



Roots of V-to-C Movement in Romance: Investigating the Late Latin Grammar

Origens do Movimento de V para C nas Línguas Românicas: investigando a Gramática do Latim Tardio

André ANTONELLI *

ABSTRACT: The paper investigates the syntactic structure of *wh*-clauses in late Latin. The results show that, in sentences with a *wh*-phrase as direct object, the interrogative operator reaches FocP in the left periphery, with the finite verb raising to the Foc head. This spec-head relation accounts for why subjects and dislocated XPs (like topics or focus elements) can not be intervening constituents between the object *wh*-phrase and the verb. For *wh*-clauses in which the interrogative operator is an adjunct, the hypothesis is that the *wh*-phrase occupies [Spec,IntP]. Here, the verb does not move to the CP-field, thus explaining the possibility of intervening subjects and interpolated XPs between the adjunct *wh*-element and the verb. These results show that the verb second (V2) property of V-to-C movement, as seen in several old Romance languages, can be derived from late Latin, and not exclusively from a supposed influence of Germanic languages, as is assumed in the literature.

RESUMO: O artigo investiga a estrutura sintática de orações-*wh* no latim tardio. Os resultados mostram que, sendo o sintagma-*wh* o objeto direto, o operador interrogativo alcança FocP na periferia à esquerda, com o verbo finito movendo-se para o núcleo Foc. Essa relação especificador-núcleo explica por que sujeitos e XPs deslocados (tal como um tópico ou foco) não podem aparecer linearmente entre o sintagma-*wh* objeto e o verbo. Para orações-*wh* em que o operador interrogativo é um adjunto, a hipótese é que o sintagma-*wh* ocupa [Spec,IntP]. Aqui, o verbo não se move para o sistema CP, o que explica a possibilidade de sujeitos e XPs interpolados entre o constituinte-*wh* adjunto e o verbo. Esses resultados mostram que a propriedade V2 de movimento de V para C, como visto em várias línguas românicas antigas, pode ser derivada do latim tardio, e não exclusivamente de uma suposta influência das línguas germânicas, como se assume na literatura.

* Doutor em Linguística (UNICAMP). Professor Adjunto da Universidade Estadual de Maringá (UEM).
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7896-5465>. alantonelli@uem.br.

KEYWORDS: Late Latin. Romance languages. Interrogative clauses. Cartography.	PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Latim tardio. Línguas românicas. Orações interrogativas. Cartografia.
---	--

1 Introduction

A long standing claim in the generative literature is that medieval Romance languages are characterized as verb second (V2) grammars, especially because they show V-movement to the CP-field in different structural contexts (ADAMS, 1987; FONTANA, 1993; ROBERTS, 1993; BENINCÀ, 2006; LEDGEWAY, 2008; PINTO, 2011)¹. In (1), we present some examples illustrating the V2 phenomenon in old Romance.

- (1) a. que **purrat** ço estre? (Old French; ROBERTS, 1993, p.89)
 what could that be
 “what could that be?”
- b. este lugar **mostro** dios a abraam (Old Spanish; FONTANA, 1993, p. 64)
 this place showed God to Abraham
 “God showed Abraham this place.”
- c. A questo **resposse** Iasone (Old Neapolitan; LEDGEWAY, 2008, p. 440)
 to this replied Jason
 “Jason replied to this.”

In structural terms, the traditional analysis for the V2 word order involves XP-raising to [Spec,CP] and V-to-C movement (cf. DEN BESTEN, 1983; VIKNER, 1995). Under this proposal, as represented in (2), it straightforwardly follows the subject-verb inversion seen in each example in (1).

- (2) [CP XP_i V_p [TP S V_p ~~XP_i~~]]

¹ In general terms, V2 is a constraint requiring the finite verb to be preceded by only one constituent in finite clauses. The phenomenon has been extensively researched since the eighties, particularly the obligatoriness of just one XP in preverbal position. For a view of some of the problems around this phenomenon, cf. Battye and Roberts (1995).

