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Abstract

This dissertation deals with the seemingly-optional alternation between wh-in situ and wh-ex situ in the Romance languages of Northern Italy, and is crucially based on novel data from Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect. Indeed, Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases display an interesting movement pattern which I analyse as an instance of focus-movement into Belletti’s (2004) Foc, i.e. within the periphery of vP. My main claim is that the availability of a clause-internal focal projection for both new information and contrastive focus in Trevigiano pushes a treatment of clause-internally moved wh-phrases as subject to movement triggered by the EPP in T, under Focus-Agreement. This analysis is firmly anchored on two assumptions: first, that Cable’s (2010) ‘grammar of Q’ ought to be extended also to languages with silent Q-particles; second, that the simultaneous existence of two semantically-related structures within the same grammar (in this case, wh-in situ and wh-ex situ) functions as an indicator of an intermediate stage in the process of linguistic evolution. On these assumptions, I argue that Northern Italian wh-in situ [...]
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The main peculiarity of Romance wh-in situ is its optionality: unlike languages like Chinese, whose wh-questions only allow for wh-in situ (Huang 1982 and related works), Romance wh-in situ (virtually) always co-exists with total wh-fronting.

In this dissertation I explore the morphosyntax of wh-in situ in Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect, and more generally of interrogative wh-movement and related properties in Northern Italian dialects (NIDs) of the Romance family. Any analysis of Northern Italian insituness faces two major problems: first, the theoretically-challenging notion of optionality and second, the widespread desire to account for similar phenomena in closely-related varieties by means of a unifying derivation. These approaches, I claim, work for the varieties on which they are based, but crucially fail to account for the wide range of variation observed in the distributional properties of Northern Italian clause-internal wh-phrases. At present, there are two major and divergent analyses of Northern Italian insituness: some authors take wh-in situ to be derived via overt wh-movement to the low portion of the CP-layer (Poletto & Pollock 2000, Munaro et al. 2001 and related works), while others claim that clause-internal wh-phrases are unmoved (Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011).

Here, my aims are threefold. I first present novel data from Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect, and re-organise the large volume of published data on Northern Italian wh-questions, crucially claiming that solid patterns of properties related to insituness can be identified and that consequently the existence of (at least) three types of varieties ought to be posited, each denoted by peculiar instances of micro-variation in the way they derive wh-in situ. Then, I characterise the operation that I call Wh-to-Foc, i.e. movement of clause internal wh-phrases into the Spec of Belletti’s (2004) VP-peripheral FocP. I also claim that the apparent optionality in the Northern Italian in situ/ex situ alternation can be traced back to the exceptional existence of two different strategies to integrate the (silent) Q-particle to wh-phrases, in the sense of Cable (2010): QP-selection in the case of fronting, and Q-adjunction in the case of wh-in situ. Despite the lack of phonetically-realised Q-particles in NIDs, I argue that my approach has undeniable advantages at least for the treatment of indirect wh-in situ and island-trapped wh-phrases. Also, adopting and re-adapting Cable’s analysis for NIDs, I welcomingly eliminate the spurious notion of syntactic optionality, which I innovatively explain as an intermediate step in the process of linguistic evolution that will eventually lead to the generalisation of either strategy to join the Q-particle to
wh-phrases in interrogatives. Indeed, here wh-phrases are not taken to surface either clause-internally or clause-initially as a result of cyclic wh-movement or of an alternation between overt scope and scope construal: the movement patterns are in fact attributed to the existence of both Q-joining strategies, and to the peculiar movement properties of each. Specifically, I draw on robust cross-linguistic data from non Romance languages (Kahnemuyipour 2001, Aboh 2007, Manetta 2010 a.o.), and claim that what triggers Wh-to-Foc is a [foc]-feature, while what is relevant for wh-fronting is a [q]-feature in the head of Rizzi’s (1997) left-peripheral FocusP. I also argue that, under these assumptions, the Trevisian facts are derived correctly iff one assumes that declarative and interrogative NOM clitics are not pronominal elements but rather inflectional classes that overtly realise a set of phi-features in the presence of a relevant Spec-Head configuration in either T or C, with all morphological alternations between declarative and interrogative clitics due to the presence of an additional [q]-feature in the latter. On this theory, and in the spirit of Roberts’ (2007a) treatment of French subject-clitic inversion, I argue that in Trevigiano the verb adjoins to non-nominative clitics (when present) and moves to C as a complex head, having been attracted there by phi-features that the residual V2 environment of the interrogative CP fails to pass to T, à la Chomsky (1995). Finally, I expand my discussion to Romance varieties spoken outside Northern Italy, and argue against the possibility of accounting for the composite morphosyntax of Romance wh-in situ by means of one unique, invariant derivation. Adopting the view that the existence of both strategies to join Q and wh-phrases signals the presence of an intermediate stage of linguistic evolution, I claim that the observed facts are better explained if they are understood as a by-product of different availabilities of Q-adjunction and QP-selection, plus the presence or absence of EPP features in C and/or T and, when relevant, special prosodic requirements.
Nomenclature

Acronyms & abbreviations

(1/2/3)PP 1st/2nd/3rd person plural
(1/2/3)PS 1st/2nd/3rd person singular
iff if and only if
SCII subject-clitic inversion
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Adj adjective
ADV/Adv adverbial
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Bl Bellunese
Ch Chinese
cl clitic
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DAT dative
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EPP Extended Projection Principle
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EXPL expletive
<table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Left Periphery</td>
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</tr>
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<td>OM</td>
<td>object marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Phonological Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>pair-list (reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPPI</td>
<td>pied-piping past island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative clause marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Relativized Minimality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>short construal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>single pair (reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
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<td>Nomenclature</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>specifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tv</td>
<td>Trevigiano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>verb-second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAV</td>
<td>Immediately After the Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projections (and X’-related notations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgrOP</td>
<td>Object Agreement Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Adjective Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AspP</td>
<td>Aspectual Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Clitic Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Complementiser Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Determiner Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FinP</td>
<td>Finiteness Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FocLOW</td>
<td>Focus Projection (TP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FocusHIGH</td>
<td>Focus Projection (CP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ForceP</td>
<td>Force Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntP</td>
<td>Interrogative Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Inflection Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModP</td>
<td>Modifier Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpP</td>
<td>Operator Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Preposition Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QembP</td>
<td>Question embedded Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Question-particle Projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SubjP</td>
<td>Subject Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TopP</td>
<td>Topic Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Tense Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
<td>little VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WhP</td>
<td>Wh- Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X'</td>
<td>intermediate node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X⁰</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XP</td>
<td>maximal projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miscellaneous symbols

- (*x)  insertion of x is ungrammatical
- (x)   x is optional
- *      ungrammatical
- *(x)  insertion of x is compulsory
- /x/   phonological representation of x
- =x     x is a clitic element
- >      follows linearly
- ?      degraded
- ??     very degraded
- <->   covert movement
- XXX   impossible movement
- ←     overt movement
- §      section
- ix     x is an interpretable feature
- pro    little pro
$ux$ \hspace{1cm} x is an uninterpretable feature

$y \rightarrow x$ \hspace{1cm} x follows from y

$\{x\}$ $\{y\}$ \hspace{1cm} x and y are in complementary distribution

**Other**

✓ \hspace{1cm} well-formed

✗ \hspace{1cm} ill-formed

A' \hspace{1cm} non-argumental

A- \hspace{1cm} argumental

ALL CAPS \hspace{1cm} an element in all caps is focused

wrt \hspace{1cm} with respect to
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Introduction

This dissertation falls within the cartographic approach to syntactic structures, i.e. the attempt to draw maps of syntactic configurations that are as precise and detailed as possible. Here, I shall briefly introduce this theoretical approach and its history. The reader who is familiar with the issue can skip this part and move to §0.1. Conversely, a detailed survey of the cartographic enterprise can be found in Cinque & Rizzi (2009), which provided the main inspiration for the opening of this Chapter.

Syntactic structures are complex objects whose fine properties have been investigated by decades of formal syntactic studies. In a sense, structures have always been central in the framework of Generative Grammar (Chomsky 1957, 1965 and much further developments), but the focus on structural maps eventually arose in the early nineties, alongside the development of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1989, 1993). This interest in structural maps was an obvious progression from the identification and formalisation of multiple functional heads during the first ten years of the Principles and Parameters framework (Chomsky 1981, 1982), which led to an extension of so-called X-bar theory. The X-bar theory is a theory of syntactic category formation based on the claim that phrases contain intermediate constituents projected from a head X. The interest in maps extended this claim to the functional elements of the clause (Chomsky 1986), crucially isolating the Verb Phrase (VP) first, an Inflection Phrase (IP), and then a Complementiser Phrase (CP), along the lines in (1):

(1) \text{CLAUSES: FUNCTIONAL FIELDS}
   \[\text{CP Spec } C^0 \text{ [IP Spec } I^0 \text{ [VP Spec } V^0 \text{ ]]}\]

The motivation behind (1) was the idea that phrases, and more generally clauses, are composed of a lower lexical structure and a higher functional structure, both corresponding to hierarchical sequences of the X-bar schema. Under these assumptions, a crucial development followed the observation that functional structures, unlike lexical projections, actually consist of more than one head: indeed, in (1), IP and CP are not functional projections but rather functional fields. In fact, the preliminary investigations into the core functional structure of the clause, Pollock (1989) and Belletti (1990), led to the definition of IP not as a projection but as a layer, and were followed by many studies along the same lines: among many others, Cinque (1999) on the syntax of adverbs; Shlonsky (1997, 2000) on
the Semitic IP and subject positions, respectively; Sigurðsson (2000) on the locus of structural case-marking; Cardinaletti (2004) on the structural position of subject projections; Schweikert (2005) for a hierarchy of thematic roles expressed by prepositional phrases; and Bianchi (2006) on the syntax of personal arguments. The same logic then led to a splitting of the CP into more articulated hierarchical sequences of functional projections, the CP-domain or Left Periphery, first proposed in Rizzi (1997) (then refined in 2001 and related works). Further investigations include, among many others, Benincà (2001,2006) on the positions of topics and focus and on the medieval Romance LP, respectively; Benincà & Poletto (2004b) on the LP of V2-languages; Boci (2004) on the LP in Italian; Cruschina (2006) on the LP of Sicilian; Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007) on German and Italian topics. Similar claims have also been made for the Determiner Phrase (DP) (Cinque 1994, Brugè 2002, Giusti 2002, Scott 2002, Svenonius 2008), and more recently for Prepositional Phrases (PP) (Cinque & Rizzi 2010), though these are beyond the main focus of this dissertation.

On the basis of the evidence gathered over the last two decades, the cartographic approach assumes that the distinct hierarchies of functional projections are to be considered universal, even though languages differ in the type(s) of movements that they allow and/or in the extent to which they realise each functional head and Specifier overtly. The universality comprises not only the type of heads and specifiers contained within the functional layers dominating VP, NP, AP (Adjectival Phrase), PP, IP etc., but also the number of those heads and specifiers and their relative order. This possibility, widely explored in Cinque (2006) and Kayne (2008), implies that if a language provides evidence for the existence of a particular functional head or Spec, that projection must be present in every natural language, independently of the presence or absence of overt evidence for it. It follows that, because of its universal nature, all work stemming from the cartographic program is based firmly on the evidence coming from comparative and typological studies.

This dissertation is therefore firmly anchored on systematic cross-linguistic comparisons between published and novel data from Lombard and Venetan dialects, and more broadly from Romance. My main references for Northern Italian dialects (henceforth, NIDs) are the works by Munaro, Poletto & Pollock (Munaro 1999, Poletto 2000, Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto & Pollock 2000 to 2015, a.o.), alongside Manzini & Savoia’s data and discussion (Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011, Manzini 2014, a.o.). To this, I add novel data from Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect, as presented and preliminarily analysed in Bonan (2017a;2017b;2018). Multiple works work on the topic of interrogative wh-movement in Romance and non-Romance languages are also discussed and cited throughout.

The main topic that I explore here is the morphosyntax of wh-in situ in Northern Italian dialects, and more broadly Romance. Wh-in situ is a term commonly used to refer to clause-internal occurrences of wh-phrases, as in the French example in (2):
The type of wh-in situ explored in this dissertation is the genuine type, i.e. the one used in answer-seeking questions (as opposed to echo questions, which repeat a previously-uttered constituent and do not have the truth-values of real questions). Also, the languages that are relevant for my discussion are those where wh-in situ is a seemingly optional question-formation strategy which co-exists peacefully with wh-fronting (French, NIDs and, to a more limited extent, Spanish and Portuguese), as opposed to languages such as Chinese where insituness is the only available option (see discussion in §0.1, and references cited therein).

My aims here, which I develop throughout, are threefold: first, to present and re-organise the large amount of published data on the subject of Northern Italian wh-in situ, crucially laying out significant distributional patterns and exceptions; second, to present the existing analyses of the phenomena, underlining their strengths and weaknesses; and to propose a new explanation for the Trevisian facts, which I shall then extend to a number of NIDs, thereby proposing a novel typology of wh-in situ. In my approach, I shall make extensive use of two functional layers, Rizzi’s (2001) CP (the so-called Left Periphery) and the periphery of VP as described in Belletti (2004), whose fine structures have been the subject of many investigations. Crucially, following Rizzi (2001), Rizzi & Bocci (2017) and Belletti (2004), I take the LP of the clause to have the form in (3), and the VP-periphery to consist of the projections in (4):

(3) **THE LEFT PERIPHERY** (as in Rizzi & Bocci 2017:8(29))

\[ [ \text{Force} \ [ \text{Top}^* \ [ \text{Int} \ [ \text{Top}^* \ [ \text{Focus} \ [ \text{Top}^* \ [ \text{Mod} \ [ \text{Top}^* \ [ \text{Qemb} \ [ \text{Fin} \ [ \text{IP} \ldots ]])]})])])]

(4) **THE LOW PERIPHERY** (as in Belletti 2004)

\[ \ldots [ \text{Top} \ [ \text{Foc} \ [ \text{Top} \ [ \text{VP} \ldots ]])]]]

Here and in the above cited works, the LP of the clause is assumed to consist of strictly-ordered projections that encode functional information such as force, finiteness etc. These projections are delimited by **ForceP**, where a connection is established between the clause and the discourse or a higher selecting V, and **Fin(iteness)P**, which is in direct contact with IP, as in (3). **Focus** is the projection whose Spec is commonly assumed to host either focused elements or fronted wh-phrases, while the low **Qemb(added)P** (previously called WhP in Rizzi 2001) has been argued to host wh-phrases in

---

1 Asterisks such as those in (3) are conventionally used in generative works to signal that TopPs, i.e. the projections hosting topicalised elements, are recursive.

2 In this dissertation, I shall instead use the label QembP, to avoid any possible confusion: I actually use the label WhP as a general term to rather refer to the lexical category projected by wh-words.
focus-containing indirect wh-questions (refer to Rizzi 2001;2004 and Rizzi & Bocci 2017 for a detailed discussion). The presence of a focal projection in the periphery of VP, Foc, was originally posited in Belletti (2004) as the host of Italian post-verbal subjects. Because of the ungrammaticality of the wh-in situ strategy in Standard Italian, Belletti’s Foc was at first thought to only attract focused elements, not wh-movement. However, further studies have subsequently proposed that Belletti’s SpecFoc is available as the target of Romance clause-internal wh-phrases, such as the work by Kato (2003) (published as Kato 2013) for Brazilian Portuguese, Belletti (2006) for French, and Manzini (2014) for NIDs, among many others. This analysis of wh-in situ as targeting Foc, refined on the basis of robust data from non-Romance languages (Mahajan 1990, Manetta 2010;2011, Jayaseelan 1996, Aboh 2006, Sinopoulou 2008, Cheng & Bayer 2015, a.o.), is the one that I shall adopt here to account for the Trevisian data. Throughout, to avoid any possible confusion, I shall refer to Rizzi’s left-peripheral focal projection as Focus_HIGH, and to Belletti’s VP-peripheral focal projection as Foc_LOW.

This detailed introduction begins with an overview of the syntax of interrogative wh-movement, with special attention given to wh-in situ (§0.1). A whole section is dedicated to the morphosyntax of Northern Italian wh-in situ, and to an introductory overview of the existing treatments thereof (§0.1.1). In §0.2, I shall briefly present the Venetan language, then introduce novel data from the Trevisian variety, which constitute the main data-related contribution of this dissertation (§0.2.1). The Trevisian data on clause-internal movement of wh-phrases open the discussion of the working questions and problems for the existing theories of Northern Italian wh-in situ raised by Trevigiano, which are outlined in §0.2.2. To conclude, a summary of the major theoretical claims of this dissertation is provided in §0.3.

0.1 On interrogative wh-movement

Languages vary substantially in the ways in which they realise wh-movement in genuine, answer-seeking interrogatives, at least superficially. The name wh-movement stems from the early days of generative grammar, as a reference to the transformational analysis of the day whereby the wh-expression appeared in its canonical position at deep structure, i.e. in the clause-internal first-merge position occupied by the corresponding argument or adverbial in declaratives, as in (5a), and then moved leftward into its derived clause-initial position at surface structure, as illustrated in (5b):

(5) FRONTING OF A DIRECT OBJECT FROM ITS ARGUMENTAL POSITION

   a. Your brother ate all of my chocolates
   b. What did your brother eat ___ ?

Consequently, wh-movement can be argued to result in discontinuities that appear to follow interesting patterns cross-linguistically. Wh-phrases are operators which bind variables at the level of
Logical Form (LF), like other quantifier noun phrases: in some cases, the correct binding configuration is created before Spell-Out, i.e. overtly, while in other cases it is delayed to LF, i.e. it is done covertly. In a way, wh-movement can be thought of as a syntactic solution to a semantic problem: just as any other quantifier, a wh-operator must be split across two positions to be interpretable, one which serves as the operator itself and one which serves as the variable. The implication of this hypothesis is that, whether or not the movement of wh-words is detectable in the phonetic string, all wh-words must move to create the relevant operator-variable configuration before interpretation occurs. Consequently, the different cross-linguistic distributional properties of wh-words are assumed to be the result of the fact wh-movement occurs either overtly or covertly.

Genuine wh-questions can be single, when only one wh-phrase is present, as in (6a), or multiple, when two or more elements are questioned, as in (6b):

(6) SINGLE vs MULTIPLE WH-QUESTIONS

a. Who did you meet ___ at the market?
b. Who did you meet ___ where?

