertamente / desde luego}\}, \text{ Julia está muy enfadada.} \\
& \quad \quad \text{‘Obviously / certainly / of course}, \text{ Julia is very angry’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \{\text{Evidentemente / ciertamente / desde luego}\} \text{ que Julia está muy enfadada.} \\
& \quad \quad \text{[Obviously / certainly / of course] that Julia is very angry}
\end{align*}
\]

It is worth noting that (88a) and (88b) are by no means semantically equivalent. As has been observed by Etxepare (1997:98), “there is a subtle but nevertheless clear and substantial difference” between the two cases: unlike those in (88b), the examples in (88a) can be uttered out of the blue. In other words, (88a) qualifies as an appropriate construction in the following situation: someone is late and realizes that Julia got very angry. By contrast, (88b) are emphatic sentences that can only be used to stress an already-mentioned proposition [i.e., *Creo que Julia está muy enfadada* (“I think that
Julia is very angry”]. That is, in order to utter (88b) felicitously, “you need a linguistic antecedent” (see Etxepare (1997:99)). This clearly suggests that the presence of *que* in (88b) is associated with an echoic value. Interestingly enough, this pattern resembles the pattern displayed by the alternation between *bien/bien que* discussed above (see the examples in (34)-(39)).

Moreover, the subset of attitudinal adverbs which precede the complementizer *que* behave like *bien/sí* with respect to polarity markers.

Compare, in this respect, (89) with (44)-(45):

(89) a. ¿Se ha enfadado Julia?
    ‘Did Julia get angry?’
 b. *Evidentemente sí / no
    Obviously yes/not
  c. Evidentemente *que sí / no
    Obviously that yes/not
    ‘It’s obvious that she did’

Returning to (40), what I am proposing is that *ForceP* is the locus of Echo (that is, “high” polarity). More precisely, I suggest that *bien*, like other attitudinal adverbs, may occupy the Spec position of *ForceP* and take scope over the main assertion of the sentence, which gives rise to an echoic interpretation. Following this interpretation, it is predicted that *bien* and *sí*, when followed by *que*, allow for a “low” polarity marker such as *no/sí* (located in *PolP*) to appear. Since the two kinds of elements do not compete for the same position, they do not clash. This is illustrated in (90):

(90) \[\text{ForceP } [\text{bien }[[\text{que}]] ... [\text{PolP } \text{no } [\text{IP } ...]]] \]

In sum, the alternative II accommodates the data discussed so far rather naturally, by simply assuming that two polarity layers are at work in the sentential structure. However, several questions remain open and more research is needed to substantiate a relevant proposal concerning the role played by the complementizer *que* in emphatic sentences. I speculate that the option for C to be null or phonologically realized in modality-marked sentences obeys parametric factors. A relevant piece of evidence in this regard comes from Catalan, which shows a strong preference for the second strategy. The relevant data are given in (91)-(92):

(91) a. Fa calor a Barcelona?
    ‘Is it hot in Barcelona?’
b. *Sí hi fa calor.
   Yes CLLOC it is hot
\[c. \text{Sí que hi fa calor.} \]
   Yes that CLLOC it is hot
   ‘Yes, it is hot’

(92)  a. No ha vingut la Maria?
   Not has come the Maria?
   ‘Didn’t Maria come?’
 b. *Sí ha vingut.
   Yes has come
 c. Sí que ha vingut.
   Yes that has come
   ‘Yes, she did come’

As the paradigm in (91)-(92) is intended to show, the option for a null complementizer in emphatic affirmative sentences is fully excluded (or rather marginal) in Catalan. The same does not hold for Spanish, which allows both strategies, as already discussed (see (42)).

In light of these data, it could be hypothesized that the head que in ForceP spells out illocutionary features associated with an abstract operator of the required type hosted in this projection. However, I will not pursue this issue here.

6. Conclusion

In this study I have addressed the analysis of emphatic affirmative sentences in Spanish, and have argued that they activate the domains of Focus and Force in the left periphery. I have mainly concentrated on the study of the particle bien, which has been claimed to behave as an assertive operator which, besides its affirmative value, encapsulates both an emphatic reading and a presuppositional interpretation. It has been shown that Spanish makes use of three varieties of bien, whose contribution to the semantic interpretation of the sentence is reminiscent of their respective scopal domain. The status of bien in the left periphery has been examined in the second part of this work, where I have showed that the properties of this particle crucially parallel those of the wh-words, and I have argued as well that bien moves from PolP to FocusP in order to check its emphatic value. I have then turned to the alternation between bien and bien que, and have

---

58 See Hernanz and Rigau (2006), for a more detailed account of this issue.
suggested that the latter option provides support to postulate that bien may also merge in ForceP. In this connection, I have claimed that the presence of the complementizer que (“that”) is associated with an echoic value, and that the bien/bien que pattern extends to other constructions where a similar picture arises. Finally, in light of the proposed analysis and on the basis of some comparative data, I have proposed that emphatic affirmative sentences may be taken as relevant evidence to claim that the largely motivated bifurcation between internal and external negation also holds for the paradigm of affirmation.
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