WH-CLAUSES IN CLASSICAL PORTUGUESE: VERB MOVEMENT AND THE LEFT PERIPHERY

ORAÇÕES-WH NO PORTUGUÊS CLÁSSICO: MOVIMENTO DO VERBO E PERIFERIA ESQUERDA

André Antonelli[1]

Abstract: Within the generative literature on wh-interrogatives in Classical Portuguese, it is traditionally assumed that, in matrix clauses, this language shows generalized verb movement to the CP field (DAVID, 2016; KATO; MIOTO, 2005; KATO; RIBEIRO, 2009; LOPES-ROSSI, 1996). In this paper, we present further evidence which confirms such an analysis. Under a cartographic view of the CP layer (RIZZI, 1997, 2001, 2004), we show, however, that the verb does not occupy the same position in two types of wh-clauses, an aspect not discussed in the previous literature. Our proposal is that this difference is related to the fact that Classical Portuguese is characterized as a V2 language (ANTONELLI, 2011; GALVES; PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, 2017; GIBRAIL, 2010).

Keywords: Cartography; Generative Grammar; Syntax; V2.

1   Universidade Estadual de Maringá. E-mail: alantonelli@uem.br

Resumo: No âmbito da literatura gerativista sobre interrogativas wh do português clássico, tradicionalmente se assume que, em orações matrizes, essa língua apresenta movimento generalizado do verbo para a camada CP (DAVID, 2016; KATO; MIOTO, 2005; KATO; RIBEIRO, 2009; LOPES-ROSSI, 1996). Neste artigo, apresentamos evidências adicionais que confirmam esse tipo de análise. Sob uma visão cartográfica do nível CP (RIZZI, 1997, 2001, 2004), mostramos, no entanto, que o verbo não ocupa a mesma posição em dois tipos específicos de interrogativas wh, aspecto este ainda não discutido na literatura. Nossa proposta é que essa diferença se relaciona ao fato de que o português clássico se caracteriza como uma língua V2 (ANTONELLI, 2011; GALVES; PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, 2017; GIBRAIL, 2010).

Palavras-chave: Cartografia; Gramática Generativa; Sintaxe; V2.

INTRODUCTION[2]

The goal of this article is to discuss the syntactic structure of matrix wh-clauses in Classical Portuguese (henceforth ClaP).[3] Since Lopes-Rossi (1996), it is usually assumed that ClaP shows generalized V-to-C movement in this context (DAVID, 2016; KATO; MIOTO, 2005; KATO; RIBEIRO, 2009). Here, we present further evidence which confirms such an analysis. Under a cartographic view of the CP layer (RIZZI, 1997, 2001, 2004), we show, however, that wh-structures in ClaP show a dichotomy in terms of the syntax of verb movement. Although we observe that V-movement to the left periphery is generally applicable, we also note that the verb does not occupy the same position all the time, an aspect not discussed in the earlier literature. Besides that, our proposed analysis also makes a connection between this rich articulated C-system of wh-interrogative clauses and the fact that ClaP behaved as a V2-type grammar (ANTONELLI, 2011; GALVES; PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, 2017; GIBRAIL, 2010).

The article is organized as follows: section 1 undertakes a review of the traditional analysis of wh-clauses in ClaP, demonstrating how it should be updated in order to fully explain new data not contemplated in the previous literature. In section 2, we develop our analysis, showing the different structural positions the verb can occupy within the left periphery and how this is related to the V2 property. In the last section, we summarise the results of the preceding discussion.

---

[2] I thank the audience at the Seminário Internacional sobre a Ordem de Palavras nas Línguas Ibero-Românicas for comments, and two anonymous reviewers for useful criticisms. The (remaining) errors are, of course, my full responsibility.

[3] We follow Galves, Namiutti & Paixão de Sousa (2006) by assuming that ClaP ranges from the 14th century up to the end of the 17th century.

1   THE TRADITIONAL ANALYSIS

In her pioneering work, Lopes-Rossi (1996) makes the most detailed description of the syntax of wh-interrogative clauses in ClaP.[4] She observes that, in a matrix context, an overt subject never appears between the wh-operator and the finite verb. As can be seen in the examples in (1), the subject is always post-verbal (LOPES-ROSSI, 1996, p. 40).

(1)   a.   <u>Que</u> **dizeis** [vós], Humildade?[5]
             What say-2pl you-2pl, Humility
             "What do you say, Humility?" (16th century)
       b.   <u>Como</u> **posso** [eu] caber aí?
             How can I to.fit there
             "How can I fit there?" (17th century)

This pattern is similar to what is found in languages like English and Italian, as illustrated in (2) and (3), respectively (RIZZI, 1996, p. 63).