Interestingly, in case of multiple wh-questions, some languages have compulsory total fronting of all wh-words (such as Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian, as described in Rudin 1988a/b, Bošković 2000, 2002, Krapova 2002, Krapova & Cinque 2008, a.o.), while in other languages fronting both elements is only one of many options (Persian, Mirdamadi 2018). Moreover, there are languages where only one wh-element is fronted (like English and French, Kuno & Robinson 1972 and Kotek 2016, a.o.), languages where all wh-words stay clause-internally (as in Chinese and Japanese, Soh 2005, Takita & Yang 2014, a.o.), and languages like French which can marginally leave more than one wh-word clause-internally (Mathieu 1999, Bošković 2001, Shlonsky 2012). These movement patterns are linked to, yet not always constrained by, the movement properties of wh-phrases in single wh-questions. In addition, in truth-conditional terms, while the interpretation of a single wh-question is always one within the set of propositions that are true for all x that the wh-phrase can stand for, multiple wh-questions can be associated with a pair-list (PL) or a single-pair (SP) reading, or both. For example, English multiple questions like (6b) are known to be exclusively compatible with a PL reading, as illustrated in (7):

(7) INTERPRETATION OF ENGLISH MULTIPLE WH-QUESTIONS

What did your brother eat where?

a. ✓ PL READING: My brother ate your chocolates on the sofa, my candies in his bed, the jar of nutella in the kitchen, ...

b. × SP READING: * My brother ate your chocolates on the sofa
In contrast, in languages like Japanese only the single-pair reading is available (Yoshida 1995, Saito 1999), while in French a single-pair interpretation is possible iff both wh-words stay clause-internally (Bošković 2001). In a way, the availability of one or the other interpretation seems linked to the position occupied by the wh-phrase at Spell-Out: the pair-list reading is coupled with overt wh-fronting, while the single-pair reading is accessible if the language has wh-in situ. The study of multiple wh-movement goes back to Baker (1970), Bolinger (1978) and Kuno & Robinson (1972). Among more recent contributions are Higginbotham & May (1981), Fiengo et al. (1988), Lasnik & Saito (1992), Kayne (1983) and Dayal (2002). Influential works on the semantics of multiple wh-questions include, among others, Hagstrom (1998), Bošković (2001), Kitagawa et al. (2004), Cable (2010) and Kotek (2014). However, the issues surrounding multiple wh-questions are complex, and are beyond the scope of this dissertation. Further details on the morphosyntax and semantics of multiple wh-questions can be found in the works cited above and references therein.

The distribution of single direct wh-questions is also broad and complex. Some languages, like Standard English for instance, require total fronting of the wh-phrase in the unmarked case (Ross 1967, Culicover 1976, Chomsky 1977, Bošković 2000, a.o.), as illustrated in (8a). In these languages, the absence of wh-fronting is associated with an echo interpretation, as in (8b):

\[(8)\] **WH-FRONTING vs WH-IN SITU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standard English** | \[a. WH-FRONTING = genuine question \]
|                 | \[Who did you see ___?\]                                                    |
|                 | \[b. NO WH-FRONTING = echo question \]                                      |
|                 | \[You saw WHO?!\]                                                          |

In other languages, like Chinese (Huang 1982, Aoun & Li 1993, Tsai 1994, a.o.) and Japanese (Lasnik & Saito 1992, Watanabe 1992, Aoun & Li 1993), the wh-word must stay clause-internally for the question to be felicitous, as in (9):

\[(9)\] **PURE WH-IN SITU** (adapted from Huang 1982:253(159))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese</strong></td>
<td>[a. Ni kanjian-le shei?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[you see-ASP who]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[‘Who did you see?’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[b. * Shei, ni kanjian-le t,?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[who you see-ASP]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this dissertation, languages that strand wh-phrases clause-internally will be referred to as pure in situ languages, as opposed to optional in situ languages, where wh-in situ co-exists with wh-fronting. Among these optional in situ languages, which are the subject of this work, is Contemporary Spoken French: leaving aside the question of pragmatic variation, both total wh-fronting, as in (10a), and no
wh-fronting, as in (10b), are attested in genuine questions (Chang 1997, Mathieu 1999, Bošković 2000, Starke 2001, Baunaz 2011, a.o.):

(10) WH-FRONTING vs WH-IN SITU

Contemporary Spoken French

a. Qui est-ce que tu as vu ____?
   who est-ce que you have seen
   ‘Who did you see?’

b. Tu as vu qui?
   you have seen who

Theoretically, wh-in situ languages of both the pure and the optional type are challenging: the correct binding configuration of the wh-phrase is clearly not obtained in overt syntax, and the phonetic string is not sufficient to understand whether the wh-phrase is unmoved, or moved covertly. The situation is further complicated in the case of optional in situ languages, optionality being a problem per se in any theoretical account.

Since Huang (1982), pure in situ languages like Chinese and Japanese have been argued to have real insituiness. Consequently, the wh-words in examples like (9a) are commonly considered to be located in their first-merge position. The correct operator-variable configuration is hence obtained in covert syntax: the interpretation of the wh-phrase is done after Spell-Out, at the level of LF. Consequently, while overt wh-fronting is ruled out in pure in situ languages, as seen in (9b), covert wh-fronting does take place, as in (11):

(11) WH-MOVEMENT AT LF (adapted from Huang 1982:253(160))³

Chinese

[[shei]], [ni kanjian-le ti]?

who, you see-ASP ti

LF-moved wh-words like that in example (11) have been argued to be subject to the same interpretation and scope as overtly moved wh-elements (such as the English words in 8a), yet constrained differently in terms of sensitivity to islands and intervention effects. This theoretical model, in which the choice between overt and covert movement is considered to be parametrised, faces at least three problems: first, as noted by Huang himself, clause-internal wh-phrases are constrained differently than overtly moved wh-items in terms of sensitivity to islands and intervention effects (see Watanabe 1992, Reinhart 1998, Pesetsky 2000, Richards 2000, a.o. for detailed discussions in this regard); second, while Chinese-like languages do indeed lack any traces of overt wh-movement, the full-fronting languages like English do not actually eschew the in situ strategy, and hence cannot be said to manifest the negative setting of an overt/covert movement parameter (wh-in situ is possible, and actually the

³Throughout, I use solid arrows to illustrate pre Spell-Out movement (= overt movement), dashed arrows to illustrate post Spell-Out movement (= covert movement), and bi-directional dashed arrows for Agree relations.
only permitted option, in multiple wh-questions, as previously exemplified in (6b)); third, the very existence of optional in situ languages is problematic, since under a parametric approach to insituness, (apparently) free variation between wh-movement and wh-in situ is not expected. Detailed accounts of the morphosyntax of pure in situ languages, which are not the focus of this dissertation, can be found in Huang (1982), which inspired many further developments (Lasnik & Saito 1992, Watanabe 1992, Aoun & Li 1993, Tsai 1994, Soh 2005, Pan 2014, a.o.). See also Beck & Kim (1997) and Ko (2005) for Korean, Bruening & Thuan (2006) for Vietnamese, Cole & Hermon (1994) for Aconcach Quechua, Cole & Hermon (1998) for Malay, Kishimoto (2005) for Sinhala, and Downing (2011) for Bantu languages.

Those Romance languages that allow wh-phrases to surface clause-internally constitute a typologically interesting case between pure in situ languages, where wh-fronting is ruled out, and full-fronting languages, in which insituness is disallowed. In single wh-questions in Romance, if insituness is possible in answer-seeking contexts, it always co-exists with the option of total wh-fronting, albeit to different extents. Although wh-fronting is always possible in fact, wh-in situ can be limited to certain wh-words, and its availability varies both intra- and cross-linguistically. However, on the whole, Romance insituness can be considered optional; these peculiar instances of wh-in situ are the subject of this work. Optional in situ languages include French (Obenauer 1994, Mathieu 1999, Bošković 2000, Baunaz 2011, Shlonsky 2012, Cheng & Bayer 2015, a.o.), NIDs (Munaro 1999, Poletto 2000, Manzini & Savoia 2005, a.o.), and partially Spanish (Jiménez 1997, Etxepare & Urive-Etxebarria 2005, Kaiser & Quaglia 2015, Biezma 2018, a.o.) and Portuguese (Cheng & Rooryck 2000;2002, Kato 2013, a.o.). Further references on various aspects of Romance insituness are scattered throughout this dissertation. Details on Northern Italian wh-in situ, which is the main focus of this dissertation, are provided in §0.1.1.

The study of Romance insituness is directly relevant to the general characterisation of wh-in situ phenomena and to the theoretical models built to explain it. All issues related to the properties of covert movement (for instance, the distinction between feature and phrasal movement), of semantic intervention phenomena (à la Beck 2006, Honcoop 1998, Szabolcsi & Zwarts 1992, a.o), and of syntactic intervention and locality (Rizzi 1990 and further related works), are at least as intriguing, if not more so, in languages in which wh-in situ is optional.

0.1.1 Wh-in situ in Northern Italian dialects

I have mentioned above that Spanish and (European and Brazilian) Portuguese partially license wh-in situ: the reason behind this choice of adverb is the distributionally-limited availability of insituness in genuine questions in these languages, as opposed to languages such as Contemporary Spoken French and NIDs, where wh-in situ is a widely-employed question-formation strategy. In
Contemporary Spoken French\(^4\), wh-in situ has a unique, puzzling feature: it is incompatible with subject-clitic inversion (henceforth, \textit{SCI}I), as illustrated in (12), and with \textit{est-ce que} insertion, as in (13). These two interrogative strategies, perfectly acceptable with wh-fronting, are inconsistent with a clause-internal wh-phrase:

(12) \textbf{WH-PLACEMENT WITH SCI}\(\text{I}\) \textit{Contemporary Spoken French}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \underline{Qui} as-tu rencontré ___?
\item * As-tu rencontré qui?
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item who have=you met
\item have=you met who
\end{enumerate}

\textit{Who did you meet?’}

(13) \textbf{WH-PLACEMENT WITH EST-CE QUE} \textit{Contemporary Spoken French}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Qui est-ce que tu as rencontré ___?
\item * Est-ce que tu as rencontré qui?
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item who est-ce que you have met
\item est-ce que you have met who
\end{enumerate}

The peculiar interrogative grammar of French has been explained as either the result of syntactic properties or prosodic constraints (Aoun et al. 1981, Aoun 1986, Obenauer 1994, Boeckx 1999, Mathieu 1999, Munaro et al. 2001, Starke 2001, Cheng & Rooryck 2002, Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2005, Adli 2006, Baunaz 2011 and Oiry 2011, a.o.). However, to date there have been several serious descriptive inaccuracies in the study of wh-in situ in European French. To build a reliable theoretical account of French wh-in situ, I believe it is crucial to distinguish between Standard French and Contemporary Spoken French: in fact, only the latter is indeed relevant to the study of French wh-in situ.

This is not the case in the Northern Italian domain, where the realisation of \textit{SCI}I in root questions is orthogonal to the position occupied by the wh-phrase at Spell-Out (as correctly observed in Manzini & Savoia 2011). Nonetheless, the morphosyntax of Northern Italian wh-in situ is a fertile research field; the derivation of the phenomenon has been the subject of a 20-year debate, which I outline briefly in what follows.

Research into the syntax of wh-movement in Romance was initiated by Kayne (1972), on the basis of French data. Later, Kayne’s (1994) \textit{antisymmetry}, with its emphasis on strict \textit{binary branching} (one complement and one Spec per head) and the ban on rightward movement, provided a very productive framework for the study of simple and complex interrogative inversion (Kayne & Pollock 2000;2012, Hulk & Pollock 2001, Pollock 2006 and references therein). The cross-linguistic variation in the syntax of interrogatives then received substantial impetus from Rizzi’s (1996) paper, according to which wh-movement is driven by a so-called \textit{Wh-Criterion}, namely the formal requirement that a

\footnote{Throughout, I make a distinction between two varieties of European French: Standard French and Contemporary Spoken French. I shall claim that this distinction is crucial: while in Standard French wh-in situ is restricted, in the Contemporary Spoken variety insituness is widespread and virtually unconstrained.}
[+wh]-carrying wh-phrase ends up in a Spec-head relation with C, which is also specified as [+wh] in questions. The Criterion was revisited and refined in a recent development of the theory, Rizzi (2006). The most influential syntactic investigations of Northern Italian wh-in situ have been carried out within this framework, and adopt two diametrically opposed stances: clause-internal wh-words in NIDs are either taken to be moved into a left-peripheral Spec (henceforth the remnant-IP movement hypothesis) or to stay in their first-merge position (covert movement hypothesis). I briefly summarise these theories in what follows, then analyse them in detail in Chapter 6.

Following Kayne’s (1994) influential work, Munaro et al. (2001), Poletto & Pollock (2004) (and further related papers) have extended the remnant movement approach to the syntax of interrogatives in French and NIDs. This theory is based on Bellunese (as described in Munaro 1999) and linguistically-related Venetan and Lombard varieties, in which wh-interrogatives only license non-D-linked (= bare) wh-words clause-internally (and only in sentence-final position), and do so exclusively in root contexts, and never within syntactic islands. According to these studies, wh-in situ in Northern Italian dialects is actually an instance of fake insituness: clause-internal wh-words are assumed to undergo wh-movement into a left-peripheral Spec, which is masked in the phonetic string because further movements take place, which displace the whole (remnant) IP to the LP of the clause.

A very simplified derivation of a Bellunese question such as (14) is provided in (15):

(14) **Bellunese** (Poletto & Pollock 2000:118(5))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ha-tu</th>
<th>parecìà che?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have=you</td>
<td>prepared what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘What did you prepare?’

(15) **BELLUNES (MOVED) WH-IN SITU** (simplified derivation)

**Input:** [IP tu ha parecìà che ]

a. **First step:** Wh-movement to a functional projection higher than IP (here, XP)

   [XP che, X0 [IP tu ha parecìà ___]]

b. **Second step:** Movement of the remnant-IP to a higher functional projection (YP)

   [YP [IP tu ha parecìà ___], Y0 [XP che X0 ___]]

The remnant-IP movement analysis came under strong criticism from by Manzini & Savoia (2005;2011), both for theory-internal and data-related reasons. These authors, who based their discussion on Lombard data, claimed that Northern Italian clause-internal wh-phrases should be assumed to be unmoved from their first-merge position, i.e. covertly moved to the LP after Spell-Out, as in Chinese-like languages. However, as I shall argue extensively in Chapter 6, the data used to support the covert movement analysis are very different from those used by Munaro et al.: most Lombard dialects, in fact, do not display a D-linked/non-D-linked asymmetry, fail to have a sentence-finality requirement for clause-internal wh-phrases (in Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria’s 2005 terms),
and felicitously license wh-in situ not only in long construals and indirect wh-questions, but also within islands for extraction. On Manzini & Savoia’s understanding, the parameter between wh-in situ and wh-fronting in NIDs is a very classical distinction between *scope construal* and *overt scope* (respectively), and the different distributions of clause-internal wh-phrases observed in their varieties and those studied by Munaro et al. have their origins in the setting of very basic properties. In their account, in the context of micro-variation among closely-related varieties, it is in fact possible that some factors force wh-movement in embedded sentences in some grammars but not in others; similarly, they argue that differences in island sensitivity can be explained if these are assumed to be related not to conditions on movement operations but rather conditions on LF interpretive construals.

Interestingly, in a more recent development, Manzini (2014) very briefly suggested that Northern Italian wh-in situ might actually move from its first-merge position and target a TP-internal Spec. The projection in question is *Foc*, within Belletti’s (2004) VP-periphery, which has a structure along the lines of that shown in (16):

\[ VP_{\text{PERIPHERY}} (\text{as in Belletti 2004}) \]
\[
[CP \ldots [TP \ldots [\text{TopP} \text{Top} [\text{FocP} \text{Foc} [\text{TopP} \text{Top} \ldots \text{VP}]]]]]
\]

In this dissertation, I shall argue that there are at least two main problems with these existing analyses of Northern Italian insituness: first, that they are based on varieties that display completely contrasting behaviour in how they allow insituness; and second, they aim to establish a unifying theory based on the legitimate yet idealistic desire to account for all cross-linguistic data by means of a unique derivation.

Approaches similar to that of Manzini (2014), where wh-in situ is argued to target a low focal projection, had already been proposed for some Romance languages (Kato 2013 for Brazilian Portuguese, Belletti 2006 for French) and for some non-Romance ones (Mahajan 1990 and Manetta 2010;2011 for Bangla and Hindi/Urdu; Jayaseelan 1996 for Malayalam; Aboh 2006 for the Bantu language Aghem; Sinopoulou 2008 for Greek multiple wh-questions, Kahnemuyipour 2001 and Mirdamadi 2018 for Persian, a.o.). Interestingly, Cheng & Bayer (2015) claimed that insituness in South Asian languages is actually an instance of overt movement to the left edge of VP/vP); they claim that there is no evidence for wh-movement to the CP-domain in these languages, with the only exception of Kashmiri, a V2-language. Consequently, South Asian languages have been argued to form a typologically interesting and significant linguistic type between full-moving and pure in situ languages. More details on the status of wh-in situ in South Asian languages, along with concrete examples, are provided in Chapter 3 of this dissertation. A TP-internal wh-movement of that sort had never been attested in NIDs; however, short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases can indeed be found in Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect. I present the interrogative syntax of Trevigiano in §0.2, and discuss it throughout this dissertation.
To conclude, it has been observed that Northern Italian wh-in situ has a peculiar property that makes it unique in the Romance domain, and beyond. In many varieties, there exists not only the regular single insituëss type described so far (where only one wh-phrase appears clause-internally and no other wh-word or wh-operator is present in the structure), but also wh-doubling, where a clause-internal wh-phrase is construed with a higher, left-peripheral wh-word or wh-operator (as widely discussed in Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011, Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015, Manzini 2014, a.o.), as illustrated in the examples in (17):

(17) WH-DOUBLING (Poletto & Pollock 2009:2(1))

   a. S’a-lo   fat  che?  
      what’has=he done what
      ‘What did he do?’

   b. Ndo   e-lo   ndat   endoe? 
      where is=he gone where
      ‘Where did he go?’

