

## TWO FOCUS POSITIONS IN THE HISTORY OF BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE<sup>1</sup>

Mary A. Kato<sup>2</sup>

mary.kato@gmail.com

**RESUMO:** A função de foco é interpretada nas línguas naturais principalmente através da prosódia, mas, em línguas que admitem variação de ordem, ela vem frequentemente marcada por determinada ordem sentencial, caso das línguas românicas de sujeito nulo. O objetivo do trabalho é fazer uma varredura de trabalhos anteriores sobre o Foco e as perguntas-Wh, confirmando ou modificando hipóteses. Nesse estudo, procura-se mostrar como de uma gramática com Foco na periferia sentencial à esquerda passa-se para uma gramática com foco sentencial na posição medial. A discussão começa mostrando como o padrão sentencial que focaliza o sujeito informacionalmente através da ordem V(X)S (*Um carro novo comprou O JOÃO*) vem se perdendo no Português Brasileiro (PB), sendo substituído pela construção clivada (*Foi O JOÃO que comprou um carro novo.*) e como esta construção acaba também se estendendo para focalizar informacionalmente outros constituintes (*Foi UM CARRO NOVO que o João comprou.*). Ao mesmo tempo, o PB começa a apresentar um aumento substancial de *wh*-in-situ. O trabalho mostra que os dois fenômenos têm a mesma origem, a saber, o elemento focal e o elemento-*wh* passam a ocupar a posição medial da sentença perdendo o movimento para o início da oração. A partir da clivada, o PB vem sofrendo ainda mudanças devidas a processos de gramaticalização, que não atingiram a variedade portuguesa.

**Palavras-chaves:** Foco informacional- Foco contrastivo - Português Brasileiro- Ordem sentencial- Clivagem-Gramaticalização

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Word order comes frequently associated with discursive functions, like *Focus* and *Topic*. In generative grammar, *Focus* is considered, since Chomsky(1971), to be the information extracted from the nuclear stress of a sentence. *Focus* is, moreover, complementary to the notion of *presupposition*, namely the remaining part of the sentence after the Focus is replaced by a variable.

In a question-answer pair, the element that replaces the *wh*-constituent in the answer is the *Focus*, and the proposition that results from the replacement of the Focus for a variable is

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on a talk given at UFBa, in June 2015, at *Encontro de Gramática Gerativa*, in honor of Ilza Rbeiro. I thank Marcello Marcelino for the review of English.

<sup>2</sup> UNICAMP/CNPq.

the *presupposition* in LF. The Focus can be the whole sentence as in (1a), the predicate as in (1b), the direct object as in (1c), the subject as in (1d), just the verb as in (1e), and the subject+ verb as in (1f). The context-question appears after each answer. Notice that, except for (1f), where the *Focus* is the subject, in all other cases the nuclear stress falls on the object (*the pie*).

(1) a. [<sub>F</sub> John ate the pie].

[What happened]

b. John [<sub>F</sub> ate the pie].

[What did John do?]

c. John ate [<sub>F</sub> the pie].

[What did John eat?]

d. [JOHN] ate the pie.

[Who ate the pie?]

e. John [<sub>F</sub> ate] the pie.

[ What did John do to the pie]

f. [<sub>F</sub>

John ate ] the pie.

[ What happened to the pie?]

(Zubizarreta, 1998: p.3)

*Informational Focus*, which we approached above, should be distinguished from *Contrastive* or *Emphatic focus*. In this case the stress is assigned using a different algorithm from the nuclear stress, and the assertion is generally used with a metalinguistic function of contradicting the previous statement <sup>3</sup>. For Zubizarreta, the contrastive stress is freely assigned, licensed *in-situ*.

(2) a. JUAN comió una manzana, (no Pedro).

[Pedro comió una manzana.]

b. Maria puso el LIBRO sobre la mesa ( no la revista)

[ Maria puso la revista sobre la mesa]

(Zubizarreta, 1998: p.20,21 )

---

<sup>3</sup> This is not the case with emphatic *Focus*, in which case the context can be a question, as we will see in Section 2.

So far, *Focus* seems to be only a prosodic issue, not a syntactic one.

In the present study, I will present data to show that in the eighteenth to the nineteenth century BP underwent one major *syntactic* change in *Focus* structures (Kato & Ribeiro 2009), with minor later *phonological* changes, which did not affect EP. It is also the aim of this paper to show that the changes in *wh*-questions also affected the changes in declarative *Focus* structures.

## 2. FRONTED FOCUS

Studying *Focus* in European and Brazilian Portuguese, Kato & Raposo (1996) showed that, when the *Focus* appears in the beginning of a sentence, subject inversion occurs in Modern European Portuguese (MEP) while in Modern Brazilian Portuguese (MBP), the order is *FocusSV*, except with unaccusative and some inergative verbs (ex. 7).

(3) Q: *QUE CDs te recomendou a Maria?* (MEP/ \*MBP)

what CDs 2sg-dat-cl recommended M?

“Which CDs did Maria recommend?”

A: *SÓ ESSES CDs me recomendou a Maria.* (MEP/ \*BP)

only those CDs cl recommended M

“Only these did CDs Maria recommend.”