(2)   a.   <u>What</u> **has** [Mary] said? (English)
       b.   *<u>What</u> [Mary] **has** said?
(3)   a.   <u>Che cosa</u> **ha** detto [Maria]? (Italian)
       b.   *<u>Che cosa</u> [Maria] **ha** detto?

Following the same analysis developed by Rizzi (1996) for English and Italian, Lopes-Rossi assumes that examples like those in (1) are a piece of evidence that the wh-phrase and the verb have moved to the CP field. The idea is that the linear adjacency between the interrogative operator and the finite verb is established in the left periphery, with the wh-element being hosted in [Spec,CP] and the verb occupying C^0. Under this approach, the subject remains in a lower layer (in [Spec,TP], for instance), thus deriving the verb-subject (VS) word order.[6] The representation in (4) gives a view of this structure.

---

[4]   The corpus of ClaP investigated by Lopes-Rossi is composed of plays published between the 16th century and the 18th century.

[5]   In this and subsequent examples, the verb is bold-faced, the wh-operator is underlined and other relevant elements are presented between brackets.

[6]   An alternative proposal is the one offered by Barbosa (2001). At least for null subject Romance languages, the author claims that the VS word order derives from an operation in

---

(4) $[_{CP} [_{Spec} WH] [_{C'} V+T+C^0 [_{TP} [_{Spec} Subject] \sout{V+T^0}...\sout{WH}]]]$

However, this traditional analysis, which is followed by more recent works (DAVID, 2016; KATO; MIOTO, 2005; KATO; RIBEIRO, 2009), faces some challenges. The first one relates to the structure of the left periphery itself. Since Rizzi (1997), it has been shown that the CP-layer can be decomposed into a variety of functional heads, each one conveying a specific semantic value. If we accept a new makeup of the left periphery as the one presented in (5),[7] the logical conclusion is that Lopes Rossi's account must be reinterpreted in order to answer the following question: in what functional layer(s) within the cartographic CP are the wh-phrase and the verb now located?

(5) $[_{ForceP} [_{TopP} [_{FocP} [_{TopP} [_{FinP} [_{TP} ...]]]]]]$

Additionally, new data shows that the strict adjacency between the wh-constituent and the finite verb can be broken by different types of elements in certain structures. Looking at the first full translation of the New Testament in Portuguese,[8] we observe an interesting contrast between object and adjunct wh-clauses. In the first group, there is systematic subject verb-inversion, as can be seen in (6), a fact already noted by Lopes-Rossi.

(6)   a.   <u>que</u> **dará** [o homem] por resgate de sua alma?
                what will.give the man for rescue of his soul
                "what can a man give in exchange for his soul?" (Mark 8:37)
        b.   <u>que</u> **quer** dizer [este Paroleiro]?
                what wants to.say this Babbler
                "what is this Babbler trying to say?" (Acts 17:18)

---

which the wh-marker raises to the highest specifier in Infl, and not to [Spec,CP]. The verb does not move to the left periphery too, and the subject remains *in situ*, i.e., inside VP. A similar analysis has been made for Catalan (BONET, 1990; SOLA, 1992; VALLDUVÍ, 1992), Iberian Spanish (CONTRERAS, 1991; URIBE-ETXEBARRIA, 1991; ZUBIZARRETA, 1997) and Romanian (DOBROVIE-SORIN, 1994).

[7]   Further developments of Rizzi's original idea for the CP field are found in Benincà (2006), Benincà & Poletto (2004) and Rizzi (2001, 2004), among others.

[8]   This translation was published in 1681 by João Ferreira de Almeida. A facsimile version is found in the website of the Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal (http://www.bnportugal.pt).

If pre-verbal, subjects appear before the wh-element, as in (7).

(7) a.   [tu] pois <u>que</u> **dizeis**?
            you-2pl then what say
            "now what do you say?" (John 8:5)

      b.   E [o braço do Senhor], <u>a quem</u> **he** revelado?
            And the arm of.the Lord to whom is revealed
            "to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?" (John 12:38)

In table 1, we see the quantitative linear distribution of overt subjects in object wh-clauses.

Word Order	N	%
Wh-V-S	22	81,48
S-Wh-V	5	18,52
Total	27	100

Table 1: Quantitative distribution of overt subjects in object wh-clauses.

In adjunct wh-sentences, post-verbal subjects are also attested, just like in object wh-clauses, as shown in (8).

(8) a.   <u>Porque</u> **falla** [este] blasfemias?
            Why speaks this blasphemies
            "Why does this fellow talk like this?" (Mark 2:7)

      b.   <u>donde</u> **poderá** [alguém] fartar a estes de pam
            from.where will.be.able someone satisfy to these of bread
            "Where can anyone get enough bread to feed them?" (Mark 8:4)

The interesting contrast is that, if pre-verbal, subjects can appear not only before the wh-operator (see (9)), as in object wh-clauses, but also in an intervening position between the finite verb and the interrogative phrase (see (10)).

