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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 (SCI) is compulsory (1):

(1) a. Vien-tu al marcà co nojaltri?  
    Come=you to.the market with us
    ‘Are you going to the market with us?’

b. * Te *vien al marcà co nojaltri?  
    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 SCI 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?  
    Have=you seen who
    ‘Who did you see?’

b. * Te a visto chi?  
    You have seen who
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Differently from BL though, TV allows for real ‘optional insiteness’ - 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’):

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 (?a). The order Place>Time is at best degraded (?b). Differently, ungrammaticality arises when adverbs precede an argument (?c-d):

(7) a. Giani el gà magnà pomiDO jerìTIME al ristorantePLACe

   Gianni has eaten apples yesterday at the restaurant

   'Yesterday, Gianni ate apples at the restaurant'

b. ? Giani el gà magnà pomiDO al ristorantePLACe jerìTIME

   Gianni has eaten apples at the restaurant yesterday

c. * Giani el gà magnà jerìTIME pomiDO al ristorantePLACe

   Gianni has eaten yesterday apples at the restaurant

d. * Giani el gà magnà al ristorantePLACe pomiDO jerìTIME

   Gianni 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-ca visto cossa a Maria ____?

   Has=he 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 SCII) (9):

(9) a. Tè gà magnà el dolse quando??

   You have eaten the cake when
   'You ate the cake WHEN?!

b. Tè gà visto a Maria dove??

   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 quando, 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 seenF where # the Maria
   'Mary, where did you see?'

   c. Ghe a ga-tu datà a chi, a tecia? RD
   DAT it have=you givenF 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):¹

(11) a. Ghe o ga-tu regacà 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 regacà quando *{aa Maria} l’anel {aa Maria}? RD
   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
   Think1PS to go at Toni tonight
   'I think I’ll go to Toni’s tonight'

   b. Penso che l vae da Toni doman
   Think1PS that he goSUBJ at Toni tomorrow
   'I think he’ll go to Toni’s tomorrow'

¹ I am thankful to my colleague Richard Zimmermann for this useful observation.
c. Me domando se l' andarà da Toni doman
   Myself ask1PS if he goFUT 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: Fin0, Force0, and Int0,
respectively. Predictably, the use of che is extended also to long distance questions (12b):

(12) b'. Cuando pensi-tu che l vaie da Toni?
   When think2PS=you that he goSUBJ 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 quando
    She herself asks se he comeFUT when
    ‘She wonders when he’s going to come’
 c. Voria saver se se catemo dove
    Would1PS 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 sewh). 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 quando i pomì
t_____
    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 persegherì
t_____
    She herself asks se he plantFUT 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 pomì quando
    Myself ask se you have eaten the apples when
    ‘I wonder when you ate the apples'
b. Me domando se i gā magnà quando, ipomi 
Myself ask se you them have eaten,mascPL 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):

\[(16)\ a. * \text{Me domando cossa se te gà magnà} \]
\[
\text{Myself ask what se you have eaten} \\
‘I wonder what you ate’
\[
b. \text{Me domando cossa che te ga magnà} \]
\[
\text{Myself ask what that you have eaten}
\]

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):

\[(17)\ a. * \text{Hai mangiato cosa?} \]
\[
\text{Have2PS eaten what} \\
‘What did you eat?’
\[
b. * \text{Vorrei sapere se hai mangiato cosa} \]
\[
\text{Would1PS know se have2PS eaten what}
\]

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’):

\[(18)\ a. \text{Pensi-tu che vegnarà catarne chi?} \]
\[
\text{Think=you that comeFUT see.us who} \\
‘Who do you think will visit us?’
\[
b. \text{Pensi-tu che i voje magnar cossa?} \]
\[
\text{Think=you that they wantSUBJ eat what} \\
‘What do you think they want to eat?’
\]

\[(18)\ a'. \text{Chi pensi-tu che vegnarà catarne?} \]
\[
\text{Who think=you that comeFUT see.us} \\
‘Who do you think will visit us?’
\[
b'. \text{Cossa pensi-tu che i voje magnar?} \]
\[
\text{What think=you that they wantSUBJ eat} \\
‘What do you think they want to eat?’
\]

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):

\[(19)\ a. \text{Pensi-tu che magnaremos quando i fighi } \]
\[
\text{Think=you that eat1PP,FUT when the figues}
\]
‘When do you think we will eat the figues?’

b. Pensi-tu che a voje metar dove i piteri?
Think=you that she wantSUBJ 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 SCI and is associated to an echo reading (20c):

(20) a. * Pensi-tu che magnaremo i fighi quando?
Think=you that eatIPP,FUT the figues when
‘When do you think we will eat the figues?’

b. Pensi-tu che i magnaremo quando, i fighi?
Think=you that them eatIPP,FUT when # the figues
‘The figues, when do you think we’re going to eat?’

c. Te pensi che magnaremo i fighi quando?!
You think that eatIPP,FUT the figues when
‘You think we’re going to eat the figues WHEN?!’