Wh-doubling configurations are not instances of multiple wh-questions: the two wh-words are in fact interpreted as a unit, hence the semantics of the question in which they appear is merely that of a regular single wh-question. Depending on the variety under investigation, wh-doubling can be a root-only phenomenon and/or a non-root phenomenon, and it can either be compulsory or can alternate with single (= non-doubling) insituëss. The extent to which it applies to different wh-words is subject to significant variation, as I shall show in Part I.

0.2 Venetan, and novel data from Trevigiano

Venetan is a Romance language with around 3.9 million native speakers. It is spoken mostly in the Veneto region (North-Eastern Italy), where most of the 5 million inhabitants can at least understand it. It is also spoken and understood outside the Veneto, namely in Trentino, Friuli and Venezia Giulia, Istria, and some towns in Dalmatia.

Commonly referred to as an Italian dialect (even by its own speakers), Venetan is actually an independent language. In fact, it was derived from Vulgar Latin and only partially influenced by Standard Italian. The main regional varieties of Venetan are the Central variety (spoken in Padua, Vicenza, and the Polesine area); the Eastern or Coastal variety (spoken in Venice, Trieste, Grado, Istria, and Fiume); the Western variety (Verona and some areas of the Trentino region); the Northern-Central variety, spoken in the Destra Piave\(^5\) part of the Province of Treviso and most of the Province of Pordenone; and the Northern variety, spoken in the Sinistra Piave\(^6\) part of the Province of Treviso.

\(^5\) Variety spoken on the right bank of the Piave river.
\(^6\) Variety spoken on the left bank of the Piave river.
(including Belluno, but also Feltre, Agordo, Cadore, and Zoldo Alto). All of these different varieties of Venetan are mutually intelligible to a very high degree, even those with the most substantial differences (the Central and the Western varieties). Other noteworthy variants are spoken in Chioggia, the Pontine Marshes, Dalmatia, some southern Brazilian cities (where Venetan is known as Talian), and the Mexican city of Chipilo.

In this dissertation, I shall exclusively present data from Trevigiano, and more precisely from the variety spoken in the wider Ponte di Piave area, i.e. a mixed Destra-Sinistra Piave variety where wh-in situ is most productive.

0.2.1 Trevigiano: interrogative syntax

The data presented in this section are gathered from recently published working papers (Bonan 2017a/b/2018), where I discussed previous versions of the theory developed here.

NIDs, like Standard Italian, have traditionally been described as pro-drop languages (Poletto 1993, but see Cardinaletti & Repetti 2008 & 2010 for a partial pro-drop analysis). In generative grammar, a positive setting of the pro-drop parameter allows empty pronominal elements to be identified by their governor: structurally, the empty subject position is filled by the phonetically-null element pro (‘little pro’). Therefore, in the unmarked case declaratives seem subject-less, as in (18):

\[
(18) \text{INSERTION OF LITTLE pro} \\
\]

a. \textit{pro} \textit{vegno} \textit{dopo} \textit{sena}  \\
\textit{pro} \textit{come} \textit{IPS.FUT} \textit{after} \textit{dinner}  \\
‘I shall come after dinner’

b. \textit{pro} \textit{magnaremo} \textit{tuta a} \textit{ciocoeata a} \textit{Nadal}  \\
\textit{pro} \textit{eat} \textit{PP.FUT} \textit{all the chocolate} \textit{at} \textit{Christmas}  \\
‘We will eat the chocolate up at Christmas’

Of course, the subject of a clause in a null-subject language can also be overt; the sentences in (18) are still perfectly grammatical in the presence of an overt NOM pronoun, as in (19):

\[
(19) \text{OVERT SUBJECT PRONOUN} \\
\]

a. \textit{Mi} \textit{vegno} \textit{dopo} \textit{sena}  \\
\textit{I} \textit{come} \textit{FUT} \textit{after} \textit{dinner}  \\
‘I shall come after dinner’

b. \textit{Nojaltri} \textit{magnaremo} \textit{tuta a} \textit{ciocoeata a} \textit{Nadal}  \\
\textit{we} \textit{eat} \textit{FUT} \textit{all the chocolate} \textit{at} \textit{Christmas}  \\
‘We will eat the chocolate up at Christmas’

Along with full-fledged pronouns like those in (19), Trevigiano also has two series of nominative clitics, assertive and interrogative. The declarative series of nominative clitics is incomplete: only three clitics out of six grammatical persons exist, namely 2-3PS and 3PP. Thus, Trevigiano behaves
like Paduan, Venetian and Triestino (Poletto 1993). The situation is different when it comes to the interrogative series of nominative clitics, where the clitic for the 2PP is realised, and for some speakers the 1PS clitic and the expletive are also available. In this respect, Trevigiano differs from the varieties described in Poletto (1993), whose interrogative clitic series is wholly complete. The Trevisian clitic paradigms are illustrated in Table 0.1. Forms in brackets are those that are not at the disposal of all speakers:

(20) DECLARATIVE vs INTERROGATIVE NOM CLITICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASSERTIVE</th>
<th>INTERROGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1PS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(io)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PS</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PS</td>
<td>el_M / a_F / -</td>
<td>eo_M / ea_F / (eo_EXPL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PP</td>
<td>i_M / e_F</td>
<td>i_M / e_F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a subject clitic is available, it must be phonetically realised, both in declaratives, as in (20a), and in interrogatives, as in (20b). Note that, throughout, the compulsory insertion of an element *x is signalled by means of the traditional notation *(x), while the infelicity of an element is shown as (*x). While the declarative clitic appears in proclisis, i.e. before its verbal host, the interrogative is enclitic on the verb, i.e. it follows it directly.

The interrogative clitics play a crucial role in the formation of Trevisian answer-seeking matrix interrogatives, which display compulsory SCII, as in (21):

(21) COMPULSORY SCII IN DIRECT INTERROGATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trevigiano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Vien-tu al marcà?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>come=cl to.the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Are you coming to the market?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>* Te vien al marcà?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cl_2PS come to.the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Cuando si-tu ndà al marcà?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when are=cl gone to.the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘When did you go to the market?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. * Cuando te sí ndà al marcà?
   when cl$_{2PS}$ are gone to the market

$SCL_{II}$ is a very widespread question-formation strategy in NIDs (Poletto 1993;2000, Munaro 1999, Manzini & Savoia 2005, a.o.) and in wh-interrogatives it is orthogonal to the position occupied by the wh-phrase (as correctly observed in Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011), as in (22):

(22) $SCL_{II}$ THROUGHOUT

   a. Chi ga-tu catà ____?
      what have=cl$_{2PS}$ eaten?
      ‘Who did you meet?’
   b. Ga-tu catà chi?
      have=cl$_{2PS}$ met who

   In this respect, Trevigiano and NIDs in general differ from French, which has $SCL_{II}$ yet categorically excludes it in construction with a clause-internal wh-phrase, as in (23):

(23) NO $SCL_{II}$ WITH WH-IN SITU

   a. Qui as-tu croisé ____?
      who have=you met
      ‘Who did you meet?’
   b. * As-tu croisé qui?
      Have-you met who

   Trevigiano is hence an optional in situ language. There is a high degree of optionality in the in situ-ex situ alternation, with two exceptions: the what-word che, which is only felicitous clause-internally, as in (24), and the why-word parché, which only appears clause-initially, as in (25):

(24) DISTRIBUTION OF CHE

   a. Vo-tu che?
      want=cl$_{2PS}$ what
      ‘What do you want?’
   b. * Che vo-tu ____?
      what want=cl$_{2PS}$

(25) DISTRIBUTION OF PARCHÉ

   a. Parché te sí ndaa al marcà?
      why cl$_{2PS}$ are gone=to the market
      ‘Why did you go to the market?’
   b. ??/* Te sí ndaa parché al marcà?
      cl$_{2PS}$ are gone= why to the market

   I shall argue that parché behaves like its Italian counterpart perché, as widely described in Rizzi (2001) and further related work. In fact, in a system that requires $SCL_{II}$ in matrix questions, Trevisian
parché exceptionally does not trigger it, as in (25). However, parché does trigger SClI in long-distance construals if it is construed with the embedded verb, i.e. moved from the embedded LP to the matrix LP. A detailed account of this exceptional behaviour, which will eventually reveal more about the nature of SClI itself, is given in Chapter 4.

Aside from the exceptions in (24) and (25), wh-words in Trevigiano are distributionally rather free. In fact, not only non-D-linked but also D-linked wh-phrases can be licensed clause-initially and clause-internal, as in (26). Note that the Trevisian why-word parcossa, unlike parché, can be licensed both in situ and in a fronted position, as in (27). This distribution is unexpected, since cross-linguistically why-words have been argued to be merged directly in the LP, and hence should be impossible clause-internally (Rizzi 2001, Stepanov & Tsai 2008, Shlonsky & Soare 2011, a.o.):

(26) DISTRIBUTION OF D-LINKED WH-PHRASES

Trevigiano

a. Ga-tu leto cuanti libri ?
   have=cl2PS read how.many books
   ‘How many books did you read?’

b. Cuanti libri ga-tu leto __?
   how.many books have=cl2PS read

(27) DISTRIBUTION OF PARCOSSA

Trevigiano

a. Parcossa si-tu ndaa al marcà __?
   why are=cl2PS goneF to.the market
   ‘Why did you go to the market?’

b. Si-tu ndaa parcossa al marcà __?
   are=cl2PS goneF why to.the market

The peculiar distribution of parcossa will be discussed in Chapter 5. Examples like (27) introduce another property of Trevisian wh-in situ: the absence, in this language, of a sentence-finality requirement in the sense of Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria (2005), i.e. the need for a clause-internal wh-phrase to occupy the rightmost position. This sets Trevigiano apart from closely-related Bellunese, in which clause-internal wh-words must occupy the rightmost edge of the clause (Munaro 1999, Munaro et al. 2001, a.o.). In fact, in Trevigiano the absence of a requirement for sentence-finality goes as far as actually requiring clause-internal wh-phrases to move, plausibly within TP. In fact, clause-internal wh-phrases in Trevigiano display a peculiar movement pattern which, to the best of my knowledge, has not to date been observed in other Northern Italian varieties, nor generally in Romance languages for which movement to Foc has been posited (Brazilian Portuguese, French, and NIDs, as mentioned in §0.1.1). The distributional properties of clause-internal wh-IOs and wh-adverbials suggest that in

---

7Throughout, I use the labels D-linked and non-D-linked to refer to wh-phrases with and without a lexical restrictor, respectively. The reason why I do not use the terms bare and complex is that these could create confusion. Indeed, in the approach developed in this dissertation wh-phrases are never assumed to be bare in the compilation of genuine wh-questions, in the sense that they always entertain a close structural relation with the Q-particle, in Cable’s (2010) terms.
situ wh-words do not stay in their external-merge position in Trevigiano. In an SVO language where the declarative order of theta-arguments and adverbs is rigidly fixed, and the latter obligatorily follow the former (see Chapter 2 for a detailed discussion), clause-internal wh-phrases clearly move to a linear position below the surface position occupied by the past participle, as in (28) and (29):

(28) A WH-IO PRECEDES THE DO

  a. Ge ga-tu dato a chi\textsubscript{wh-DO} a tecia\textsubscript{IO} ___ ?
     DAT have=cl\textsubscript{2PS} given to who the saucepan
     ‘Who did you give the saucepan to?’
  b. * Ge ga-tu dato a tecia\textsubscript{IO} a chi\textsubscript{wh-DO}?
     DAT have=cl\textsubscript{2PS} given to who

(29) A WH-ADV PRECEDES THE DO

  a. Ga-tu magnà cuand\textsubscript{wh-Adv} el dolse\textsubscript{DO} ___ ?
     have=cl\textsubscript{2PS} eaten when the cake
     ‘When did you eat the cake?’
  b. * Ga-tu magnà el dolse\textsubscript{DO} cuand\textsubscript{wh-Adv}?
     have=cl\textsubscript{2PS} eaten the cake when

The short movement of wh-phrases observed in (28) and (29) is crucial to the theory of Trevisian wh-in situ that I shall develop in this dissertation (and especially in Chapters 2 and 3), and will also have theoretical consequences for the existing theory of Northern Italian wh-in situ, as I discuss in Chapter 6.

In the absence of clause internal movement of the wh-phrase, Trevisian wh-in situ receives an echoic interpretation. As in English, echo questions in Trevigiano lack interrogative syntax altogether: SC\textsubscript{II}, otherwise compulsory in root questions, is ruled out in constructions with unmoved clause-internal wh-phrases, as in the examples (30) and their ungrammatical counterparts in (31):

(30) GRAMMATICAL ECHO QUESTIONS (declarative syntax)

  a. Te gà magnà el dolse cuand\textsubscript{?!}
     cl\textsubscript{2PS} have eaten the cake when
     ‘You ate the cake WHEN?!’
  b. Te ge gà dato a tecia a chi\textsubscript{?!}
     cl\textsubscript{2PS} DAT have given to who
     ‘You gave the saucepan TO WHO?!’

(31) UNGRAMMATICAL ECHO QUESTIONS

  a. * Ga-tu magnà el dolse cuand\textsubscript{?!}
     have=cl\textsubscript{2PS} eaten the cake when

---

8One might wonder if the wh-words in (28) and (29) are at the rightmost edge of the clause, as in Bellunese, while the following complements are right-dislocated. In Chapter 2, for reasons related to the movement properties of arguments and adverbials in the declaratives of Trevigiano, I shall argue that they are not.
b. * Ge ga-tu dato a tecia a chi?!
DAT have=clPS given the saucepan to who

In Trevigiano, wh-in situ is also rather productive in embedded environments. Throughout, for the sake of descriptive ease, I use the term *embedded insituiness* to refer to occurrences of wh-in situ under a complementiser, i.e. both long-distance construals, as in (32), and indirect wh-questions, as in (33). Note that in both cases wh-in situ coexists with the option of total wh-fronting:

(32) WH-PLACEMENT IN LONG DISTANCE CONSTRUALS

Trevigiano

a. Pensi-tu [ che a voje metar dove i piteri ___ ]?
think=clPS that she wants put where the vases
‘Where do you think she wants to put the vases?’
b. Dove pensi-tu [ che a voje metar i piteri ___ ]?
where think=clPS that she wants put the vases

(33) WH-PLACEMENT IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS

Trevigiano

a. A se domanda [ se-l plantarà dove i persegheri ___ ]
cl3PS,F herself asks if=cl3PS,M plantFUT where the peach.trees
‘She wonders where he’ll plant the peach trees’
b. A se domanda [ dove che-l plantarà i persegheri ___ ]
cl2PS,F herself asks where that=cl2PS,M plantFUT the peach.trees

The examples in (33) display an interesting alternation in the form of the embedding COMP, whose forms are *boldfaced*. Trevigiano is a language which systematically violates so called *doubly-filled COMP filter* (van Riemsdijk & Williams 1986) in embedded questions, i.e. a wh-phrase moved into a Spec of the embedded LP must obligatorily be construed with the relevant COMP-head. In constructions with a fronted wh-phrase, the Trevisian embedding COMP is a very canonical that-COMP, as in (33b). However, with wh-in situ, what looks like the embedding COMP actually takes the form of a semantically void if-COMP, *se*, which I shall call seWH to avoid confusion with the homophonous if-COMP of yes/no questions. I shall discuss the morphosyntax of seWH in detail in Chapter 5. It should also be noted that the movement of clause-internal wh-phrases observed in matrix questions is also compulsory in embedded questions, as illustrated in (32) and (33).

Trevigiano also has wh-in situ within islands for extraction. Syntactic islands have been broadly investigated in Huang (1982), Kayne (1983), Longobardi (1988), Cinque (1990) and Rizzi (1990), among others, and come in two different types: *weak* and *strong*. While extraction out of weak islands is generally easier than extraction out of strong islands, cross-linguistic differences exist, and with regard to the felicity of wh-in situ within these peculiar environments. If the right context is provided, Trevisian speakers can successfully licence insituiness in both strong and weak islands, as in (34) and (35), respectively. In both cases, overt extraction out-of-island is at best slightly degraded:
0.2 Venetan, and novel data from Trevigiano

(34) SUBJECT ISLAND (strong)

Trevigiano

Context: You work in a bookshop in a commercial street. Rumours say that some clients of the clothes shop down the street left without paying this morning. You overhear a colleague of yours discussing this with a friend. However, he’s actually saying something about the grocery store next door, so you think he might have got the wrong information. You ask:

a. I te gà dito che [i clienti [de chi ]] no i gà pagà?
   cl to.you have said that the clients of whom NEG cl have paid
   ‘Who is x, such as x is someone’s client, and you were told that x failed to pay?’

b. * De chi i te gà dito che [i clienti [___ ]] no i gà pagà?
   of whom cl to.you have said that the clients NEG cl have paid

(35) WH-ISLAND (weak)

Trevigiano

Context: Your husband keeps on forgetting things. Your daughter tells you that, earlier in the morning, she overheard him wondering whether the two of you had already bought something that she couldn’t hear. You go see him and ask:

a. No te te ricordi [se vemo comprà [cossa]]?
   NEG cl2PS yourself remember whether had1PP bought what
   ‘What is x such as you don’t remember whether we bought x?’

b. ? Cossa no te te ricordi [se vemo comprà [___]]?
   what NEG cl2PS yourself remember whether had1PP bought

Predictably, strong islands resist extraction more than weak islands; however, in both cases the felicity of the question is assured if the wh-phrase is located within the island at Spell-Out. The case of island-contained wh-in situ is not trivial and deserves substantial attention, since the realisation of matrix SCI and the possibility of extraction from islands shows interesting patterns of variation, as I shall discuss in Chapter 5.

