

# ON INSITUNESS AND (VERY) LOW WH-POSITIONS THE CASE OF TREVIGIANO\*

Caterina Bonan ([caterina.bonan@unige.ch](mailto:caterina.bonan@unige.ch))

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, novel data on Trevigiano (TV), a Northern Italian Romance dialect spoken in the Provincia di Treviso, are presented and analysed. The interrogative syntax TV of lies somewhere between that of more widely studied Romance languages like French (Mathieu 1999; Bošković 2000; Cheng and Rooryck 2002, among others) and Bellunese (Munaro 1995; Munaro et al. 2001; Munaro and Pollock 2005), which makes it worth studying. In this language, the uncanonical relative order of *V*-selected arguments and ‘in situ’ wh-adjuncts, along with the presence of an ‘if’-COMP that licenses ‘insituness’ in indirect questions, makes it incompatible with a *Remnant-IP Movement* analysis à la Munaro et al. 2001 (and related works) and rather calls for a *TP-internal movement* analysis of ‘in situ’ instances.

## 2. INSITUNESS IN TREVIGIANO

Like many Northern Italian Dialects (NIDs) (Poletto 1993; Munaro 1999; Manzini and Savoia 2005), TV has two series of pronouns: a declarative proclitic paradigm, and an interrogative enclitic one. In matrix questions, Subject-Clitic Inversion (*SCII*) is compulsory (1):

- (1) a. Vjen-tu al marcà co nojaltri? TV  
Come=you to.the market with us  
'Are you going to the market with us?'  
b. \* Te vjen al marcà co nojaltri? TV  
You come to.the market with us

In wh-interrogatives, both *exsituness* and *insituness* are possible in genuine questions, which makes TV similar to both Bellunese (BL) and French (FR). However, whereas TV requires for *SCII* even when the wh-phrase is ‘in situ’ (2), just like BL (Munaro 1995) (3), this construction is ruled out in FR (4):

- (2) a. A-tu visto chi? TV  
Have=you seen who  
'Who did you see?'  
b. \* Te a visto chi? TV  
You have seen who

---

\* This work was fully supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation, project n° 156160: “Optional wh-in-situ in French Interrogatives: Syntax and Prosody”. I would like to thank Ur Shlonsky and Giuliano Bocci for all the useful comments and remarks made on the (numerous) drafts of this paper. I would also like to express my gratitude to my patient informants. Of course, all errors are mine.

- (3) a. À-tu ciot qual? BL  
 Have=you taken which.one  
 'Which one did you take?'  
 b. \* Tu à ciot cual? BL  
 You have taken which.one
- (4) a. Tu as vu qui? FR  
 You have seen who  
 'Who did you see?'  
 b. \* As-tu vu qui? FR  
 Have=you seen who

Differently from BL though, TV allows for *real* 'optional insituness' - just like FR, it can license virtually all types of wh-elements 'in situ'. In BL, only *non-D-linked* wh-elements (in Pesetsky's 1987 terms) can appear 'in situ' (5c), whereas *D-linked* ones must be fronted (6c'):

- (5) a. A-tu leto cossa? TV  
 Have=you read what  
 'What did you read?'  
 b. Tu as lu quoi? FR  
 You have read what  
 c. À-tu ledést che? BL  
 Have=you read what
- (5) a'. A-tu leto cuanti libri? TV  
 Have=you read how.many books  
 'How many books did you read?'  
 b'. Tu as lu combiende livres? FR  
 You have read how many books  
 c'. \* À-tu ledést quanti libri? BL  
 Have=you read how.many books
- (6) a. Cossa a-tu leto? TV  
 What have=you read  
 'What did you read?'  
 b. Qu'as-tu lu? FR  
 What'have=you read  
 c. \* Che à-tu ledést? BL  
 What have=you read
- (6) a'. Cuanti libri a-tu leto? TV  
 How.many books have=you read  
 'How many books did you read?'  
 b'. Combien de livres as-tu lu? FR  
 How many books have=you read  
 c'. Quanti libri à-tu ledést? BL  
 How.many books have=you read

Micro-variation among Romance languages is very interesting and clearly bound to tell us more about the fine structure of the Left Periphery (*LP*). Other than the properties just

discussed, TV also displays some peculiarities in the distribution of wh-adjuncts with respect to arguments (1.1), and licenses for embedded ‘insituness’ productively (1.2).

### 2.1. Matrix questions

In TV, in the canonical declarative order, Time-adverbs naturally precede Place-adverbs, and all adverbs must follow all *V*-selected arguments (7a). The order Place>Time is at best degraded (7b). Differently, ungrammaticality arises when adverbs precede an argument (7c-d):

- (7) a. Gianni el gà magnà pomido jeriTIME al ristorantePLACE  
Gianni he has eaten apples yesterday at.the restaurant  
'Yesterday, Gianni ate apples at the restaurant'
- b. ? Gianni el gà magnà pomido al ristorantePLACE jeriTIME \_\_\_\_  
↑\_\_\_\_\_  
Gianni he has eaten apples at.the restaurant yesterday
- c. \* Gianni el gà magnà jeriTIME pomido \_\_\_\_ al ristorantePLACE  
↑\_\_\_\_\_  
Gianni he has eaten yesterday apples at.the restaurant
- d. \* Gianni el gà magnà al ristorantePLACE pomido jeriTIME \_\_\_\_  
↑\_\_\_\_\_  
Gianni he has eaten at.the restaurant apples yesterday

Unexpectedly, sentence internal wh-phrases surface moved from their base position in TV. Compare the relative positions occupied by wh-adjuncts and arguments in (8):

- (8) a. Ga-tu magnà **quando** el dolse \_\_\_\_ ?  
↑\_\_\_\_\_  
Have=you eaten when the cake  
'When did you eat the cake?'
- b. Ga-tu visto **dove** a Maria \_\_\_\_ ?  
↑\_\_\_\_\_  
Have=you seen where the Maria  
'Where did you see Maria?'
- c. Ghe ga-tu dato **a chi** a tecia \_\_\_\_ ?  
↑\_\_\_\_\_  
DAT have=you given to who the saucepan  
'Who did you give the saucepan to?'
- d. Ga-ea visto **cossa** a Maria \_\_\_\_ ?  
↑\_\_\_\_\_  
Has=she seen what the Maria  
'What did Maria see?'

Actually, the wh-phrase *can* stay in its base position in TV, but this gives rise to *echo* questions – the interrogative syntax is lost all together (no *SCI*) (9):

- (9) a. Te gà magnà el dolse quando?! ECHO  
You have eaten the cake when  
'You ate the cake WHEN?!'
- b. Te gà visto a Maria dove?! ECHO  
You have seen the Maria where  
'You saw Maria WHERE?!'

- c. Te ghe gà dato a tecia a chi?! ECHO  
 You DAT have given the saucepan to who  
 'You gave the saucepan TO WHO?!'
- d. A Maria a gà visto cossa?! ECHO  
 The Maria she has seen what  
 'Maria saw WHAT?!'

Notice that in (8) there is no pause between the dislocated wh-element and the following DO. If the argument was right dislocated (RD), there would be a prosodic pause (#), obligatory *clitic resumption* and, if needed, gender and/or number agreement on the past participle (10):

- (10) a. O ga-tu magnà cuando, el dolse? RD  
 It have=you eaten when # the cake  
 'The cake, when did you eat?'
- b. A ga-tu vista dove, a Maria? RD  
 She have=you seen<sub>F</sub> where # the Maria  
 'Mary, where did you see?'
- c. Ghe a ga-tu data a chi, a tecia? RD  
 DAT it have=you given<sub>F</sub> to who # the saucepan  
 'The saucepan, who did you give it to?'

That the DO of sentences like (8) is not right-dislocated is also confirmed by the distributional properties of dislocated DOs of di-transitive *V*s, which can both be *followed* or *preceded* by the IO (11a) - in the absence of RD, an IO placed before the DO is out (11b)<sup>1</sup>:

- (11) a. Ghe o ga-tu regaeà **quando**, {aa Maria}, l'anel, {aa Maria} RD  
 DAT it have=you given when to.the Maria # the'ring # to.the Maria  
 'The ring, when did you give to Maria?'
- b. Ghe ga-tu regaeà **quando** \*{aa Maria} l'anel {aa Maria}?  
 DAT have=you given when to.the Maria the'ring to.the Maria  
 'When did you give Maria the ring?'