Apart from the question if the old Romance varieties were generalized V2 systems or just residual ones², a much less discussed topic concerns the origin itself of the V2 phenomenon and, more specifically, the development of the V-to-C syntax. One hypothesis is that this property evolves from a direct Germanic influence, as argued by Mathieu (2009, p. 345), for example, in relation to V2 word order in old French: “The influence of Germanic on what was to become French may have been through contact, first through the invasion of Gaul by the Franks, and second, by the Normans in the North-West.”

While the contact with languages of the Germanic branch can be seen as a key factor in the development of the V2 syntax in old French, such an analysis faces some challenges if extended to other medieval Romance varieties which also manifested V2 features. For instance, it is not a consensus whether old and classical Portuguese were V2 grammars (in favor of the V2 hypothesis, cf. RIBEIRO, 1995; GALVES, 1997; PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, 2004; ANTONELLI, 2011; contrary to the V2 hypothesis, cf. KAISER, 1999; EIDE, 2006; RINKE, 2009). In fact, in declarative matrix clauses, besides V2 word order, we can also find V1 and V3 patterns which are not attested in strict V2 languages, as exemplified, respectively, in (3) and (4) for old Portuguese³.

- (3) **Diremos** nós ora, padre, que ...
 say-FUT.1PL we now father that
 “We will say now, father, that ...” (Ribeiro 1995:121)

² Rizzi (1996) makes a distinction between generalized and residual V2 languages. The first group is composed of those grammatical systems in which there is systematic V-movement to C in main declarative clauses and in interrogative structures. A residual V2 language is, in turn, the one in which verb raising to the CP-field occurs only in interrogative sentences.

³ In standard V2 languages, V1 word order is seen in yes/no questions, imperative sentences and conditional clauses (cf. HAIDER, 1986; ROBERTS, 1993), but not in declarative matrix structures (cf. ZWART, 2005). As for V3 sentences, V2 languages usually allow this word order if the first XP is resumed by a pronoun (cf. ZWART, 2005). This is not the case in the example (4) of old Portuguese.

- (4) E enton hũũ homem **siia** em as pousada ...
and then a man sat.down in his inn
“Then a man sat down in his inn ...” (Ribeiro 1995:124)

However, in *wh*-interrogative main clauses, it seems clear that V-to-C movement applies, as the examples in (5) of classical Portuguese show⁴.

- (5) a. donde **poderá** alguém fartar a estes de pam
from.where will.be.able someone satisfy-INF to these of bread
“where can anyone get bread to feed them?” (ANTONELLI, 2017, p.17)
b. Como **posso** eu caber aí?
how can I fit-INF there
“How can I fit there?” (LOPES-ROSSI, 1996, p. 40)

The word order in (5) is similar to what is found in *wh*-questions in standard V2 languages, like German.

- (6) Welches Buch **hat** Peter gelesen?
which book has Peter read
“Which book has Peter read?” (VIKNER, 1995, p. 39)

The examples in (5) and (6) present the finite verb in strict adjacency to a dislocated *wh*-phrase, giving rise to subject-verb inversion (VS). As already pointed out, for standard V2 languages, this word order is taken as an important evidence that the verb has moved to the left periphery, establishing a Spec-head relation with the *wh*-phrase located in [Spec,CP]. Since Portuguese shows an identical pattern, it seems reasonable to suppose that this language featured V2 traces, at least in matrix interrogative clauses (residual V2, if we assume that V-to-C movement is a property

⁴ Similar data are also attested in old French (ROBERTS, 1993; KAISER, 1996).

not generalized to declarative sentences). But, even though the examples in (5) manifest a striking similarity with the word order pattern in German, it is not clear, in terms of diachronic evolution, how the Portuguese syntax was influenced by languages of the Germanic branch. The traditional view is that most of the Germanic impact on the development of Portuguese was restricted to the lexicon, without substantial influence on syntax (cf., for instance, HEAD; SEMËNOVA-HEAD, 2013). So, the question of how Portuguese, as well as other old Romance varieties not directly affected by the Germanic branch, developed V2 features remains unanswered. Here, not denying the possible impact of Germanic languages, we propose that the V-to-C property, specifically in interrogative structures, has an earlier root in the grammar of late Latin⁵.