(4) Q: *QUE CDs a Maria te recomendou?* (\*MEP/MBP)

A: *SÓ ESSES CDs a Maria me recomendou.* (\*MEP/ MBP)

(5) Q: *QUANTAS MULHERES amou o João?* (MEP/\*MBP)

how-many women loved John

“How many women did John love?”

A: *MUITAS MULHERES amou o João.* (MEP/\*MBP)

many women loved John

“Many women did John love.”

(6) Q: *QUANTAS MULHERES o João amou?* (\*MEP/BP)

A: *MUITAS MULHERES o João amou.* (\*MEP/ MBP)

(7) Q: *QUANDO chega o Pedro.?* (MEP/MPB)

when arrives the Peter

“When does Peter arrive?”

A: *SÓ AMANHÃ chega o Pedro.* (MPE/MPB)

only tomorrow arrives the Peter

“ Only tomorrow does PETER arrive. “

In Kato & Raposo’s study, the purpose was to compare EP and BP regarding *Focus* structures and word order, but the study also intended to show that Affective Operators, which are normally the *Focus* of a sentence, trigger proclisis in both EP and BP when fronted. Topics, on the other hand, trigger enclisis only in EP<sup>4</sup>.

(8) Q: Quanto custou o teu carro? (MEP/ MBP)

how much cost the your car?

“How much did your car cost?”

A1: (O carro) custou-**me** \$20.000. (MEP/ \*MBP)

Topic cost –cl \$20.000

A2: (O carro) **me** custou \$20.000. (\*MEP/ MBP)

Topic cl cost \$20.000

Fronted *Focus* with postverbal subjects can also appear in EP, with the difference that ordinary DPs trigger enclisis. Brazilian speakers can also have DP fronted *Foci*, but the subject is always pre-verbal and proclisis is the norm in all cases.

(9) Q: *Que CDs te sugeriu a Joana?* (MEP/\*MBP)

which CDs cl suggested the? Joana

“Which CDs has Joana suggested?”

A1: *OS DO CHICO sugeriu-me a Joana.* (MEP/\*MBP)

the from Chico suggested cl the Joana

“The ones from Chico has Joana suggested.

---

<sup>4</sup> As often a DP can be either a Topic or a Focus, whenever possible, we will try to use Affective Operators for *Focus*, as they are, by nature a Focus constituent.

(10) Q: *QUE CDS a Joana te sugeriu?* (MEP/MBP)<sup>5</sup>

which CDs the Joana cl suggested

“Which CDs has Joana suggested to you?”

A1: *OS DO CAETANO a Joana me sugeriu?* (?MEP/MBP)

the from Caetano the Joana cl suggested

“The ones from Caetano has Joana suggested to me.”

The clause structure assumed in Kato & Raposo for fronted *Focus* was based on Uriagereka’s (1995) Focus Phrase (FP), above TP and below CP, with the Affective Operators moving to Spec,FP<sup>6</sup>. Though not explicitly stated in Kato & Raposo (1996), *wh*-constituents also move to FP when fronted.

(11) a. [<sub>FP</sub> Muitas mulheres [<sub>F’</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> amou [<sub>VP</sub> o João ~~amou~~ [<sub>VP</sub> ~~amou~~ muitas mulheres]

b. [<sub>FP</sub> Quantas mulheres [<sub>F’</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> amou [<sub>VP</sub> o João ~~amou~~ [<sub>VP</sub> ~~amou~~ quantas mulheres]

We will be assuming explicitly that *wh*-constituents are Affective Operators and that they occupy Spec, F, when fronted.

But, in the present study, we will assume that FP is inside a more elaborate clausal periphery (12), within the Cartographic approach (Rizzi, 1997).

(12) [ForceP [ TopP [**FocusP** [TopP [ FiniteP [ TP ]]]]]]

We will also assume an extension of the Cartographic approach with discursive projections in a lower vP periphery (13), proposed by Belletti (2006).

(13) [<sub>TP</sub> T [ TopP [**FocusP** [TopP [<sub>vP</sub> .....[VP .....]]]]]]]

## 2. THE IN-SITU FOCUS

The data in section 1 show that the Affective elements and focalized DPs always appeared in the fronted position of the sentence. In this section we will examine cases where the *Focus*

<sup>5</sup> With D-linked *wh*-expressions, MEP can also have the SV order (Ambar 1992)

<sup>6</sup> Different from Ribeiro’s (1995a and 1995b) analysis of Portuguese as a V2 language, with V raising to C, we assume Kato & Raposo’s (1996) analysis of V staying in T, except when no affective operator raises to Spec,FP, a situation in which the verb raises to F. (i) *Telefonou-me o Pedro*. Lit. Peter called.

appears *in-situ*<sup>7</sup> in a typical configuration of an informational *Focus*. But if the *Focus* contains an Affective operator, this constituent can have an extra heavy stress and be interpreted as an emphatic or contrastive *Focus*.

(14) Q1: *QUANTOS LIVROS leu o João ontem?* (MEP)  
 how many books read the John yesterday

“How many books did John read yesterday?”

Q2: *QUANTOS LIVROS o João leu ontem?* “ (MBP)  
 how many books read the John yesterday

“How many books has John read?”