These distributional data suggest two things: (i) that in TV 'insituness' is only apparent, and (ii) that the wh-phrases of this language undergo wh-movement to a very low functional projection. In 1.2, further novel data are provided, crucially showing that in TV 'sentence internal wh-movement' is performed systematically also in embedded contexts.

## 2.2. Embedded questions

The LP of TV looks very Italian-like. In fact, superficially, TV appears to have 3 COMPs: the infinitival COMP *de* (12a), the declarative COMP *che* (12b), and the polarity COMP *se* (12c):

- (12) a. Penso **de** ndar da Toni stasera  
 Think<sub>1PS</sub> to go at Toni tonight  
 'I think I'll go to Toni's tonight'
- b. Penso **che** l vae da Toni doman  
 Think<sub>1PS</sub> that he go<sub>SUBJ</sub> at Toni tomorrow  
 'I think he'll go to Toni's tomorrow'

<sup>1</sup> I am thankful to my colleague Richard Zimmermann for this useful observation.

- c. Me domando *se* l ndarà da Toni doman  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> if he go<sub>FUT</sub> to Toni tomorrow  
 ‘I wonder whether he’ll go to Toni’s tomorrow’

Because of their distribution with respect to topics and focus, the COMPs of TV are likely to occupy the same left-peripheral positions as their Italian counterparts: *Fin*<sup>0</sup>, *Force*<sup>0</sup>, and *Int*<sup>0</sup>, respectively. Predictably, the use of *che* is extended also to long-distance questions (12b’):

- (12) b'. Cuando pensi-tu *che* l vae da Toni ?  
 When think<sub>2PS=you</sub> that he go<sub>SUBJ</sub> at Toni  
 ‘When do you think he’ll go to Toni’s?’

However, surprisingly, in TV the distribution of the ‘if’-COMP *se* is also extended to indirect wh-questions, as discussed in 1.2.1.

### 2.2.1. Indirect questions

In TV, *se* appears also in genuine indirect wh-questions when the wh-phrase is ‘in situ’ (13):

- (13) a. Me domando *se* te gà magnà cossa  
 Myself ask se you have eaten what  
 ‘I wonder what you ate’  
 b. A *se* domanda *se* l vegnarà cuando  
 She herself asks se he come<sub>FUT</sub> when  
 ‘She wonders when he’s going to come’  
 c. Voria saver *se* se catemo dove  
 Would<sub>1PS</sub> know se ourselves meet where  
 ‘I wonder where we’ll be meeting’

Here, *se* does not give rise to a yes/no interpretation - it is *semantically vacuous* and simply introduces a genuine indirect wh-question (these occurrences of the ‘if’-COMP will henceforth be referred to as *se<sub>WH</sub>*). In these constructions, the distribution of wh-adjuncts with respect to arguments patterns that observed in 1.1 for matrix clauses (14a-b):

- (14) a. Me domando *se* te gà magnà cuando i pomi \_\_\_\_  
 Myself ask se you have eaten when the apples  
 ‘I wonder when you ate the apples’  
 b. A *se* domanda *se* l piantarà dove i persegneri \_\_\_\_  
 She herself asks se he plant<sub>FUT</sub> where the peach.trees  
 ‘She wonders where he’ll plant the peach trees’

In the absence of sentence internal wh-movement, the sentences in (14) would be very marginal (15a). Notice that (14a) are not instances of RD, because they lack *clitic resumption*, to which RD is always associated in TV (15b):

- (15) a. ?? Me domando *se* te gà magnà i pomi cuando  
 Myself ask se you have eaten the apples when  
 ‘I wonder when you ate the apples’

- b. Me domando *se* te i già magnai quando, i pomi RD  
 Myself ask se you them have eaten.<sub>mascPL</sub> when # the apples  
 ‘The apples, I wonder when you ate’

Interestingly, if the *wh*-element of indirect questions is fronted to the embedded CP-domain, *se* becomes ungrammatical (16a) and *che* (‘that’) must be used instead (16b):

- (16) a. \* Me domando cosa *se* te già magnà  
 Myself ask what se you have eaten  
 ‘I wonder what you ate’  
 b. Me domando cosa che te già magnà  
 Myself ask what that you have eaten

One might wonder what the nature of this *se-che alternation* is, and whether these two COMPs are the same that introduce yes/no questions and embedded clauses, respectively - which is dealt with in section 3. To conclude, notice that the absence of indirect *se*-questions in Italian (IT), where ‘insituness’ is ruled out in the first place, is unsurprising (17a-b):

- (17) a. \* Hai mangiato cosa? IT  
 Have<sub>2PS</sub> eaten what  
 ‘What did you eat?’  
 b. \* Vorrei sapere se hai mangiato cosa IT  
 Would<sub>1PS</sub> know se have<sub>2PS</sub> eaten what

### 2.2.2. Long-distance questions

In TV, embedded ‘insituness’ is also licensed in long-distance questions (18), which alternates freely with *wh*-fronting to the matrix LP (18a’-b’):

- (18) a. Pensi-tu *che* vegnarà catarne chi?  
 Think=you that come<sub>FUT</sub> see.us who  
 ‘Who do you think will visit us?’  
 b. Pensi-tu *che* i voje magnar cosa?  
 Think=you that they want<sub>SUBJ</sub> eat what  
 ‘What do you think they want to eat?’  
 (18) a’. Chi pensi-tu *che* vegnarà catarne?  
 Who think=you that come<sub>FUT</sub> see.us  
 ‘Who do you think will visit us?’  
 b’. Cossa pensi-tu *che* i voje magnar?  
 What think=you that they want<sub>SUBJ</sub> eat  
 ‘What do you think they want to eat?’

The sentence internal *wh*-movement seen in matrix (1.1) and indirect (1.2.3) ‘insituness’ is clearly at play also in long-distance questions (19):

- (19) a. Pensi-tu *che* magnaremo quando i fighi \_\_\_?  
 Think=you that eat<sub>1PP.FUT</sub> when the figues

- ‘When do you think we will eat the figues?’  
 b. Pensi-tu che a voje metar dove i piteri \_\_\_?  
 Think=you that she want<sub>SUBJ</sub> put where the vases  
 ‘Where do you think she wants to put the vases?’

In the absence of wh-movement, (19) are ungrammatical (20a), unless RD is performed (20b), or the sentence lacks *SCII* and is associated to an echo reading (20c):

- (20) a. \* Pensi-tu che magnaremo i fighi cuando?  
 Think=you that eat<sub>1PP.FUT</sub> the figues when  
 ‘When do you think we will eat the figues?’  
 b. Pensi-tu che i magnaremo cuando, i fighi? RD  
 Think=you that them eat<sub>1PP.FUT</sub> when # the figues  
 ‘The figues, when do you think we’re going to eat?’  
 c. Te pensi che magnaremo i fighi cuando?! ECHO  
 You think that eat<sub>1PP.FUT</sub> the figues when  
 ‘You think we’re going to eat the figues WHEN?!’

### 2.3. Cross-linguistic evidence

Single ‘insituness’ is not a TV-specific option but rather quite a common Romance phenomenon that has been attested at least in: French (Obenauer 1994, Boeckx 1999, Mathieu 1999, Bošković 2000, Adli 2006, Baunaz 2011, Poletto and Pollock 2009); Spanish (Jiménez 1997, Uribe-Etxebarria 2003, Reglero 2007, Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2012); Brazilian and European Portuguese (Cheng and Rooryck 2000;2002, Ambar and Veloso 2001, Pyres and Taylor 2009, Kato 2013, Silva and Grolla 2016); North and Central Venetan dialects (Poletto 1993, Poletto and Vannelli 1993, Munaro 1999, Munaro et al. 2001, Manzini and Savoia 2005, Poletto and Pollock 2009;2015); Lombard dialects (Manzini and Savoia 2005;2011, Manzini 2014, Poletto and Pollock 2004-2015) and Swiss Italian dialects (Lurà 1987, Poletto and Pollock 2004-2015).