2 Interrogative clauses in Late Latin: the data

Our investigation of *wh*-structures in late Latin is based on examples drawn from the Vulgate, Jerome's Latin translation of the Bible finished in the 4th century.⁶ In particular, we look at the Old Testament books of 1st and 2nd Samuel and 1st and 2nd Kings as well as the Gospels and the book of Acts in the New Testament. For the present work, we use the 5th edition of the *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*.

The first point observed in our corpus is that all the examples we collected show the *wh*-operator in the left periphery of the clause, as exemplified in (7)⁷.

⁵ Usually, the V2 word order in declarative and interrogative sentences is considered as non-related. However, Roberts (2004) shows that, if a language is V2 in declarative structures, then it is also V2 in nondeclarative contexts. All Germanic languages, with the exception of English, present this behavior pointed out by the author.

⁶ We understand late Latin as a grammatical period extending from the 3rd century up to the 6th century. For a detailed discussion on the difficulties in defining this period, cf. Adams (2011).

⁷ This does not mean that the grammar of late Latin did not license *wh-in-situ* structures. Probably, as is the case in modern Romance varieties like Brazilian Portuguese, the non-movement of the interrogative phrase is disfavored in written texts.

- (7) a. *quare scidisti vestimenta tua*
 why tear-PST.2SG clothes your
 “Why have you torn your robes?” (2nd Kings 5:8)⁸
- b. *quid faciet agricolis illis*
 what do-FUT.3SG tenants-DAT those-DAT
 “What will he do to those tenants?” (Matthew 21:40)
- c. *quem vultis dimittam vobis*
 who-ACC want-2PL release-1SG you-DAT.2PL
 “Which one do you want me to release to you?” (Matthew 27:17)

Another interesting fact arises when we compare the position of subjects in sentences where the *wh*-operator is an object or an adjunct phrase. In the first group, we observe a strong tendency to show subject-verb inversion. For instance, particularly in sentences which present the interrogative element *quid* (“what”) functioning as an object argument XP, the VS word order is widely attested. In (8), we present some examples of postverbal subjects in *quid*-clauses.

- (8) a. *quid habet populus*
 what has people
 “What is wrong with the people?” (1st Samuel 11:5)
- b. *quid dixerunt viri isti*
 what say-PST.3PL men those
 “What did those man say?” (2nd Kings 20:14)
- c. *quid faciemus et nos*
 what do-FUT.1PL also we
 “What should we do?” (Luke 3:14)
- d. *quid vult seminiverbius hic dicere*
 what want-3SG babblers this say-INF
 “What is this babblers trying to say?” (Acts 17:18)

⁸ All the English translations are from the *New International Version* (NIV).

If preverbal, subjects appear before the *wh*-element, as illustrated in (9). In our corpus, we do not find any example of a subject breaking the adjacency between the *wh*-phrase and the verb.

- (9) *tu* *quid* ***dicis*** *de* *eo*
 you-2SG what say of him
 “What have you to say about him?” (John 9:17)

Sentences with an adjunct *wh*-operator, however, in particular those with the interrogative phrase *quare* (“why”), manifest a different pattern. Postverbal subjects are also attested, just like in *quid*-sentences, as illustrated in (10).

- (10) a. *quare* ***percussit*** *nos* *Dominus* *hodie*
 why defeat-PST.3SG us Lord today
 “Why did the Lord bring defeat upon us today?” (1st Samuel 4:3)
- b. *quare* ***succenderunt*** *servi* *tui* *segetem* *meam*
 why fire-PST.3PL servants your field my
 “Why have your servants set my field on fire?” (2nd Samuel 14:31)
- c. *quare* ***maledicit*** *canis* *hic* *moriturus* *domino* *meo*
 why curse-3SG dog this dead lord-DAT my-DAT
 “Why should this dead dog curse my lord?” (2nd Samuel 16:9)
- d. *quare* ***fremuerunt*** *gentes*
 why rage-PST.3PL nations
 “Why do the nations rage?” (Acts 4:25)

However, SV structures are quite common, especially the linear order in which the subject appears between the *wh*-element and the verb. Examples of intervening subjects are presented in (11).