2.3. Cross-linguistic evidence


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___?
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):
Maria pensa que o Joao comprou o qué? 

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 seWH 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 
Pierre has asked if you have seen who

‘Pierre asked who you saw’

b. O Joao perguntou se tu compraste o qué 
The John asked if you bought what

‘John asked what you bought’

c. Eu me perguntei se o Joao comprou o qué 
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. LOwer(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 ndá [whP 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 ocial __] ]]? 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 _cualdo_ da nojaltri?
Think=you that Toni he comeFUT when at ours
‘When do you think Toni will come over?’
b. El vol saver se me mare a vegnarà _cualdo_ da ti
He wants know seWH my mother she comeFUT when at yours
‘He wants to know when my mother will come to your place’

The questions in (25-26) would be ungrammatical if _cualdo_ 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 [SubjP el [TP vegnarà [whP _cualdo_ [vP ts tv da nojaltri __]]]

b’. El vol saver se [SubjP me mare [SubjP a [TP vegnarà [whP _cualdo_ [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 [whP [TopicP [TopP [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°_ upwards (28b):

(28) a. Te gà magnà el dolse _cualdo_?! ECHO
You have eaten the cake when
‘You ate the cake WHEN?!’
b. [CP … [TP te disi [ForceP(emb) che [TP te gà magnà el dolse _cualdo_ [[]]]]]? 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_{YN}), 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_{YN}:

29. a. [Sto libro], me domando se te o gà za leto
   This book myself ask_{1PS} se_{YN} you it have already read
   ‘I wonder whether you’ve already read this book’
   b. Me domando se te o gà za leto, [sto libro]
      Myself ask_{1PS} se_{YN} you it have already read this book
   c. Me domando, [sto libro], se te o gà za leto
      Myself ask_{1PS} this book se_{YN} you it have already read
   d. Me domando se, [sto libro], te o gà za leto
      Myself ask_{1PS} se_{YN} 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 gà regaeà a chi
    This book myself ask_{1PS} se_{WH} you DAT it have given to whom
    ‘I wonder who you gave this book to’
   b. Me domando se te ghe o gà regaeà a chi, [sto libro]
      Myself ask_{1PS} se_{WH} you DAT it have given to who this book
   c. Me domando, [sto libro], se te ghe o gà regaeà a chi
      Myself ask_{1PS} this book se_{WH} you DAT it have given to who
   d. ?? Me domando se, [sto libro], te ghe o gà regaeà a chi
      Myself ask_{1PS} 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 to 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 gà leto
    This book myself ask_{1PS} where che you it have read
    ‘I wonder where you read this book’
   b. Me domando dove che te o gà leto, [sto libro]
      Myself ask_{1PS} where che you it have read this book
c. Me domando, [ sto libro], dove che te o gà leto
M自己 ask_{IPS} this book where che you it have read

d. ?? Me domando dove, [ sto libro], che te o gà leto
M自己 ask_{IPS} where this book che you it have read

e. ? Me domando dove che, [ sto libro], te o gà leto
M自己 ask_{IPS} where che this book you it have read

(iv) only se_{YN} 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 gà leto
M自己 ask_{IPS} this book se_{YN} yesterday you it have read
‘I wonder if you read this book yesterday’

b. * Me domando, [ sto libro], se, [jeri], o gà leto chi
M自己 ask_{IPS} this book se_{WH} yesterday it has read who
‘I wonder who read this book yesterday’

c. * Me domando, [ sto libro], chi che, [jeri], o gà leto
M自己 ask_{IPS} this book who che yesterday it has read

(v) a focus can only follow se_{YN} (33), whereas it must precede se_{WH} 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 gà leto (no staltro)
M自己 ask_{IPS} se_{YN} 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 gà leto (no staltro)
M自己 ask_{IPS} THIS BOOK se_{YN} you have read (NEG the.other)

(34) a. Me domando sto LIBRO se o gà leto chi
M自己 ask_{IPS} THIS BOOK se_{WH} it has read who
‘THIS BOOK I wonder who read’

b. * Me domando se sto LIBRO o gà leto chi
M自己 ask_{IPS} se_{WH} THIS BOOK it has read who

(35) a. Me domando sto LIBRO chi che o gà leto
M自己 ask_{IPS} THIS BOOK who che it has read
‘THIS BOOK I wonder who read’

b. * Me domando chi sto LIBRO che o gà leto
M自己 ask_{IPS} who THIS BOOK che it has read

c. ?? Me domando chi che sto LIBRO o gà leto
M自己 ask_{IPS} who che THIS BOOK it has read