Whereas in Spanish and Portuguese ‘insituness’ has been claimed to be felicitous only in ‘strongly presuppositional’ contexts (Pyres and Taylor 2009, Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2012), the same is not true in French, where only clause-final ‘in situ’ wh-phrases are typically presuppositional, whereas clause-medial ‘in situ’ wh-phrases are not (Baunaz 2011, Baunaz and Patin 2011). As a consequence, sentence internal wh-movement of ‘in situ’ wh-phrases seems to be at play not only in TV but also in FR (21):

- (21) a. T’as mis quand le pain dans le placard \_\_\_? FR  
 You’ve put when the bread in the cupboard  
 ‘When did you put the bread in the cupboard?’  
 b. T’as mis le pain dans le placard quand?  
 You’ve put the bread in the cupboard when

Differently, in Spanish (Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria 2012) and Bellunese (Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto and Pollock 2009;2015) the ‘in situ’ wh-element must always be sentence-final for the sentence to be well-formed.

The possibility of licensing ‘insituness’ in genuine long-distance questions is also attested in Brazilian Portuguese (*BrazP*) (Kato 2013) (22):

- (22) Maria pensa *que* o Joao comprou o quê? BrazP  
 Mary thinks that the John bought what  
 ‘What does Mary think John bought?’

The same is true for the varieties of French spoken in France and Switzerland, where embedded ‘insituness’ is ruled out in indirect *wh*-questions (23a), but is indeed felicitous in long-distance questions (23b), as claimed in Obenauer (1994) and recently confirmed experimentally by Tual (2017):

- (23) a. ?? Marie se demande [ Paul a invité qui ]  
 Mary herself asks Paul has invited who  
 ‘Mary wonders who Paul invited’  
 b. Jean a dit [ que Marie a invité qui ]?  
 John has said that Mary has invited who  
 ‘Who did John said Mary invited?’

Finally, the (although contested) presence of an ‘if’-COMP similar to *se<sub>WH</sub>* has already been observed in Belgian French (*BelgFR*) (Boeckx et al. 2000) (24a), in European Portuguese (*EurP*) (Cheng and Rooryck 2000) (24b), and in Brazilian Portuguese (Kato 2013) (24c):

- (24) a. Pierre a demandé *si* tu as vu qui BelgFR  
 Pierre has asked if you have seen who  
 ‘Pierre asked who you saw’  
 b. O Joao perguntou *se* tu compraste o quê EurP  
 The John asked if you bought what  
 ‘John asked what you bought’  
 c. Eu me perguntei *se* o Joao comprou o quê BrazP  
 I myself asked if the John bought what  
 ‘I wondered what John bought’

The examples from this section clearly show that the TV data are not unique, and that a systematic cross-linguistic study of Romance interrogatives is needed to better understand *how* and *when* ‘insituness’ is licensed, both in matrix and in embedded contexts.

### 3. LOW(ER) LANDING SITES FOR WH-MOVEMENT

The data presented in section 2 suggest that in TV there must be (i) a sentence internal *wh*-projection that is targeted by ‘in situ’ *wh*-phrases, and (ii) at least one left-peripheral *wh*-projection headed by *che* and / or *se* in indirect *wh*-questions. This is discussed in 2.1-2.

#### 3.1. IP-internal ‘little whP’

The *wh*-movement of ‘in situ’ instances discussed in 1.1-3 appears to target an *IP*-internal *wh*-projection. Let us call it *whP* (‘little whP’) (25):

- (25) a. Si-tu [IP ndà [<sub>whP</sub> cuando ... [VP al marcà \_\_\_\_ ]]]?  
 Are=you gone when to.the market  
 ‘When did you go to the market?’



- b. Ga-tu [IP posà [whP dove ... [VP i ociai \_\_\_\_ ]]]?  
 Have=you put where the glasses  
 ‘Where did you put the glasses?’

To understand where *whP* is located, let us observe the distribution of sentence internal *wh*-phrases in long-distance and indirect *wh*-questions - they clearly target a position that is lower than the position targeted by the finite *V* (26):

- (26) a. Pensi-tu che Toni el vegnarà **quando** da nojaltri?  
 Think=you that Toni he come<sub>FUT</sub> when at ours  
 ‘When do you think Toni will come over?’  
 b. El vol saver se me mare a vegnarà **quando** da ti  
 He wants know<sub>se<sub>WH</sub></sub> my mother she come<sub>FUT</sub> when at yours  
 ‘He wants to know when my mother will come to your place’

The questions in (25-26) would be ungrammatical if *quando* occupied any other structural position. It seems safe to suggest that *whP* must lie in *vP* (Belletti 2004) (26a’-b’):

- (26) a’. Pensi-tu che [SubjP Toni [Subj° el [TP vegnarà [whP **quando** [VP ts tv da nojaltri \_\_\_\_ ]]]]?  
 b’. El vol saver se [SubjP me mare [Subj° a [TP vegnarà [whP **quando** [VP ts tv da ti \_\_\_\_ ]]]]

*whP* is very likely the focal position that was called *FocP* in Belletti (2004) (27):

- (27) ... [vP [whP/FocP **wh-phrase** [wh° [TopicP [Top° [VP [V° \_\_\_\_ ]]]]]]

Claiming that the targeted landing site is a focal position pairs *IP*-internal *wh*-movement to left-peripheral *wh*-movement to *FocusP*, which is theoretically desirable.

Insituness has already been claimed to target an *IP*-internal position in Japanese by Miyagawa (2001), and a similar proposal has been made for Brazilian Portuguese by Kato (2013), who also takes ‘insituness’ to target a functional projection in the *vP*-area. Also Manzini (2014) briefly suggests a derivation of the sort for NIDs, contra Manzini and Savoia (2005;2011), who took sentence internal *wh*-phrases to stay in their argumental position in NIDs. An analysis like (27) could be extended to FR as well, as this language clearly shows *wh*-movement within the *IP*-area in highly presuppositional contexts, as in (21). Differently from FR though, TV allows for the unmarked declarative order only in echo questions, whose syntax is clearly not interrogative (28a). Following Kato’s (2013) proposal concerning the underlying structure of echo questions in Brazilian Portuguese, one could plausibly consider the echo questions of TV as *elliptical questions*, truncated at least from the embedded *Force*<sup>o</sup> upwards (28b):

- (28) a. Te gà magnà el dolse quando?! ECHO  
 You have eaten the cake when  
 ‘You ate the cake WHEN?!’  
 b. [CP ... [TP ~~te~~ ~~disi~~ [ForceP(emb) ~~ehe~~ [TP te gà magnà el dolse quando ]]]?!  
 You say that you have eaten the cake when

Regardless of the derivation that one posits for TV echo questions, their peculiarities are bound to tell more about the syntax of genuine ‘in situ’ questions, whose sentence-internal wh-phrases clearly occupy a different structural position.

### 3.2. Low left-peripheral *WhP*

Despite the morpho-phonological equivalence,  $se_{WH}$  is different from its yes/no counterpart (henceforth,  $se_{Y/N}$ ), and appears to realize a lower left-peripheral head - they are two distinct COMPs heading two different functional projections. The same is true for *che* (‘that’) - even at a first glance, it is clear that the *che* of ‘ex situ’ indirect wh-questions lies way lower than its declarative homophonous. To understand where the two ‘if’- and ‘that’-COMPs of TV sit in the structure, let us observe their distribution(s) with respect to *topics* and *focus*:

- (i) a topic like *sto libro* (‘this book’) can either undergo Clitic Dislocation (*CID*) to the left (29a) or the right (29b), or directly precede (29c) or follow (29d)  $se_{Y/N}$ :

- (29) a. [Sto libro], me domando *se* te o g\`a za leto  
This book myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{Y/N}$  you it have already read  
‘I wonder whether you’ve already read this book’  
b. Me domando *se* te o g\`a za leto, [sto libro]  
Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{Y/N}$  you it have already read this book  
c. Me domando, [sto libro], *se* te o g\`a za leto  
Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book  $se_{Y/N}$  you it have already read  
d. Me domando *se*, [sto libro], te o g\`a za leto  
Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{Y/N}$  this book you it have already read

- (ii) when the wh-element is ‘in situ’, a topic like *sto libro* can undergo *CID* to the left (30a) or to the right (30b), or it can precede  $se_{WH}$  directly (30c). If it is placed after  $se_{WH}$ , the sentence is degraded (30d):