- (11) a. *quare* *servus* *tuus* ***fit*** *oneri*
 why servant your be.done-3SG burden-DAT
 “Why should your servant be an added burden?” (2nd Samuel 19:35)

- b. *quare dominus meus flet*
 why lord my weep-3SG
 “Why is my lord weeping?” (2nd Kings 8:12)
- c. *quare discipuli tui transgrediuntur traditionem seniorum*
 why disciples your break-3PL tradition elders-GEN
 “Why do your disciples break the tradition of the elders?” (Matthew 15:2)

There is another striking difference between *quid* and *quare*-sentences. In the former, even though subjects cannot break the *wh*-adjacency with the finite verb, we attest that some conjunctions can appear as intervening constituents. In (12), we present examples with these elements, usually called connective particles or discourse markers (cf. KROON 1998).

- (12) a. *quid enim feci*
 what for do-PST.1SG
 “But what have I done?” (1st Samuel 29:8)
- b. *quid ergo vult ut faciam ei*
 what so want-3SG that do-1SG her-DAT
 “What can be done for her?” (2nd Kings 4:14)
- c. *quid igitur faciam de Iesu*
 what so do-FUT.1SG of Jesus
 “What shall I do, then, with Jesus?” (Matthew 27:22)

In fact, not only discourse markers appear as intervening material in *quid*-clauses. We also find 6 examples of clitic-like elements, particularly non-nominative personal pronouns, as in (13), and one example of fronted XP, as in (14), clearly a quite marginal case. As a matter of comparison, discourse markers appear as breaking constituents in 16 examples.

- (13) a. *quid tibi dixit Heliseus*
 what you-DAT say-PST.3SG Elisha
 “What did Elisha say to you?” (2nd Kings 8:14)

- b. quid *vobis* **praecepit** Moses
 what you-DAT.2PL command-PST.3SG Moses
 “What did Moses command you?” (Mark 10:3)
- c. quid *tibi* **vis** faciam
 what you-DAT want-2SG do-1SG
 “What do you want me to do for you?” (Luke 18:41)

- (14) quid *in via* **tractabatis**
 what in road argue-PST.2PL
 “What were you arguing about on the road?” (Mark 9:33)

In *quare*-sentences, we also find connective particles breaking the linear adjacency between the *wh*-operator and the verb, as shown in (15).

- (15) a. quare *ergo* **peccas** in sanguine innocio
 why so sin-2SG in blood innocent
 “Why then would you do wrong to an innocent man?” (1st Samuel 19:5)
- b. quare *ergo* **contempsisti** verbum Domini
 why so despise-PST.2SG word Lord-GEN
 “Why did you despise the word of the Lord?” (2nd Samuel 12:9)
- c. quare *ergo* **regnavit** Adonias
 why so reign-PST.3SG Adoniah
 “why then has Adoniah become king?” (1st Kings 1:13)

However, contrary to what we saw in clauses with a *wh*-object, structures with *quare* seem to impose no restriction on the presence of fronted XPs between the *wh*-phrase and the verb, since these structures are widely attested. In (16) we present examples of this word order.

- (16) a. quare *iuxta murum* **accessistis**
 why near wall approach-PST.2PL
 “Why did you get so close to the wall?” (2nd Samuel 11:21)
- b. quare *hoc* **fecisti**
 why that do-PST.2SG
 “why do you behave as you do?” (1st Kings 1:6)

- c. *quare in parabolis loqueris eis*
 why in parables speak-2SG them-DAT
 “Why do you speak to the people in parables?” (Matthew 13:10)

In sum, our description of the data shows that the VS word order is widely attested in *wh*-clauses with an interrogative operator functioning as an object argument XP. In sentences with an adjunct *wh*-phrase, postverbal subjects are also attested, but SV structures are quite common, in particular those in which the subject is positioned between the interrogative operator and the verb. Besides that, clauses with an adjunct *wh*-phrase also allow for fronted XPs breaking the linear adjacency between the question operator and the verb, something not found in sentences with and object *wh*-constituent. A common feature is that in both structures connective particles can break the adjacency between the *wh*-phrase and the verb. In the next section, we propose an analysis of these facts trying to show how they can be interpreted as an evidence that a process of V-to-C movement already takes place in late Latin.