(9) a.   Mas [tu], <u>porque</u> **julgas** a teu irmaõ?
            But you-2sg why judge to your brother
            "Why do you judge your btother?" (Romans 14:10)

Estudos
Linguísticos e literários

b.   Ou [tu tambem], <u>porque</u> **desprezas** a teu irmaõ?
Or you also why despise to your
"Why do you look down on your brother?" (Romans 14:10)

(10)   a.   <u>Porque</u> [teus discipulos] **traspassaõ** a tradiçaõ dos anciaõs?
Why your disciples break the tradition of.the elders
"Why do your disciples break the tradition of the elders?"
(Matthew 15:2)

        b.   <u>porque</u> [os discipulos de Joaõ, e os dos phariseos] **jejumaõ**, e teus
why the disciples of John and the of.the pharisees fast and your
discipulos naõ jejumaõ?
disciples not fast
"how is it that John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees
are fasting, but yours are not?" (Mark 2:18)

An additional fact in adjunct wh-sentences is that we also find topicalized XPs (i.e., non subject phrases) breaking the linear adjacency between the wh-operator and the verb (see (11)). In object wh-clauses, such a word order is not attested. Note that the example (11b) presents not only a topicalized XP, but also an intervening subject.

(11)   a.   E <u>porque</u> [tambem â toda ora] **entramos** em perigo?
And why also to every hour enter-1pl in danger
"Why do we endanger ourselves every hour?" (1st Corinthians
15:30)

        b.   <u>como</u> [David] [em espirito] o **chama** seu senhor?[9]
how David in spirit him calls his lord
"how is it then that David, speaking by the spirit, calls him Lord?"
(Matthew 22:43)

In table 2, we also present the quantitative linear distribution of overt subjects in adjunct wh-clauses.

---

[9]   Since clitics are usually assumed to be structurally adjoined to the verb, we do not count them as intervening constituents.

Word Order	N	%
Wh-V-S	70	84,34
Wh-S-V	7	8,43
S-Wh-V	6	7,23
Total		100

Table 2: Quantitative distribution of overt subjects in adjunct wh-clauses.

This new set of data raises a second challenge to Lopes-Rossi's analysis. Considering that, at least in a subgroup of wh-interrogative clauses, ClaP does not manifest strict adjacency between the wh-operator and the verb, is it possible to say that this grammar really shows generalized verb movement to the left periphery in matrix wh-sentences? Evidently the answer to this question can be positive under a cartographic view of the left periphery, since we would have a very rich articulated sytem comprising different projections. A possible solution, and which saves the principle behind Lopes-Rossi's proposal, would be to say that the verb always moves to the CP field, but in object wh-clauses the verb and the interrogative operator establish a spec-head relation, while in adjunct wh-clauses there would be no spec-head configuration. Under this view, there are different positions for the verb and/or for the interrogative constituent within the CP layer. But, here again, we are left with the following question: in what functional layer(s) within the cartographic CP are the wh-phrase and the verb now located in both types of wh-interrogative clauses? In the light of this discussion, it is clear that wh-structures in ClaP demand a new type of analysis, which will be presented in the next section.[10]

2   VERB MOVEMENT AND THE LEFT PERIPHERY

In our analysis, we assume an updated split-CP view (see Rizzi 1997, 2001, 2004), as the one schematized in (12).

(12)   [ForceP [TopP [IntP [FocP [TopP [FinP [TP ...]]]]]]]

---

[10]   Another possibility, and which we will not explore here, would be to assume a cartographic IP like the one proposed by Cinque (1999). Under this alternative, a VS word order could be an instance where both subject and verb are located inside the inflectional layer, but with the verb in a higher projection. In SV sentences, both subject and verb would still be located within IP, but in this configuration the verb would be positioned in a lower projection.

At first sight, we could explain the contrast between object and adjunct wh-clauses in ClaP in terms of what Rizzi (1996, 2001) proposes for modern Italian. In this language, interrogative clauses usually show VS linear order, as already exemplified in (3). However, some operators like *perché* "why" and *come mai* "how come" allow subjects to surface in pre-verbal position (RIZZI, 2001, p. 293), as we can see in (13).

(13)   a.   <u>Perché</u> [Gianni] **è** venuto?
             "Why has Gianni left?"
       b.   <u>Come mai</u> [Gianni] **è** partito?
             "How come Gianni has left?"

Besides that, only clauses with these particular operators allow fronted XPs (contrastive focus, for instance) to break the linear adjacency between the wh-operator and the verb, as the contrast between (14) and (15) shows.

(14)   a.   <u>Perché</u> [QUESTO] **avremmo** dovuto dirgli, non qualcos'altro?
             "Why THIS we should have said to him, not something else?"
       b.   <u>Come mai</u> [IL MIO LIBRO] gli **ha** datto, non il tuo?
             "How come MY BOOK you gave to him, not yours?"