- (30) a. [Sto libro], me domando *se* te ghe o g\`a regae\`a **a chi**  
This book myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{WH}$  you DAT it have given to whom  
‘I wonder who you gave this book to’  
b. Me domando *se* te ghe o g\`a regae\`a **a chi**, [sto libro]  
Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{WH}$  you DAT it have given to who this book  
c. Me domando, [sto libro], *se* te ghe o g\`a regae\`a **a chi**  
Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book  $se_{WH}$  you DAT it have given to who  
d. ?? Me domando *se*, [sto libro], te ghe o g\`a regae\`a **a chi**  
Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{WH}$  this book you DAT it have given to who

- (iii) when the wh-element is ‘ex situ’, a topic like *sto libro* can undergo *CID* to the left (31a) or the right (31b), or it can precede the wh-element directly (31c). If placed between the wh-element and the COMP *che*, the sentence is very degraded (31d), and degraded if it follows the COMP (31e):

- (31) a. [Sto libro], me domando **dove** *che* te o g\`a leto  
This book myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> where *che* you it have read  
‘I wonder where you read this book’  
b. Me domando dove *che* te o g\`a leto, [sto libro]  
Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> where *che* you it have read this book

- c. Me domando, [sto libro], dove *che* te o g a leto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book where *che* you it have read
- d. ?? Me domando dove, [sto libro], *che* te o g a leto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> where this book *che* you it have read
- e. ? Me domando dove *che*, [sto libro], te o g a leto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> where *che* this book you it have read

(iv) only *se<sub>Y/N</sub>* can be *surrounded* by topics (32a); whereas this is never the case for the COMPs of indirect ‘in situ’ (32b) and ‘ex situ’ (32c) questions:

- (32) a. Me domando, [sto libro], *se*, [jeri], te o g a leto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book *se<sub>Y/N</sub>* yesterday you it have read  
 ‘I wonder if you read this book yesterday’
- b. \* Me domando, [sto libro], *se*, [jeri], o g a leto chi  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book *se<sub>WH</sub>* yesterday it has read who  
 ‘I wonder who read this book yesterday’
- c. \* Me domando, [sto libro], chi *che*, [jeri], o g a leto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book who *che* yesterday it has read

(v) a *focus* can only follow *se<sub>Y/N</sub>* (33), whereas it must precede *se<sub>WH</sub>* in indirect wh-questions with ‘insituness’ (34) and precede the wh-phrase+*che* cluster in indirect questions when the wh-element is ‘ex situ’ (35):

- (33) a. Me domando *se* STO LIBRO te g a leto (no staltro)  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> *se<sub>Y/N</sub>* THIS BOOK you have read (NEG the.other)  
 ‘THIS BOOK I wonder if you read (not the other one)’
- b. \* Me domando STO LIBRO *se* te g a leto (no staltro)  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> THIS BOOK *se<sub>Y/N</sub>* you have read (NEG the.other)
- (34) a. Me domando STO LIBRO *se* o g a leto chi  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> THIS BOOK *se<sub>WH</sub>* it has read who  
 ‘THIS BOOK I wonder who read’
- b. \* Me domando *se* STO LIBRO o g a leto chi  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> *se<sub>WH</sub>* THIS BOOK it has read who
- (35) a. Me domando STO LIBRO chi *che* o g a leto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> THIS BOOK who *che* it has read  
 ‘THIS BOOK I wonder who read’
- b. \* Me domando chi STO LIBRO *che* o g a leto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> who THIS BOOK *che* it has read
- c. ?? Me domando chi *che* STO LIBRO o g a leto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> who *che* THIS BOOK it has read

The data in (i-v) suggest that *se<sub>Y/N</sub>* must be hosted by a *high* left-peripheral head that can indeed be surrounded by topics but only *followed* by focus (36a), whereas *se<sub>WH</sub>* and *che* realize the head(s) of one or more lower interrogative projection(s) that can only be *preceded* by both focus and topics (36b-c). This ‘che’-COMP lies way lower in the structure than its declarative homophonous - henceforth, let us call it *che<sub>WH</sub>* to avoid confusion. The summary of the distribution of the COMPs under investigation is given in (36):

- (36) a.  $se_{Y/N} > \text{Focus} > \text{Topic}$   
 b.  $\text{Focus} > \text{Topic} > se_{WH}$   
 c.  $\text{Focus} > \text{Topic} > che_{WH}$

Consequently, it seems safe to affirm that  $se_{Y/N}$  is likely to realize  $Int^\circ$ , as its Italian counterpart (Rizzi 2001), whereas  $se_{WH}$  heads a *very low* left-peripheral functional projection, situated lower than the last  $TopP$ . Let us call it  $FP$  for now (37):

- (37)  $[_{ForceP} Force^\circ [_{TopP} Top^\circ [_{IntP} se_{Y/N} [_{TopP} Top^\circ [_{FocP} Foc^\circ [_{TopP} Top^\circ \dots [_{FP} se_{WH} [_{FinP} Fin^\circ [_{IP} I^\circ ]]]]]]]]]]$

The structural position of *che* will be dealt with in the next section.

### 3.2.1. *WhP and the 'se/che alternation'*

At this stage, the problem arises about how to analyze  $se_{WH}$ , and how to treat the *se/che-alternation*. The impossibility for *wh*-phrases to occupy the Spec of  $FP$  suggests that this projection might not be a landing site for *wh*-movement (38a). Differently, the projection headed by  $che_{WH}$  ( $FP_2$ ) is a *wh*-landing site, situated very low in the  $LP$ , as suggested by the distribution of “*wh*-phrase+ $che_{WH}$ ” clusters with respect to topics and focus (38b):

- (38) a.  $\dots [_{FocP} Foc^\circ [_{TopP} Top^\circ \dots [_{FP} *wh\text{-phrase } se_{WH} [_{FinP} Fin^\circ [_{IP} I^\circ ]]]]]]]]$   
 b.  $\dots [_{FocP} Foc^\circ [_{TopP} Top^\circ \dots [_{FP_2} wh\text{-phrase } che_{WH} [_{FinP} Fin^\circ [_{IP} I^\circ ]]]]]]]]$

As a consequence, it could be tempting to say that  $se_{WH}$  and  $che_{WH}$  head two different left-peripheral projections, and that the insertion/activation of the  $FP$  hosting the former is a *last resort operation* performed to save the indirect question in cases where ‘insituness’ is more desirable than ‘exsituness’ for economy or informational reasons. However, this would mean that we should:

- (i) posit that inserting an extra  $XP$  (here,  $FP$ ) to leave the *wh*-phrase ‘in situ’ is derivationally less demanding than moving the *wh*-phrase further to the  $LP$ ;
- (ii) find a way to account for the impossibility for  $che_{WH}$  (or of a covert counterpart of  $che_{WH}$ ) to license ‘insituness’ alone;
- (iii) find a way to explain why the two can never co-occur. In fact, if  $che_{WH}$  introduces indirect *wh*-questions and  $se_{WH}$  is only required to license insituness, there is no reason why  $che_{WH}$  should disappear from the structure once  $se_{WH}$  is inserted.

