WH-movement in the history of Brazilian Portuguese*

MARY A. KATO
University of Campinas /CNPq
mary.kato@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Like Old English (cf. Lightfoot, 1991) and Old French (Adams, 1987, Roberts 1993), Old Portuguese (OP) has been claimed to have been a V2 language (Ribeiro, 1995) and Modern European Portuguese (EP) and Brazilian Portuguese (BP) have been proposed to have residual V-to-Comp in Wh-questions (Lobato,1988, Ambar, 1992). Example (1a) is the typical residual V2 type. However, Brazilian Portuguese has lost even the residual V2 type[1] but has acquired two other orders, the WhSV order (1b) and the *wh-in-situ* pattern (1c) (Duarte 1992, Lopes-Rossi 1996).

In the 17th century there appeared, in EP, the first signs of the reverse cleft question (2a), with *é que* [2], with the other types in (2) appearing only in the 20th century **spoken language**, and only in BP.

(1) a. **O que** viu a Ana? — Wh-VS
what saw the Ana
b. **O que** a Ana viu? — WH SV
what the Ana saw
c. A Ana viu **o que**? — WH-in-situ
the Ana saw what
'What did Ana see?'

(2) a. **O que** é que a Ana viu? — Reverse cleft
what is that the Ana saw
b. **O que que** a Ana viu? — Reduced cleft
what that the Ana saw
c. É **o que** que a Ana viu? — Canonic cleft
is what that the Ana saw
'What is it that Ana saw?'

* This work had the support of grant CNPq 301219/2008-7. I thank Marcello Marcelino for his usual help in revising the text.

[1] BP can have WHVS with unaccusatives and with other types of verbs when the subject is in right dislocation.

(i) Onde pro está o menino?
where pro is the boy

[2] Cf. Kato and Ribeiro (2009).

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

2. The aims, and hypotheses of the paper

2.1. The aims of the paper

The aims of the paper are

a) to provide a brief history of wh-questions from Old and Middle Portuguese [3] to 19th and 20th century EP[4] and BP[5] [6].

b) to provide a comprehensive analysis of the patterns found;

c) to provide a different view on the *wh-in-situ* pattern in natural languages, with the claim that there is no covert, or (LF) wh-movement in BP *wh-in-situ*;

d) to interpret the difference between the grammar of BP and the grammars of OP and EP.

2.2. The assumptions and hypotheses of the paper

My analyses will be based on the following assumptions and hypotheses:

a) I assume that every interrogative sentence has a clause-typing *Q*, which corresponds to the *–ka/no* in Japanese (cf. Miyagawa 2001), be it a *yes/no* question or a *wh*-question.[7] I assume that *Q* is in the head of *ForceP* (cf. Rizzi's 1997 cartographic approach);

b) within the cartographic approach I assume both a FocP in the sentential periphery (cf. Rizzi 1997), and a FocP left-adjacent to vP (cf. Belletti 2004, 2005)[8], with additional TopP when needed;

(3) a+b: **[Force P Q... [FocP••.. [TP ....••[FocP••• [vP [VP]]]]]**

c) the Focus head is assumed to be syncretic for the purposes of Focus and wh-checking;

d) grammaticalization can involve erasure processes at PF;

3. The evolution of Focus structures and wh-questions in Portuguese

3.1. The oldest forms: the V2 and the reverse pseudo-cleft

Confirming previous studies (Torres Morais 1995: Ribeiro 1995a, 1995b, Kato & Raposo 2009), Old and Classic Portuguese are found to exhibit verb second patterns in both declaratives and *wh*-questions:

---

[3] I will be using Kato and Ribeiro (2009) for V2 constructions in both declarative and wh-questions, covering the periods between the 14th and the 18th century. The examples of Old and Middle Portuguese are marked according to the source:
Argote, Dom JeronymoContador de. 1725. *Regras da Lingua Portugueza, espelho da lingua latina*. 2a. Imp. Lisbon Occidental: Off. da Musica **DSG** .In: Mattos e Silva, R.V. 1971. A mais antiga versão portuguesa dos "Quatro livros dos diálogos de São Gregório". PhD dissertation, University of São Paulo.; **FLOS**. In: Machado Filho, A.V.L. 2003. Um *Flos Sanctorum do Século XIV*. Edições, Glossário e Estudo Lingüístico. PhD dissertation, UFBA.

[4] I will be using using Lopes-Rossi (1996) for this period.

[5] I will be using Duarte (1992), Lopes-Rossi (1996), and Kato and Duarte (2002) for this period.

[6] Other examples have been taken from my own work .