3 The analysis

In our analysis, we assume a split-CP view (cf. RIZZI 1997, 2001, 2004), as the one schematized in (17).

(17) [ForceP [TopP [IntP [FocP [TopP [FinP]]]]]

We propose that *quid* and *quare* are positioned in the CP-domain, in accordance with the fact that late Latin is a *wh*-movement language. However, we argue that these question operators must target different positions. As for *quid*-clauses, our idea is that both the *wh*-phrase and the verb are moved to the left periphery, the former reaching [Spec,FocP] and the latter being raised to Foc⁰ (as a result of the *Wh*-Criterion, for instance; cf. RIZZI, 1996), in a paradigm similar to what has been proposed for object

wh-clauses in Italian (cf. Rizzi 1997). Under this configuration, the subject either remains in a lower layer ([Spec,IP], for instance), thus accounting for the Wh-V-S word order, or is generated in a Topic position above FocP, thus deriving the S-Wh-V sequence. Besides that, the spec-head relation between *quid* and the finite verb also explains the marginality of fronted intervening XPs, since there would be no peripheral space for interpolated dislocated phrases⁹. In relation to intervening non-nominative personal pronouns, we assume that they are clitic elements adjoined to the verbal constituent¹⁰. In this case, their presence to the left of the verb does not contradict the hypothesis of V-to-C movement.

As for clauses in which the *wh*-operator is an adjunct, we propose that *quare* functions as *perché* (“why”) in Italian. Rizzi (2001) shows that *perché* does not target [Spec,FocP] because its occurrence is compatible with the presence of a focalized constituent to its right, as the contrast in (18) exemplifies. That is one of the reasons why the author proposes an additional layer above FocP specialized in hosting *wh*-phrases like *perché*, namely IntP.

- (18) a. Perché QUESTO avremmo dovuto dirgli, no qualcos’altro?
 Why THIS should have said to him, not something else?
 b. *QUESTO perché avremmo dovuto dirgli, no qualcos’altro?consensus

Rizzi shows that *come mai* (“how come”) behaves like *perché*, as confirmed by the pair of sentences in (19).

- (19) a. Come mai IL MIO LIBRO gli ha dato, non il tuo?
 How come MY BOOK you gave to him, not yours?
 b. *IL MIO LIBRO come mai gli ha dato, non il tuo?

⁹ The only example of the word order Wh-XP-V could be understood as a performance product, and not a structure derived from the linguistic competence of the speaker.

¹⁰ For a view that classical Latin already had non-nominative personal clitic pronouns, cf. Adams (1994).

For Rizzi, the position in the CP-domain of question operators like *perché* is [Spec,IntP]. In addition to that, he also proposes that V-to-C movement does not apply in this type of *wh*-structure. Such a claim would explain why the SV word order is possible in *perché*-clauses, as illustrated in (20). Since the verb is not in the left periphery, a subject in [Spec,IP] would occupy a position structurally higher than that where the verb is landed.

- (20) Perché *Gianni* è venuto?
 “Why has Gianni come?”

A second advantage of this analysis is that it accounts for why fronted XPs are allowed to appear between *perché* and the finite verb, as already seen in (19a). An additional example is also presented in (21). Here again, since the verb is not in a Spec-head relation with the *wh*-operator, specialized positions for a focus element or topic constituents can be activated below IntP.

- (21) Perché, *il mio libro*, Gianni lo ha portato via?
 Why, my book, Gianni took it away?