The data in (i-v) suggest that se_{YN} must be hosted by a high left-peripheral head that can indeed be surrounded by topics but only followed by focus (36a), whereas se_{WH} 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 homophones - henceforth, let us call it che_{WH} 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 \( Int^o \), 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) \([\text{ForceP} \text{Force}^o [\text{TopP} \text{Top}^o [\text{IntP} se_{Y/N} [\text{TopP} \text{Top}^o [\text{FocP} \text{Foc}^o [\text{TopP} \text{Top}^o ... [\text{FP} se_{WH} [\text{FinP} \text{Fin}^o [\text{IP} I^o ]]ossip]]]])]]

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 \( che_{WH} (FP2) \) 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. \( ... [\text{FocP} \text{Foc}^o [\text{TopP} \text{Top}^o ... [\text{FP} \text{wh-phrase} se_{WH} [\text{FinP} \text{Fin}^o [\text{IP} I^o ]]]]])]
   b. \( ... [\text{FocP} \text{Foc}^o [\text{TopP} \text{Top}^o ... [\text{FP2} \text{wh-phrase} che_{WH} [\text{FinP} \text{Fin}^o [\text{IP} I^o ]]]]])]

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 ... [\text{ForceP(embedded)}] \text{Force}^o ... [\text{FP} se_{WH}/che_{WH} [\text{FinP} \text{Fin}^o [\text{IP} I^o ]]]])]])}
The alternation between se<sub>WH</sub> and che<sub>WH</sub> 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<sub>WH</sub> 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 Bocchi 2016). The summary of the discussion conducted so far is given in (40):


c. *Wh-indirect questions “in situ”*:

d. *Wh-indirect questions “ex situ”*:

e. *Echo questions*:
…”IP X says…” [FocP -that … [IP subj V [VP tS tv *wh-phrase&gt; ]]]

To conclude, che<sub>WH</sub> 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*:

b. *Long-distance questions*:

c. *Wh-indirect questions “in situ”*:

d. *Wh-indirect questions “ex situ”*:

e. *Echo questions*:
…”IP X says…” [FocP -that … [IP subj V [VP tS tv *wh-phrase&gt; ]]]

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 Dr Shlonsky, whom I wholeheartedly thank, actually suggested I explain this alternation in terms of se<sub>WH</sub> being able to license a null operator in its Spec, and che<sub>WH</sub> failing to do so. However, this would mean that we are actually dealing with two different COMPs, 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<sub>WH</sub> 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<sub>WH</sub> or se<sub>V,N</sub>) 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° is a Critical 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 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

(43) Infinitival embedded wh-questions:

\[
[FoCP \{wh-phrase\} \text{SCI ... (a) } \text{wh-phrase} \{\text{FinP de} \text{IP V whp \{wh-phrase\} wh° } [V P t_S t_V <_{\text{wh-phrase}}]\]
\]

It could be tempting yet not reasonable to think that cheWh might realize the head of FinP - as showed in (42), Fin° 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 ‘insituiness’ 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), ‘insituiness’ 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 parecìa che? (Have-you prepared what, ‘What did you prepare?’) is (44):

(44) Input: [IP Tu ha parecìa che]? 

a. Wh-movement: [XP che; X° [IP tu ha parecìa t_i]]?

b. Remnant IP movement: [VP [IP ha-tu parecìa t_i] Y [XP che; X° t_i]]?
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 fàt che?  
      What has=he done what  
      ‘What did he do?’  

b. Ngo fèt màjà ngont?  
      Where do=you eat where  
      ‘Where do you eat?’

c. Cuma tā l’è cūsinā cumè?  
      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, ø here) sub-part (46b-c):

(46)  a. Overt wh-doubling: [che, cossa]  

b. Non-D-linked wh-phrase ‘in situ’: [che, ø]  

c. Non-D-linked wh-phrase ‘ex situ’: [ø, 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’, 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. Gianì *el gà càntà tutà jerì  

      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 cheWH in long-distance questions and seWH 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 [TP abje cantà chi jeri in ciesa ]?
   Think=you that hasSUBJ sung who yesterday in church
   ‘Who do you think sang in Church yesterday?’

b. Pens-ea che [TP abje spacà chi el vaso ]?
   Thinks= she that hasSUBJ 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-advverbials.

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 phrase 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 gà-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 gà-tu dito che el gà magnà cossa, Carlo
  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 SCIL 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 ‘insituiness’ in indirect questions seems to be linked mainly to the (un)availability of an overt sewer-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] feature⁵. However, some languages only have the [+WH] che, not the

⁵ 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 seWH 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 phonomically covert parts that split during the derivation, allowing only and 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 ‘false 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 seWH 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 seWH, if as I think she is a Destra Piave speaker. Be as it may, even for the speakers that do not have an overt version of seWH, WhP is clearly active in indirect wh-questions: in their speech too, chWH appears to sit way lower in the structure than Force, 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 sewh, 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).
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