[7] I do not assume, like in Cheng and Rooryck (2000). that *Q* is present only in yes/no questions in the specific cases of French *wh-in-situ* questions.

[8] I also assume the other projections: two TopP and a FiniteP, though I will not be representing these in this paper.

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

(4) [COM TANTA PACEENÇA] sofria ela esta enfermidade.
(DSG, 14th c.)
with so.much patience suffered she this illness
'She suffered this illness with such patience.'

(5) *COMO* veestes vós a aqueste ermo?
(FLOS, 14th c.)
how came you to this place
'How did you get to this deserted place?'

Reverse *pseudo*-clefts were the only constructions found in the oldest period as alternatives for the V2 patterns. The cleft *wh-questions* in this period are of the inverse *pseudo*-cleft type, but the only *wh*-pronoun that appears in this type of question is *o que*. This pseudo-cleft pattern is the first to disappear, not going beyond the 18th century.

(6) ELE he **o que** tempera a sanha.
(DSG, 14th c.)
he is what seasons the rage
'He is what seasons the rage.
(7) QUE he **o que** dizes, irmãã?
(DSG, 14th c.)
what is what say (you) sister
'What is it that you say, sister?'

3.2. The first innovation: the reverse that-clefts
Declarative reverse that-clefts (8) are the next type to appear in the seventeenth century. The interrogative that-clefts start to appear also in the same period.

(8) E *ISSO é que* se chama postura, ou posição reta.
(Argote 17th c.)
and this is that calls posture or position straight
'And this is what one calls posture, or straight position.'

(9) a. *COM QUE SUBSTANTIVO é que* concordam?
(Argote, 17th c.)
with which noun is that agree-3PL
'Which noun is it that it agrees with
b. *E QUANDO é que* são Relativos?
(Argote, 17th c.)
and when is that are Relatives
'And when is it that they are Relatives?

3.3. A new innovation: the canonic clefts
In the eighteenth century EP and 19th century BP we have another innovation: the appearance of canonic *pseudo-clefts* ((10) and also canonic *that*-clefts (11):

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

(10) **Foi** VOSSA EMINÊNCIA quem julgou que eu era digna de expor.
(Alorna, 18th c.)
was Your Eminence who considered that I was worth of expose
'It was Your eminence who considered that I was worth exposing

(11) **É** O REI LEGÍTIMO que devemos opor ao usurpador.
(Alorna,18th c.)
is the king legitimate that (we) should oppose to the usurper
'It is the legitimate king that we have to oppose to the usurper.'

No corresponding wh-questions have been found in the written corpora. We assume, however, that the canonic clefts also existed in the form of wh-questions, as it can be observed today in recordings of children's production and of their mothers' (see Lessa de Oliveira (2003), though very little is found in adults'corpora. It is also relevant to compare what happens in Québec French with structures similar to those in (12), but in adult language (13).

(12) a. **É O QUE** que cê qué, filha? (mother's input)
is what that you want baby
'What is it that you want, baby?
b. **É QUEM** que tá tomano banho? (mother's input)
is who that is having bath
'Who is it that is having bath?
c. **É QUEM** que tá tocano o violão? (Luana,child: 02; 03. 22)
is who that is playing the guitar
'Who is playing guitar?
d . **É QUE** que tá gravano? (Luana, child: 02;03. 22)
is what that is recording
'What is being recorded?'

(13) C'ést **OÙ** que t'ás mis les oranges? (apud Noonan 1989)
it is where that you have put the oranges
'Where did you put the oranges?'

3.4. The reduced that-cleft

In the 20th century, there appears the pattern that Kato & Ribeiro (2009) call the reduced cleft question, the most vernacular of the BP wh-questions. It appears only in the spoken corpus of NURC (Educated Brazilians), and in TV dialogues. What is interesting is that Québec French can also have this sort of *wh*-question.

(14) a. O QUE que você faz?' (NURC Spoken corpus)
what that you do
'What is it that you do?'
b. DE QUEM que é esse peixe?' (TV)

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

of whom that is this fish
'Whose is this fish?'

(15) Où que t'á mis les oranges?' (apud Noonan 1989)
where that you have put the oranges
'Where have you put the oranges?

Fronted focalized examples can also be heard in colloquial BP in the same pattern.

(16) a. ESSA MENTIRA que ela me contou.
this lie that she me told
'THIS LIE she told me.
b. O PAI DELE que está na cadeia.
the father of-his that is in-the jail
'HIS FATHER is in jail.

Wh-questions of this kind are still strongly stigmatized in written language, according to Kato and Mioto (2005).