Actually, since  $se_{WH}$  and  $che_{WH}$  are in complementary distribution, it is more reasonable to claim that they are two different phonetic realizations of the same head. The matrix  $V$  selects for an embedded complement whose  $CP$  has a specialised *wh*-landing site for *wh*-movement headed by a COMP that surfaces either as  $se_{WH}$  or as  $che_{WH}$  (39):

- (39)  $V \dots [_{ForceP(embedded)} Force^\circ \dots [_{FP} se_{WH}/che_{WH} [_{FinP} Fin^\circ [_{IP} I^\circ ]]]]]]]]$

The alternation between  $se_{WH}$  and  $che_{WH}$  can tentatively be attributed to the presence or absence of a relevant  $wh$ -feature<sup>2</sup>: similarly to what happens in the *que/qui alternation* observed in French relative clauses (among others, Rizzi 1990, Rizzi and Shlonsky 2007),  $se_{WH}$  surfaces as *che* when it is crossed over by  $wh$ -movement, thus being endowed with a  $[+WH]$  feature<sup>3</sup>. Let us call the relevant  $wh$ -projection *WhP*, borrowing Rizzi's terms (*QembP* in Rizzi and Bocci 2016). The summary of the discussion conducted so far is given in (40):

- (40) a. I wonder ... [<sub>ForceP(emb)</sub> Force° ... [<sub>FocP</sub> Foc° [<sub>TopP</sub> Top° ... [<sub>WhP</sub> **se** [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin° [<sub>IP</sub> I° ... [<sub>whP</sub>  $wh$ -phrase<sub>[+WH]</sub> ... [<sub>VP</sub> < $wh$ -phrase<sub>[+WH]</sub>> ]]]]]]]]]]  
 b. I wonder ... [<sub>ForceP(emb)</sub> Force° ... [<sub>FocP</sub> Foc° [<sub>TopP</sub> Top° ... [<sub>WhP</sub>  $wh$ -phrase<sub>[+WH]</sub> **che** [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin° [<sub>IP</sub> I° ... [<sub>whP</sub> < $wh$ -phrase<sub>[+WH]</sub>> ... [<sub>VP</sub> < $wh$ -phrase<sub>[+WH]</sub>> ]]]]]]]]]]

To conclude,  $che_{WH}$  is clearly not the same that introduces long-distance  $wh$ -questions. In fact, the latter does not head a landing site for  $wh$ -movement, and sits way higher in the  $LP$ <sup>4</sup>.

### 3.3. Intermediate conclusions

Following the discussion carried out so far, the structures of the different interrogatives of TV can be summarized as in (41). This will be relevant for the discussion in section 4:

- (41) a. Matrix questions:  
 ... [<sub>FocP</sub> { $wh$ -phrase} *SCII* \* $wh$ -phrase ... [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin° [<sub>IP</sub> ... [<sub>whP</sub> { $wh$ -phrase}  $wh$ ° [<sub>VP</sub> V° < $wh$ -phrase> ]]]]]]  
 b. Long-distance questions:  
 ... [<sub>FocP</sub> { $wh$ -phrase} *SCII* \* $wh$ -phrase ... [<sub>ForceP(embedded)</sub> \* $wh$ -phrase **che** ... [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin° [<sub>IP</sub> ... [<sub>whP</sub> { $wh$ -phrase}  $wh$ ° [<sub>VP</sub> V° < $wh$ -phrase> ]]]]]]  
 c. Wh-indirect questions “in situ”:  
 ... [<sub>FocP</sub> \* $wh$ -phrase [<sub>IP</sub> X wants to know ... [<sub>FocP(embedded)</sub> \* $wh$ -phrase Foc° [<sub>WhP</sub> \* $wh$ -phrase **se** [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin° [<sub>IP</sub> I° [<sub>whP</sub>  $wh$ -phrase  $wh$ ° [<sub>VP</sub> V° < $wh$ -phrase> ]]]]]]  
 d. Wh-indirect questions “ex situ”:  
 ... [<sub>FocP</sub> \* $wh$ -phrase [<sub>IP</sub> X wants to know ... [<sub>FocP(embedded)</sub> \* $wh$ -phrase Foc° ... [<sub>WhP</sub>  $wh$ -phrase **che**<sub>WH</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin° [<sub>IP</sub> ... [<sub>whP</sub> < $wh$ -phrase>  $wh$ ° [<sub>VP</sub> V° < $wh$ -phrase> ]]]]]]  
 e. Echo questions:  
 [<sub>IP</sub> ~~X~~ says [<sub>ForceP</sub> ~~that~~ ... [<sub>IP</sub> subj V [<sub>VP</sub> ts tv  $wh$ -phrase ]]]]

Because of the unavailability of *WhP* as a landing site for  $wh$ -movement in matrix questions (41a) and in long-distance questions (where a higher site is exploited, *SpecFocP*) (41b), this projection might be active only in the  $LP$  of *embedded*  $wh$ -questions (as *QembP*,

<sup>2</sup> Cecilia Poletto and Uri Shlonsky, whom I wholeheartedly thank, actually suggested I explain this alternation in terms of  $se_{WH}$  being able to license a null operator in its *Spec*, and  $che_{WH}$  failing to do so. However, this would mean that we are actually dealing with two different *COMP*s, which seems undesirable. I leave the question open for further investigation - see Bonan (2019) for more details, and for a discussion of the possibility of treating  $se_{WH}$  as  $wh$ -doubling of the type ‘operator / invariable  $wh$ -word’ à la Poletto and Pollock 2015 and related works.  
<sup>3</sup> This claim seems confirmed by the fact that in TV any ‘if’-*COMP* (be it  $se_{WH}$  or  $se_{Y/N}$ ) always appears in projections whose *Spec* is empty, whereas the ‘that’-*COMP* of both indirect and ‘doubly filled-*COMP*’ direct questions (2) always co-occur with a  $wh$ -phrase in their *Spec*:

(2) Cossa che te gà magnà?  
 What that you have eaten

<sup>4</sup> The ‘che’ used in TV to introduce long-distance questions and embedded declaratives is systematically *followed* both by both topics and focus, which suggests it may realize *Force*°, as its Italian counterpart (Rizzi 1997).

Rizzi and Bocci 2016) (41c-d). Also, the impossibility for wh-phrases to move higher than *WhP* suggests that *Wh*<sup>o</sup> is a *Criterial head* (Rizzi 2006; 2010).

If one excludes echo questions (that do not have interrogative syntax) (41e), in TV all types of wh-questions systematically have *two* possible landing sites for wh-movement. This is also the case of embedded infinitival questions (42), have not been discussed yet:

- (42) a. **Cuando** pensi-tu de tajar el pin \_\_\_\_?  
 ↑  
 When think=you to cut the pine.tree  
 ‘When do you plan on cutting down the pine tree?’
- b. \* Pensi-tu cuando de tajar el pin?  
 Think=you when to cut the pine.tree
- c. Pensi-tu de tajar **cuando** el pin \_\_\_\_?  
 ↑  
 Think=you to cut when the pine.tree

If one takes the *CP* of infinitival clauses to be truncated (Hooper et al. 1973, Johnson 2001, Haegeman 2006, Shlonsky and Soare 2011, to cite a few), then it is unsurprising that there should be no available landing site for wh-movement in it (42b) - in infinitives, the wh-phrase can either be moved within the *IP* (42a), or reach for the higher-*CP* (42c), as summarized in (43):

(43) Infinitival embedded wh-questions:

[<sub>FocP</sub> {wh-phrase} *SCII* ... [<sub>CP(emb)</sub> \*wh-phrase- [<sub>FinP</sub> *de* [<sub>IP</sub> V [<sub>whP</sub> {wh-phrase} wh<sup>o</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>v</sub> <wh-phrase> ] ] ] ] ]

It could be tempting yet not reasonable to think that *che*<sub>WH</sub> might realize the head of *FinP* - as showed in (42), *Fin*<sup>o</sup> is actually realized as *de*, and its *Spec* is not a landing site for wh-movement (contrary to *SpecWhP*).

#### 4. SOME SPECULATIONS ON INSITUNESS

The leading analysis for ‘insituness’ in NIDs, *remnant-IP movement* (Poletto and Pollock 2000-2015; Munaro et al. 2001), is incompatible with the interrogative syntax of TV. This is discussed throughout this section, along with the predictions and questions raised by the proposed model.

##### 4.1. Incompatibility with Remnant-TP movement

Since Poletto and Pollock (2000) and Munaro et al. (2001), ‘insituness’ in NIDs has been taken to be the result of overt wh-movement to the *LP*, masked in the phonetic string by further movement of the remnant-*IP* to an even higher functional projection in the *CP*-domain. In this theoretical model, the sketched derivation of a BL question like *A-tu parecià che?* (Have-you prepared what, ‘What did you prepare?’) is (44):

- (44) Input: [<sub>IP</sub> Tu ha parecià che ]?
- a. Wh-movement: [<sub>XP</sub> che<sub>i</sub> X<sup>o</sup> [<sub>IP</sub> tu ha parecià t<sub>i</sub> ] ]?  
 ↑  
 b. Remnant IP movement: [<sub>YP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> ha-tu parecià t<sub>i</sub> ]<sub>i</sub> Y [<sub>XP</sub> che<sub>i</sub> X<sup>o</sup> t<sub>j</sub> ] ]?  
 ↑

Munaro et al. base their claim on the phonetically-manifested presence of two left-peripheral projections targeted by wh-movement in some Northern Italian and Southern Swiss dialects that display ‘wh-doubling’ configurations (45):

- (45) a. Cossa a-lo fat che? BL  
 What has=he done what  
 ‘What did he do?’
- b. Ngo fet majà ngont? Monnese  
 Where do=you eat where  
 ‘Where do you eat?’
- c. Cuma ta l’è cūsinaa cumè? Mendrisiotto  
 How you it’have cooked how  
 ‘How did you cook it?’