A: *O João leu MUITOS LIVROS ontem (não poucos).* (MEP/MBP)

the John read many books yesterday (not few)

“John has read many books, and not few.”

In BP *wh*-constituents can also appear *in-situ* freely, with a falling intonation (\\)<sup>8</sup>, which makes it a real question and not just an echo one.<sup>9</sup> Except in the case of subjects, other constituents can be focalized *in-situ*.

(15) Q: *O João leu QUANTOS LIVROS ontem?*\\ (MBP/ ?MEP)  
 the John read which books yesterday

“Which books has John read yesterday?”

A: *O João leu MUITOS LIVROS ontem, (não poucos).* (MBP)

When the answer focalizes the subject in EP, it can be in sentence-final position if the predicate is not heavy (ex. as in (17)). With heavy predicates, EP chooses subject-*in-situ*<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Kato & Raposo (1996) do not deal with these cases.

<sup>8</sup> See Kato’s (2013) for an analysis of *wh*-*in-situ* in BP. The judgments in EP are not so clear, but many *in-situ* questions accepted by Brazilians are rejected by Portuguese speakers.

<sup>9</sup> Echo-questions in BP have a rising intonation (/) and requires just the repetition of the interlocutor’s previous statement:

(i) Maria esteve na Grécia em dezembro. (ii) Maria esteve onde/?  
 Mary was in Greece in December. Maria was where?

<sup>10</sup> Zubizarreta (1998) considers this phenomenon for Italian (and we would add MBP), and states the following restriction for some languages: *P-movement of constituent A across constituent B is degraded if A is metrically heavier than B.*”

[i] a. Comió una manzana JUAN.  
 b. ?Há mangiato una mela GIANNI.  
 c. \*Comeu uma maçã O JOÃO.

- (16) Q: *QUEM comprou esses livros ontem?* (MEP)  
 who bought these books yesterday  
 “Who bought these books yesterday?”
- A1: *Comprou (esses livros ontem) O MEU FILHO.* (?MEP/ \*MBP)  
 bought these books yesterday the my son  
 “MY SON bought these books yesterday .”
- A2: *O MEU FILHO comprou (esses livros ontem).* (MEP/MBP)  
 “MY SON bought these books yesterday .”
- (17) Q: *Telefonou QUEM?* (MEP/MBP)  
*called who*  
 “Who called?”
- A: *Telefonou O CHEFE (o sócio dele não) .* (MEP/MBP)  
*called the boss but not his partner*  
 “THE BOSS called, (not his partner)”

### 3. FRONTED AND IN-SITU FOCUS IN CLEFT SENTENCES

One of the most well distributed ways to focalize a constituent in natural languages is through the use of clefts, namely a complex sentence where the *Focus* appears in the domain of a copula. The *Focus* may appear after the copula or in sentence-initial position.

Contextual question (for informational *Focus*):

- (18) Q: *QUEM foi que esteve em casa ontem?* Wh-question (BP/EP)  
 who was that was at home yesterday  
 “Who was it that was at home yesterday?”
- A1: *Foi O PAULO (quem esteve em casa ontem).* Wh-cleft (BP/EP)  
 was the Paulo who was at home yesterday

“ It was Paul who was at home yesterday.

A2: *Foi O PAULO (que esteve em casa ontem).* That-cleft (BP/EP)

was the Paulo that was at home yesterday

“It was Paul that was at home yesterday.

A3: *O PAULO (foi quem esteve em casa ontem.)* Inverse Wh-cleft (BP/EP)

the Paulo was who was at home yesterday

“Paul was who was at home yesterday. “

A4: *O PAULO (foi que esteve em casa ontem).* Inverse That-cleft (BP/EP)

the Paulo was that was at home yesterday

“Paul was who was at home yesterday.

“

Contextual sentence (for contrastive *Focus*):

(19) *O Pedro esteve em casa ontem.*

the Pedro was at home yesterday

“ Peter was at home yesterday.

(20) A1: *Não, foi O PAULO (quem esteve em casa ontem).* Wh-cleft  
(MBP/MEP)

no was the Paulo who was at home yesterday

“No, it was Paul who was at home yesterday.”

A2: *Não, foi O PAULO (que esteve em casa ontem”).* That-cleft  
(MBP/MEP)

no was the Paulo that was at home yesterday

“No, it was Paul that was at home yesterday.”

A3: *Não, o PAULO (foi quem esteve em casa ontem.)* InverseWh-  
cleft(MBP/MEP)

no the Paul was who was at home yesterday

“No, PAUL was who was at home yesterday.”

A4: *Não, o PAULO (foi que esteve em casa ontem).* Inverse That-  
cleft(MBP/MEP)

no the Paulo was that was at home yesterday

“No, PAUL was the one that was at home yesterday.”

Notice that cleft answers can be used for both informational and contrastive *Focus*. And all cleft replies are equally grammatical in MBP and MEP, though *wh*-clefts are more conservative and each variety has its own preferences (Cf. Fernandes, 2007)<sup>11</sup>.