3.5. The non-V2 Wh SV type

In the second half of the 19th century there appears the non-V2 type of wh-questions, the WhSV pattern. This type appears also in spoken 20th century corpus.

(17) a. ONDE ele foi? (Dias Gomes, 2nd half of the 19th c.)
where he went
'Where did he go?'
b. QUANTO você ganha? (TV)
how much you earn
'How much do you earn?

Declarative SV sentences with the Focus in initial position are also possible today:

(18) a. PRO AEROPORTO ele foi, não pro escritório.
to-the airport he went not to-the office
" TO THE AIRPORT he went, not to the office'.
b. UMA FORTUNA eu paguei meu carro.
a fortune I paid my car
'A FORTUNE I paid my car.

3.6 The wh-in-situ

According to Lopes-Rossi (1996), the so called *wh-in-situ* questions start to appear in the second half of the 20th century, but is barely noticeable in EP written documents (2.9%), against a more expressive presence in BP (8.1).
In spoken language EP exhibits only 8.1%, while BP shows 28.1%.

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

Lessa (2003) discusses differences in the production of mothers' *wh-in-situ*, depending on whether the family is from São Paulo or from the northeast. In the northeast of Brazil the child starts producing *wh-in-situ* earlier than the other patterns, which she believes to be a function of the frequency on *wh-in-situ* in the input.

In this study, I will only include considerations about the *wh-in-situ* in Brazil and will leave what happens in EP for future work.

3.7. Summary

The following figure summarizes the findings in previous works.

Fig 1

OP & **ClP** 14th-18th	Wh**VS**	Wh **é o que**				
EP 18th-20th	Wh**VS**	-----	Wh **é que VS/SV**	wh-**in-situ**		
BP 19th -20	-----	-----	Wh **é que SV**	wh-**in-situ**	Wh **que SV**	Wh **SV**

(adapted from Lopes-Rossi 1996)

4. Reviewing some analyses

4.1. Reviewing the V2 analysis

The previous studies (Ribeiro 1995, Torres-Morais 1995 a.o.) have been assuming that the oldest pattern is technically a V2 structure, with the V+I moving to Focus, or to C in the non-cartographic frame.

The fact that OP was also a Null Subject (NS) language makes us rethink this analysis. It contains many V1 structures with either a NS or a postposed subject, and in embedded contexts it has an ordinary non-V2 syntax. We will propose, after Kato (1993) and Kato and Raposo (1996) that OP was like EP, where a null head F had strong *wh* and focus features, but had weak Tense features. The V+I stays in T and the subject stays in the postposed subject position, where it gets nominative by AGREE.[9] An adverb or adjunct can, moreover, occupy the second position, instead of the verb, such that the order can be Wh X VS, as in (20):

(19) $[_{FocP}$ Wh/Focus [Ø $[_{TP}$ (X) V+T $[_{vP}$ Subject …….]]]]

(20) – Como **em tanto tempo** fezesti tu tã pouco como esto? [Flos 14th]
how in such long time did you so little like this
'How come you did so little in such a long time, like this?

[9] In Kato (1993) I used the notion of Nominative by government in Koopman and Sportiche (1990), before the introduction of the notion AGREE in (Chomsky 2001). Recent studies with apparent V2 structures have been analyzed in Romance along similar lines (see a.o. Ordoñez for Spanish, and Barbosa (2001) for EP.

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

4.2. Maintaining the analysis of the reverse cleft and the canonic cleft

The analysis of reverse clefts is maintained from Kato and Ribeiro's (2009):
(i) its input sentence is similar to the *presentative* sentence (21a)[10], with some constituent marked +*wh*;
(ii) the result merges with a complementizer,
(iii) subsequently the copula merges;
iv) the copula makes the derivation project the matrix sentence and its periphery with a null Focus head;
(v) the *wh*-element is then moved to check the Focus features in the matrix Focus.

(21) a. É que [o Pedro ama a Maria] Presentative cleft
is that the Peter loves the Maria'
Ít happens that Peter loves Mary.
b. **Quem** é que o Pedro ama? Reverse cleft
who is that the Peter loves
'Who is it that Peter loves?'

(22) a. [$_{TP}$ O Pedro ama **quem** $_{+F}$]
b. [$_{CP}$ que [$_{TP}$ O Pedro ama **quem** $_{+F}$]]
c. é [$_{CP}$ que [$_{TP}$ O Pedro ama **quem** $_{+F}$]]]
d. [$_{FocP}$Ø [$_{Tp}$ é [$_{CP}$ que [$_{TP}$ O Pedro ama **quem** $_{+F}$]]]]
e. [$_{FocP}$ **quem** Ø [$_{Tp}$ é [$_{CP}$ que [$_{TP}$ O Pedro ama ~~**quem**~~ $_{+F}$]]]]

The derivation of canonic *that*-cleft is also maintained from Kato and Ribeiro (2009), and goes as follows:
(i) it is derived from the same input, to which a complementizer is merged;
(ii) a copula merges subsequently;
(iii) a FocP merges to the vP periphery of the copula;
(iv) the element with *wh*-features moves to this low FocP,
(v) the copula moves over it to T.