(15)   a.   *<u>Che cosa</u> [A GIANNI] **hanno** detto (non a Piero)?
             "What TO GIANNI they have said (not to Piero)?"
       b.   *<u>A chi</u> [QUESTO] **hanno** detto (non qualcos'altro)?
             "To whom THIS they said (not something else)?"

Another difference concerns the distribution of adverbs. Only clauses with *perché* and *come mai* license short adverbs like *già* "already" in pre-verbal position (see (16)). In clauses with a wh-argument, this sort of adverb is categorically post-verbal (see (17)).

(16)   a.   <u>Perché</u> (i tuoi amici) [già] **hanno** finito il lavoro?
             "Why (your friends) already have finished the work?"
       b.   <u>Come mai</u> (voi) [già] **siete** tornati a Milano?
             "How come (you) already have come back to Milan?"

(17) a. <u>Che cosa</u> **hanno** [già] fatto?

"What have (they) already done?"

   b. *<u>Che cosa</u> [già] **hanno** fatto?

Rizzi (1996) argues that the inverted pattern is a result of the Wh-Criterion: a wh-operator must establish a spec-head relation with an X^0 endowed with a wh-feature. This structural configuration is satisfied in the CP-domain between the wh-argument moved to [Spec,CP] (or [Spec,FocP], in cartographic terms; see Rizzi 1997) and the finite verb moved to C^0 (or Foc^0).[11] Assuming that the subject remains inside the TP-layer, it naturally follows the VS sequence. For the non-inverted pattern, Rizzi (2001) proposes that *perché* is directly merged in [Spec,IntP]. The head of IntP would be intrinsically endowed with a wh-feature.[12] Under this configuration, the Wh-Criterion is satisfied without requiring V-movement to the CP-field, thus subject-verb inversion does not arise. Additionally, since there is no structural linear adjacency between *perché* and the verb, fronted XPs could be hosted in topic or focus positions below Int^0. This type of analysis also accounts for the asymmetry in relation to the position of short adverbs. Assuming that adverbs are merged below the CP-layer (CINQUE, 1999), the fact that they are categorically post-verbal in clauses with a wh-argument derives from the idea that, in this structure, there is V-to-C movement. In clauses with *perché* and *come mai*, since there is no V-movement to the left periphery, the word order Adverb-Verb could be licensed.

For ClaP, the analysis would follow the same reasoning. In object wh-clauses, there would be V-movement to the FocP-layer, where the interrogative phrase and the verb would establish a spec-head relation. This would explain the unavailability of intervening subjects and fronted XPs. In adjunct wh-clauses, there would be no spec-head relation between the interrogative operator and the verb: the former would be hosted in [Spec,IntP] and the latter would remain within the TP-layer. Under this configuration, intervening

---

[11] It seems plausible to assume that wh-arguments land in [Spec,FocP], since they are excluded in a clause with a focalized constituent, as shown in (15).

[12] Rizzi does not give details on why Int^0 is intrinsically endowed with a wh-feature. This could be related to the fact that interrogative operators located in [Spec,IntP] are directly merged in this position, while wh-elements occupying [Spec,FocP], probably due to their selectional and interpretive requirements, are firstly merged in some lower IP-internal position.

subjects could be licensed in [Spec,TP] and intervening fronted XPs could land in a topic or focus position below Int^0. In both types of wh-structures, subjects preceding the interrogative phrase could be hosted in a topic position above FocP or IntP, thus deriving the linear order S-WH-V, as attested in our corpus.

However, the idea of V-movement to the left periphery only in object wh-sentences faces some challenges in ClaP. The first problem is a quantitative one. As shown in table 2, the percentage of intervening subjects in adjunct wh-clauses is quite marginal (8,43%). In view of this, the following question naturally arises: if there is no V-movement to the CP-field in this context, why are SV structures so marked in quantitative terms?

This point gets clearer when we compare *porque* clauses in ClaP with *perché* sentences in a contemporary Italian translation of the New Testament.[13] Examples of VS word order in ClaP are systematically SV sequences in Italian. Assuming the natural hypothesis that *porque* and *perché* show the same morphosyntactic properties and assuming that there is no V-movement to the CP-field in both languages, it is a real surprise why the same word order pattern does not arise. This difference is illustrated in the examples from (18) to (21).

(18) a. <u>porque</u> **come** [vosso mestre] com os publicanos, e pecadores
           why eats your teacher with the tax collectors and sinners
           "why does your teacher eat with tax collectors and sinners?"
           (Matthew 9:11)

      b. <u>Perché</u> [il vostro maestro] **mangia** con quelli delle tasse e con gente di cattiva reputazione?