The *wh*-clefts – both the canonic ((17A1) and (19A1)) and the inverse type ((17A3) and (19A3)) – seem to be fairly well distributed cross-linguistically. But as noted by Lambrecht (2001) *that*-clefts, or what he calls *it*-clefts, divide languages into types: (i) those that have it as an alternative for other focusing strategies (English and Italian), and here we add Portuguese; (ii) those that do not license it (German); (iii) those whose only construction to codify contrastive *Focus* is the *that*-cleft construction (French) (cf. Kato & Ribeiro (2009), for further details). Although, in principle, BP can have all these forms, historically the tendency is to become like French. The written language still registers the *wh*-clefts<sup>12</sup>, while the preference in the vernacular is for the *that*-clefts (cf. Fernandes 2007; Kato & Ribeiro 2009, Kato 2013).

#### 4. RECENT INNOVATIONS IN BP

Duarte (1993) and Lopes-Rossi (1996) had noticed that the twenty century BP started to drop the copula in cleft questions, and Kato & Raposo (1996) assumed that the copula dropping occurred in the inverse *wh*-cleft type (21a). Kato & Ribeiro (2009) reconsider this assumption and propose that copula dropping occurred in sentence initial position, namely in the canonic cleft type (21b), arguing that copula drop in other cases always occurred sentence-initially (ex. (21)).

(21) a. *Quem (é) que chegou?* (inverse cleft)

who (is) that arrived

“Who has arrived?”

b. *(É) quem que chegou?* (canonic cleft)

is who that arrived

“Who has arrived?”

<sup>11</sup> In her experimental work Fernandes (2007) has found out that Portuguese speakers have preference for *wh*-clefts, while Brazilians prefer *that*-clefts.

<sup>12</sup> The *wh*-questions derived from pseudo-clefts, however, *did* not last until MEP and MBP, and we will not discuss them in this work (cf. Lopes-Rossi, 1996).

(i) *Quem foi o que* esteve em casa?

- (22) a. *Seu cabelo \*(é) lindo!*  
 “Your hair \* (is) beautiful! “  
 b. *(É) lindo o seu cabelo!*  
 is beautiful the your hair  
 “Your hair is beautiful.”

Kato and Ribeiro also noticed that in declarative focalized sentences, the same phenomenon occurred, resulting in what they call the reduced cleft sentences. They proposed, moreover, that EP does not introduce this innovation due to the fact that the *consecutio temporum* (tense agreement) is maintained in this variety in both declarative sentences and wh-questions. In BP the copula undergoes a grammaticalization process becoming invariable in tense, leading to its possible erasure.

- (23) a. *(É) A MARIA que chegou.* (MBP)  
 is the Maria that arrived  
 “It is Maria that arrived.”  
 b. *\*(Foi) A MARIA que chegou.* (MEP)  
 was the Maria that arrived  
 “It was Maria that arrived.”

- (24) a. *(É) QUEM que chegou?* (MBP)  
 is who that arrived  
 Who has arrived?”  
 b. *\*(Foi) QUEM que chegou?* (MEP)  
 was who that arrived  
 “Who has arrived?”

In declaratives, the copula can also be invariable in number:

- (25) a. *(É) OS MENINOS que saíram.* (MBP)  
 is the boys that left  
 “It was the boys that left.”  
 b. *(Foram) OS MENINOS que saíram.* (MEP)

were the boys that left

“It was the boys that left.”

Though it is not easy to find structures such as (23a) in adults, it is not hard to find them in children’s discourse<sup>13</sup>.

(26) a. *É QUEM que tá tocando o violão?* (Luana, child: 02; 03. 22)

is who that is playing the guitar

‘Who is playing guitar?’

b. *É QUE que tá gravando?* (Luana, child: 02;03. 22)

is what that is recording

“What is being recorded?”

Considering our hypothesis that BP is becoming a language like French, we can see what happens in its questions, and what we find are sentences corresponding to (27) as its norm:

(27) *C’est 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?”

Though it is hard to find these null copula cleft types in written or oral *corpus*, today it is not difficult to hear such reduced forms both in questions and in declarative focalization sentences (cf. Lopes-Rossi, 1996; Kato & Mito (2005):

(28) a. *QUE que eu faço?*

what that I do

“What do I do?”

b. *QUE que é isso?*

what **that** is that

“What is that?”

---

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Adriana Lessa (2003) for these data.

- (29) a. *A MARIA que fala inglês.*  
 the Mary that speaks English  
 “It is Mary that speaks English.”
- b. *O CARRO DO JOÃO que eu vi na rua.*  
 the car of John that I saw on the street  
 “It was John’s car that I saw on the street.”

Again, questions such as (30) are common in present day French:

- (30) *OÙ que t’ás mis les oranges?* (apud Noonan 1989)  
 where that you-have put the oranges  
 “Where have you put the oranges?”

Another innovation, found only in MBP, is the structure WH-SV and FOCUS-SV, seen in section 1 of this paper. We’ve assumed until now Kato & Raposo’s (1996), according to which, in BP, with the loss of the Null Subject (cf. Duarte 1995; Kato & Duarte 2002), the Focus moves to Spec,FP and the subject moves to Spec,TP to obey (comply with?) the EPP. The derivation would have nothing to do with cleft structures.

- (31) [<sub>FocP</sub> Wh/Focus [<sub>TP</sub> Subject V+T [<sub>VP</sub> Subject [  $\forall$  O .]]]]