(23) a. É **quem** que o Pedro ama.
is who that the Peter loves
'Who is it that Peter loves?'

(24) a. [$_{TP}$ O Pedro ama **quem** $_{+wh}$]
b. [$_{CP}$ que [o Pedro ama **quem**$_{+wh}$]
c. [$_{vP}$ é [$_{CP}$ que [o Pedro ama **quem**$_{+wh}$]]]
d. [$_{FpcP}$ **quem** Ø[$_{vP}$ é [$_{CP}$ que [o Pedro ama ~~**quem**~~$_{+wh}$]]]]
e. [$_{TP}$ é [$_{FpcP}$ **quem** Ø[$_{vP}$ ~~é~~ [$_{CP}$ que [o Pedro ama ~~**quem**~~$_{+wh}$]]]]]

4.3. The spoken variant Wh que in BP

The analysis of the pattern in (25) is maintained from Lopes-Rossi (1996), who follows suggestion by Noonan (1989) for Québec French. The source of this

[10] First used in Casteleiros (1979).

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

pattern is, thus, assumed to be the canonic cleft (25a), which undergoes copula erasure at PF just as it is suggested for Québec French:

(25) a. É **quem** que tá tocando violao?
b. PF: ~~É~~ **quem** que tá tocando violao?
(26) a. (C'ést) **où** que t'ás mis les oranges?
b. **OÙ** que t'ás mis les oranges?

(apud Noonan 1987)

Kato and Ribeiro (2009), who adopts the phonological solution, explains, however, that this phonological erasure is triggered by a grammaticalization process in the copula, The copula becomes invariable in BP, losing the *consecutio temporum* with the embedded verb, a phenomenon that did not happen with EP.

(27) a. **É** quem que chegou? BP *EP
is who that arrived
b. **Foi** quem que chegou? EP
was who that arrived
'Who arrived?

4.4. The late variant WHSV in BP

With the disappearance of the WhVS structure, what takes over are the cleft constructions, with the apparent counterpart WHSV appearing only at the end of the 19th century.

(28) **Onde** ela pôs o violão?
where she put the guitar
'Where did she put the guitar '

However, the first analysis for this structure was proposed in Kato and Duarte (2002), who attributed it to the loss of referential NSs and the loss of free inversion in BP[11]. The delay of such structure from appearing would be explained, as the loss of the referential NS started only in the 19th century. With the loss of pronominal agreement, BP acquired weak pronouns which would have to be moved to Spec of T to obey the EPP (cf. Kato 1999), launching also the loss of free inversion.

(29) [$_{FocP}$ Wh/Focus [Ø [$_{TP}$ Subject V+T [$_{vP}$ ~~Subject~~ [~~V~~ O .]]]]

But, the analysis which we are endorsing, would have the reduced cleft as its source, through the stylistic **erasure of the complementizer**, a solution also suggested by Noonan (1989) for Québec French. The delay of its appearance is also

[11] This thesis is reinforced by Ordoñez and Olarrea`s (2006) study of Caribean Spanish, which underwent a similar change.

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

understandable as the reduced cleft appeared only in spoken language, and the WHSV would be a stylistic variant more acceptable in written form.

(30) a. **OÙ (**que) t'ás mis les oranges?
where that you have put the oranges
b. **OÙ** t'ás mis les oranges?'
'Where have you put the oranges?

(apud Noonan 1989)

(31) a. (É) **quem** que tá tocando violao?
Is who that is playing guitar
b. **Quem** ~~que~~ tá tocando violão?

What is revealing in the empirical work with data is not so much the presence of something in the corpora, but its absence, or small frequency. When the reduced clefts start to appear, the WhSV pattern also starts to appear, but while in spoken language the reduced type have around 20% of the wh-questions, and the WHSV cases have around 15.0 %, in the written corpora the reduced type barely appears (7.9%) contrary to the WHSV, which has around 12.3 % in one corpus (cf. Lopes-Rossi 1996) and 45% in newspaper corpus (cf. Kato & Mioto 2005). The canonic type, on the other hand, seems to be the most stigmatized, appearing only in "motherese" and in child language. Adults tend to erase the copula. Our assumption is, therefore, that the three types are structurally the same, and variation depends on stylistic factors.