0.2.2 Problems, questions, and preliminary answers


Despite the large volume of literature on the phenomenon, French wh-in situ clearly lacks both an adequate empirical description and a satisfactory theoretical analysis. In fact, the existing works attribute conflicting syntactic, semantic and prosodic properties to wh-in situ: rather unsurprisingly, on the basis of this problematic data, researchers have proposed complex and mutually-incompatible
analytic machineries with major implications for the architecture of the grammar, which I shall discuss in the conclusions of this dissertation. Though they are not the main focus of this dissertation, the insituness-related properties of French nonetheless need to be discussed, since the literature on Northern Italian wh-in situ has made them the subject of extensive cross-linguistic comparisons (principally though not exclusively in Munaro et al. 2001 and much related work). Here, only the syntactic dimension will be taken into account, and more specifically the properties that are relevant to the development of a theory of Northern Italian wh-in situ, such as:

(a) the ways in which the French pattern is different from the patterns observed in other optional wh-in situ languages, and more specifically in NIDs;

(b) the reasons why French wh-in situ is banned in main questions in the presence of est-ce que, in constructions with SCL, and in indirect questions. Munaro et al. have relied heavily on this pattern to argue in favour of an intimate link between the nature of SCL and the way wh-in situ is licensed; however, as correctly pointed out by Manzini & Savoia (2011) and claimed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, no direct link between the (un)availability of SCL and wh-in situ is observed in NIDs;

(c) the reasons behind the availability of wh-in situ in French and some NIDs, but not in closely-related languages like Standard Italian, as illustrated in (36):

(36) UNGRAMMATICALITY OF WH-IN SITU

* Hai visto chi?
  have seen who
  ‘Who did you see?’

Related to (c), and even more mysterious, is the availability of wh-in situ in some regional varieties of Italian, such as that spoken in the Veneto region. An example is provided in (37):

(37) GRAMMATICALITY OF WH-IN SITU

Hai visto chi?
  have seen who

How can the grammaticality of the non-standard example in (37) be accounted for? Which properties prevent the standard variety from licensing wh-phrases clause-internally, as in (36)? An explanation might be found either in the (un)availability of a clause-internal focal projection, or in the intrinsic properties of wh-words. However, the first possibility appears very weak, given Belletti’s (2004) proposed VP-peripheral Foc in Standard Italian. Beyond establishing the factors that allow or block wh-in situ in the aforementioned contexts, some of the broad questions that will be explored in this dissertation are the following:

(i) what is the status of an optional strategy?
(ii) how is the short movement of Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases achieved? What is its nature and how can it be accounted for? Which feature (if any) triggers it and at what point in the derivation does it take place?

(iii) let us assume the movement in (ii) is syntactic wh-movement. Under Chomsky’s (1973) assumption that wh-movement is successive-cyclic and Rizzi’s (2006) claim that an element that lands in a criterial position cannot be moved further, how is it possible for a moving wh-phrase to either stop TP-internally (wh-in situ) or move further to the LP (total wh-fronting)? How is the alternation possible? Does total wh-fronting skip cyclicity? Or is Trevisian clause-internal movement not feature-driven?

(iv) what is the status of SCI? What is its link (if any) to wh-in situ and more generally wh-movement? How and when does it take place?

(v) what is the role played by seWH in Trevisian indirect wh-questions? Is it an instance of exceptional wh-doubling or something else?

(vi) how are the relevant interrogative features checked when wh-in situ is felicitously trapped inside an island, i.e. in the absence of detectable interrogative movement to the LP?

These are only some of the questions that will be addressed in the rest of this work. The Northern Italian linguistic panorama is in fact very rich, and I shall argue that different varieties license wh-in situ in different ways and that the major analyses of wh-in situ in NIDs, namely the remnant-IP movement analysis (Munaro et al. 2001 and related works) and the covert movement hypothesis (Manzini & Savoia 2011), have data-related weaknesses. How can a derivation of wh-in situ that includes wh-movement to the CP account for embedded insituiness, wh-in situ within islands, and short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases? Similarly, how can an analysis of wh-in situ as unmoved account for the two most puzzling characteristics of Bellunese wh-in situ, namely the infelicity of D-linked wh-phrases clause-internally, and the requirement for clause-internal wh-words to occupy the rightmost position? Where does Trevigiano fit into this discussion? Quite clearly, both existing analyses face some major data-related challenges, and fail to account for the complete set of attested data. Moreover, the computational complexity of a derivation that includes movement of the remnant-IP is so great that it is unlikely to extend to all varieties, and must at best be reserved for very marginal cases. These restrictions, and others mentioned below, show that even an optional strategy of interrogation is formally constrained in intricate ways. An understanding of these restrictions is one of the goals of this dissertation.

In §0.3, I provide a brief overview of this work, i.e. summary of main problems and claims, to facilitate a better understanding of what follows.\(^9\)

\(^9\) Or indeed to dissuade the reader from wasting their precious time any further!
0.3 This dissertation: central claim and main characters

In this dissertation I argue that the notion of syntactic optionality in the in situ-ex situ alternation can be dispensed with if we take the movement properties of wh-phrases to be a by-product of the availability of two different lexical strategies to integrate them to the (silent or phonetically-realised) Q(uestion)-particle: both QP-selection and Q-adjunction à la Cable (2010). To do so, I make use of published cross-linguistic data from the whole Northern Italian domain, as well as novel data from Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect of the Romance family. It clearly emerges that, while it might be argued that simple featural variations in bare wh-words are enough to account for their ability to surface either sentence-initially or clause-Internally, Northern Italian wh-doubling provides evidence in favour of treating wh-phrases as composite structures.

According to Cable (2010), wh-fronting and wh-in situ languages share a very similar subjacent structure, where the interpretation of wh-words is made possible by the presence of a (silent or phonetically-realised) Q-particle, which must move to C in time for interpretation. Accordingly, languages differ in the way the Q-particle attaches to wh-words: either directly or to a larger structure that selects the wh-word, i.e. a wh-phrase. Compare (38) and (39):

\[
\begin{align*}
(38) & \text{ Q-PROJECTION} \\
& QP \rightarrow Q \rightarrow XP \\
& \ldots \text{wh-word} \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(39) & \text{ Q-ADJUNCTION} \\
& XP \rightarrow Q \rightarrow \text{QP} \\
& \ldots \text{wh-word} \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

Wh-in situ languages crucially differ from wh-fronting languages in the way Q-particles project after they are in the derivation: in the former, Q adjoins to XP and XP projects, as in (39), while in the latter Q merges with XP and projects a QP layer, as in (38). For Cable, the choice between Q-adjunction and Q-projection is made at the level of the individual language and used in the derivation of all questions of the given language. Optional in situ languages, I claim, derive their exceptional behaviour from the availability of both strategies for joining the Q-particle to wh-phrases.

Under these assumptions, I argue that Trevisian wh-fronting is actually an instance of QP-fronting, made possible under Q-agreement, and driven by an EPP-feature in Rizzi’s (1997) left-peripheral FocusP (which I call Focus_{\text{HIGH}} throughout). Similarly, re-adapting Cable’s account, I claim that wh-in situ is made possible under Q-agreement between the Q-adjoining wh-phrase and the head of Focus_{\text{HIGH}}, plus Q-to-C attraction of the Q-particle triggered by the EPP. What makes Trevigiano special with respect to other in situ languages, I claim, is the existence of clause-internally moved wh-phrases that target the Spec of Belletti’s (2004) VP-peripheral focal projection, Foc (here, Foc_{\text{LOW}}).
This movement analysis, which I refer to as Wh-to-Foc, is justified both by the movement patterns of clause-internal wh-phrases (which appear to target a linear position below the surface position of the past participle), and by the presence of clause- internally moved contrastive focus in Trevigiano. I argue that the short movement under consideration is not proper wh-movement but rather focus movement made under focus-agreement, along the lines in (40). C-checking then proceeds via the Q-particle as in regular in situ languages where focus movement of wh-phrases is not present.

(40) FOCUS-AGREEMENT + CLAUSE-INTERNAL FOCUS-MOVEMENT OF THE WH-PHRASE

Other morphosyntactic treatments of Northern Italian wh-in situ have been proposed in the literature, which provide diametrically-opposed explanations for the phenomenon: on the one hand, Chinese-like insituness, where wh-phrases do not leave their first-merge position (Manzini & Savoia 2005 and their 2011 refinement); on the other hand, fake insituness, derived via wh-movement of clause-internal wh-words to the CP-layer, followed by further computations which displace the whole IP to higher functional projections (Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto & Pollock 2015 and references therein).

To the best of my knowledge, no account of Northern Italian wh-in situ as subject to focus-movement into Belletti’s (2004) SpecFoc has ever been proposed in the literature, with the sole exception of Manzini’s (2014) non-empirically motivated claim. In contrast, robust empirical evidence in favour of focus-movement of clause-internal wh-phrases exists for non-Romance varieties, and many authors have already discussed the case of interrogative focus-movement to a low focal projection, be it FocP or the edge of vP (Kahnemuyipour 2001, Aboh 2006, Manetta 2010, Cheng & Bayer 2015, a.o.).
Similar claims have been put forth for Brazilian Portuguese (Kato 2003;2013) and French (Belletti 2006), even though the movement in question is taken to be proper wh-movement, not focus movement.

The major weakness of the existing treatments of Northern Italian wh-in situ, I claim, is their desire to account for the massive morphosyntactic variability observed by means of a single, unifying derivation. As a consequence, and on the basis of the Trevisian data and of the newly-proposed analysis in terms of Wh-to-Foc, I establish a primitive typology of Northern Italian (and more generally Romance) wh-in situ that crucially ranges over different linguistic types on the basis of a number of variables relevant to the licensing of clause-internal wh-phrases: presence or absence of focus movement, pre- vs. post-Spell Out checking of the interrogative features in C, availability of wh-in situ in embedded questions and/or within islands for extraction, plausible presence of special prosodic requirements, stages of linguistic evolution.

The reader will find it easier to follow my discussion if he or she keeps in mind that I assume that direct and indirect interrogatives are inherently endowed with different LPs. Namely, I take the LP of Northern Italian interrogatives to have an IntP à la Rizzi (2001), endowed with an [int]-feature, while FocusHIGH is associated to a [q]-feature; in contrast, indirect wh-interrogatives have a declarative-like LP with FocusHIGH set as [foc], modulo the presence of Rizzi & Bocci’s (2017) QembP, which I analyse as inherently [wh]. Additionally, some languages have a [foc]-feature in the clause-internal focal head, Foc0LOW. The [int]-feature in IntP can only be checked by inordinary wh-words that are externally-merged directly in the LP, whether in SpecIntP (as in Rizzi 2001) or in the lower portion of the LP (as in Shlonsky & Soare 2011). In contrast, the [q]-feature in the interrogative FocusHIGH is checked by elements moved from within TP: QPs in the case of wh-fronting, the Q-particle when wh-phrases stay clause-internally, and polar particles in the case of yes/no questions. The declarative FocusHIGH also hosts elements moved from within TP, namely contrastively-focused constituents. However, I shall argue that this type of focus fronting is only available in languages in which FocLOW is not endowed with a [foc]-feature, such as Standard Italian. In all other languages, clause-internal focus fronting into SpecFocLOW is observed. The [wh]-feature in QembP is checked either via fronting of the bare wh-word or of the higher element of wh-doubling (which I analyse here as a Q-particle exceptionally endowed with [wh]-features); additionally, in the absence of wh-fronting and wh-doubling, an inherently interrogative element can be externally-merged directly in Qemb0 and license and interrogative Op in SpecQembP, such as Trevisian seWH. To conclude, when relevant, the [foc]-feature in FocLOW is responsible for clause-internal focus fronting of both wh-phrases and constrastive foci. The choice behind the labels used for features is arbitrary: whatever their names, the crucial point is that each of the projections under consideration is compatible with one and only one of these features.
Part I

Optional Insituness in Northern Italian Dialects: Data
Chapter 1

Wh-in situ in Northern Italian dialects

Optional insituness is a very widespread phenomenon in Northern Italian dialects (NIDs). In these languages, wh-in situ alternates with wh-fronting. The different degrees to which this alternation applies are discussed in detail in what follows. Throughout, I use the terms insituness and wh-in situ as synonyms of clause-internal, without really adopting a position on their structural placement (first-merge vs derived position), unless otherwise stated.

In this Chapter, I provide an overview of the literature on the in situ-ex situ alternation in NIDs, paying special attention to data from Venetan (as described in Benincà & Vanelli 1982, Poletto & Vanelli 1993, Munaro 1995;1997, Munaro et al. 2001, Obenauer 2004 & 2006, Benincà & Poletto 2004, Manzini & Savoia 2005, Munaro 2005, Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015, Garzonio 2016, Bonan 2017b;2018, a.o.), Lombard (Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011, Manzini 2014, Poletto & Pollock 2000;2005, a.o.), and Southern Swiss dialects (Lurà 1987, Poletto & Pollock 2009;2015, a.o.). The theoretical discussion is the focus of Part II of this dissertation. The varieties described and discussed in this Chapter are only a sample of the numerous Romance dialects spoken in Northern Italy. The selection of dialects for investigation was made with the aim of covering all patterns of distribution and/or co-occurrence of single insituness, wh-doubling, and subject-clitic inversion (SCII) as thoroughly as possible. Note that, throughout, I provide English glosses and translations for Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) examples, which were originally translated into Italian. All mistakes are mine.

Those familiar with the Northern Italian data could technically skip this Chapter. However, some valuable comparisons between Trevigiano and other NIDs will also be made, which should facilitate understanding of later Chapters.
Organisation of this Chapter

§1.1 overviews the Venetan, Lombard and Southern Swiss NIDs which allow for matrix (§1.1.1) and embedded (§1.1.2) optional insituness of the single type to varying extents. §1.2 deals with all the different types of wh-doubling attested in the literature which, as I shall argue, follow strict behavioural patterns. In §1.3, I shall first discuss the distribution of SCI in NIDs, then argue that at least three types of Northern Italian varieties can be identified on the basis of the distribution of clause-internal wh-phrases in matrix and embedded clauses and, where relevant, within syntactic islands. This distinction will lay the groundwork for my discussion in Part III, where I outline a primitive typology of Northern Italian wh-in situ.

1.1 Single wh-in situ

The phenomenon referred to as optional wh-in situ has been attested to varying degrees in numerous NIDs, quite extensively in matrix contexts (§1.1.1) and less frequently in embedded questions (§1.1.2). Remember that I use the term embedded to refer to both long construals and indirect wh-questions. In Part II of this work, I shall actually argue against the presence of syntactic optionality in the in situ-ex situ alternation. However, for descriptive ease I still use the traditional term optional wh-in situ to refer to the relatively free variation between wh-phrases in cause-initial or clause-internal position in genuine questions.

1.1.1 Insituness in matrix questions

In Venetan dialects such as Feltrino (Benincà & Vanelli 1982), Pagotto\(^1\) (Munaro 1995;1997, Munaro et al. 2001, Obenauer 2004, Manzini & Savoia 2005, Munaro 2005, Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015), Zoldoaltino (Manzini & Savoia 2005) and Cortese (Manzini & Savoia 2005), among others, wh-in situ has been argued to alternate to different extents with wh-fronting in genuine direct questions. The same optional in situ-ex situ alternation has been attested in Lombard dialects such as Monnese (Benincà & Poletto 2004; Poletto & Pollock 2000;2005;2015), Passiranese (Manzini & Savoia 2005), Grumellese (Manzini & Savoia 2005), Borghese (Manzini & Savoia 2005) and Strozzense (Manzini & Savoia 2005, Manzini 2014), among others. A number of Lombard dialects spoken in Southern Switzerland also display optional insituness. Among these is Mendrisiotto (Lurà 1987, Poletto & Pollock 2009), where insituness has actually been argued to be associated to an interpretation of

---

\(^1\)Spoken in Alpago, a comune in the Province of Belluno. It is the variety that has been simply referred to as ‘Bellunese’ in much work on Venetan dialects, starting from Munaro (1995).
surprise or disapproval\(^2\), in contrast to wh-fronting, which constitutes the genuine, unmarked option, as in (1):

(1) **IN SITU/EX SITU ALTERNATION** (Poletto & Pollock 2009:3-4(7-6))

\[\begin{align*}
a. \text{**Cusè ta mangiat ____ ?**} \\
\text{what you eat} \\
\text{‘What are you eating?’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
b. \text{**T’è fai cusè?**} \\
\text{you=have done what} \\
\text{‘What (on Earth) have you done?’}
\end{align*}\]

Note that wh-words do not necessarily have the same phonological form when they appear clause-initially or clause-internally, as illustrated in (2). This phenomenon, quite widespread in NIDs, is rarely observed elsewhere in Romance.

(2) **IN SITU/EX SITU MORPHOLOGICAL ALTERNATIONS** (Poletto & Pollock 2005:136(2))

\[\begin{align*}
a. \text{**Ngo fet majà ____ ?**} \\
\text{where do=you eat} \\
\text{‘Where do you eat?’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
b. \text{**Fet majà ngont?**} \\
\text{do=you eat where}
\end{align*}\]

To generalise, when NIDs allow for both wh-fronting and single wh-in situ, there are two options: either the clause-internal wh-phrase and its fronted counterpart are phonologically identical, or two different forms exist. I shall argue that this generalisation also holds in embedded contexts; however, the (un)availability of wh-in situ in embedded questions is subject to substantial variation, which I explore in §1.1.2. In contrast, the varieties that allow for genuine matrix insituness only in the presence of wh-doubling (including Civate, Olgiate, Manzini & Savoia 2005 and Manzini 2014; Mendrisiotto, Lurà 1987) shall be discussed in §1.2.

### 1.1.2 Insituness in embedded questions

In some Northern Italian varieties, wh-in situ has been claimed to be exclusively a root phenomenon. Among these NIDs are the variety of Bellunese spoken in Tignes d’Alpago, Mendrisiotto, the variety of Bresciano spoken in Rovato (Poletto & Vanelli 1993), and Pagotto (Munaro 1995, Munaro et al. 2001). In NIDs, the availability of matrix single wh-in situ is a necessary but not sufficient condition

\(^2\)Here, pragmatic- and discourse-related notions will be excluded from the syntactic discussion, along with the quantitative distribution of clause-internal wh-phrases. In fact, what I am interested in is the ability of the grammars under consideration to license wh-in situ, and the syntactic facts with which this co-occurs: as long as wh-in situ is grammatical in non-echo questions, then it belongs in my discussion.
for a variety to be able to license single wh-in situ in long-distance and in indirect wh-questions. Nonetheless, some varieties do license clause-internal wh-words in non-root environments, as I shall argue throughout this section. Since wh-in situ does not have the same distribution in long-distance questions and in indirect wh-questions, a distinction will be drawn between the two. Here, only data from the varieties that license single wh-in situ are presented.