But, the analysis which we are endorsing here for Wh-SV (cf. Kato & Ribeiro, 2009; Kato 2013; Kato 2014a and Kato 2014b) would have the reduced cleft as its source, through a stylistic rule which erases the complementizer, a solution also suggested by Noonan (1989) for Québec French. The delay of its appearance in written corpora is also understandable as the reduced cleft appeared only in the spoken language, and the WHSV would be a stylistic variant more acceptable in written form.

- (32) 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)

Studying Portuguese diachronically, Lopes-Rossi (1996) shows that the last two innovations in BP appear simultaneously at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. And a change to be noticed is the *wh-in-situ* pattern preceding the last two innovations. It is also to be noted that it is in the period when the canonic *that*-cleft is introduced that the order VS is lost in BP<sup>14</sup>.

**Fig 1<sup>15</sup>**

<b>OP &amp; CIP</b> 14 <sup>th</sup> -18 <sup>th</sup>	WhVS	Wh é (o) que				
<b>EP</b> 18 <sup>th</sup> -20 <sup>th</sup>	WhVS	-----	Wh é que VS/SV	wh-in-situ		
<b>BP</b> 19 <sup>th</sup> -20	-----	-----	Wh é que SV	wh-in-situ	Wh que SV	Wh SV

(adapted from Lopes-Rossi 1996)

We defend that Wh-que-SV and WH-SV are stylistic variants, with the latter being preferred in the written style. Kato (2014a and Kato 2014b) refers to the stylistic rule of haplology<sup>16</sup>, which eliminates similar syllables<sup>17</sup>.

It is worth referring to what Kato (2014b:9) says about previous empirical results:

What is revealing in the empirical work with data is not so much the presence of something in the corpora, but its absence, or low frequency. When the reduced clefts start to appear, the WhSV pattern also starts to appear, but while in spoken language the reduced type has around 20% of the wh-questions, the WHSV cases have around 15.0 %. In the written corpora, the reduced type (Wh-que-SV) barely appears ( 7.9%), contrary to the WHSV, which has around 12.3 % in one corpus (cf. Lopes-Rossi 1996) and 45% in the newspaper corpus (cf. Kato & Mito 2005). The canonic cleft type, on the other hand, seems to be the most stigmatized, appearing only in “motherese” and child language. Adults tend to erase the

<sup>14</sup> Duarte (1993) had noticed this correlation, but Lopes-Rossi (1996) argued against it as EP also introduced *that*-cleft questions but did not lose the VS order.

<sup>15</sup> OP= Old Portuguese; CIP=Classic Portuguese

<sup>16</sup> For a good discussion of the phenomenon of haplology cf. Nevins (2012).

<sup>17</sup> Duarte (1993) had observed that the first occurrences of WHSV were with cases of *wh*-adjuncts, and Kato (2014) notices that these are mostly cases of identical syllables (Com *que que*, De *que que*, Por *que que*, etc.

copula. Our assumption is, therefore, that the three types are structurally the same, and variation depends on stylistic factors.”

Kato (2014) summarizes Lopes-Rossi’s Figure as follows, with the last vertical cell containing the latest variants in BP *wh*-questions and focalization structures:

**Fig 2**<sup>18</sup>

Wh/FocusVS	Wh/Focus é que VS/ SV	Wh/Focus-in-situ	(É) Wh/Focus (que) SV
OP/EP	OP/EP/BP	%MEP/MBP	MBP

(adapted from Lopes-Rossi 1996)

## 5. EXPLAINING THE SINGLE STRUCTURAL CHANGE

Looking at Fig 2, we notice that a major change occurs in MBP: while in the previous period the Focus and the *wh*-element was fronted, namely to the left periphery of the sentence, in MBP and MEP the *wh*-element and the *Foci* start to appear *in-situ*.

- (32) Q: *QUE CARRO comprou o Paulo?* OP/EP  
 which car bought the Paulo  
 “Which car has Paulo bought?”
- Q2: *QUE CARRO é que o Paulo comprou?* MBP/ MEP  
 which car is that the Paulo bought  
 “Which car was it that Paul bought?”
- A1: *O NOVO FIAT comprou o Paulo, não o Honda Fit.* OP/EP  
 the new Fiat bought the Paulo, not the Honda Fit  
 “The new Fiat did Paul buy, not the Honda Fit.”
- A2: *O NOVO FIAT foi o que o Paulo comprou, não o Honda Fit.* OP/EP  
 the new Fiat was what the Paulo bought, not the Honda Fit  
 “The new Fiat was what Paul bought, not the Honda Fit.”

<sup>18</sup> The % symbol indicates restricted acceptance.

- (33) Q1: *O Paulo comprou QUE CARRO?* MBP/ %MEP  
 the Paulo bought which car  
 “Which car did Paul buy?”
- Q2: *É QUAL CARRO que o Paulo comprou?* MBP/ \*MEP  
 is which car that the Paulo bought  
 “Which car was it that Paul bought?”
- A1: *O Paulo comprou O NOVO FIAT, não o Honda Fit.* MBP/ MEP  
 the Paulo bought the new Fiat, not the Honda fit  
 “Paul bought the new Fiat not the Honda Fit.”
- A2. *É O NOVO FIAT que o Paulo comprou, não o Honda Fit.* MBP/MEP  
 is the new Fiat that the Paulo bought not the Honda Fit  
 “It was the new Fiat that Paul bought, not the Honda Fit.”