It seems clear that the late Latin facts around *quare*-clauses are amenable to a similar analysis. So, we propose that *quare* is in [Spec,IntP], without manifesting a Spec-head relation with the verb, since in this context there would be no V-to-C movement. As in Italian, this proposal derives the word order Wh-S-V, with the subject in [Spec,IP] and the finite verb in I⁰. The presence of fronted XPs breaking the adjacency between *quare* and the verb is also accounted for, since the lack of V-to-C movement would allow the activation of FocP or TopP below IntP. Concerning postverbal

subjects, as shown in (10), it could be assumed that they are *in-situ*, remaining inside the VP-layer¹¹.

A particular challenge arises when we consider discourse markers, which can break the adjacency between the *wh*-operator and the verb in both classes of interrogatives. In clauses with *quare*, the presence of an intervening connective particle is not a problem, since we could assume that it is located in the CP-domain, occupying either a spec position or a head position below IntP. Under the view that there is no V-to-C movement in this particular type of interrogative, there would be enough space below IntP for left peripheral elements. However, in sentences in which the *wh*-phrase is an object, such a proposal would not fit with the view that *quid* and the verb are in a spec-head relation, thus weakening the hypothesis of V-movement to the CP-field in these clauses.

A solution is to say that these discourse markers are clitics. The examples in (22) are an evidence that the particles under study do not occupy a fixed position in the left periphery. In (22a), *ergo* follows the object *wh*-phrase, while in (22b) *ergo* precedes it. This behavior is clearly identified with second position clitics, since in both cases the discourse marker is ahead of just one element.

- (22) a. *quid ergo faciemus*
 what so do-FUT.1PL
 “What should we do then?” (Luke 3:10)
- b. *tu ergo quid dicis*
 you-2SG so what say-2SG
 “Now what do you say?” (John 8:5)

¹¹ It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss why subjects occur pre and post verbally. One possibility would be to say that discursive factors are at stake, in the same line of what Belletti (2001, 2004) has proposed for the alternation SV/VS in Italian declarative clauses.

A similar pattern is also noticed in matrix declarative clauses, as exemplified in (23).

- (23) a. Dicit ergo ei mulier illa samaritana ...
 say-PST.3SG so him-DAT woman that samaritan
 “The samaritan woman said to him ...” (John 4:9)
- b. ego autem dico vobis quia ...
 I but say you-DAT that
 “But I tell you that ...” (Matthew 5:22)

It should not be forgotten, however, that connective particles present their own independent accent, despite their syntactic behavior as second position clitics. That is true considering that elements like *ergo* or *autem* are disyllabic words. As well-known regarding Latin prosody, in a structure with two syllables, the placement of the accent is always on the first one, due to the trochaic rhythm (MESTER, 1994; ONIGA, 2014). Thus, it is not suitable to say that these discourse markers are clitics.

It is also interesting to note that, in other languages, similar words not only appear in strict second position. Portuguese is a good example. Connectors like *entretanto* (“however”) and *portanto* (“therefore”) can be licensed in second position order, as exemplified in (24) and (25), respectively.

- (24) Ele, *entretanto*, deve estudar sintaxe.
 he however should study syntax
 “However, he should study syntax.”
- (25) Ele, *portanto*, deve estudar sintaxe.
 he therefore should study syntax
 “Therefore he should study syntax.”

However, contrary to their counterparts in Latin, these connective particles in Portuguese may also appear in other positions with some different levels of acceptability, as exemplified in (26) for *todavia* and in (27) for *portanto*. Anyway, it

seems clear that the conjunctions are not clitics, considering their flexibility within the clause. In view of these facts, it could be said that connective particles in Latin are not clitics as well, with the difference that they would present a more restricted distribution in the sentence.

- (26) a. *Entretanto*, ele deve estudar sintaxe.
 b. Ele deve, *entretanto*, estudar sintaxe.
 c. Ele deve estudar, *entretanto*, sintaxe.
 d. Ele deve estudar sintaxe, *entretanto*¹².
- (27) a. *Portanto*, ele deve estudar sintaxe.
 b. Ele deve, *portanto*, estudar sintaxe.
 c. ?Ele deve estudar, *portanto*, sintaxe.
 d. Ele deve estudar sintaxe, *portanto*.