Long-distance construals

In the Introduction I argued that in long-distance construals, wh-phrases in Trevigiano surface either in the clause-internal position or high in the LP, as in (3). Unsurprisingly, since clause-typing takes place in the matrix C, wh-phrases cannot move to the embedded LP, as in (3c):

(3) WH-PLACEMENT IN LONG-DISTANCE QUESTIONS

Trevigiano

a. *Chi pensi-tu [che vegnarà catarne ___]? who=cl2PS that comeFUT see.us ‘Who do you think will visit us?’

b. Pensì-tu [che vegnarà catarne chi]? think=cl2PS that comeFUT see.us who ‘What do you think he/she will see us?’

c. *Pensi-tu [chi che vegnarà catarne ___]? think=cl2PS who that comeFUT see.us ‘Who do you think will visit us?’

Wh-in situ in long distance questions has also been attested in Venetan varieties of the Belluno area, namely Cortese and Zoldoaltino, and in Lombard varieties spoken in the Province of Bergamo, such as Grumellese, Borghese, Colognese, Sanrocchese and Strozzense (Manzini & Savoia 2005).

In Trevigiano, the non-realisation of the embedding that-COMP che gives rise to ungrammaticality, regardless of the position occupied by the wh-phrase, as in (4):

(4) OBLIGATORITY OF THE THAT-COMP

Trevigiano

a. Cossa pensi-tu *(che) i voje magnar ___? what think=cl2PS that cl3PP want eat ‘What do you think they want to eat?’

b. Pensì-tu *(che) i voje magnar cossa? think=cl2PS that cl3PP want eat what ‘What do you think he wants to eat?’

The availability of optional omission of the embedded COMP in long-distance questions has only been attested in Strozzense (Manzini & Savoia 2005), as illustrated in (5):

(5) ABSENCE OF THE THAT-COMP IN LONG DISTANCE QUESTIONS

Strozzense

(adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:591(155))

‘pensì-t (k) el ‘faye ko’ze?’
think2PS (that) he does what
‘What do you think he is doing?’
In all the other varieties mentioned above, all occurrences of long-distance construals display an overt COMP. In the absence of positive evidence that omission of the embedded COMP is permitted, I shall just assume that all Northern Italian varieties other than Strozzense require the embedded COMP to be realised, as Trevigiano does.

Insituness in indirect questions

Single wh-in situ in indirect questions is somewhat rare. There are also two respects in which varieties differ: the realisation and the form of the embedded COMP, as I shall outline here. The first of these relates to the extraordinary absence of an embedded COMP, which is only attested in Colognese (Manzini & Savoia 2005), as illustrated in (6):

(6) **ABSENCE OF THAT-COMP IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS**

Manzini & Savoia 2005:592(156))

a. *do'mande-ga l a ˈfatʃ ko'he  ask-him he has done what
   'Ask him what he did'

b. ˈore  ha' l e  nˈaตาร indo'c  want3PS know he is gone where
   'I want to know where he went'

The Colognese examples in (6) are the only cases of indirect insituness under no COMP attested in the literature on NID3s. The lack of an embedded COMP in these constructions actually raises questions about their plausible analysis as reported speech.

The second is the presence of a specialised COMP for wh-in situ, different from the COMP used in constructions with wh-fronting. As mentioned in the Introduction, Trevigiano has a specialised semantically-vacuous if-COMP (*se*) which obligatorily introduces indirect wh-questions when the wh-phrase is realised clause-internally, as in (7):

(7) **SEWH LICENSES WH-IN SITU IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS**

Trevigiano

a. *Me domando [ se te gà magnà cossa ]  myself ask seWH cl2PS have eaten what
   'I wonder what you ate'

b. A se domanda [ se-l vegnarà cuandò ]  cl3PS,F herself asks seWH=cl3PS comeFUT when
   'She wonders when he’s going to come'

This COMP, which I call *seWH* to avoid confusion with the homophonous if-COMP found in indirect yes/no questions, does not give rise to a yes/no interpretation: indeed, it fails to add anything to the semantics of the indirect questions in which it appears. As a consequence, a sentence like (2a)

---

3Note that Manzini & Savoia (2005) do not discuss the status of the corresponding ex situ counterparts of (6).
Wh-in situ in Northern Italian dialects does not mean ‘what is such that I wonder whether you ate it’, but simply ‘I wonder what is such that you ate it’. Se\textsubscript{WH} is not at the disposal of all speakers of Trevigiano; however, only those who have it are able to license wh-in situ in these environments. To the best of my knowledge, the presence of a se\textsubscript{WH}-like COMP has never previously been attested in NIDs, but it has been briefly discussed for other Romance languages such as European Portuguese (Cheng & Rooryck 2002), Brazilian Portuguese (Kato 2013) and Belgian French (Boeckx et al. 2000), as I discuss in Chapter 6.

In languages such as Trevigiano, if the wh-phrase is moved to the embedded LP, the presence of se\textsubscript{WH} is ruled out and a that-COMP, che, must be used instead, as in (8):

(8) CHE INSTEAD OF SE\textsubscript{WH} IN CASE OF WH-FRONTING

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. * Me domando [cossa se te gà magnà] myself ask what se\textsubscript{WH} cl\textsubscript{2PS} have eaten ‘I wonder what you ate’
  \item b. Me domando [cossa che te gà magnà] myself ask what that you have eaten
\end{itemize}

In non-doubling configurations where the wh-word is moved to the embedded LP, the presence of a similar that-COMP in two Lombard varieties, Civate and Strozzense, is attested in Manzini & Savoia (2005). In these varieties, interesting cases are attested of embedded wh-doubling where the higher wh-item closely resembles to Trevisian se\textsubscript{WH}, as in (9) and (10):

(9) SE\textsubscript{WH} OR WH-DOUBLING?

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. al so mia se ‘fa ku’ze it know\textsubscript{1PS} NEG se do what ‘I don’t know what to do’
  \item b. di-m se te ‘fe ku’ze tell-me se you do what ‘Tell me what you’re doing / you do’
\end{itemize}

(10) SE\textsubscript{WH} OR WH-DOUBLING? (ii)

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. ‘so mia se por’ta-t (ko’ze) know\textsubscript{1PS} NEG se bring-you\textsubscript{2PS} what ‘I don’t know what to bring you’
  \item b. ‘so mia se mäj di ko’ze know\textsubscript{1PS} NEG se eat what ‘I don’t know what to eat’
\end{itemize}

No evidence exists regarding the possibility of doubling wh-phrases other than direct objects using the se in (9) and (10). It is therefore difficult to understand whether the Civate examples (along with similar se-doubling configurations in Olgiate and Strozzense discussed in Manzini 2014) are
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instances of $se_{WH}$ or actual wh-doubling configurations with $se$ as the higher of the two what-words. However, the Strozzense case in (10a), where the lower wh-item is optional, suggests that at least in this variety $se$ is a genuine doubling wh-item. Nonetheless, the very existence of these structures raises questions regarding:

(i) the reasons why some languages have a $se_{WH}$-like COMP, while others do not;
(ii) the very nature of $se_{WH}$: is this an instance of embedded wh-doubling (see §1.2), a real COMP, or an element of different nature?;
(iii) the reasons why in some varieties $se$ only appears construed with what-words.

In Part II, I shall argue that the answers to these questions follow straightforwardly from the analysis that I provide for Trevisian wh-in situ. To sum up, single insituness in indirect questions is only attested in NIDs in Colognese and Trevigiano: in the absence of an overt COMP in the former, and under $se$ in the latter. Some varieties have a $se_{WH}$-like element which has to date been treated as an instance of wh-doubling. Wh-fronting is never construed with $se_{WH}$ but with a that-COMP, which is also attested in varieties that lack wh-in situ in indirect questions.

1.2 Different patterns of wh-doubling

The distribution of wh-doubling configurations and their co-existence with single wh-in situ display multiple different patterns. This section provides an overview of all possible matrix and embedded wh-doubling configurations attested in NIDs. I shall divide them into three categories based on the nature of the doubling elements involved, building on Poletto & Pollock (2009-2015) (11):

(11) DOUBLING CONFIGURATIONS

a. TYPE A DOUBLING: Clitic wh-pronoun - wh-strong pronoun

Illasiano (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015:146(26))

Sa eto dito che?
what have=you$_{2PS}$ said what
‘What did you say?’

b. TYPE B DOUBLING: Weak wh-pronoun - tonic wh-pronoun

Mendrisiotto (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015:146(28))

Cusa t’è fai cusè?
what you$_{2PS}$ have done what
‘What have you done?’

c. TYPE C DOUBLING: Invariant wh-operator - wh-pronoun

Mendrisiotto (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015:147(29))

Che fè-t däl a chi?
wh do-you$_{2PS}$ give=it to whom
‘To whom will you give it?’
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According to Poletto & Pollock (2015), Type A doubling is restricted to the counterparts of *what*, *who*, *when* and *how* and is never attested with D-linked wh-phrases. Type B doubling is restricted to the same subset of wh-elements as Type A, the only difference being that Type B excludes SClI altogether, even in the dialects where SClI is otherwise obligatory. Finally, Type C doubling resembles German and Dutch partial wh-movement, where the higher invariable what-word doubles a lower one, which takes various shapes and functions. In Poletto & Pollock (2015) and much related work, no embedded insituness is attested, be it single or doubling. However, Manzini & Savoia (2005;2011) provide extensive evidence of the presence of embedded wh-in situ of both types in Lombard.

Here, to avoid the debate about the legitimacy of a tripartite division of pronominal forms à la Cardinaletti & Starke (1999), and more precisely regarding the existence of so-called weak pronouns, I call the doubling element of the second paradigm a non-clitic wh-pronoun, a term intended to cover all elements that are neither wh-clitics nor invariable operators.

### 1.2.1 Configuration A: Fronted clitic wh-pronoun

The first type of wh-doubling configuration found in NIDs involves a clause-initial wh-clitic that doubles a clause-internal *non*-clitic wh-word. Doubling configurations of this type have been attested in Venetan, Lombard and Southern Swiss Italian dialects.

#### Matrix wh-questions

As a general rule, wh-doubling configurations are not as widespread in the Venetan region as they are in Lombard or Southern Swiss varieties. For instance, Type A wh-doubling in matrix questions has been attested only in Illasiano which only licenses wh-in situ in doubling configurations (Poletto & Pollock 2004). The situation is radically different when it comes to Lombard varieties, where wh-doubling is very productive both in matrix and in embedded contexts. In matrix questions, Type A doubling is attested in Monnese (Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015), Strozzenese, Civate and Intelvino (Manzini & Savoia 2005). An example from Monnese is provided in (12):

(12) TYPE A MATRIX WH-DOUBLING (Poletto & Pollock 2004:284(2))

  a. *Ch'et fat què?*
     the*have=you done what*
     ‘What have you done?’
  b. *Ngo fet maja ngont?*
     where do*=you eat  where*
     ‘Where do you eat?’

While only Type A wh-doubling is attested in Monnese, in all other varieties this doubling strategy co-exists with Type B doubling. As I shall argue throughout this section, the cross-linguistic availability of more than one type of wh-doubling is in fact a fairly widespread phenomenon.
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Among Southern Swiss Northern Italian varieties, wh-in situ in Type A wh-doubling has been attested in Mendrisiotto (Poletto & Pollock 2009), where it co-exists with Type B (§1.2.2) and Type C doubling (§1.2.3), but also with single insituteness (§1.1.1).

Embedded wh-questions

Type A wh-doubling has been observed in embedded contexts both in Venetan (Poletto & Pollock 2005) and in Lombard varieties (Poletto & Pollock 2005, Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011, Manzini 2014). Its availability is, however, very limited, especially in Venetan. Indeed, in long-distance wh-questions, Type A wh-doubling has only been observed in two varieties (Manzini & Savoia 2005): Borghese, where it is optional and only attested with *ki* (*who*), as illustrated in (13a), and Sanrocchese, where it appears limited to *ndo* (*where*), as in (13b):

(13) TYPE A WH-DOUBLING IN LONG CONSTRUALS (Manzini & Savoia 2005:591(155))

a. *Borghese*
   
   (ki) 'penset ke l vêve ki?
   who think$_{2PS}$ that he comes who

   ‘Who do you think will come?’

b. *Sanrocchese*

   ndo 'kroöet ke 'avīh n’doe?
   where think$_{2PS}$ that go$_{1PS}$ where

   ‘Where do you think I’m going?’

In indirect questions, Type A wh-doubling is only observed in the Venetan area in Illasiano (Poletto & Pollock 2005). In the Lombard area, Type A wh-doubling is observed in Passirane with the wh-word *ke* (*what*), but also in Civate and in Strozzense (Manzini & Savoia 2005). In (14), I provide an example from , where Type A wh-doubling co-exists with Type B in indirect questions (§1.2.2):

(14) TYPE A WH-DOUBLING IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS

(Manzini & Savoia 2005:593(156))

so 'nia se por ŭa-t ko’ze
know$_{1PS}$ NEG what bring=you$_{2PS}$ what

‘I don’t know what to bring you’

Type A wh-doubling is thus rare in embedded contexts and, with the exception of some indirect clefts found in Passirano (which are not pertinent to the present discussion), it is never found in constructions with SCII nor with an overt embedded COMP. Cases of wh-doubling similar to Type A are in fact attested in Monnese (Poletto & Pollock 2005). However, in this variety the high doubling element looks more like a demonstrative and is followed by an overt COMP, as in (15), as it would be in the corresponding French structure in (16):
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(15) DEVIAN'T CASES OF EMBEDDED WH-DOUBLING
(adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2005:147(37))

So mia col che l’a fat què know₁PS NEG that₂dem that he’has done what
‘I don’t know what he did’

(16) INDIRECT QUESTIONS INTRODUCED BY DEMONSTRATIVE + COMP
(adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2005:147(37))

Je ne sais pas ce qu’il a fait
I ne know NEG that₁dem that he has done

Because of their structural deviation from the usual model described throughout this section, the Monnese data not relevant for the present discussion.

1.2.2 Configuration B: Fronted non-clitic wh-pronoun

The second type of wh-doubling configuration attested in NIDs involves a clause-internal wh-phrase that is doubled by a clause-initial wh-word that is neither a wh-clitic nor an invariable operator.

Matrix wh-questions

As stated in §1.2.1, wh-doubling is not a very widespread phenomenon in Venetan. In matrix questions, Type B wh-doubling has only been attested in Pagotto (Munaro 1997, Munaro & Obenauer 1999, Poletto & Pollock 2000), where it is limited to cossa (‘what’)⁴, and it exists alongside single insituiness, as discussed in section §1.1.1. Again, the situation is different in Lombard varieties, where Type B wh-doubling is attested as the only form of doubling in Grumellese and Sanrocchese, while it co-exists with Type A in Strozzense, Civate and (Manzini & Savoia 2005). This is shown in (17):

(17) TYPE B MATRIX WH-DOUBLING (Manzini & Savoia 2005:588(154))

a. koh ma ‘portet ko’hè?
what to.me bring₂PS what
‘What are you bringing me?’
b. indo ‘et indo’è?
where go₂PS where
‘Where are you going?’

In Southern Swiss varieties, Type B matrix wh-doubling is attested in Mendrisiotto (Lurà 1987, Poletto & Pollock 2009-2015), where it co-exists with Type A and with single insituiness, as argued in §1.2.1, but also with Type C wh-doubling (§1.2.3).

⁴Munaro & Obenauer 1999 argue that wh-doubling in Pagotto actually gives rise to special questions. However, given that these are genuine wh-questions with regular interrogative syntax, I do include them in the discussion.
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**Embedded wh-questions**

In long-distance questions, Type B wh-doubling is only attested with non clitic what-words, and only in Sanrocchese and Strozzense (Manzini & Savoia 2005). Rather surprisingly, the embedded COMP can be omitted in Strozzense, as in (18):

(18) **COMP-LESS LONG CONSTRUAL** (Manzini & Savoia 2005:591(155))

\[ \text{koza} \ \text{penset} \ (k) \ \text{el} \ \text{fay} \ \text{ko`ze}\]
what  think3PS  that  he doSUBJ what

‘What do you think he’s doing / he does?’

Type B wh-doubling appears more productive in indirect wh-questions. In the Venetan area, it is only observed in Illasiano (Poletto & Pollock 2005), while in Lombardy it is attested in Grumellese, Borghese, Sanrocchese, Strozzense and Civate (Manzini & Savoia 2005), mostly with the counterparts of what and when, but also with how in Strozzense, as in (19):

(19) **TYPE B WH-DOUBLING IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS**

(Manzini & Savoia 2005:592-3(156))

a. \[ \text{so} \ \text{mia `kome} \ i \ \text{fa ko`me}\]
know1PS  NEG how  they do how

‘I don’t how they do (what they’re doing)’

b. \[ \text{me} \ \text{se do mante `koza i} \ \text{fa ko`zE}\]
to.me  ask  what  they do what

‘I’m asked what they’re doing / they do’

1.2.3 Configuration C: Fronted invariable wh-operator

In the third wh-doubling configuration found in NIDs, a clause-initial *invariable* wh-word/operator doubles a clause-internal wh-word. This is not attested in Venetan, nor in embedded contexts in any variety.

**Matrix wh-questions**

The two Lombard varieties which display Type C wh-doubling in matrix questions, Passiranese and Olgiate (Manzini & Savoia 2005), have it as their only wh-doubling strategy. In the former, the doubling element is *ke*, as in (20), while in the latter it is *se*, as in (21):

(20) **TYPE C MATRIX WH-DOUBLING** (Manzini & Savoia 2005:190(154))

\[ \text{ke} \ \text{ma `portet ki?}\]
ke  to.me  bring2PS what

‘What are you bringing to me?’

---

5A valid question at this point is whether these are real instances of indirect questions or simply of reported speech. I am unable to provide an answer here, and hence shall leave these very marginal occurrences out of the discussion.
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b. ke ni:ʃ en’doe ‘oter?
ke come=you2PP where you2PP
‘You, where are you going?’

(21) TYPE C MATRIX WH-DOUBLING (Manzini & Savoia 2005:190(154))

a. se ’feːตน ku’zɛ?
se do2PS what
‘What are you doing?’

b. se la ʃoŋ kuŋ ku’zɛ 1u:r?
se it do3PP with what them
‘They, what to they do it with?’