I have been using the terms *in-situ Foci* and *wh-in-situ*, but we still have to clarify what we mean by these notions. Let us start with the old *wh*-parameter in Huang (1982), according to which languages are parametrized according to whether the *wh*-element is moved overtly to CP, or only covertly at LF, remaining overtly *in-situ* in syntax. A completely different view is explored in Miyagawa (2001), who claims that in English the *wh*-phrase is associated with both *Q*-features (or Force 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.

I will assume with Kato (2013) that MBP is like Japanese, with a null *Q* in Force, and a short *wh*-movement<sup>19</sup> to a lower projection, which I assume to be at the edge of vP, in accordance with Belletti’s (2004, 2006) proposal, repeated here as (34):

(34) [<sub>ForceP</sub> Q. [ TP.....[<sub>TopP</sub> ...[<sub>FocP</sub> ...[<sub>TopP</sub> ... [vP [VP ]]]]]]

(35) a. *O Paulo comprou QUE CARRO?*

b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> Q [ TP<sub>0</sub> Paulo comprou[<sub>FocP</sub> QUE CARRO [vP ~~o Paulo comprou~~ [VP ~~comprou que~~

<sup>19</sup> Or, using a more recent notion for movement, we have the “internal merge” of *wh*-element in Chomsky(2007). What we have normally been calling “merge” would be external merge” in Chomsky’s (2007) terms.

~~carro~~ ]]]]

(36) a. *O Paulo deu pra Ana QUE CARRO?*

b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> Q. [<sub>TP</sub> o Paulo deu [<sub>TopP</sub> pra Ana [<sub>FocP</sub> QUE CARRO [<sub>VP</sub> ~~o Paulo deu~~ [<sub>VP</sub> ~~deu que~~  
~~carro~~  
~~pra Ana~~]]]]]]]

(37) a. *O Paulo deu QUE CARRO pra Ana?*

*the Paulo gave which car to Ana?*

*“Which car did Paul give Ana?”*

b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> Q. [<sub>TP</sub> o Paulo deu [<sub>FocP</sub> QUE CARRO [<sub>TopP</sub> pra Ana [<sub>VP</sub> ~~o Paulo deu~~ [<sub>VP</sub> ~~deu que~~  
~~carro~~  
~~pra Ana~~]]]]]]]

Notice that the Topic *Ana* can appear on either side of the Focus in BP, and it is part of the presupposition.

The Focus in declarative sentences can likewise appear at the edge of vP, with the Topic on either side.

Context question:

(38) *O Paulo deu QUE CARRO pra Ana?*

*the Paul gave which car to Ana*

*“Which car did Paul give Ana?”*

(39) a. *O Paulo deu UM NOVO FIAT para a Ana.*

b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> Decl. [<sub>TP</sub> o Paulo [<sub>T</sub> deu [<sub>FocP</sub> UM NOVO FIAT [<sub>TopP</sub> pra Ana [<sub>VP</sub> ~~o Paulo deu~~ [<sub>VP</sub>  
~~deu~~  
~~um novo Fiat pra Ana~~]]]]]]]]]

(40) a. *O Paulo deu pra Ana UM NOVO FIAT.*

b. [<sub>ForceP</sub> Decl. [<sub>TP</sub> o Paulo [<sub>T</sub> deu [<sub>TopP</sub> pra Ana [<sub>FocP</sub> UM NOVO FIAT [<sub>VP</sub> ~~o Paulo deu~~ [<sub>VP</sub>  
~~deu~~  
~~um novo Fiat pra Ana~~]]]]]]]]]

The last type to be examined is the canonic cleft, which detonated the new innovations in MBP.

- (41) a. *É QUEM que toca violão?*  
 is who that plays guitar  
 “Who plays the guitar?”  
 b. *É A MARIA que toca violão.*

Let us derive the declarative sentence (41b).

- (42) a. Input sentence: [TP A Maria [T' toca [VP a Maria toca [VP toca violão]]]]]  
 b. Merge of Finite complementizer :  
 [Finite que [TP A Maria [T' toca [VP ~~a Maria toca~~ [VP ~~toca~~-violão]]]]]  
 c. Movement of *a Maria* to Spec,Focus:  
 [FocusP A MARIA [Finite que [TP ~~A Maria~~ [T' toca [VP ~~a Maria toca~~ [VP ~~toca~~-violão]]]]]]]  
 d. Merge of the copula:  
 [VP é [FocusP A MARIA [Finite que [TP ~~A Maria~~ [T' toca [VP ~~a Maria toca~~ [VP ~~toca~~-violão]]]]]]]  
 e. Merge of the silent Finite and Force operators and spell-out:  
 [ForceP ∅ [Finite ∅ [ é A MARIA que toca violao]]]

Summing up, what we had when we lost the pattern FocusVS and the inverse kinds of clefts was the loss of the Left Periphery position for the *Focus* Projection and the appearance of a new *Focus* position at the edge of vP.