Here, we would like to briefly present the analysis made by Peterson (1999) for parentheticals. He argues that examples like those presented in (28) are cases in which the parenthetical clause is not syntactically linked to a higher structure, behaving as an aside to the central message.

- (28) a. John Smith — at least I think that's his name — is asking to see you.
 b. John Smith — is that his real name? — is asking to see you.
 c. John Smith — he's persistent, isn't he? — is asking to see you.
 d. John Smith — boy! is he persistent — is asking to see you.

For Peterson, the examples in (29), with interpolated structures, and the non-juxtaposed constructions in (30) are non-equivalent sentences. In his view, this should be taken as an evidence that parenthetical clauses can not be treated as dependent elements syntactically linked to a host.

¹² This construction is licit in Portuguese, although unusual.

- (29) a. It will stop raining, I expect, before Sunday.
 b. John Smith, would you believe, is asking to see you.
- (30) a. I expect (that) it will stop raining before Sunday.
 b. Would you believe (that) John Smith is asking to see you.

He argues that (29b), for instance, is closer to (31), which conveys the proper illocutionary meaning, than to (30b), which is not declarative, as it would be expected in the case of equivalence, but interrogative.

- (31) Would you believe, John Smith is asking to see you.

Following Peterson's analysis for parentheticals, we propose that connective particles also function as independent elements, establishing a non-syntagmatic relationship with the clause. In other words, they would be linked to the sentence only by linear adjacency, but not by hierarchical construction¹³. Although there is a pragmatic connection between the connector and the remaining clause, this would occur independently of a superordinate syntactic relationship. Thus, we can account for why discourse markers are not linearly adjoined to a specific type of constituent. The point to be emphasized, however, is that, under this proposal, the presence of elements like *ergo* between the *wh*-operator and the finite verb does not block the application of V-to-C movement in *quid* clauses.

4 Final remarks

Our results show that the process of V-to-C movement is already present in a specific type of *wh*-interrogative clause in late Latin. This is particularly welcome considering those medieval Romance varieties which, despite showing V2 features,

¹³ Evidently this idea is not compatible with the theory of syntactic linearization developed by Kayne (1994), who proposes that linear order is mapped from hierarchical structure.

did not undergo a substantial impact from Germanic languages. Our findings show that V2 properties in Romance can be traced back to late Latin, a more natural predecessor than the hypothesis of Germanic influence.

References

ADAMS, J. N. Wackernagel's law and the position of unstressed personal pronouns in classical Latin. **Transactions of the Philological Society**, v. 92, n. 2, p. 103-178, 1994. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.1994.tb00430.x>

ADAMS, J. N. Late Latin. In: CLACKSON, J. (ed.). **A companion to the Latin language**. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. p. 257-283. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444343397.ch16>

ADAMS, M. **Old French, null subjects, and verb second phenomena**. 1987. 248 f. PhD Dissertation – University of California, Los Angeles, 1987

ANTONELLI, A. **Sintaxe da posição do verbo e mudança gramatical na história do português europeu**. 2011. 230 f. PhD Dissertation – State University of Campinas, Campinas, 2011.

ANTONELLI, A. *Wh*-clauses in classical Portuguese: verb movement and the left periphery. **Estudos Linguísticos e Literários**, v. 58, p. 13-31, 2017. DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.9771/ell.v0i58.26803>

BELLETTI, A. 'Inversion' as focalization. In: HULK, A. C. J.; POLLOCK, J.-Y. (ed.). **Subject inversion in Romance and the theory of universal grammar**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. p. 60-90.

BELLETTI, A. Aspects of the low IP area. In: RIZZI, L. (ed.). **The structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures**, vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. p. 16-51.

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

Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

DEN BESTEN, H. On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. *In: ABRAHAM, W. (ed.). On the formal syntax of the Westgermania*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1983, p. 47-131. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.3.03bes>

EIDE, K. **Word order structures and unaccusative verbs in classical and modern Portuguese**. 2006. 208 f. PhD Dissertation – University of Oslo, Oslo, 2006

FONTANA, J. **Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish**. 1993. 312 f. PhD Dissertation – University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1993.