(19) a. <u>Porque</u> **falla** [este] blasfemias?
           Why speaks this blasphemies
           "Why does this fellow talk like this?" (Mark 2:7)

      b. <u>Perché</u> [costui] **osa** parlare in questo modo?

(20) a. <u>porque</u> **pede** sinal [esta geraçaõ]?
           why asks sign this generation
           "why does this generation ask for a miraculous sign?" (Mark 8:12)

      b. <u>Perché</u> [questa gente] **chiede** un segno miracoloso?

---

[13] We took our data from the 2nd edition of *La Bibbia in Lingua Corrente* (2000).

(21)   a.   <u>Porque</u> **bramaõ** [as gentes],
             Why rage the nations
             "Why do the nations rage?" (Acts 4:25)
       b.   <u>Perché</u> [i pagani] si **sono** agitati con orgoglio?

Another problem concerns the position of post-verbal subjects in relation to adverbs in adjunct wh-interrogatives. In our corpus, we attest that an adverb like *logo* "so" can either precede or follow post-verbal subjects. This contrast can be seen in (22).

(22)   a.   Como **permanecerá** [logo] [seu reyno]?
             How will.stand then his kingdom
             "How then can his kingdom stand?" (Matthew 12:26)
       b.   como **dizes** [tu] [logo] convem que o Filho do homem seja
             how say you so is.necessary that the Son of.the man be
             levantado?
             lifted.up
             "how can you say, 'The Son of Man must be lifted up'?" (John 12:34)

Let us assume that *logo* is located in the left border of VP. In (22a), we could say that the subject remains *in situ*, i.e., inside VP, deriving the Adverb-Subject word order. In (22b), the subject would be hosted in [Spec,TP], thus deriving the Subject-Adverb linear order. Under these assumptions, the only way of accounting for the generalized VS sequence in (22) is by assuming that, in both instances, the verb has moved to the left periphery, since the verb would be located in a structural position above the one where the subject is licensed, either [Spec,TP] or some slot inside the VP layer.

Finally, the idea that the verb does not move to the CP-field in adjunct wh-clauses faces a challenge related to clitic interpolation. For instance, Neg interpolation (that is, the word order in which *não* "not" breaks the linear adjacency between the verb and the clitic) is categorical in clauses with *porque*, as illustrated in (23).

(23)   a.   porque pois [lhe] [naõ] **destes** credito?
             why then to.him not gave-2pl trust
             "then why didn't you believe him?" (Matthew 21:25)

Estudos
Linguísticos e literários

b.   porque [o] [naõ] **pudemos** nos lançar fora?
        why it not could we to.drive out
        "why couldn't we drive it out?" (Mark 9:28)

c.   Porque [o] [naõ] **trouxestes**?
        Why him not brought-2pl
        "why didn't you bring him in?" (John 7:45)

d.   Porque [se] [naõ] **vendeo** este unguento
        Why SE not sold this perfume
        "Why wasn't this perfume sold?" (John 12:5)

In the 17th century, this pattern of clitic placement is also found categorically in embedded clauses without the complementizer *que* "that" (ANTONELLI, 2014, p. 210), as shown in (24).

(24)   a.   se attreveo a dizer a seu Pay // [se] [naõ] **achava** com resoluçaõ[14]
                SE dared-3sg to to.say to her father SE not was with resolution
                "she dared to say to her father that she was not prepared"

        b.   he de crer // [o] [naõ] **saberia** o seu Director;
                is of to.believe it not would.know the her Superior
                "it is possible that her Superior was not aware of it;"

        c.   e persuadido // [a] [naõ] **deixasse** de fazer;
                and persuaded it not left of to.do
                and persuaded that she would do it;"

        d.   mas consta-me // [lhe] [naõ] **pedio** oraçoens;
                but believe-me to.him not asked prayers
                "but I believe that she didn't ask him for prayers;"

It is interesting to note that complementizerless clauses are a clear case of V-movement to the left periphery. Antonelli (2015, p. 187-190) shows that, in ClaP, this particular structure manifests a striking characteristic: subjects are categorically post-verbal (see (25)). This is worth noting because, in equivalent clauses introduced by the complementizer *que*, an overt subject can appear both in pre and in post-verbal position (see the contrast in (26)).

---

[14] The beginning of the embedded clause is marked with a forward slash symbol.