4.5. Summary of section 4.
Ignoring the second column, with the pseudo-cleft[12], and adding the canonic cleft in the fourth column, with the copula and the complementizer erasure at PF, we have:

Fig 2

WhVS	**Wh** é que VS/SV	wh-in-situ	
-----	**Wh** é que SV	wh-in-situ	**(**É**) Wh (**que**)** SV
OP/EP	OP/EP/BP	EP/BP	BP

5. The so-called wh-in-situ in Brazilian Portuguese[13]

5.1. Two types of wh-in-situ in BP

Besides the types of wh-questions studied in the previous sections, BP has a

[12] Recall that in Fig. 1, this pattern did not last until Modern EP and BP.
[13] This section is based on Kato (2004, 2011).

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

wh-in-situ pattern, but with two different intonations: a) a falling intonation (↓), interpreted as an ordinary question, and b) a rising intonation (↑), which is interpreted as an echo-question.

(32) a. Ele foi **onde**? ↓ (falling intonation) (ordinary question)
he went where
'Where did he go?'
b. Ele foi onde ? ↑ (rising intonation) (echo-question)
'He went where?'

French has a similar phenomenon of "optional" wh-movement, and two recent solutions have been provided.

According to Cheng, L.L.S. & J.Roorick (2000), *yes/no* questions and *wh*-in-situ questions share the same rising intonation in French due to the same Q-morpheme. The presence of this Q morpheme bans the movement of the *wh*-word. *Q* can appear optionally in the numeration. If it is not in the numeration, *wh*-movement occurs.

The same analysis cannot be applied in BP as the rising intonation that we have in *yes/no* questions does not occur in ordinary *wh-in-situ* questions, where we have the falling type. Moreover, the intonation in (32a) is that of a declarative clause, and the one in (32b) is that of a *yes/no* question[14].

In Boškovič's (1998) analysis, French allows LF insertion of C^0 with a strong [*wh*-feature]. The consequences are that: a) in overt syntax of the in-situ construction, the *wh*-word does not move because there is no feature to attract the *wh- word;* b) no *wh*-in-situ is allowed in embedded sentences because LF insertion of *wh*-feature can only occur at the root level; and c) at LF, after the insertion of the *wh*-feature, the *wh-* feature of the *wh*-word moves to check the C^0, the reason why *wh-in-situ* is not allowed in islands[15].

(33) a. **Marie pense que Jean a acheté **quoi**?* ↑
Mary thinks that John has bought what
b. ** Je me demande si Jean a acheté **quoi**?* ↑
I myself ask if John has bought what
c. **Marie aime le livre que **qui** a écrit?* ↑

[14] French does not seem to make any difference between echo questions and ordinary *in-situ* questions, as according to Cheng and Rooryck (2000) ordinary *in-situ* questions have the same intonation as yes/no questions.

[15] Further differences between French and BP are certain intervention effects, which do not affect BP:

(i) a. *Jean **n**e mange pas **quoi**?
b. O João **não** come **o que?**
`*****John doesn't eat what?

(ii) a. A: Marie a acheté **quoi**?
B: # **Rien**.
'Mary has bought what?'
b. A: A Maria comprou **o que**?
B: **Nada.**
' Nothing.'

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

Mary loves the book that who has written

However, Bošković's analysis does not account for the facts of BP, as all such structures are possible with its *wh-in-situ* ordinary questions, though (34b and c) are impossible with echo-questions[16].

(34) a. Maria pensa que o Jõao comprou o quê ?↓
Mary thinks that the John bought what
b. Eu me perguntei se o João comprou o que ? ↓
I myself asked whether the John bought what
c. Maria ama o livro que quem escreveu? ↓
Mary loves the book that who wrote

5.2. BP echo questions

A solution for BP echo questions comes from what happens in Japanese.

In Japanese the echo-question has always an overt complementizer *-tte,* as in (35a), which also occurs with complements that are indirect declarative sentences as in (35b):

(35) a. John –wa dare-o mitta-tte?
J-topic wh-acc saw tte
'John saw who?
b. [(Kimi-wa) [John-ga dare-o mitta tte] itta ka/no]?
you-topic John-nom who-acc saw tte said ka/no
'You said that John saw who?'

In BP, there is no specific complementizer for either the echo-question or the indirect speech complement, but the intonation is the same:

(36) a. O João viu quem ? ↑
the John saw who
b. [Você disse [(que João viu quem] ? ↑
You said that João saw who] ?