GALVES, C. Do Português clássico ao Português europeu moderno: uma análise minimalista. *Estudos Linguísticos e Literários*, v. 19, p. 105-128, 1997.

HAIDER, H. V-second in German. *In: HAIDER, H.; PRINZHORN, M. (ed.). Verb second phenomena in Germanic languages*. Dordrecht: Foris, 1986, p. 49-75. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110846072>

HEAD, B. F.; SEMËNOVA-HEAD, L. Vestígios da presença Sueva no noroeste da península Ibérica: na etnologia, na arqueologia e na língua. *Revista Diacrítica*, v. 27, n. 2, p. 257-277, 2013.

KAISER, G. A. V2 or not V2? Subject-verb inversion in old and modern French interrogatives. *In: BRANDNER, E.; FERRARESI, G. (ed.). Language change and generative grammar*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1996. p. 168-190. DOI https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-322-90776-9_7

KAISER, G. A. A ordem das palavras e a posição do verbo finito no Português antigo. *In: PAL, F. (ed.). Actas do congresso internacional por motivo dos vinte anos do Português no ensino superior*. Budapest: Departamento de Língua e Literatura Portuguesas da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Eötvös Loránd de Budapeste, 1999. p. 248-261.

KAYNE, R. **The antisymmetry of syntax**. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1994.

KROON, C. A framework for the description of Latin discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, v. 30, n. 2, p. 205-223, 1998. DOI [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)00025-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00025-3)

LEDGEWAY, A. Satisfying V2 in early Romance: merge vs. move. *Journal of Linguistics*, v. 44, p. 437-470, 2008. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226708005173>

LOPES-ROSSI, M. A. **A sintaxe diacrônica das interrogativas-Q do português**. 1996. 1997 f. PhD Dissertation – State University of Campinas, Campinas, 1996.

MATHIEU, E. On the Germanic properties of old French. *In*: CRISMA, P.; LONGOBARDI, G. (ed.). **Historical syntax and linguistic theory**. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009, p. 344-357. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199560547.003.0020>

MESTER, R. A. The quantitative trochee in Latin. **Natural Language and Linguistic Theory**, v. 12, p. 1-61, 1994. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992745>

ONIGA, R. **Latin: a linguistic introduction**. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, M. C. **Língua barroca: sintaxe e história do português nos 1600**. 2004. 450 f. PhD Dissertation – State University of Campinas, Campinas, 2004.

PETERSON, P. On the boundaries of syntax: non-syntagmatic relations. *In*: COLLINS, P.; LEE, D. (ed.). **The clause in English: in honour of Rodney Huddleston**. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. p. 229-250. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.45.16pet>

PINTO, C. F. **Ordem de palavras, movimento do verbo e efeito V2 na história do espanhol**. 2011. 309 f. PhD Dissertation – State University of Campinas, Campinas, 2011.

RIBEIRO, I. Evidence for a verb-second phase in old Portuguese. *In*: BATTYE, A.; ROBERTS, I. (ed.). **Clause structure and language change**. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. p. 110-139.

RINKE, E. Verb placement in old Portuguese. *In*: DUFTER, A.; JACOB, D. (ed.). **Focus and background in Romance languages**. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2009, p. 309-332. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.112.11rin>

RIZZI, L. Residual verb second and the *wh*-criterion. *In*: BELLETTI, A.; RIZZI, L. (ed.). **Parameters and functional heads: essays in comparative syntax**. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. p. 63-90.

RIZZI, L. The fine structure of the left periphery. *In*: HAEGEMAN, L. (ed.). **Elements of grammar**. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1997, p. 281-337. DOI https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7

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

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

ROBERTS, I. **Verbs and diachronic syntax**. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1993.

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

The Holy Bible: New International Version. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.

VIKNER, S. **Verb movement and expletive subjects in the Germanic languages**. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

ZWART, J.-W. Verb second as a function of merge. *In*: DEN DIKKEN, M.; TORTORA, C. M. (ed.). **The function of function words and functional categories**. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2005. p. 11-40. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.78.03zwa>

Article received: 04.27.2021

Article approved: 05.26.2021