(25) a. pedia // lhe **desse** [o Arcebispo] a praça
         he.asked to.him gave the archbishop the vacancy
         "he asked the Archbishop to give him the vacancy"

     b. entendendo // lhe **teria** [ela] encomendado esta deligencia
         understanding to.her would.have she asked this task
         "thinking that she would have asked her this task"

(26) a. dizia // que [Deus] **dera** à sagrada Ordem dos Pregadores
         he.said that God had.given to.the sacred Order of.the Preachers
         "he said that God had given to the sacred Preachers Order"

     b. diz a Escriptura, // que **descançou** [Deus] de tudo
         says the Scripture that rested God of everything
         "the Scripture says that God rested from everything"

The variation in (26) could be explained by assuming that the verb is in T^0. A pre-verbal subject would be located in [Spec,TP], while a post-verbal subject would stand *in situ*.[15] V-raising to the left periphery would be blocked due to the presence of the complementizer *que*. In (25), we could say that, in the absence of the complementizer, there is the application of V-movement to the CP field. Under this configuration, regardless of being in [Spec,TP] or inside VP, the subject will be categorically post-verbal, since the finite verb is always structurally higher than the subject.

These facts about complementizerless clauses make it possible to do the following correlation: if there is verb movement to the left periphery, as in complementizerless clauses, the clitic systematically appears to the left of *não*, thus licensing Neg interpolation. Having this in mind, we can say that examples like those in (23), where there are instances of Neg interpolation in adjunct wh-clauses, are an evidence that these structures also show verb movement to the left periphery.[16]

The fact that all wh-interrogative structures in ClaP instantiate V-movement to the CP field, despite the differences in word order between object wh-clauses and adjunct wh-clauses, can be accounted for in connection to the V2 property of this grammar (ANTONELLI, 2011; GALVES; PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, 2017; GIBRAIL, 2010). It is beyond the scope of this paper to present a

---

[15] For practical reasons, we assume a non-split TP projection, since it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the impact of a cartographic inflectional layer to our analysis in general.

[16] For a more detailed view on Neg interpolation, see Andrade & Namiuti-Temponi (2016).

detailed description of the V2 syntax of ClaP.[17] Here, we just follow the idea that, in a language which manifests this property, Fin^0 always requires a PF-realization (LEDGEWAY, 2008; ROBERTS, 2004). We propose that, in finite root contexts in ClaP, including interrogative sentences,[18] this structural requirement is satisfied through V-movement to Fin^0. For object wh-sentences, our proposal is that the verb undergoes a second movement targeting Foc^0, thus establishing a spec-head relation with the wh-operator. This second movement could be motivated by something like the Wh-Criterion of Rizzi (1996). Such a configuration would prevent the presence of intervening elements, as subjects or fronted XPs. A representation of this structure is presented in (27).

(27) $[_{FocP} [_{Spec} WH] [_{Foc'} V+T+Fin+Foc^0 [_{FinP} \overline{V+T+Fin}^0 [_{TP} \overline{V+T}^0 [_{VP} \overline{V}^0 \ldots \overline{WH}]]]]]$

In adjunct wh-clauses, the verb moves only to Fin^0, as a consequence of the V2 property, but without a subsequent movement to a higher layer where the wh-operator is hosted. Our idea is that elements like *porque* or *como* are located in [Spec,IntP], in the same way as *perché* in Italian, where the head of IntP is intrinsically endowed with a wh-feature. Thus, there is no requirement for V-movement to Int^0 in order to satisfy the Wh-Criterion. This derivation is illustrated in (28).

(28) $[_{IntP} [_{Spec} WH][_{Int'} Int^0_{+wh} [_{FinP} \overline{V+T+Fin}^0 [_{TP} \overline{V+T}^0 [_{VP} \overline{V}^0 \ldots]]]]]$

Under such an analysis, fronted XPs can appear in pre-verbal position in adjunct wh-clauses, occupying either a topic or a focus position (depending on their discursive value). So, an example like (29) would have a structural representation like the one in (30).

---

[17]   Roughly speaking, the V2 constraint is a requirement determining that the finite verb must be preceded by exactly one constituent in finite clauses. This descriptive definition has been placed under intense scrutiny in the last three decades, in particular the aspect which says that just one element can precede the verb. For a classic overview of different problems around this phenomenon, see the papers in Battye & Roberts (1995).

[18]   Much of the literature on V2 tend to treat this phenomenon in declarative and interrogative clauses as non related. However, as Roberts (2004) points out, this is not the case, since there seems to be a universal principle determining that, if a language has V2 in declarative clauses, then it has V2 in nondeclarative contexts as well. This is the situation, for instance, in all Germanic languages which manifest the V2 propoerty in declarative sentences.

(29)   <u>Como</u>, [sendo tu, Judeo], me **pedes** a my de beber,
How being you-2pl Jew me asks to me of to.drink
"How is it that you, being a Jew, ask a drink from me" (John 4:9)

(30)   [IntP [Spec *Como*] [Int′ Ø [FocP/TopP [Spec *sendo tu, Judeo,*] [Foc′/Top′ Ø [FinP *me pedes* [TP
…]]]]]]

In the same way, intervening subjects would be associated with a focus or topic interpretation. This is quite clear in example (10b), shown again as (31). In this example, we can see that the pre-verbal subject presents a contrastive reading in relation to the subject of the following clause (*os discipulos de Joaõ, e os dos phariseos* X *teus discipulos*).