I analyze the form in (36a) as an elliptical form of (36b), where we have an explicit indirect speech form. Japanese has the complementizer explicit in the echo-question, while BP and English retain only the prosody assigned by the *Q* complementizer of the performative main clause.

Moreover, I also support Kayne's view that in both yes/no questions and echo-questions, the IP with the in-situ *wh-* moves to spec of Q to produce the rising intonation.

[16] Moreover, in most dialects. wh-in-situ in BP does not necessarily require a "common ground", as described in Pires and Taylor (2007).

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

(37) a. [$_{ForceP}$ Q [$_{IP}$Você disse [que João viu **quem**] ↑
b. [[$_{IP}$Você disse [(que **)** João viu **quem**] Q [~~$_{IP}$Você disse [que João viu **quem**~~]
c. [[$_{IP}$~~Você disse [que~~ João viu **quem**] Q [~~$_{IP}$Você……..~~

Possibly, the movement of the remnant IP in (37b) is restricted by weight, which explains why echo-questions are , in general, short.

5.3 BP ordinary "wh-in-situ" questions [17]

5.3.1. Short movement and not LF movement

Natural languages can exhibit the wh question word in two positions for ordinary questions: dislocated to the front of the sentence, as in English, or in-situ, as in Japanese, the well-known wh-parameter (Huang 1982). In Huang's terms English undergoes movement overtly, while in Chinese and Japanese the movement is covert[18].

A completely different view is explored in Miyagawa's (2001), who claims that, in English the wh-phrase is associated with both *Q*-features and *wh*-features. As a consequence the wh-phrase has to move to Spec of CP to satisfy the EPP feature on C. In Japanese the two features are distributed between two morphologically independent items : *-ka* in C and the *wh*-word in T.

The difference in the *wh*-parameter between Huang and Miyagawa would be movement in LF for the former and short overt movement for the latter.

I will assume Miyagawa's proposal of a short movement in "*wh-in-situ"* constructions, but instead of movement to T, I will propose that the *wh*-element will move to a designated FocP position, in Belletti's (1998) model, at the edge of vP, where other discursive projections, like TopP, can appear.

(38) [$_{ForceP}$ Q.. [$_{TP}$.....[$_{TopP}$ ...[$_{FocP}$ ...[$_{TopP}$ ... [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$]]]]]

(apud Belletti 1998)

(39) a. *Você viu **quem**?* ↓
you saw who
b. [Q [$_{TP}$ você viu [$_{FP}$ **quem**[$_{VP}$ $t_{você}$ t_{viu} [$_{VP}$ t_{viu} t_{quem}]]]]

[17] Two previous alternative analyses for *wh-in-situ* in Portuguese are worthy of mention. One is proposed by Lopes Rossi (1996) for BP, who follows Kim's (1991) analysis for Korean /Japanese that the *wh* has the nature of a quantifier. The other is Ambar's (2003), for whom *in-situ* questions are actually derived from the dislocated one by remnant movement of the IP to AssertiveP (AssP), after the *wh* has moved to Spec of WhP Despite their interest, neither analysis distinguishes two types of "*wh-in-situ*" constructions as in my study.

[18] But see problems regarding covert operations since Chomsky (2000).

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

The motivation of this lower Focus position is in the Italian postposed subjects, which are focalized.

(40) a. Ha parlato Gianni.
has spoken John
'JOHN has spoken.'
b. [$_{CP}$ .... [$_{TP}$ pro ha parlato [$_{FocP}$ Gianni [$_{vP}$ t_{Gianni} [$_{VP}$]]]]]

Indirect objects can also be focalized, and moved to this position, with the direct object moved to TopP, the place of the presupposition.

(41) a. Você deu pra quem esse CD?
You gave to whom this CD
'To whom did you give this CD?'
b. [$_{CP}$ Q[$_{TP}$ Você deu [$_{FP}$ PRA QUEM [$_{TopP}$ este CD ~~[$_{vP}$ você deu [$_{vP}$ este CD[pra quem~~

The element in FocP requires nuclear stress (cf. Zubizarreta 1997), and a falling prosody, eliminating the effect of the *Q*-morpheme in the sentence intonation.

5.3.2. Arguments for the mid-sentence FocP for the landing site of wh-phrases
I.There are no problems in BP *wh-in-situ* ordinary questions, regarding the occurrence of the wh-element in embedded or in island contexts as shown in section 5.1. The short nature of the movement explains the lack of such restrictions.

II. The intonation of *wh-in-situ* ordinary questions is similar to the falling intonation of a simple declarative sentences with postposed focalized subjects[19]:

(42) a. Você viu **quem**?↓
you saw who

b. Chegou a Maria↓.
arrived the Maria

III. In Europen Portuguese, the possibility of *wh-in-situ* is subject to Focus-sets according to word order (cf. Cheng and Rooryck 2002, apud Costa 1997).