The subsequent changes, which were described in section 4 did not affect syntax: a) the morphological change, or grammaticalization, turning the verbal ending of the copula invariable, and b) phonological changes which produced the reduced cleft type, and the WH-SV type, which we assumed to result from a stylistic rule of haplology.

Kato (2014b) summarizes the changes adding a line in Fig. 2.

**Fig 3**

a) WhVS	b) Wh é que SV	c) wh-in-situ	d) (É) Wh (que) SV
---------	-------------------	---------------	--------------------

OP/CIP/EP	CIP/EP/BP	EP/BP	BP
<b>Long wh- movement</b>	<b>Long wh-movement</b>	<b>Short Wh-movement</b>	<b>Short Wh-movement</b>

(apud Kato, 2014b)

From (a) to (b) Portuguese is still a sort of V2 grammar, though with no more thematic verb in second position, but in (b) the second position is now reduced to the copula, with the Focus and WH still moving to the left periphery. In (c) and (d) the WH and the Focus undergo only a short movement to the vP periphery.

## 6. DIACHRONIC EVIDENCE FOR THE “STRUCTURAL” WORD ORDER CHANGE

In this section we present some empirical evidence of the structural change that Portuguese underwent from Old Portuguese (OP) to MEP and MBP.

- Long *Wh*- movement

(43) a. *COMO* posso eu seer monge? (WHVS) (FLOS, 14th )  
 how can I be monk  
 “How can I be a monk?”

b. *QUE* he o que dizes, irmãã? (Inverse *wh*-cleft) (DSG, 14th)  
 what is what say (you) sister  
 “What is it that you say, sister?”

c. *E QUANDO* é que são Relativos? (Inverse *that*-cleft) (Argote, 17th c.)  
 and when is that are Relatives  
 “And when is it that they are Relatives?”

- Long *Focus*-movement

(44) a. *AQUESTO* he o que todos devemos a fazer. (Inverse *wh*-cleft) (DSG, 14th c.)  
 that is what everyone should to do  
 “That is what everyone should do”

b. *ELE* he o que tempera a sanha. (Inverse *wh*-cleft) (DSG, 14th)  
 he is what seasons the rage  
 “He is who seasons the rage”

- c. *A DEMANDA DO SANTO GRAAL é que*, em tam mostrará a estes homees [...] (Inverse *that*-cleft) (DSGraal, 15th)  
 the quest of.the Holy Grail is that so will.show to these men”  
 “THE QUEST FOR THE HOLY GRAIL will then show these men [...]”

It should be observed that all the long-movement types appear as early as OP: Wh-VS, Inverse *wh*-clefts and Inverse *that*-clefts. But inverse *that*-clefts are the last form to appear, and the only one that remains until MBP. The other two types ceased to appear after the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

- Short *wh*-movement

- (45) a. *Mas dizia-lhe O QUÊ ?* (PE spoken language, 2<sup>nd</sup> half, 19<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 but said -cl. What  
 “But what did you tell him?”
- b. *O santo é padroeiro DE QUE?* (PE) spoken language, Port. Fund., 20<sup>th</sup> cent.)  
 the saint is patron of what  
 “What is the saint patron of?”
- c. *...você pensava EM QUÊ na sua vida?* (BP TV 20<sup>th</sup> century)  
 you thought in what in your life  
 “What did you think about in your life?”
- d. *...mas faz O QUE com essa grana?* “ (BP TV, 20<sup>th</sup> century)  
 but does what with this money  
 “What do you do with this money?”

- Short Focus-movement

- (46) a. *foi VOSSA EMINÊNCIA quem me conduziu à presença de Sua Alteza Real*  
 was Your Eminence who me took to.the presence of Your Highness Royal  
 “It was Your Eminence who took me to the presence of Your Royal Highness.”  
 (PB canonic *wh*-cleft) (Alorna, 18th c.)
- b. *É O REI LEGÍTIMO que* devemos opor ao usurpador.  
 is the king legitimate that (we) should oppose to the usurper  
 “It is the legitimate king that we have to oppose to the usurper.”  
 (PB canonic *that*-cleft) (Alorna, 18th c.)
- c. *É NAS MÃOS DE VOSSA EMINÊNCIA que* êles depositam hoje a

is in the hands of Your eminence that they deposit today the  
sorte da Igreja e da França destiny of.the Church and of France  
“It is in Your Eminence’s hands that they deposit the destiny of the Church and of France.”  
(PB canonic *that-* cleft) (Alorna, 18th c.)

Short *Focus*-movement appears in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and sets the Modern grammar, both in MEP and MBP. But short *Wh*-movement data are still rare in written language, perhaps still stylistically stigmatized.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In this paper we reexamined previous studies of the author, or author plus collaborators, on two topics apparently unrelated: declarative *Focus* structures and *wh*-questions in Brazilian Portuguese. The hypothesis that they are structurally related was strongly supported by empirical diachronic and comparative data, and could also be sustained theoretically assuming Belletti (2004), who claims that the same kind of discourse projections proposed in Rizzi (1997), at the Left Periphery of the sentence, can be found in natural languages at the edge of vP.

The basic change that affected *Focus* and *wh*-questions was found to be in the fact that, in both *Focus* and *wh*-structures, long movement was lost and short movement was generalized. This change affected both varieties of Portuguese, but, while EP maintains the old conservative forms in variation with the new ones, Brazilian Portuguese has more radically dropped the ones with long movement and even innovated using the new ones as triggers.