As a consequence, they assume that all non-D-linked wh-words of NIDs must have a *composite bimorphemic structure* - made up either of two phonetically realized parts (46a), or of an overt and a covert (which they call the *Restrictor*,  $\emptyset$  here) sub-part (46b-c):

- (46) a. Overt wh-doubling: [ *che, cossa* ]  
 b. Non-D-linked wh-phrase ‘in situ’: [ *che,  $\emptyset$*  ]  
 c. Non-D-linked wh-phrase ‘ex situ’: [  $\emptyset, cossa$  ]

To account for the ‘in situ-ex situ alternation’, they posit the existence of:

- (i) a low left-peripheral wh-projection (*Op1P* in Poletto and Pollock 2000; *Wh1P* in Munaro et al 2001) where the ‘in situ’ wh-words of BL land, and through which all ‘ex situ’ wh-words move on their way to *ForceP* in FR and IT;
- (ii) a high left-peripheral wh-projection (*Op2P* or *Wh2P*) reached by all wh-phrases in FR and IT, and by all D-linked wh-phrases in BL. When no overt ‘wh-doubling’ is at play, one of the two wh-projections is targeted by a null sub-part of the wh-phrase.

The different structural positions targeted by non-D-linked and D-linked wh-words are taken to depend on the intrinsic nature of wh-words. In fact, the former ones are existential quantifiers that appear in the scope of a disjunction operator, and thus target *Op1P*, whereas the latter lack existential import and thus check the higher wh-position, *Op2P*. This is crucially the reason why D-linked wh-phrases and wh-adverbials are taken to be incompatible with ‘insituness’. Differently, embedded ‘insituness’ is argued to be ruled out by Economy - embedded clauses are selected by the matrix *V*, and for this reason they are inherently interrogative, hence there is no need for the embedded remnant-*IP* to check *Force*.

Clearly, the data in sections 2-3 show that a Remnant-IP Movement analysis à la Munaro et al. is indeed incompatible with the interrogative syntax of TV – it displays *IP-internal* wh-movement to *whP*, a *vP-internal* interrogative/focal projection likely to correspond to *FocP* of Belletti (2004). That wh-subjects are inconsistent with S-clitics (very likely to be the phonetic realizations of *Subj $\emptyset$* , as in Rizzi 2016) (47b-c), which are otherwise obligatory (47a), validates the theory that wh-elements in TV are indeed always moved, be it *IP-internally* or to the *LP*:

- (47) a. Giani \*(el) gà cantà tuta jeri  
 Gianni he has sung all yesterday  
 ‘Yesterday, Gianni sang all day’

- (47) b. Chi (\*el) gà cantà tuta jeri?  
 Who he/it has sung all yesterday  
 ‘Yesterday, who sang all day?’  
 c. (\*El) gà cantà chi tuta jeri?  
 He/it has sung who all yesterday

The *IP*-internal *wh*-movement analysis can actually be extended to both matrix and embedded ‘insituness’. The latter, despite being considered impossible by Poletto and Pollock (2015) and related works, is actually very productive in TV - under *chew<sub>WH</sub>* in long-distance questions and *se<sub>WH</sub>* in indirect *wh*-questions. Given for granted that it would be impossible to derive an ‘in situ’ long-distance question via movement of the remnant-*IP*, the position occupied by *wh*-subjects in embedded questions clearly confirms that the position targeted by ‘in situ’ *wh*-elements in TV is *IP*-internal, not left peripheral (48):

- (48) a. Pensi-tu che [<sub>TP</sub> abje cantà *chi* jeri in ciesa ]?  
 Think=you that has<sub>SUBJ</sub> sung who yesterday in church  
 ‘Who do you think sang in Church yesterday?’  
 b. Pens-ea che [<sub>TP</sub> abje spacà *chi* el vaso ]?  
 Thinks=she that has<sub>SUBJ</sub> broken who the vase  
 ‘Who do you think broke the vase?’

Also, let us recall that, in TV, D-linked *wh*-words are perfectly fine ‘in situ’, which is not predicted by an account where the movement of the remnant-*IP* is taken to target a position that is lower than that occupied by lexically-restricted *wh*-elements and *wh*-adverbials.

To conclude, as shown in 1.3, both *IP*-internal *wh*-movement and embedded ‘insituness’ are attested in Romance languages other than TV (French, Brazilian and European Portuguese, Lombard dialects) - with language-specific adaptations, the analysis presented in this paper could plausibly be extended to these languages as well.

#### 4.2. On the “in situ-ex situ alternation” in Trevigiano

The data presented so far call for a movement analysis that is powerful enough to account for the possibility to perform *wh*-movement to a *TP*-internal projection, and to do so *optionally* (the other possibility, always available, being total fronting to the *LP*). In fact, it would be formally easier to account for *real* ‘insituness’, i.e. total lack of movement, than for the possibility of moving a *wh*-element to the *vP* domain, and then either stop the movement, or drag the *wh*-word to a higher left peripheral position - *derivational optionality* is clearly not formally desirable. What makes it possible for the *wh*-phrase to stay *TP*-internally? Is this possibility linked to derivational economy, or maybe to the informational structure of *wh*-questions? By *what* and *how* is (*TP*-internal and left peripheral) *wh*-movement probed? Does prosody play a role in licensing *wh*-movement to *whP*? What properties make this option available only in some languages? These are only few of the numerous questions on ‘optional insituness’ that are to be answered.

Interestingly, the presence of *whP* inside the *TP*-domain, witnessed in TV by overt *wh*-movement of sentence internal *wh*-phrases, is compatible with recent work by Bocci et al. (2017) and Bocci and Cruschina (2017). In their works, Bocci et al. observe the phenomenon of subject inversion in matrix and embedded contexts in IT, together with the distribution of Nuclear Pitch Accent. Crucially, making use of *Phase theory* (Chomsky 1998), they prove experimentally that *successive cyclic wh-movement* to the *LP* must indeed proceed through the edge of *every* intervening phase to ensure that the *wh*-element remains accessible to further



syntactic operations after the domain of a phase head is sent to Spell Out. As a consequence, wh-movement in Italian stops over the *edge* of every intervening *vP*- and *CP*-phase that it crosses, causing *subject inversion* when the wh-phrase passes through the *CP*-edge. This proposal is very appalling, and should definitively be tested cross-linguistically to understand *how* and *why* some intermediate wh-projections allow for the wh-element to stop in their Spec, whereas other *Specs* only function as escaping patches.

In TV for instance, following the discussion above, the edge of *vP* is targeted by movement of ‘in situ’ wh-phrases; also, as in IT, subject inversion is systematically performed in embedded contexts when a wh-element is extracted (49):

- (49) a. ?? Cossa me gà-tu dito che Carlo gà magnà?  
 What me have=you said that Carlo he has eaten  
 ‘What did you said Carlo ate?’  
 b. Cossa me ga-tu dito che gà magnà Carlo?  
 What me have=you said that has eaten Carlo

The post-verbal subject has been claimed to be hosted by the *vP*-internal *TopP* (Belletti 2004). In TV, in such constructions, if the wh-phrase stops in *SpecwhP*, the lexical *S* must obligatorily be *right dislocated*, which is witnessed by the fact that the clitic *S* in *Subj°* must be realized for the question to be well-formed (50). This suggests that there might be a subjacent reason why a topic and a focal element (wh-phrase in *whP*) cannot appear at the same time in the left periphery of the *VP*:

- (50) Me ga-tu dito che el gà magnà cossa, Carlo RD  
 Me have=you said that he has eaten what # Carlo  
 ‘What did you said Carlo ate?’