Word order	Focus set
SVO	O, VO, or SVO
VSO	S, or O
VOS	S

(43) a.*O João pensa que[quem viu a Maria?] (SVO)
the John thinks that who saw the Maria
b. O João pensa que [viu a Maria quem?] (VOS)
the John thinks that saw the Maria who

[19] I thank Raquel Santos who drew the intonation contour of these sentences.

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

c. ?O João pensa que [viu quem a Maria?] (VSO)
the John thinks that saw who the Maria

IV. BP, contrary to EP, does not license postverbal subjects with transitive verbs. It also cannot have a *wh-in-situ* question with a postposed wh-subject with such verbs.

(44) a. Telefonou [a Maria]. ↓ EP BP
telephoned the M.
'MARY called.'
b Telefonou quem?↓ EP BP
telephoned who
"Who called?"

(45) a. Compraram os CDS [os meninos]. ↓ EP *BP.
bought the CDs the boys
'The boys bought the CDs.'
b. Comprou os CDs quem?↓ EP *BP
bought the CDs who
'Who bought the CDs?'

Following this reasoning, we can say that *wh-in-situ* questions in French cannot derive from the landing of the *wh*-element on the low FP position, since it has no inverted subjects and neither a falling intonation in *wh*-questions. As it has the same intonation as echo questions, we can support Kayne's (1994) idea that *in-situ* questions in French are like *Yes/no* questions, with movement of the whole sentence to Spec of C.

V. *Wh*-elements do not have to appear in sentence-final position, because, in Belletti's system, the clause internal A'-area has, like in Rizzi's (1997) periphery, TopP projections below and above FP .

(46) a. João tinha restituído que livro para a Maria?
John had returned which book to the Mary
'Which book had John returned to Mary?
b. João tinha restituído para a Maria que livro?
John had returned to Mary which book
'Which book had John returned to Mary?'

(47) a. João tinha restituído [$_{FP}$ que livro [$_{TopP}$ para a Maria [$_{VP}$ ~~que livro [para a Maria...~~

b. João tinha restituído [$_{TopP}$ para a Maria [$_{FP}$ que livro [$_{VP}$ ~~que livro~~ [$_{v}$ ~~para a Maria...~~

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

Conclusions

We started our study assuming that not only OP and EP had wh-movement, but that Modern BP had a sort of optional wh-movement. But no explanation was provided for the increase of the so-called *wh-in-situ* questions.

Our analysis changed our assumptions in radical ways.

First, the so-called fronted *wh*-questions were considered syntactically canonic cleft questions, with the copula in V1. The *wh*-element had structurally moved to the low FocusP position, and was sitting to the right of the copula before its erasure.

Second, the so-called *wh-in-situ* questions were proposed to have the *wh*-element undergoing a short movement to the same FocP position, at the edge of vP.

This means that, after the 19th century, short wh-movement marks the typical BP wh-questions, with a conservative long one still shared with EP. Though licensed in EP, wh-in-situ is still stigmatized in EP, especially in written language, while the only cleft that is possible is the type without PF erasure.

Fig 3

WhVS	**Wh** é que VS/SV	wh-in-situ	
-----	**Wh** é que SV	wh-in-situ	**(**É**) Wh (**que**)** SV
OP/EP	OP/EP/BP	EP/BP	BP
Long wh-movement	**Long wh-movement**	**Short Wh-movement**	**Short Wh-movement**

References

Adams, M. (1987) *Old French, Null Subjects and Verb-second Phenomena*. UCLA:PHD Dissertation.

Ambar, Manuela (1992) *Para uma Sintaxe da Inversão Sujeito-Verbo em Português*. Lisboa: Ed. Colibri.

Barbosa, P. (2001) On Inversion in *Wh*-questions in Romance. In: A. Hulk and J.-Y Pollock (eds) *Romance Inversion.* New York: Oxford. 2-59.

Belletti, A. (2004) Aspects of the low IP area. In; *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartograph of Syntactic Structures.* Luigi Rizzi (ed), 16-51. New York: Oxford University Press.

Belletti, A. (2005) Answering with a 'cleft': the role of the null subject parameter and the VP periphery. In: *Proceedings of the Thirtieth "Incontro di Grammatica Generativa"*, L.Brugè, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, W. Schweikert & G. Turano (eds), 63-82. Venezia: Cafoscarina.