Of the Southern Swiss varieties, Mendrisiotto has Type C wh-doubling (Poletto & Pollock 2009; 2015), along with single wh-in situ and Type A and B wh-doubling (as in §1.2.1 and §1.2.2). In this variety, the doubling uses either che, as in (22a), or cossa, as in (22b):

(22) TYPE C MATRIX WH-DOUBLING (Poletto & Pollock 2015:147(29;31))

a. Che fɛ-t dæjɛl a chi?
che do=you2PS give.it to who
‘[To] whom will you give it?’

b. Cosa la pesa quanto, l’to sac?
cosa it weights how.much the’your sac
‘How much does your sack weight?’

Of all the Northern Italian varieties discussed in this section, Mendrisiotto is the only one to have all three types of wh-doubling configurations.

1.2.4 Regularities in the distribution of wh-doubling

The patterns of distribution of wh-doubling and SCII in matrix and embedded contexts observed so far are summarised in Tables 1.1 to 1.4. Since, as previously argued, the distribution of wh-in situ in long-distance questions is strikingly different from its availability in indirect questions, I discuss the two separately. For each variety, I list all fronted doubling wh-elements attested in the literature I am aware of, and signal the status of SCII. NA, ‘non attested’, means that a construction has not been observed in the literature cited here; the symbol x is used when evidence exists for the unavailability of a construction.

As a generalisation, wh-doubling is restricted to theta-arguments and to the wh-adverbs where and how in matrix questions. NIDs show one or two forms of wh-doubling, with the sole exception of Mendrisiotto, which has all three configurations. As argued in Poletto & Pollock (2015), no NID has a generalised doubling strategy valid for all wh-phrases, nor a combination of the three types that is powerful enough to allow stranding of any wh-word. The patterns of wh-doubling observed in Northern Italian matrix clauses are illustrated in Tables 1.1 and 1.2:
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### Table 1.1 Wh-doubling patterns: matrix questions (i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Venetan</th>
<th>Lombard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illasi</td>
<td>Pagotto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndo ‘where’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci ‘who’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no SCII</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>cossa ‘what’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no SCII</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no SCII</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1.2 Wh-doubling patterns: matrix questions (ii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lombard</th>
<th>South Swiss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grumellese</td>
<td>Sanrochese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no SCII</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>koha ‘what’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>indo ‘where’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kome ‘how’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no SCII</td>
<td>koha ‘what’</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kon koha ‘with what’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no SCII</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Poletto & Pollock (2015), Type A wh-doubling is restricted to a limited subset of wh-words: what, who, where and how, as discussed in §1.2.1 and shown in Tables 1.1-2. Type B wh-doubling is realised with the same wh-words as Type A, and is claimed to be incompatible with SCII, ‘even when SCII is otherwise active in the dialect’ (p. 147). Finally, in Type C the operator is systematically a what-word which doubles different types of clause-internal wh-elements. However, Poletto & Pollock’s (2015) claim that Type B wh-doubling is never construed with SCII is invalidated
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by the Strozzense and Intelvino examples in (23) and (24), where non-clitic doubling elements are construed with clause-internal wh-words in the presence of SCII:

(23) SCII IN TYPE B WH-DOUBLING (Manzini & Savoia 2005:589(154))

a. koza me 'port-el ko'ze?
   what to.me bring=he what
   ‘What is he bringing me?’

b. kome fi:f ko me?
   how do=youpp how
   ‘How do you do (this)?’

(24) SCII TYPE B IN WH-DOUBLING (Manzini & Savoia 2005:590(154))

a. in'du e-l 'nai ndu'e?
   where is=he gone where
   ‘Where did he go?’

b. 'kuma l a-l 'fai ku me?
   how it has=he done how
   ‘How did he do it?’

The situation is significantly different in embedded environments. All instances of wh-doubling observed in long-distance questions are given in Table 1.3. As argued in §1.1, the embedded COMP is systematically realised in NIDs, except in Strozzense where it is optional.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Table 1.3)</th>
<th>Lombard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strozzense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>SCII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no SCII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>SCII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no SCII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>SCII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no SCII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wh-doubling patterns: long distance questions

The patterns observed in indirect wh-questions are given in Table 1.4. As in long-distance questions, wh-doubling never co-occurs with SCII here, which is not surprising, because the absence of subject inversion in embedded questions is a (virtually) universal property of human language. Doubling is also not compatible with an overt COMP in the embedded LP. As previously observed in Poletto & Pollock (2005), this is also true in the varieties that systematically violate the filter, i.e. where the embedded COMP has a compulsory phonetically-realised form when single wh-movement to the
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embedded LP takes place. The omission of the that-COMP with wh-doubling is theoretically relevant, and will play an important role in the discussion of Trevisian se\textsubscript{WH} in Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Civate</th>
<th>Lombard</th>
<th>Sanrocchese</th>
<th>Passirane</th>
<th>Borghese</th>
<th>Strozzese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no SCII</td>
<td>se ‘what’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m ‘how’</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wh-doubling patterns: indirect questions

To sum up, in the two first sections of this Chapter, I have presented the distribution of root and embedded wh-in situ in NIDs, drawing a distinction between two types thereof: *single* wh-in situ (§1.1), and *doubling* wh-in situ (§1.2). I have argued that the phenomenon of root wh-in situ is widespread across the whole Northern Italian area, while embedded insituness is almost exclusively observed in Lombard varieties, where wh-doubling is the most productive. What I claimed is that, despite the superficial complexity of the Northern Italian linguistic panorama, it is possible to find some regularities in the distribution of doubling and non-doubling insituness. For instance, among the languages which have wh-in situ, only some license wh-doubling. Also, among those which do have wh-doubling, none requires systematic doubling to license wh-in situ in root clauses: in all varieties, single root insituness is always possible. The same is not true for *embedded* wh-in situ, which some varieties are only able to license in the presence of wh-doubling (Grumellese, Borghese, Sanrocchese and Civate, as described in Manzini & Savoia 2005). In addition, some varieties that never require wh-doubling in root questions do actually license it in embedded environments (Borghese, Manzini & Savoia 2005). To conclude, all varieties that allow for both wh-doubling and single wh-in situ in indirect questions systematically realise the embedding that-COMP when the wh-element is fronted and not doubled, while no COMP is realised in case of doubling. I discuss this property in Chapter 5.

Two more generalisations from the literature on wh-doubling, not discussed in this Chapter, should be mentioned at this point: first, the fact that the relative order of the two sub-parts involved in wh-doubling can never be changed (Poletto & Pollock 2004); and second, the fact that the counterparts of *why* cannot be doubled (Poletto & Pollock 2015). These observations, which will play a role in the development of my theory of Northern Italian wh-in situ, form the basis of the discussion of §1.3, where I provide an overview of the distribution of different wh-words in NIDs, along with the
interaction of doubling and single insituness with SCII, and the felicity of wh-in situ inside islands to extraction. What I shall argue is that NIDs show regular behavioural patterns in the distribution of (doubling and single) wh-in situ along (at least) three variables: (i) the position occupied by the clause-internal wh-phrase (final vs. non-final); (ii) availability in long-distance and/or indirect questions; (iii) felicity within islands.

1.3 Insituness-related patterns in NIDs

The morphosyntax of Northern Italian wh-in situ is complex, but some distributional patterns can be observed, which I discuss in detail in this section. In §1.2, I argued that the first generalisation that can be made for Northern Italian wh-in situ concerns the availability of single insituness in root clauses in varieties that have wh-doubling: in all contexts where doubling is possible, single wh-in situ is also systematically possible. Then, I also showed that the generalisation does not hold in the opposite direction, since the felicity of a structure construed with wh-doubling is not guaranteed in the absence of doubling. Long construals and indirect wh-in situ are possible more often with wh-doubling than with single insituness, and are hence found more frequently in Lombard varieties, where wh-doubling is the most productive. Here, I shall show that the distributional patterns of (doubling and single) wh-in situ can be better explained by observing the interaction of three major variables: (i) the position in the clause occupied by the clause-internal wh-element (edge position vs. non-final position); (ii) the availability of wh-in situ in long-distance and/or indirect questions; and (iii), the felicity of wh-phrases inside (weak and strong) islands to extraction. In §1.3.1, I address the co-occurrence of SCII and wh-in situ, and claim that no direct correlation between the two is observed in NIDs (as in Manzini & Savoia 2011).

1.3.1 Distribution of SCII

There is significant variation across NIDs with regard to SCII in matrix and embedded questions. The alternation between presence and absence of SCII in constructions with clause-internal wh-phrases in languages that allow optional wh-in situ is a well-known cross-linguistic puzzle. Take for example the striking difference between French (Chang 1997, Mathieu 1999, Bošković 2000, Baunaz 2011, Shlonsky 2012, a.o.) and Trevisian wh-in situ: what is the explanation for the incompatibility of SCII with wh-in situ in the former (where it is otherwise possible with fronted wh-elements and in yes/no questions), as in (25), versus its obligatory presence in the latter, as in (26)?

(25) INCOMPATIBILITY OF WH-IN SITU WITH SCII

a. Tu as mangé quand?
you have eaten when
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b. * As-tu mangé quand?
   have=you eaten when

(26) **OBLIGATORY SCII IN CONSTRUCTIONS WITH WH-IN SITU**

Trevigiano

a. * Te gâ magnà quando?
   cl2PS have eaten when

b. Ga-tu magnà quando?
   have=cl2PS eaten when

The situation in NIDs is further complicated by the presence of embedded wh-in situ and of three types of wh-doubling. The patterns attested in NIDs are shown in Table 1.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>matrix questions</th>
<th>embedded questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long-distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indirect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>single</th>
<th>wh-doubl</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>wh-doubl</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>wh-doubl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pagotto</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoldoaltino</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevigiano</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illasi</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monnese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunnuovese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strozzenese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanrochese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grumelless</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borghese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colognese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passiranese</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olgiate</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelvino</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendrisiotto</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        |        |          |          |          |        |          |

Distribution of SCII across NIDs

The varieties where wh-in situ is exclusively a root phenomenon, like Pagotto (Munaro 1995, Munaro et al. 2001, a.o.), show a very classical pattern with respect to the distribution of SCII, which is compulsory in matrix questions and disallowed in embedded contexts. However, since these varieties do not license embedded wh-in situ in the first place, no pattern of co-occurrence between embedded
wh-in situ and SCII can be observed. The same is true for varieties like Trevigiano and Colognese, where embedded wh-in situ is indeed possible, but only of the single type. In these languages, when SCII is compulsory in matrix questions, it is ungrammatical in embedded contexts (Trevigiano), and when SCII is never present in matrix questions it is predictably also disallowed in embedded questions (Colognese). In short, the realisation of SCII is orthogonal to the presence of wh-in situ. Similarly, in the varieties that do allow wh-doubling, the distribution of matrix SCII varies cross-linguistically but never language-externally and also, whether a language has SCII in matrix questions or not, it is always ruled out in non-root environments (as for instance in Grumellese). Therefore, no variety is attested among NIDs that has SCII as a question-formation strategy but bans it in constructions with clause-internal wh-words, as French does.

1.3.2 Distribution of Wh-Phrases

This section deals with the distributional patterns of D-linked and non-D-linked wh-words in NIDs. Aggressively non-D-linked wh-words are not discussed here because their distribution is consistently canonical, i.e. they can only appear fronted, as discussed in Pesetsky (1987).

On the basis of the robust distributional patterns of wh-in situ in different NIDs, I shall argue that at least three types of varieties exist: those that behave like Bellunese, those that resemble Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) Lombard NIDs, and finally Trevigiano and like varieties. I deal with the first type separately, since their interrogative syntax sets them apart from most varieties of the Northern Italian domain; I then analyse the two last types together, as these only differ in how they license wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions and in the phenomenon of short-movement of clause-internal wh-phrases, which is not attested in Lombard. Interestingly, these types correspond to the groups of varieties used in the existing theoretical treatments of Northern Italian wh-in situ, i.e. the remnant-IP movement analysis à la Munaro et al. (2001) and the covert movement hypothesis à la Manzini & Savoia (2005). These approaches, as I shall argue in Chapter 6, have the major weakness of being unifying, i.e. their aim, which is not achieved successfully, is to provide one single explanation that is strong enough to account for all Northern Italian data. It should be noted that Manzini & Savoia (2005) provided data in support of their analysis from both Lombard and Venetan varieties. Here, I am using the ‘Lombard’ label exclusively for descriptive ease: it is an inclusive term that I use to refer also to those Venetan varieties that share their insituness-related properties with Lombard.

Wh-in situ: the Bellunese type

The first type of Northern Italian insituness is the Bellunese type. In Bellunese, wh-in situ is mostly of the single type (the sole exception being the doubling what-word cossa). In Pagotto, the
variety of Bellunese first described in Munaro (1995), non-D-linked wh-words can only be licensed clause-internally, as in (27), while D-linked wh-phrases are obligatorily fronted, as in (90):

(27) DISTRIBUTION OF NON-D-LINKED WH-WORDS (Munaro 1999:14(1.2))

Bellunese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Che vestito à-tu sièlt?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what dress have=you₂PS chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Which dress did you choose?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. * A-tu  sièlt che vestito?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have=you₂PS chosen what dress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28) DISTRIBUTION OF D-LINKED WH-PHRASES

Bellunese

(adapted from Munaro 1999:50(1.56))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. A-tu parecià che?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have=you₂PS prepared what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘What did you prepare?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. * Che à-tu parecià?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what have=you₂PS prepared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two non-D-linked wh-words have an unusual status, since they can only appear fronted: *cossa* ('what') and *parché* ('why'). Also, only two non lexically-restricted wh-words, *qual* ('which one') and *quant* ('how much') are able to surface either clause-internally or in the clause-initial position.

In Bellunese, embedded insituness is felicitous in long-distance environments, as (29)⁶, and excluded in indirect questions, as (30):

(29) LONG CONSTRUAL (Munaro 1999:72(1.100-102))

Bellunese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. À-tu dit che l’à comprà che?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have=you₂PS said that he=has bought what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘What did you say he bought?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. À-tu dit che l’è ‘ndat andé?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have=you₂PS said that he=is gone where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Where did you say he went?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(30) INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS (Munaro 1999:69(1.93))

Bellunese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. No so che che l’a comprà</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG know₁PS what that he’has bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I don’t know what he bought’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. * No so (che) l’ha comprà che</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG know₁PS (that) he’has bought what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁶Munaro explained examples such as (29) in terms of the ability of wh-phrases in subordinate clauses to correctly establish an interpretive connection with the ‘abstract operator in the matrix CP that is legitimised by the interrogative inflection on the matrix verb [my translation]’. However, it should be noted that the existence of wh-in situ in long construals is problematic for the remnant-II movement analysis, where insituness is expected to target a left-peripheral wh-projection systematically. I discuss this issue further in Chapter 6.
Note that Bellunese displays a systematic violation of the Filter, as illustrated in (30a). This variety also lacks a COMP of the se_{WH} type. Bellunese is therefore unable to license indirect single wh-in situ, since the that-COMP is incompatible with a clause-internal wh-phrase, as in (30b).

Another crucial property of Bellunese wh-in situ, which will be highly relevant for the discussion in Chapter 6, is the requirement for clause-internal wh-words to occupy the rightmost position in the clause. According to Munaro (1999), Poletto & Pollock (2015), and related works, the order of internal arguments in Bellunese wh-questions shows that clause-internal wh-words obey what I shall call a sentence-finality requirement (à la Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2005), as illustrated in (32):

(31) SENTENCE-FINALITY REQUIREMENT FOR CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-WORDS
(Bellunese)
(adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015:139(2))

a. Al ghe a dat al libro a so fradel
   he DAT has given the book to his brother
   ‘He gave the book to his brother’

b. * Ghe ha-lo dat che a so fradel?
   DAT has=he given what to his brother
   ‘What has he given to his brother?’

c. Ghe ha-lo dat che, a so fradel?
   DAT has=he given what # to his brother

In Bellunese che-questions, like that in (87b), the dative complement (a so fradel, ‘to his brother’) is necessarily de-accented, though not in statements like (31a). Moreover, the wh-DO must occupy the rightmost position, while anything that follows is an independent intonational phrase (‘comma intonation’, signalled here by means of #). According to the authors, if the wh-word in cases like (87a) was in the ordinary sentence-internal DO-position (where il libro ‘the book’ is located in 31a), these facts would be difficult to understand. In Chapter 6, I shall show that this argument is a central to their discussion, which takes Bellunese (and more generally Northern Italian) clause-internal wh-words to be instances of fake insituness that have actually been moved from their first-merge position.

The literature on NIDs attributes different sensitivities to clause-internal wh-phrases to weak and strong syntactic islands (in the sense of Huang 1982, Kayne 1983, Longobardi 1988, Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1990, a.o.) in Venetan and Lombard dialects. Munaro (1999) noticed that in Pagotto the presence of a wh-phrase inside a syntactic island gives rise to different degrees of degradation, and even ungrammaticality with strong islands, which are opaque for extraction. Munaro provides examples of subject islands, of complex NP islands, and of adjunct islands. Examples of subject islands where the wh-element is a complement of the embedded preverbal subject are provided in (32):

(32) SUBJECT ISLANDS (strong) (Munaro 1999:74(1.104))

Bellunese

a. * Te à-li dit che [i clienti de chi] no i-à pagà?
   you_{you} have=they said that the clients of who NEG they=have paid
   ‘Whose clients did they tell you didn’t pay?’
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b. * Pensi-tu che [partir quando] saria sbaglià?
think=you_{2PS} that leave when would be wrong
‘When do you think it would be wrong to leave?’

Degradation is also observed in the distribution of wh-in situ within weak islands, although to a lesser degree than in strong islands. According to Munaro, this is true both in wh-islands, where a wh-element is found inside an indirect wh-question, and in negative islands, where a wh-phrase is in the scope of negation. Examples of wh-islands are provided in (33):

(33) WH-ISLANDS (weak) (Munaro 1999:74-75(1.107))

a. ?? No te-te-ricorda [andé che von comprà che] ??
NEG you_{2PS}=yourself=remember where that have_{1PP} bought what
‘You don’t remember where we bought what?’

b. * Te à-li domandà [ parché che al-se-à comportà come] ??
you_{2PS} have=they asked why that he=himself=has behaved how
‘They asked you why he behaved how?’