However, despite these and other superficial similarities between IT and TV, it appears crucial to explain why wh-phrases can stop in *SpecwhP* in the latter, but need to move all the way up to *SpecFocusP* in the former. Cross-linguistically in fact, it appears clear that the wh-positions exploited as landing sites for wh-movement are various. Over-generalizing, we can say that three patterns are found: (i) the wh-elements of single wh-questions always appears sentence-initially in languages like English, Bulgarian or Italian; (ii) in other languages, like for example Japanese and Chinese, they can only appear sentence-internally; (iii) in the ‘optional wh-in-situ’ languages discussed throughout this paper both positions are available as landing sites for wh-movement. The situation gets even more complicated when it comes to *multiple* wh-questions, whose discussion is not the subject of this work. Intra-linguistically, the three patterns above do not seem to be directly dependent on the (un)availability of *SCII* as a question-formation strategy, or on the distinction between overt or covert movement, or on the presence of a special prosody associated to wh-questions. However, it seems plausible that the presence / absence of the ‘in situ’ and ‘ex situ’ strategies might depend on different combinations of all of these factors. Differently, the possibility of licensing ‘insituness’ in indirect questions seems to be linked mainly to the (un)availability of an overt *se<sub>WH</sub>*-like COMP, very plausibly for *locality* reasons. In this work, it has been claimed that the ‘se/che alternation’ is the result of movement of a wh-phrase that crosses over the low left-peripheral COMP *se*, endowing it with a [+WH] feature<sup>5</sup>. However, some languages only have the [+WH] *che*, not the

<sup>5</sup> An anonymous reviewer of an abstract submitted for WOLP 17 (October 17-18, 2017, Oslo) claimed that I was being too liberal in positing the existence of *WhP* low in the LP and that, to their best knowledge, no such COMP

[-WH] counterpart, which needs to be looked into more in depth. In fact, the impossibility of licensing embedded ‘insituness’ in indirect wh-questions in the absence of a *se*-like COMP is likely to be intimately linked to how ‘in situ’ wh-elements manage to check *Force* in the first place. If  $se_{WH}$  is needed to guarantee that the connection between the ‘in situ’ wh-word and *Force* is built correctly, then *se* is a crucial area of investigation to understand how *TP*-internal wh-movement can be sufficient for the sentence to be correctly interpreted as interrogative.

These inter-linguistic variations are further complicated by the fact that in closely-related languages (e.g. BL and TV) the distribution of D-linked and non-D-linked wh-elements varies greatly, which suggests that the reasons behind the ‘in situ-ex situ alternation’ might be due not only to the syntax and prosody of the languages in question, but also to the internal morphology of their wh-words. Since wh-phrases are composed of a +Q and a +WH part (Rizzi 1990), and there exist ‘wh-doubling configurations’ as discussed in Poletto and Pollock 2000 (and related works), would it be possible to explain the different distributional patterns of wh-words positing that their internal structure is complex, and that it crucially combines phonetically realized and phonetically covert parts that split during the derivation, allowing only a sub-fragment of the whole wh-word to reach for the LP? If so, which part moves to the CP-domain, +Q or +WH? And how are wh-words structured? Are the +Q and the +WH part in a Spec-Head relationship?

Quite clearly, it appears that a satisfactory, cross-linguistically valid explanation for the optionality of the ‘in situ-ex situ alternation’ cannot come from syntax alone, but needs to be looked for at the *Interfaces* between the various components of grammar.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

This paper showed that what looks like ‘insituness’ in TV is actually an instance of *IP*-internal wh-movement, which is argued to target an FP at the edge of *vP*, *whP*. This view is compatible not only with Bocci and Cruschina (2017) and Bocci et al.’s (2017) experimental confirmation that wh-movement is cyclic and stops at the edges of all *vP*- and *CP*-phases that it crosses, but also partially with Munaro et al.’s (2001, and related works) analysis of ‘fake insituness’ in Romance. However, differently from what happens in the varieties described by Munaro et al., there is no such thing as remnant-*IP* movement in TV - in this variety, the *Spec* targeted by ‘in situ’ wh-phrases lies in the periphery of the *V*, not in the *CP*-layer.

Also, the paper argued in favour of a low left-peripheral *WhP* in the *indirect* wh-questions of TV, whose existence could plausibly be posited also in root wh-questions, to accommodate the ‘in situ’ wh-words of languages where remnant-*TP* movement *is* at play. Actually, finding a language that displays both remnant-*TP* movement in ‘in situ’ matrix wh-questions and *TP*-internal wh-movement in embedded environments would provide perfect evidence in favour of both Munaro et al.’s analysis and the analysis proposed here. *WhP* seems one of the ‘root/non-root asymmetries’ involving the *LP* of the clause, as discussed in Haegeman (2012). In Rizzi and Bocci (2016), the existence of *QembP* in IT is posited to account for the marginal possibility, otherwise ruled out in root clauses, of licensing focus in indirect wh-questions, in the order FOC-Wh. However, in IT the co-occurrence of focus and wh-elements in indirect questions is way more limited than it is in TV, where virtually *any* type of focalized element can successfully co-occur with a questioned wh-word. In TV, the wider compatibility of focus

---

as  $se_{WH}$  exists in TV. For this, I would like to clarify that the variety of TV discussed here is the *Sinistra Piave* one (spoken on the left bank of the Piave river), and that it comes without surprise that the reviewer does not have  $se_{WH}$ , if as I think s/he is a *Destra Piave* speaker. Be as it may, even for the speakers that do not have an overt version of  $se_{WH}$ , *WhP* is clearly active in indirect wh-questions: in their speech too,  $che_{WH}$  appears to sit way lower in the structure than *Force*<sup>o</sup>, where the declarative homophonous *che* is generated. So not all speakers might have an overt ‘if’-COMP to license embedded ‘insituness’, but all of them have *WhP* low in the LP of indirect wh-questions.

and wh-elements in indirect clauses is clearly not linked to the availability of ‘insituness’ alone, or the presence of *se<sub>WH</sub>*, otherwise many more languages of the Romance family would show this pattern, and IT would lack it altogether. Nonetheless, in both languages, the co-occurrence of a wh-element and focus raises the question of *locality*: focus is a quantificational element, if it crosses over a wh-element, shouldn’t we have a violation in terms of Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990, and refinements)? This issue is worth investigating, since it is bound to tell more about *how* and *when* wh-words and focus are sent to *LF* to be interpreted.

A number of questions and predictions are raised by this paper – let us leave them for further work, hoping that a systematic cross-linguistic comparison among Romance varieties will shed more light on the complex natures of *insituness* and *linguistic optionality* (if any).

## REFERENCES

- Adli, A. (2006) "French wh-in-situ questions and syntactic optionality: Evidence from three data types". *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 25. 163-203.
- Ambar, M. & R. Veloso (2001) "On the nature of wh-phrases -Word order and wh-in-situ." In Y. D’hulst, J. Rooryck & J. Schrotten (eds) *Romance languages and linguistic theory 1999*. John Benjamins. Amsterdam. 1-37.
- Baunaz, L. (2011) *The grammar of French quantification*. Springer. Dordrecht.
- Baunaz, L. & C. Patin (2011) "Prosody refers to semantic factors: evidence from French wh-words". In H.-Y. Yoo & E. Delais-Roussarie (eds) *Proceedings of Interface, discours & prosodie 2009*. Université Paris 7. Parigi. 93-107.
- Belletti, A. (2004) "Aspects of the low IP area". In L. Rizzi (ed.) *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Vol. 2*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford University Press. New York. 16-51.
- Bocci, G., Bianchi, V. & S. Cruschina (2017) *Prosody tracks cyclic movement: evidence from Italian wh-questions*. Manuscript.
- Bocci, G. & S. Cruschina (2017) "Postverbal subjects and nuclear pitch accent in Italian wh-questions." To appear in R. Petrosino et al. (eds) *Beyond the veil of Maya - from sounds to structure*. Festschrift for Andrea Calabrese. De Gruyter. Berlin.
- Boeckx, C. (1999) "Decomposing French questions". In J. Alexander, N.-R. Han & M. Minnick Fox (eds) *Proceedings of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, vol. 6.1. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*. Penn Linguistics Club. Philadelphia. 69-80.
- Boeck, C., Stateva, P. & A. Stepanov (2000) "Optionality, Presupposition, and Wh-in Situ in French". In J. Camps & C. R. Wiltshire (eds) *Romance Syntax, Semantics, and L2 Acquisition*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 57-71.
- Bošković, Ž. (2000) "Sometimes in [Spec CP], Sometimes in-situ". In R. Martin, D. Michaels & J. Uriagereka (eds) *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalism in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. MIT Press. Cambridge. MA. 53-88.
- Cardinaletti, A. & M. Starke (1999) "The Typology of Structural Deficiency: On the three grammatical classes". In H. van Riemsdijk (ed) *Clitics in the Language of Europe*. 145-233.
- Cheng, L. L.-S. & J. Rooryck (2000) "Licensing WH-in-situ". *Syntax* 3. 1-18.
- Cheng, L. L.-S. & J. Rooryck (2002) *Types of Wh-in-situ*. Manuscript.
- Chomsky, N. (1998) "On Phases" In R. Freidin, C. P. Otero & M. L. Zubizarreta (eds) *Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of J.-R. Vergnaud*. MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2013) "Problems of projection". *Lingua, Special Issue in Language and Cognition*. 33-49.

