**The derivation of Latin INFL-final word order**

A discourse-neutral Latin clause is head-final in the lower part of clause: direct objects precede the lexical verb, and lexical verbs precede auxiliaries. Capitalizing on proposals made by Haegeman (2000), Mahajan (2003) and Biberauer & Roberts (2005) (among others), I will argue that the INFL-final word order in Latin discourse-neutral sentences is derived through movement of *v*P to the middle field. Sentences like (1) suggest that this large verbal chunk targets a fairly high position, viz. higher than sentential negation *non*; (2) shows that other functional elements like adverbs (e.g. *necessario* 'necessarily') can appear in between the past participle and the auxiliary as well:

(1) Et eo die tabernacula statui **passus** non **est**.

and that.ABL day.ABL tents.NOM set.up.INF.PASS permitted.NOM not he.is

'And on that day, he did not allow that tents were set up.' (= Caes. Bel. Civ. 1.81)

(2) altero **usus** necessario **est** [...].

other.ABL used.NOM necessarily.ADV he.is

'He necessarily has used the other one.' (= Cic. Pro Sestio 92)

I will argue that assuming a derivation involving movement of a large (remnant) XP has a number of advantages over accounts that (i) base-generate the INFL-final pattern or (ii) derive it by displacing the individual items contained in the verb phrase. Finally, I will also discuss sentences that exhibit the order V-O-Aux (3-4), which seem to be a violation of the soc. Final-Over-Final-Constraint ('FOFC', cf. Biberauer, Holmberg & Roberts 2010).

(3) ni **professus** indicium **foret**.

unless offered.NOM information.ACC he.were.SUBJ

'unless he gave information.' (= Tac. Ann. 6.3.1-4)

(3) [...] quod ex lege **subsortitus** iudicem non **esset**.

because from law.ABL appointed.NOM judge.ACC not he.were.SUBJ

'because he had not according to the law appointed a judge.' (= Cic. Pro Cluentio 96)