Bošković, Želko. (1998). LF movement and the Minimalist Program. In: *Proceedings of NELS 28*, Pius.N. Tmanji and Kiomi Kusumoto (Eds), 43-57. Amherst,Mass, GLSA.

Casteleiros, J.M. (1979) Sintaxe e semântica das construções enfáticas com É QUE. *Boletim de*

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

Filologia [Lisbon] 25: 97-166.
Cheng, Lisa.L.S. & J.Rooryck (2000). Licensing Wh-in-situ, Syntax,3,1:1-19.
Chomsky, Noam (2000) Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In: R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds) *Step by Step.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. 89-155.
Chomsky, Noam (2001) Derivation by phase . In: M. Kentowicz (ed.) *A Life in Language.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. 1-52.
Duarte, M.E.L. (1992) A perda da ordem V(erbo) S(ujeito) em interrogativas qu- no português do Brasil. *D.E.L.T.A.*, Número Especial: 37-52.
Huang,C-T James (1982) Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar. MIT: PH.D.Dissertation.
Kato, Mary A. (1993) Word order change: the case of Brazilian Portuguese wh-questions. Paper presented at the *XI International Congress of Historical Linguistics.* Los Angeles.
Kato, Mary A. (1999) Strong pronouns and weak pronominals in the null subject parameter. *PROBUS*, (11)1: 1-37.
Kato, Mary A. (2004) Two types of wh-in-situ in Brazilian Portuguese. Paper presented at *GURT (2004).* Washington.
Kato, Mary A. (2006) Focus structures and VS order in Brazilian Portuguese. *Revista do GELNE,8:* n. 1/2:7-16.
Kato, Mary A. and Eduardo Raposo (1996) European and Brazilian word order: questions, focus and topic constructions. In C.Parodi, A.C.Quicoli, M. Saltarelli & M.L.Zubizarreta (eds) *Aspects of Romance Linguistics*.Washington: Georgetown U.Press, pp. 267-277**.**
Kato, Mary A. and M.E. L.Duarte (2002). A Diachronic Analysis of Brazilian Portuguese Wh-Questions *Santa Barbara Portuguese Studies*, vol. VI, University of California at Santa Barbara, Center for Portuguese Studies: 326-339.
Kato, Mary A. and Carlos Mioto) (2005) A multi-evidence study of European and Brazilian wh-questions. In: Stephen Kepser and Marga Reis (eds) *Linguistic Evidence: Empirical, theoretical and computational persrspectives* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Kato, Mary A. and Ilza Ribeiro (2009) Cleft sentences from old Portuguese to Modern Brazilian Portuguese. In: A. Dufter & D.Jacob (eds). *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. 123-154. John Benjamins.
Kayne, Richard (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche (1990) The position of subjects. *Lingua.* 85. 211-58.
Lessa de Oliveira, A. (2003) *Aquisição de constituintes-Qu em dois dialetos do português brasileiro.* UNICAMP: M.A. Thesis.
Lightfoot, David (1991) How to Set Parameters: Arguments from Language Change. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
Lobato Lucia (1988) Sobre a regra de anteposição do verbo no português do Brasil.*D.E.L.T.A.*,4,1:121-148.
Lopes-Rossi, Maria Aparecida. (1993) "Estudo diacrônico sobre as interrogativas do português do Brasil". In I. Roberts & M.A.Kato (eds), 307-342.
Miyagawa, S. (2001) The EPP, Scrambling, and wh-in situ. In: *A Life in Language: Ken Hale*. Michael Kenstowicz (ed). 293-338. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
Noonan, Maire (1989) Operator licensing and the case of French interrogatives, *Proceedings of the 8th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics.* University of British Columbia. Stanford Linguistics Association. 315-330.
Ordoñez, F. (1998) Post-verbal asymmetries in Spanish *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 16*. 313-346.
Ordoñez, F. and A. Olarrea (2006) Microvariation in Caribbean/non Caribbean Spanish. *Probus*, Volume 18.3. 59-97.
Pires, Acrisio and Heather Taylor (2007) The Syntax of Wh-in-situ and Common Ground: Discourse-Pragmatics and I-language. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 43, vol. 2. 201-215.
Rizzi, Luigi (1997) The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Liliane Haegeman (ed).*Elements of Grammar*. 281-337. Kluwer.
Ribeiro, Ilza. (1995) Evidence for a Verb-Second phase in Old Portuguese. In: A.Battye & I. Roberts (eds) *Clause Structure and Language Change*. New York: Oxford: 110-139.

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)

Roberts, Ian. (1993) Verbs and Diachronic *Syntax: a Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

BDD-A22713 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-15 01:52:09 UTC)