The data concerning the infelicity of wh-in situ inside syntactic islands were originally presented in Munaro (1999) to posit the existence of systematic movement of wh-words in interrogatives. In his approach, interrogative movement is also present in the case of (apparent) insituness, which he explained in terms of the presence of an abstract operator that moves to the sentence-initial position and determines the scope of the clause-internal wh-word with which it is construed. In a sense, Munaro’s original analysis runs along the same lines as the analysis that I shall propose in Chapter 6, except that what moves in my account is a silent adjoining Q-particle, à la Cable (2010). Later, the same data were employed in Munaro et al. (2001) and Poletto & Pollock (2000-2015) to actually prove the existence of left-peripheral wh-movement in all apparent instances of insituness in Pagotto and generally Northern Italian varieties.

Wh-in situ: the Trevisian and Lombard types

In the Introduction, I provided an overview of the interrogative syntax of Trevigiano. Trevisian wh-in situ displays peculiar distributional properties with respect to Bellunese (as in §1.3.2), despite the geographical proximity of the two varieties. Some Lombard dialects, as described in Manzini & Savoia (2005), appear more closely related to Trevigiano than Bellunese, though they are not identical.

The first two properties that Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) Lombard varieties share to some extent with Trevigiano are the absence of a D-linked/non-D-linked asymmetry in clause-internal position and of a sentence-finality requirement. The third property is the availability of wh-in situ in long-distance construals of the type in (34):
Wh-in situ in Northern Italian dialects

(34)  LONG CONSTRUALS (Manzini & Savoia 2005:591(155))  

a.  in’do to ‘pen set ke l in’da ge?
where you2PS think that he goes
‘Where do you think he’s going?’
b.  ‘pen set ke l in’da ge in’doe?
think2PS that he goes where

The fourth shared property is the felicity of wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions. However, Lombard varieties and Trevigiano do clearly differ in the way they licence indirect wh-in situ: Lombard lacks a specialised COMP of the se_{\text{WH}} type, hence can only license indirect wh-in situ in constructions with wh-doubling. An example is provided in (35):

(35)  WH-DOUBLING IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS  

(Manzini & Savoia 2005:593(156))  

a.  ‘so ‘mia se por’ta-t (ko’zr)
know1PS NEG se bring-you2PS what
‘I don’t know what to bring you’
b.  ‘so ‘mia se ma’ŋa ko’zr
know1PS NEG se eat what
‘I don’t know what to eat’

The fifth and last similarity relates to the availability of island-contained wh-phrases. Manzini & Savoia (2005) discuss the cases of Grumellese and Borghese, where no island effect is observed inside subject islands, as in (36a), complex NP islands, as in (36b), and adjunct islands, as in (36c):

(36)  WH-IN SITU WITHIN STRONG ISLANDS

(adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:593-4(157))  

a.  ‘dig-ei ke g e e’nit [[ i a’mis de ’ki ]]
say=them that it has come the friends of who
‘What is x such as x is someone’s friends and x came?’
b.  ta ‘pjah [[ i ‘liber k i ‘parla de ko’he ]]
you2PS like the books that they speak of what
‘What is x such as you enjoy books about x?’
c.  l e n’daf i’vja [[ ‘hænha haly’di ki ]]
he is gone away without greeting who
‘What is x such as he left without greeting x?’

Note that the status of SClI in constructions with island-trapped wh-in situ is unclear. I shall discuss this in Chapter 5, along with Manzini and Savoia’s observation that island effects do appear in Lombard when an island-trapped wh-phrase is doubled by its left-peripheral counterpart.

---

7Note that, as Ur Shlonsky (pc.) pointed out, example (36a) and the Bellunese example in (32a) are not proper minimal pairs. Indeed, in (36a) the subject is postverbal: the comparison should rather be done with a clause that contains an unergative verb and a preverbal subject. Unfortunately, I am not in possession of examples of the sort.
To conclude, Lombard dialects actually differ from Trevigiano in some of their wh-in situ properties. First, the exclusive availability of wh-doubling in the former, as discussed in §1.2. Second, the ways in which wh-in situ is licensed in indirect wh-questions: single insituness is enough in Trevigiano, while Lombard dialects need wh-doubling to license embedded insituness felicitously. Third, short-movement of clause-internal wh-phrases has never been attested in Lombard, hence its status is uncertain. Consequently it seems more reasonable to treat these two type of varieties separately, at least for the time being. The legitimacy of the tripartite division of Northern Italian varieties will become clearer in Chapter 6, where I address the existing theoretical treatments of wh-in situ in NIDs.

Intermediate Remarks

In this Chapter, I have offered a detailed overview of the different patterns of in situ/ex situ alternation observed in NIDs. My discussion was based on published data (Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015, Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011, Manzini 2014, a.o.), which I compared to the novel data from Trevigiano presented in the Introduction. Crucially, the availability of both single and doubling wh-in situ in matrix and/or embedded contexts was discussed, along with the language-internal and cross-linguistic distribution of SCII, and the different degrees of sensitivity to weak and strong syntactic islands. These observations raised a number of hypotheses and questions which I address briefly in what follows, and then develop further in the rest of this dissertation.

First of all, the Northern Italian data regarding the distribution of wh-in situ presented so far display significant enough variation to cast doubt on the feasibility of a unified explanation to account for all distributional properties attested in NIDs. The degree of micro-variation observed might indeed be so significant and complex that one single explanation cannot account for all existing patterns of in situ/ex situ alternation. All theories of Northern Italian wh-in situ presented in the literature are unifying in nature, i.e. their aim is to account for the phenomenon by means of one single, unchangeable licensing mechanism. As I shall argue in Chapter 6, this is too ambitious: an approach that, in the absence of major typological divides, predicts micro-variation along certain variables is preferable.

From the discussion presented so far, it certainly seems desirable to posit at least two different ways of deriving wh-in situ in NIDs. The first one applies to Bellunese and similar varieties, where insituness is limited to non-D-linked wh-words and is a root phenomenon that can only be licensed felicitously at the rightmost sentential edge. The fact that in these varieties wh-movement is present and indeed takes place before Spell-Out is confirmed by the sensitivity that clause-internal wh-words display to both weak and strong islands (Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto & Pollock 2015 and related works; see Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion). Bellunese and related varieties do seem to constitute a
group that should be treated independently, yet in Chapter 6 I shall claim that most of their peculiar properties can be explained in terms of micro-variations. Indeed, I shall argue that languages of the Bellunese type derive insituness as Trevigiano does, except for a number of properties related to the extent to which Q-adjunction applies and, plausibly, a special prosodic constraint. The second type is the derivation whereby the clause-internal wh-phrase stays TP-internally, whether it is unmoved à la Manzini & Savoia (2005;2011) or TP-internally moved, as I shall argue for Trevigiano. However, the undocumented status of short-movement of wh-phrases in Lombard varieties, along with the presence of wh-doubling and related properties, somewhat suggests that Lombard and similar varieties and Trevigiano should be treated as two sides of the same coin: on the one hand, Trevigiano and similar varieties where virtually all types of wh-elements can appear either sentence-initially or clause-internally, and wh-in situ is both a root and a non-root phenomenon that targets a linear position below the surface position of the past participle; on the other hand, Lombard varieties, where indirect wh-in situ is only possible in constructions with overt wh-doubling, and clause-internal wh-phrases might not move.

Why are some varieties able to license wh-in situ both in matrix and in embedded environments whereas for some others insituness is exclusively a root phenomenon? What makes island-contained wh-in situ possible? What is the role of wh-doubling, and what can it reveal about wh-movement in general? These questions could probably be explained as suggested in Manzini & Savoia (2011): respectively, as the consequence of parametrised properties that force (or do not force) overt wh-movement from embedded clauses, as different conditions on LF interpretive construals, and as an overt realisation of both the wh-word and its left-peripheral scope marker. However, these are not sufficient to explain why there is a D-linked/non-D-linked asymmetry in certain varieties, nor how the presence or absence of a sentence-finality requirement is to be accounted for. Furthermore, in this approach, the status of the short movement that clause-internal wh-phrases undergo in Trevigiano is not clear. In this theoretical background, the major prediction is that it ought to be possible to draw a typology of insituness that goes from Chinese-like languages where sentence-internal wh-words are unmoved (i.e. licensed in their first-merge position, à la Huang 1982 and related works), to the case of languages which display clause-internally moved wh-phrases.

In the next part, I shall focus on the analysis of the Trevisian data. All other data discussed so far will be analysed in Part III, where I also overview the strengths and weaknesses of the major existing analyses of Northern Italian wh-in situ.
Part II

On Clause-Internally Moved
Wh-Phrases and Related Properties
Chapter 2

On short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases: Wh-to-Foc

In Chapter 1, I provided extensive evidence in favour of a (minimally) bipartite treatment of Northern Italian wh-in situ. In this Part, I shall continue with this approach, outlining a theory of Trevisian insituinness, and shall then develop it further in Chapter 6. This treatment goes against much previous work which has attempted to bring together Northern Italian (and Romance) wh-in situ under a unifying approach (Poletto & Pollock 2000 and later developments, Munaro et al. 2001, Manzini & Savoia 2005 and related works, Manzini 2014, a.o.). More concretely, I have claimed that (at least) three types of varieties can be identified on the basis of the distributional properties of clause-internal wh-phrases. These are Bellunese and similar varieties, which correspond to those investigated in the remnant-IP movement analysis (Poletto & Pollock 2000, Munaro et al. 2001); Lombard varieties, which seem very likely to have to have real wh-in situ as claimed in Manzini & Savoia (2005); and Trevigiano and similar varieties, in which clause-internal wh-phrases appear to be TP-internally moved to a linear position below the surface position of the past participle. Here, I shall focus exclusively on the third type of varieties, i.e. on the syntax of Trevisian in situ/ex situ alternations such as those in (1):

(1) IN SITU/EX SITU ALTERNATION

a. Ga-tu magnà cuando el dolse ___ ?
   have=cl$_{2PS}$ eaten when the cake
   ‘When did you eat the cake?’

b. Cuando ga-tu magnà el dolse ___ ?
   when have=cl$_{2PS}$ eaten the cake
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Problems, assumptions, and working hypotheses

As illustrated in (1), the first working hypothesis behind this Chapter is that Trevisian wh-phrases are moved not only when they surface in sentence-initial position, as in (1b), but also when they stay clause-internally, as in (1a). This is based on the data presented in the Introduction, which I explore in detail in §2.1. The second working hypothesis is that clause-internal wh-phrases are moved to a focal projection within TP, more precisely Belletti’s (2004) Foc, which I shall call Foc\textsubscript{LOW} throughout, to avoid confusion with Rizzi’s left-peripheral (1997) Focus\textsubscript{P} (here, Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}). An analysis of wh-in situ as targeting Foc\textsubscript{LOW} has already been proposed Brazilian Portuguese (Kato 2003;2013), French (Belletti 2006), and NIDs (Manzini 2014). Henceforth, I shall refer to accounts along these lines as Wh-to-Foc. The accounts taht derive wh-in situ TP-internally are minimally based on Belletti’s (2004) assumption that the clausal domain contains a periphery of the type in (2):

\begin{equation}
\text{VP-PERIPHERY (as in Belletti 2004)}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[CP} \\
\text{... [TP} \\
\text{... [TopP Top}^0 \\
\text{FocP Foc}^0 \\
\text{TopP Top}^0 \\
\text{... VP]]]]}
\end{array}
\end{equation}

According to Belletti, the VP-periphery is typically activated in Italian subject inversion structures, which display the non-canonical VS order, with the subject interpreted as focus of new information, as in (3). Note that in these cases the canonical pre-verbal position is not available for the S, as in (3c):

\begin{equation}
\text{SUBJECT-INVERSION STRUCTURES}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Italian}
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. Question: Chi è partito / ha parlato?
Who is left / has spoken
‘Who left / spoke?’
\item b. Answer: È partito / ha parlato Gianni
is left / has spoken Gianni
‘Gianni left / spoke’
\item c. Answer: * Gianni è partito / ha parlato
Gianni is left / has spoken
\end{itemize}

Conversely, in languages like Italian, the post-verbal position is unavailable if the S of the utterance is known, i.e. shared information, unless it is dislocated. Observe the contrast between (4b) and (4c):

\begin{equation}
\text{CANONICAL SV STRUCTURES}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Italian}
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. Question: Che cosa ha fatto Gianni?
What has done Gianni
‘What did Gianni do?’
\item b. Answer: * È partito / ha parlato Gianni
is left / has spoken Gianni
‘Gianni left / spoke’
\item c. Answer: È partito / ha parlato, Gianni
is left / has spoken, Gianni
‘Gianni, he left / spoke’
\end{itemize}
The derivation proposed by Belletti for structures such as (50b) is illustrated in (5):

(5) DERIVATION OF SUBJECT-INVERSION STRUCTURES

\[ \text{Italian} \]

\[
[\text{CP} \ldots [\text{TP} \text{ pro} \ldots \text{è} \ldots \text{partito} / \text{ha parlato} \ldots [\text{TopP} \ [\text{FocLOW} \text{ Gianni} \ [\text{TopP} \ [\text{VP} \ldots ]]]]]
\]

However, despite the presence of a focal projection within TP, Standard Italian fails to license wh-phrases clause-internally (Rizzi 1982; 1997, Calabrese 1984, a.o.), as in (6):

(6) UNGRAMMATICALITY OF WH-IN SITU

\[ \text{Standard Italian} \]

\[ \text{a. } * \text{ Mangi quando da me?} \]

\[ \text{eat} \text{PS} \ \text{when} \ \text{at my place} \]

\[ \text{‘When are you coming over for dinner?’} \]

\[ \text{b. } * \text{ Hai affidato a chi l’incarico?} \]

\[ \text{have} \text{PS} \ \text{given} \ \text{to who the’job} \]

\[ \text{‘Who did you give the job to?’} \]

Under the aforementioned assumptions, the ungrammaticality of (6) is puzzling. Remember that it is not only Trevigiano that has wh-in situ, but also closely-related Venetan Italian. While a parametrisation of Standard Italian Foc\text{LOW} as an impossible landing site for movement of wh-phrases seems implausible, it is tempting to attribute the cross-linguistically different distributions of wh-in situ either to a parametrisation of the features that are checked in C and/or TP-internally à la Miyagawa (2001), or to properties of wh-phrases themselves, à la Cable (2010). I shall provide a detailed discussion of both options, and then argue in favour of an adaptation of Cable’s grammar of Q to NIDs (§2.2).

Approaches in which wh-in situ is argued to target a low focal projection have also been proposed for non-Romance languages: these include Mahajan (1990) and Manetta (2010;2011) for Bangla and Hindi/Urdu; Jayaseelan (1996) for Malayalam; Kahanmuyipour (2001) for Persian; Aboh (2006) for the Bantu Aghem; Sinopoulou (2008) for Greek multiple wh-questions. Cheng & Bayer (2015) also claimed that insituness in South Asian languages is systematically an instance of overt movement to the left edge of VP/P, the sole exception being the V2-language Kashmiri. If Foc\text{LOW} was shown to be able to host wh-phrases in some languages, there would be a theoretically-welcome correspondence between the LP and the low periphery, with both Focus\text{HIGH} and Foc\text{LOW} able to host focus-movement and wh-movement, as in (7):

(7) IDEAL CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN FOCAL PROJECTIONS

\[
[\text{ForceP} \ldots [\text{FocusHIGH} \ [\text{\checkmark focus} \ [\text{\checkmark wh}] \text{Foc}^0 \ldots [\text{TP} \ldots [\text{FocLOW} \ [\text{\checkmark focus} \ [\text{\checkmark wh}] \text{Foc}^0 \ldots [\text{VP} \ldots ]]]]]]
\]

However, many non-Romance languages are pure in situ languages, which makes their analysis less problematic, i.e. where relevant, the wh-phrase is probed into a clause-internal Spec by whatever feature is relevant to wh-movement, and no further movement is needed (at least in overt syntax).
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This is not the case for optional in situ languages, whether they be of the Romance family or not, where wh-phrases surface either clause-internally, or move all the way up to sentence-initial position. Since Chomsky (1973), wh-movement has been known to operate successive-cyclically, i.e. fronted wh-phrases are not extracted directly from their first-merge position, as in (8a), but pass through every CP that they cross, as in (8b):

(8) CYCLICITY OF WH-MOVEMENT

Movement of wh-phrases from the external-merge position to their final landing site is not direct but broken into a sequence of local steps, in a successive-cyclic way:

a. $[\text{CP } \text{Who did } [\text{TP Mary think } [\text{CP } \text{John saw } \_\_\_] ] ]$

b. $[\text{CP Who did } [\text{TP Mary think } [\text{CP } \_\_\_ [\text{TP John saw } \_\_\_] ] ] ]$

The cyclicity of wh-movement has been successfully argued for in notable works on wh-agreement, wh-movement-related inversion phenomena, and pronunciation of intermediate copies in the case of partial wh-movement (Torrego 1984, McDaniel 1986;1989, McCloskey 2001;2002, Willis 2000, a.o.). I shall therefore assume here that the existence of successive-cyclic movement is certain. Cyclicity means that if both Foc\text{LOW} and Focus\text{HIGH} are targets for interrogative wh-movement, a fronted wh-phrase like that in (1b) starts out within VP and then moves to SpecFocus\text{HIGH} successive-cyclically, along the lines of the diagram in (9):

(9) SUCCESSIVE-CYCLIC MOVEMENT THROUGH SPECFOC\text{LOW}

$[\cdot \text{Focus\text{HIGH} Cuando ga-tu [TP magnà [Foc\text{LOW} \_\_\_ [VP ... el dolse \_\_\_] ] ] ]}$

It is not implausible that wh-movement should pass through SpecFoc\text{LOW}: in phase theory, fully-fronted wh-phrases pass through every phrase-edge, i.e. both the edge of vP and of CP. This is not incompatible per se with the idea of wh-movement through Foc\text{LOW}, if we accept that the Spec of this projection is indeed the edge of vP. There is, however, a major problem with this approach, namely the fact that a wh-phrase that moves into SpecFoc\text{LOW} must be probed there by a feature or criterion: consequently, once the intermediate derived position is reached, further movement to sentence-initial position would cause a violation in terms of Criterial Freezing, a principle formulated in Rizzi (2004) which blocks phrases in the position in which they satisfy a relevant Criterion. This means that in Trevigiano one of the following must be true: (i) Foc\text{LOW} is not criterial, which is highly implausible; or (ii) there exists an escape-hatch to avoid Criterial Freezing in Foc\text{LOW} and to allow further movement of the clause-internal wh-phrase if needed; or (iii) the clause-internal movement under investigation is criterial but not relevant to proper wh-movement. An explanation along the lines of (iii) could be available if Trevisian Wh-to-Foc was actually focus-movement, triggered by a [foc]-feature, not real wh-movement driven by [wh], as claimed for example for Persian wh-in situ (Kahnemuyipour 2001).
2.1 Characterising Wh-to-Foc

To conclude, note that an analysis of Trevisian wh-in situ in terms of Wh-to-Foc requires a parallel explanation for the fact that the wh-phrase, clause-internally moved into SpecFoc\(_{\text{LOW}}\), linearly follows the past participle, which entails that both move, as shown in (10):

(10) WH-TO-FOC AND PAST PARTICIPLE PLACEMENT

\[
[\text{CP Ga-tu [IP magnà [Foc\(_{\text{LOW}}\) cuando [vP ... el dolse ... ]]]}]
\]

Depending on the analysis adopted, the past participle should be situated lower in the structure, at least no higher than \(vP\). The presence of Wh-to-Foc hence implies that the Trevisian past participle is moved to a position above Foc\(_{\text{LOW}}\), as in (10), which is theoretically not implausible given Cinque’s (1999) analysis of past participle movement out of the VP in Italian, and its linguistic proximity to Trevigiano (as I shall argue in §2.1.3).