(31)   <u>porque</u> [os discipulos de Joaõ, e os dos phariseos] **jejumaõ**, e teus
why the disciples of John and the of.the pharisees fast and your
discipulos naõ jejumaõ?
your disciples not fast
"how is it that John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees are fasting, but yours are not?" (Mark 2:18)

Assuming that a contrastive focus occupies [Spec,FocP], the example (31) could have the representation in (32).

(32)   [IntP [Spec *porque*] [Int′ Ø [FocP [Spec *os discipulos de Joaõ, e os dos phariseos*] [Foc′ Ø
[FinP *jejumaõ* [TP …]]]]]]

We can also straightforwardly account for sequences with a pre-verbal subject and an intervening XP, like the example (11b), shown again in (33). We could say that the subject occupies [Spec,FocP], while the fronted XP is hosted in [Spec,TopP].[19]

---

[19]   Rizzi (1997) shows that topic projections are recursive. So, in (33), an alternative analysis would be to say that both phrases are located in different topic layers. Which analysis is the correct one demands a more detailed investigation on the informative status of those elements positioned in the left periphery. For an in-depth discussion about topic and focus in ClaP, see Gibrail (2010).

(33)   <u>como</u> [David] [em espirito] o **chama** seu senhor?
       how David in spirit him calls his lord
       "how is it then that David, speaking by the spirit, calls him Lord?"
       (Matthew 22:43)

A structural representation of (33) can be seen in (34).

(34)   [$_{\text{IntP}}$ [$_{\text{Spec}}$ *como*] [$_{\text{Int'}}$ $\varnothing$ [$_{\text{FocP}}$ [$_{\text{Spec}}$ *David*] [$_{\text{Foc'}}$ $\varnothing$ [$_{\text{TopP}}$ [$_{\text{Spec}}$ *em espirito*] [$_{\text{Top'}}$ $\varnothing$ [$_{\text{FinP}}$ *o chama* [$_{\text{TP}}$ …]]]]]]]]

Additionally, this analysis reduces the difference between ClaP and Italian to the availability of the V2 property. As a non-V2 language, Italian does not require V-movement to Fin^0. Evidently, the verb can move to the left periphery, but not motivated by the V2 requirement determining the PF-realization of Fin^0. This is what takes place in object wh-clauses, as already noted. In these sentences, the verb moves to Foc^0 in order to establish a spec-head relation with the interrogative operator, thus satisfying the Wh-criterion. But, if the Wh-criterion can be satisfied in a different manner, V-raising to the CP field is not triggered. This is exactly what happens in clauses with *perché* and *come mai*. In these structures, Int^0 is intrinsically endowed with a wh-feature, so the Wh-criterion is satisfied between the interrogative operator in [Spec,IntP] and the null Int^0 head itself. The consequence is that the verb moves only to T^0, thus explaining why SV word order seems to be the default option in this context. In ClaP, on the other hand, the V2 requirement always triggers V-movement at least to Fin^0. In object wh-clauses, just like in Italian, the verb undergoes a second step up to Foc^0, thus satisfying the Wh-criterion in a spec-head configuration with the wh-constituent. No intervening elements are allowed between the interrogative operator and the verb due to their structural relation. In adjunct wh-clauses, however, the Wh-criterion does not trigger V-movement to Int^0, since this head itself is endowed with a wh-feature, but, differently from Italian, the verb must move to Fin^0 due to the V2 requirement. Here, even though intervening subjects are also allowed, just like in *perché* clauses in Italian, the fact is that pre-verbal subjects will have a marked status, since they would be located within the left periphery occupying positions associated to discursive factors, either as topics or as foci. This could explain why, in quantitative terms, SV sequences are less productive than VS word

order in adjunct wh-clauses in ClaP, thus contrasting with Italian, where the SV word order is the default option in the same context.

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of new data and of theoretical developments, we have shown that the traditional analysis for wh-clauses in ClaP, as the one put forth in Lopes-Rossi (1996), is unsatisfactory. We have presented a set of evidences signaling that, even though wh-interrogative sentences show generalized V-movement to the C-system, as originally proposed in the literature, the verb does not occupy the same position in the left periphery all the time, a fact quite noticeable particularly when object wh-clauses and adjunct wh-clauses are compared. In the first subgroup, the verb moves up to Foc^0, while in the second one we observe V-movement only up to Fin^0. These results show how important is to understand the CP layer as a cartographic field. Finally, we have also brought to light interesting differences between ClaP and Italian concerning the syntax of wh-clauses, showing that the attested contrasts are related to the fact that ClaP is a V2 language, but Italian is not.

REFERENCES

ANDRADE, Aroldo; NAMIUTI-TEMPONI, Cristiane. Gone without the verb: clitic interpolation and clitic climbing in the history of European Portuguese. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos*, n. 58(2), p. 201-219, 2016.