Methodologically, our studies faced difficulties with data, especially with the recent innovations, still often stigmatized by speakers, but the fact that we claimed *Focus* and *wh*-questions to be the same phenomena, and checked by the same syncretic head F, helped us filling in data gaps. Thus the canonic cleft is commonly found in declarative focalized material, but difficult to be found in canonic *wh*-clefts. We often had to construct minimal pairs ( *É A MARIA que chegou/ ?É QUEM que chegou?* ), a resource which proved useful.

As a final consideration, we can say that in both dialects we find variation in both *wh*-questions and *Focus* structures, but while in EP variation is between old and new structural

forms, in BP variation is essentially phonological. There is, nonetheless, one variant that is shared by MEP and MBP, and that is the canonical cleft type (*QUEM é que chegou?/ A MARIA é que chegou.*).

## REFERENCES

1. AMBAR, M. (1992) *Para uma Sintaxe da Inversão SUJEITO-VERBO em Português*. Lisboa: Edições Colibri.
2. 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.
3. BELLETTI, A. (2006) Answering with a ‘cleft’: the role of the null subject parameter and the VP periphery. In: L.Brugè, G.Giusti, N.Munaro, W.Schweikert, G.Turano (eds) *Cafoscarina, Venezia*. 63-82.
4. CHOMSKY, N. (1971) Deep structure, surface structure and semantic interpretation. In: D. Steinberg and L. Jakobovits (eds) *Semantics: an interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics and psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 183-216.
5. CHOMSKY, N. (2007) Approaching UG from below. In: U. Sauerland and H-M. Gärtner (eds) *Interfaces+Recursion =Language?* Berlin/New York: Mouton. 1-29.
6. 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.
7. DUARTE, M.E.L.(1995) A Perda do Princípio “Evite Pronome” no Português Brasileiro. UNICAMP: Ph.D. Dissertation.
8. FERNANDES, F.R. (2007) Ordem, focalização e preenchimento em Português: Sintaxe e prosódia. UNICAMP: Ph.D. Dissertation.
9. HUANG, C-T James (1982) *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. MIT: Ph.D. Dissertation.
10. KATO, MARY A. (2013) Deriving “wh-in-situ” through movement in Brazilian Portuguese. In: Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Angel Gimenez-Fernandez, Javier Martin-Gonzales e Mariano Reyes-Tejedor (eds). *Information Structure and Agreement*. John Benjamins: 175-191.
11. KATO, MARY A. (2014a) The role of the copula in the development of focus constructions in BP. In: M.H. Côté e Eric Mathew (eds) *Variation within and across Romance Languages.: selected papers from the 41 LSRL*, Ottawa, John Benjamins. 297-314

12. KATO, MARY A. (2014b) WH-movement in the history of Brazilian Portuguese. [http://www.ciscl.unisi.it/doc/doc\\_pub/STiL--vol5](http://www.ciscl.unisi.it/doc/doc_pub/STiL--vol5). 59-76. (digital version 1-16)
13. KATO, MARY A. (2015) Focus and *Wh*-questions in Brazilian Portuguese. In: R.T. Cacoullos, N. Dion and A. Lapierre (eds) *Linguistic Variation: confronting fact and theory*. New York;Routledge. 111-139.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. KATO, MARY A. and Carlos Mito (2005) A multi-evidence study of European and Brazilian wh-questions. In: Stephen Kepser and Marga Reis (eds) *Linguistic Evidence: Empirical, theoretical and computational perspectives* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 3017-328.
17. 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 Benjamin.
18. LAMBRECHT, K. (2001) A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions. *Linguistics* 39(3), 463-516.
19. LESSA DE OLIVEIRA, A. (2003) Aquisição de constituintes-Qu em dois dialetos do português brasileiro. UNICAMP: MA Thesis.
20. LOPES-ROSSI, M.A. (1996) A Sintaxe Diacrônica das Interrogativas-Q do Português. UNICAMP: Ph.D. Dissertation.
21. MIYAGAWA, S. (2001) The EPP, Scrambling, and wh-in situ. In: *Ken Hale*. Michael Kenstowicz (ed). *A Life in Language* . CAMBRIDGE, MASS: MIT PRESS. 293-338.
22. NEVINS, A. I. (2012) Haplological dissimilation at distinct stages of experience. In: J. Trommer (ed.) *The Morphology and Phonology of Experience*. Oxford University Press: 84-116.
22. NOONAN, M. (1989) Operator licensing and the case of French interrogatives, *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. University of British Columbia. Stanford Linguistics Association. 315-330.

23. RIZZI, L. (1997) The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Liliana Haegeman (ed). *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer: 281-337.
24. RIBEIRO, ILZA (1995a) O efeito V2 no português arcaico. PhD dissertation, UNICAMP.
25. RIBEIRO, ILZA. (1995b) 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.
26. URIAGEREKA, J. (1995) An F position in Western Romance. In: Karalín É. Kiss (ed.) *Discourse Configurational Languages*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press: 53-175.
27. ZUBIZARRETA, M.L. (1998) ) *Prosody, Focus and Word Order*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.