- Etxepare, R. & M. Uribe-Etxebarria (2012) "Las preguntas de QU-in situ en español: un análisis derivacional". In J. M. Brucart & A. J. Gallego (eds) *El movimiento de constituyentes*. Visor. Madrid. 251-271.
- Figueiredo Silva, M. C. & E. Grolla (2016) "Some syntactic and pragmatic aspects of WH-in-situ in Brazilian Portuguese." In M.A. Kato & F. Ordonez (eds) *The Morphosyntax of Portuguese and Spanish in Latin America*. Oxford University Press. New York. 259-285.
- Haegeman, L. (2006) "Argument fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the left periphery". In R. Zanuttini, H. Campos, E. Herburger & P.H. Portner (eds) *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics: Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture*. Georgetown University Press. 27-52.
- Haegeman, L. (2012) *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clauses Phenomena, and Composition of the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Vol. 8*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford University Press.
- Haumann, D. (2011) "The Syntax of Subordination". *Linguistische Arbeiten 373*. De Gruyter.
- Hooper, J. B. & S. A. Thompson (1973) "On the applicability of root transformations". *Linguistic Inquiry* 4. 465-497.
- Huang, J. C.-T. (1982) *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. PhD Dissertation. MIT.
- Jiménez, M. L. (1997) *Semantic and pragmatic conditions on word order in Spanish*. PhD Dissertation. Washington D.C. Georgetown University.
- Johnson, K. (2001) "What VP ellipsis can do, and what it can't but not why". *The Handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. 437-479.
- Kato, M. (2013) "Deriving 'wh-in-situ' through movement in Brazilian Portuguese". In M. Camacho Taboada, V. Jiménez-Fernandez, J. Martin-Gonzalez & M. Reyes-Tejedor (eds) *Information Structure and Agreement*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 175-192.
- Lasnik, H. & S. Mamoru (1992) *Move-a*. MIT Press. Cambridge.
- Lurà, F. (1987) *Il dialetto del mendrisiotto*. Edizione Unione Banche Svizzere. Mendrisio-Chiasso.
- Manzini, M. R. & L. M. Savoia (2005) *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa Vol. 1*. Edizioni dell'Orso, Alessandria.
- Mathieu, E. (1999) "French wh in situ and the intervention effect". *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 11. 441-472.
- Miyagawa, S. (2001) "The EPP, Scrambling, and wh-in-situ". In M. Kenstowicz (ed) *A Life in Language Ken Hale*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA. 293-338.
- Munaro, N. (1995) "On nominal wh-phrases in some North-Eastern Italian dialects". *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 20. 69-110.
- Munaro, N. (1999) *Sintagmi interrogativi nei dialetti settentrionali italiani*. Unipress. Padova.
- Munaro, N., C. Poletto & J.-Y. Pollock (2001) "Eppur si muove! On comparing French and Bellunese wh-movement". In P. Pica & J. Roorick (eds) *Linguistic Variation Years*. John Benjamins. Amsterdam. 293-338.
- Munaro, N. & J.-Y. Pollock (2005) "Qu'est-ce que (qu')-est-ce que? A case study in comparative Romance interrogative syntax". In G. Cinque & R. Kayne (eds) *Handbook of Comparative Syntax*. Oxford University Press. New York. 542-606.
- Obenauer, H.-G. (1994) "Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre." PhD Dissertation. Université de Paris VIII.
- Pesetsky, D. (1987) "Wh-in-Situ: Movement and Unselective Binding." In E. J. Reuland & A. G. B. Ter Meulen (eds) *The Representation of (In)definiteness*. MI Press. Cambridge. 204-251.
- Pesetsky, D. (1997) "Optimality Theory and Syntax: Movement and Pronunciation". In D. Archangeli & D. Langendoen (eds) *Optimality Theory: An Overview*. Basil Blackwell.

- Pesetsky, D. (2000) *Phrasal Movement and its Kin*. MIT Press. Cambridge.
- Pires A. & H. Taylor (2009) "The syntax of wh-in-situ and common ground." In E. Malcom, J. Kirby, O. Sawada & E. Staraki (eds) *Proceedings of the Forty-third Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society Vol. II*. Chicago Linguistics Society. 201-215.
- Poletto, C. (1993) "Subject Clitic-Verb Inversion in North Eastern Italian Dialects". In Rosemberg & Sellier (eds) *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. Torino.
- Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field. Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2000) "On the Left Periphery of Some Romance Wh-Questions". *The Structure of CP and IP*, Oxford. 251-296.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. (2004) "On wh-clitics and wh-doubling in French and some North Eastern Italian Dialects". *Probus* 16. 241-277.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2005) "On wh-clitics, wh-doubling and apparent wh-in-situ in French and some North Eastern Italian dialects". *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes. L'architecture propositionnelle, la syntaxe de la périphérie gauche* 33.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2009) "Another look at wh-questions in Romance: the case of Medrisiotto and its consequences for the analysis of French wh-in-situ and embedded interrogatives". In L. Wentzel (ed) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance' Vol. I*. John Benjamins. Amsterdam. 199-258.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2015) "Arguing for remnant movement in Romance". In G. Grewendorf (ed) *Remnant Movement*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Poletto, C. & L. Vannelli (1993) "Gli introduttori delle frasi interrogative nei dialetti italiani." In E. Banfi, G. Bonfadini & P. Cordin (eds) *Atti del Convegno Italia Settentrionale: Crocevia di Idiomi Romanzi*. Max Niemeyer Verlag. Tübingen. 145-158.
- Reglero, L. (2007) "Wh-in-situ interrogatives in Spanish." *Probus* 19(2). 267-297.
- Rizzi, L. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Rizzi, L. (1996) "Residual Verb-second and the Wh-criterion". In A. Belletti & L. Rizzi (eds) *Parameters and Functional Heads. Essays in Comparative Syntax*. Oxford studies in comparative syntax. Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, L. (2004) "On the Cartography of Syntactic Structures". In L. Rizzi (ed) *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures Vol. II*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford University Press. 223-251.
- Rizzi, L. (2006) "Selective Residual V-2 in Italian Interrogatives". In P. Brandt & E. Fuß (eds) *Form Structure and Meaning: A Festschrift presented to Günther Grewendorf on Occasion of His 60th Birthday. Studia Grammatica* 63.
- Rizzi, L. (2010) "On some properties of criterial freezing". In P. Panagiotidis (ed) *The complementizer phase: Subjects and operators*. Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. 17-32.
- Rizzi, L. (2017) "Che and weak islands". In L. Franco & P. Lorusso (eds) *Linguistic variation: structure and interpretation. M. Rita Manzini: Festschrift for her 60th birthday*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin.
- Rizzi, L. & G. Bocci (2016) "The Left Periphery of the Clause - Primarily illustrated for Italian". In M. Everaert & H. C. Van Riemsdijk (eds) *Blackwell Companion to Syntax, II Edition*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Rizzi, L. & U. Shlonsky (2007) "Strategies of subject extraction". In U. Sauerland & H-M. Gärtner (eds) *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics*. Studies in Generative Grammar 89. 115-160.
- Tual, L. (2017) "Thèse en cours. Travail expérimental". Université de Genève.
- Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (2003) "In situ questions and masked movement." *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2. 217-257.