ANTONELLI, André. *Sintaxe da posição do verbo e mudança gramatical na história do português europeu*. PhD dissertation, UNICAMP, 2011.

ANTONELLI, André. Orações subordinadas sem o complementizador *que* no português clássico. *D.E.L.T.A.*, n. 30(2), p. 197-212, 2014.

ANTONELLI, André. The structure of complementizerless clauses in Classical Portuguese. In: SMITH, J.; IHSANE, T. *Romance linguistics 2012:* selected papers from the 42nd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Cedar City, Utah, 20-22 April 2012. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2015, p. 185-198.

BARBOSA, Pilar. On inversion in wh-questions in Romance. In: HULK, A. C. J.; POLLOCK, J.-Y. *Subject inversion in Romance and the theory of universal grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, p. 20-59.

BATTYE, Adrian; ROBERTS, Ian. *Clause structure and language change*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

BENINCÀ, Paola. A detailed map of the left periphery of Medieval Romance. In: ZANUTTINI, R; CAMPOS, H.; HERBURGER, E.; PORTNER, P. *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics:* negation, tense, and clausal architecture. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2006. p. 53-86.

BENINCÀ, Paola; POLETTO, Cecilia. Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In: RIZZI, L. *The structure of CP and IP:* the cartography of syntactic structures, vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. p. 52–75.

BONET, Eulàlia. Subjects in Catalan. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, n. 13, p. 1-26, 1990.

CINQUE, Guglielmo. *Adverbs and functional heads*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

CONTRERAS, Heles. On the position of subjects. In: ROTHSTEIN, S. *Syntax and Semantcs 25*. San Diego: Academic Press, 1991, p. 63-79.

DAVID, Domitila. *A ordem SV nas orações interrogativas do português brasileiro e europeu: um estudo histórico e comparativo*. Master's thesis, UNICAMP, 2016.

DOBROVIE-SORIN, Carmen. *The syntax of Roumanian:* comparative studies in Romance. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, 1994.

GALVES, Charlotte; NAMIUTTI, Cristiane; PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, Maria Clara. Novas perspectivas para antigas questões: revisitando a periodização da língua portuguesa. In: ENDRUSCHAT, A.; KEMMLER, R.; SCHAFER-PRIET, B. *Grammatische Strukturen des europäischen Portugiesisch*. Tubingen: Calepinus Verlag, 2006, p. 45-74.

GALVES, Charlotte; PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, Maria Clara. The change in the position of the verb in the history of portuguese: subject realization, clitic placement, and prosody. *Language*, n. 93(3), p. 152-180, 2017.

GIBRAIL, Alba. *Contextos de formação de estruturas de tópico e foco no português clássico*. PhD dissertation, UNICAMP, 2010.

KATO, Mary; MIOTO, Carlos. A multi-evidence study of European and Brazilian wh-questions. In: KEPSER, S.; REIS, M. *Linguistic evidence:* empirical, theoretical and computational perspectives. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005, p. 307-328.

KATO, Mary; RIBEIRO, Ilza. Cleft sentences from Old Portuguese to Modern Portuguese. In: DUFTER, A; JACOB, D. *Focus and background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009, p. 123-154.

La Bibbia in Lingua Corrente. Roma: Alleanza Biblica Universale, 2000.

LEDGEWAY, Adam. Satisfying V2 in early Romance: merge vs. move. *Journal of Linguistics*, n. 44, p. 437-470, 2008.

LOPES-ROSSI, Maria Aparecida Garcia. *A sintaxe diacrônica das interrogativas-Q do Português*. PhD dissertation, UNICAMP, 1996.

RIZZI, Luigi. The fine structure of the left periphery. In: HAEGEMAN, L. *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997, p. 281-337.

RIZZI, Luigi. On the position 'Int(errogative)' in the left periphery of the clause. In: CINQUE, G.; SALVI, G. *Current studies in Italian syntax:* essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2001. p. 287-296.

RIZZI, Luigi. Locality and left periphery. In: BELLETTI, A. *Structures and beyond:* the cartography of syntactic structures, vol. 3. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 223-251.

ROBERTS, Ian. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In: RIZZI, L. *The structure of CP and IP:* the cartography of syntactic structures, vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. p. 297–328.

SOLA, Jaume. *Agreement and subjects*. PhD dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 1992.

URIBE-ETXEBARRIA, Myriam. *On the structural positions of the subjects in Spanish:* their nature and their consequences for quantification. Ms, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 1991.

VALLDUVÍ, Enric. A preverbal landing site for quantificational operators. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics*, n. 2, p. 319-343, 1992.

ZUBIZARRETA, Maria Luisa. *Word order, prosody and focus*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1997.

Estudos
Linguísticos e literários