Organisation of this Chapter

In this Chapter, I describe and analyse Trevisian short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases. I first discuss and confirm the existence of a VP-periphery in Trevigiano (§2.1.1), and then outline the reasons why the TP-internal movement that Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases undergo is an instance of bona fide syntactic movement (§2.1.2); finally, I argue that this short movement does indeed target Belletti’s (2004) Foc. In §2.2, I investigate the ways in which wh-phrases are probed into SpecFoc\(_{\text{LOW}}\) (in the case of insitu-ness) or SpecFocus\(_{\text{HIGH}}\) (in the case of total fronting), with specific focus on the mechanisms of C-checking that operate when no phonetically-overt movement to C is detectable. Crucially, I first investigate the possibility that Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases are merged within interrogative Clitic Phrases, as suggested for other NIDs by Poletto & Pollock (2000) and related works (§2.2.2), then abandon this approach in favour of a more up-to-date analysis à la Cable (2010) (§2.2.3).

2.1 Characterising Wh-to-Foc

I have claimed that Trevisian wh-in situ is minimally characterised by the following properties:

(i) felicity of both D-linked and non-D-linked wh-phrases in clause-internal position (lack of what I call a D-linked/non-D-linked asymmetry), with the exceptions of che (‘what’) and parché (‘why’), which can respectively surface only in situ and only fronted;

(ii) lack of a sentence-finality requirement à la Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria (2005), i.e. clause-internal wh-phrases need not occupy the rightmost edge of the clause in which they appear;

(iii) compulsory short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases, detectable in the phonetic string in the case of wh-Ios and wh-adverbials;

(iv) felicity in both long-distance construals and in indirect wh-questions;
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(v) felicity inside syntactic islands (from which wh-extraction is at best degraded).

I address (i) to (iii) in this Chapter. The discussion of (iv) and (v) shall be carried out in Chapter 5.

2.1.1 Free subject inversion and the pro-drop parameter

The hypothesis that clause-internal wh-phrases in Trevigiano (and similar languages) target a focal projection higher than VP raises at least one prediction: that in the varieties under consideration a VP-periphery along the lines of that proposed for Italian in Belletti (2004) must be active. The prediction is confirmed by the Trevisian data. What has commonly been referred to as free subject inversion in Italian involves movement of the subject to the VP-peripheral focus projection. An example is provided in (11):

(11) FREE SUBJECT INVERSION

É partito / ha parlato Gianni
is left / has spoken Gianni
‘Gianni left / spoke’

Structures like (11) are also attested in Trevigiano, as illustrated in (12):

(12) FREE SUBJECT INVERSION

Ze partìo / gà parlà Giani
is left / has spoken Gianni
‘Gianni left / spoke’

Free subject inversion is a fundamental property of null-subject languages that appears to be linked to the possibility of leaving the pre-verbal subject position phonetically unrealised. Observe the contrastive realisation of the Trevisian 1PS and 2-3PS NOM clitics, as in (13):

(13) DISTRIBUTION OF NOMINATIVE CLITICS

a. Son ndà jeri
   am gone yesterday
   ‘I went (there) yesterday’

b. *(Te) si ndà jeri
   cl₂PS are gone yesterday
   ‘You went (there) yesterday’

c. *(El) ze ndà jeri
   cl₃PS,M is gone yesterday
   ‘He went (there) yesterday’

What might look like a partial pro-drop language on the basis of the observation of the distributional properties of NOM clitics shown in (13) is actually a bona fide instance of Romance positive setting of the pro-drop parameter (for detailed discussion of the parameter, refer to Chomsky 1981, Rizzi
1982;1986, Jaeggli & Safir 1989, Moro 1997, a.o.). Indeed, as claimed in the Introduction, Trevigiano has a complete declarative paradigm of non-clitic pronouns, and an incomplete paradigm of enclitic forms, as illustrated in Table 2.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NON-CLITIC SERIES</th>
<th>CLITIC SERIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1PS</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PS</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PS</td>
<td>lu&lt;sub&gt;M&lt;/sub&gt; / ea&lt;sub&gt;F&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>el&lt;sub&gt;M&lt;/sub&gt; / a&lt;sub&gt;F&lt;/sub&gt; / Ø&lt;sub&gt;EXPL&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PP</td>
<td>nojaltri&lt;sub&gt;M&lt;/sub&gt; / nojaltri&lt;sub&gt;F&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PP</td>
<td>vojaltri&lt;sub&gt;M&lt;/sub&gt; / vojaltri&lt;sub&gt;F&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PP</td>
<td>lori&lt;sub&gt;M&lt;/sub&gt; / lore&lt;sub&gt;F&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>i&lt;sub&gt;M&lt;/sub&gt; / e&lt;sub&gt;F&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When a NOM clitic exists it must be realised, be it alone, as in (14a), construed with a pronoun of the non-clitic series, as in (14b), or with a full DP, as in (14c):

(14) DISTRIBUTION OF NOMINATIVE CLITICS

Trevigiano

a. *(El) zè zà partio
   cl<sub>3PS,M</sub> is already left
   ‘He has already left’

b. Lu *(el) zè zà partio
   he cl<sub>3PS,M</sub> is already left

c. Toni *(el) zè zà partio
   Toni cl<sub>3PS,M</sub> is already left
   ‘Toni has already left’

In contrast, non-clitic NOM pronouns are incompatible with co-referential full DPs, as in (15a), and can be omitted in unmarked declaratives, as in (15b):

(15) DISTRIBUTION OF NON-CLITIC NOMINATIVE PRONOUNS

Trevigiano

a. Toni *(lu) *(el) zè zà partio
   Toni he cl<sub>3PS,M</sub> is already left
   ‘Toni has already left’

b. (Lu) *(el) zè zà partio
   he cl<sub>3PS,M</sub> is already left
   ‘He has already left’

This shows that the behaviour of Trevisian declarative subject pronouns of the non-clitic series mirrors that found in Standard Italian, as exemplified in (16):

(16) DISTRIBUTION OF NON-CLITIC NOMINATIVE PRONOUNS

Standard Italian

a. Toni *(egli) è già partito
   Toni he is already left
   ‘Toni has already left’
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b. (Toni / egli) è già partito
   Toni / he is already left
   ‘Toni / he has already left’

Therefore, although the Trevisian paradigm of declarative NOM clitics might superficially lead to the conclusion that Trevigiano is only partially pro-drop, the complementary distribution of full-DP subjects and the Italian-like non-clitic pronominal series confirms the pro-drop status of the language.

The pro-drop analysis is further confirmed by classic tests such as the possibility for the subject of a subordinate clause to be extracted to the matrix clause domain across an overt that-COMP (Perlmutter 1971), as in (17), the non-realisation of the quasi-argumental subject of weather verbs, as in (18), and the compulsory emptiness of the position vacated in the case of extraposition of a clausal subject, as in (19). Observe the contrast between the Trevisian examples in (a) and the counterparts in English, a universally-recognised non pro-drop language, in (b):

(17) S-EXTRACTION ACROSS OVERT THAT-COMP
   a. Chi____ pensi-tu [ che _____ ] la ciamarà ]?
      who think=cl2PS that her callFUT
      ‘Who do you think will call her?’
   b. * Who____ do you think [ that _____ will call her ]?

(18) QUASI-ARGUMENT OF WEATHER VERBS
   a. (*El) pjove
      it rains
   b. *(It) rains

(19) RIGHTWARD EXTRAPosition OF CLAUSAL SUBJECT
   a. _____ i zé sicuro [ che a Luisa noa _____ partirà ]
      is sure that the Louise NEG=cl3PS.F leaveFUT
      ‘It is sure that Louise will not leave’
   b. * _____ is sure [ that Louise will not leave ]

Let us now return to (Italian) post-verbal subjects and their derivation. Belletti’s (2004) analysis of instances such as (11), along the lines of (20), leads to the assumption that Italian post-verbal subjects are focal in nature:

(20) POST-VERBAL SUBJECTS ARE FOCUSED (as in Belletti 2004)
    \[ [CP \ldots [TP pro \ldots \text{è ...partito / ha parlato} \ldots [\text{TopP} \ldots [\text{TopP} \ldots [\text{TopP} \ldots [\text{VP} \ldots \ldots ]]]] ]\]

For Belletti, this focal character is further justified by the presence of weak-crossover effects. Also, that the inverted focused subject is not situated in the LP of the clause is confirmed by the fact that the position must be c-commanded by the IP-internal negation in Italian. Contrasts like that shown in
(21), where *nesuni* (‘anyone’) must be c-commanded by the negation, constitute further evidence in favour of the presence of a VP-periphery in Trevigiano:

(21) A POST-VERBAL SUBJECT MUST BE C-COMMANDED BY NEG  

   a. *No me o gà dito nesuni*  
      NEG to.me it has said anyone  
      ‘No one told me that’  

   b. *Nesuni no me o gà dito*  
      anyone NEG to.me it has said

In examples like (21) the negative quantifier *nesuno* (‘anyone’) needs to be c-commanded by the negation, *no*. This rules out the possibility of positing movement of the subject to the left-peripheral focus position, followed by remnant movement of the IP. Indeed, this type of movement analysis would exclude c-command.

From the discussion in this section, it appears reasonable to propose that Trevigiano has Italian-like VP-periphery. In §2.1.2, I argue in favour of a movement analysis for Trevisian clause-internal *wh*-phrases, and claim that there are reasons to believe that this functional layer is indeed the landing site for clause-internally moved *wh*-phrases.

### 2.1.2 Are clause-internal *wh*-phrases moved?

In proposing an account of the syntax of questions such as that in (22), it is first necessary to determine whether the movement displayed by the clause-internal *wh*-phrases is syntactic, i.e. compulsory and triggered by the need to check a relevant feature, or movement of a different type:

(22) SHORT MOVEMENT OF *WH*-ADVERBIAL  

       Ga-tu visto *cuando me mama ___ ?*  
       have=cl₂Ps seen when my mum  
       ‘When did you see my mum?’

One might wonder whether the material that follows the clause-internal *wh*-phrases in questions like (22) is actually external to the core of the clause, i.e. right-dislocated or marginalised. I shall claim that an analysis along these lines would be incorrect. Trevigiano is in fact an SVO language where the relative order among verb-selected arguments is rigidly fixed, as in (23), as is the order among verb-selected arguments and adverbials, as in (24):

(23) UNMARKED ORDER OF VERB-SELECTED ARGUMENTS  

       a. V(erb) > D(irect)O(bject) > I(ndirect)O(bject)  
          Ghe go dato i pomi a Giani  
          DAT have₁Ps given the apples to John  
          ‘I gave the apples to John’
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b. * V > IO > DO
   * Ghe go dat a Gian i pomi DO
   DAT have_1PS given to John the apples

(24) **UNMARKED ORDER OF TIME AND PLACE ADVERBIALS**

Trevigiano

a. Arguments > Adv(verbial)\textsubscript{Time} > Adv\textsubscript{Place}
   Go magn\textsubscript{a} gnocchi\textsubscript{IO} jeri sera\textsubscript{TIME} al ristorante\textsubscript{PLACE}
   have_1PS eaten gnocchi yesterday night at the restaurant
   ‘I ate gnocchi yesterday evening at the restaurant’

b. ? Arguments > Adv\textsubscript{Place} > Adv\textsubscript{Time}
   ? Go magn\textsubscript{a} gnocchi\textsubscript{IO} al ristorante\textsubscript{PLACE} jeri sera\textsubscript{TIME}
   have_1PS eaten gnocchi at the restaurant yesterday night

(26) **INTERROGATIVE UNMARKED ORDER OF TIME AND PLACE ADVERBIALS**

Trevigiano

a. wh-Adv > DO
   Ga-tu magn\textsubscript{a} cuan\textsubscript{do}_\textsubscript{wh-ADV} patatine\textsubscript{DO} al ristorante\textsubscript{ADV}
   have you eaten French.fries at the restaurant
   ‘When did you eat French fries at the restaurant?’

b. * DO > wh-Adv
   * Ga-tu magn\textsubscript{a} patatine\textsubscript{DO} cuan\textsubscript{do}_\textsubscript{wh-ADV} al ristorante\textsubscript{ADV} cuan\textsubscript{do}_\textsubscript{wh-ADV}
   have you eaten French.fries at the restaurant when
   ‘When did you eat French fries at the restaurant?’

However, the declarative linear orders in (23) and (24) are not reproduced in wh-interrogatives. Observe the interrogative linear orders in (25) and (26):

(25) **INTERROGATIVE UNMARKED ORDER OF VERB-SELECTED ARGUMENTS**

Trevigiano

a. V > wh-IO > DO
   Ghe ga-tu dat a chi IO i pomi DO?
   DAT have you given to whom the apples
   ‘To whom did you give the apples?’

b. * V > wh-IO > DO
   * Ghe ga-tu dat i pomi DO a chi IO?
   DAT have you given the apples to whom

In genuine interrogatives such as those in (25) and (26), the wh-IO precedes the DO in the phonetic string, as do wh-adverbials. Following basic generative assumptions, I take the underlying structure of declaratives and interrogatives to be the same, and different surface orders thereof to be derived via *pre*-Spell Out movement(s) (Chomsky 1964 and further developments). In line with the contrasts observed in the examples above, it seems reasonable to posit that Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases *obligatorily* move higher than the position in which they are externally-merged, plausibly to an FP
outside of VP. (27) exemplifies the VP-to-FP movement under consideration in the case of a wh-IO. Note that I use the symbol ‘>’ to signal that the relevant order here is the surface order, and bracket FP and VP for the sake of clarity:

\[(27) \text{ SHORT MOVEMENT OF CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-WORD } \]
\[S > V > \left[ FP \text{ wh-IO}_1 \ldots \right] > \left[ VP \ldots \text{DO} > \cdots > \right] (> \text{Adv}_{\text{Time}} > \text{Adv}_{\text{Place}}) \]

An analysis along the lines of (27) also needs to be extended to cases in which the movement is not detectable in the phonetic string, as for example with wh-DOS, as in (28). A schematic representation along the lines of (27) is provided in (29):

\[(28) \text{ SILENT SHORT MOVEMENT OF A WH-DO } \]
\[Ga-tu \text{ visto chi}_i \ldots \text{jeri sera?} \]

\['Who did you meet last night?\]

\[(29) \text{ SILENT SHORT MOVEMENT OF A WH-DO } \]
\[S > V > \left[ FP \text{ wh-DO}_1 \ldots \right] > \left[ VP \ldots \right] > \text{IO} (> \text{Adv}_{\text{Time}} > \text{Adv}_{\text{Place}}) \]

One might wonder whether the DOs and adverbials of wh-questions such as (25) and (26), here (30), might be right-dislocated, which would rule out short movement of the wh-phrase:

\[(30) \text{ ARE IN SITU WH-PHRASES AT THE CLAUSE EDGE? } \]
\[a. \text{ Ghe ga-tu dato a chi } \text{i pomi?} \]

\['To whom did you give the apples?\]

\[b. \text{ Ga-tu magn\'a quando patatine al ristorante?} \]

\['When did you eat French fries at the restaurant?\]

I argue that they are not. In fact, Trevigiano requires dislocated constituents to be phrased as independent intonational phrases, with obligatory realisation of a resumptive clitic (if available) co-indexed with the dislocated element. Additionally, with analytic verb forms, phi-agreement (gender and number) must be realised on the past participle, as illustrated in (31):

\[(31) \text{ CLITIC RIGHT-DISLOCATION } \]
\[Ghe i_j \text{ ga-tu dati}_{\text{M.PL}} \text{ a chi}_i, \text{i pomi}_i? \]

\['The apples, who did you give (them) to?\]

In the absence of any of the three above properties, dislocation fails, as in (32):
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(32) ILL-FORMED DISLOCATIONS

Trevigiano

a. Absence of a resumptive clitic

* Ghe ga-tu dati a chi, i pomi?
DAT have\(_{2PS}\) given\(_{M,PL}\) to who # the apples

b. Absence of agreement on the past participle

* Ghe i ga-tu dato a chi, i pomi?
DAT cl\(_{j}\) have\(_{2PS}\) given to who # the apples\(_{j}\)

c. Absence of comma intonation

?? Ghe i ga-tu dati\(_{M,PL}\) a chi i pomi?
DAT cl\(_{j}\) have\(_{2PS}\) given\(_{M,PL}\) to who the apples\(_{j}\)

Richard Zimmermann (pc.) noted that the felicity of the short movement hypothesis is further validated if, in the presence of a clause-internal wh-ADV, the following DO can only precede the IO in the absence of dislocation, and is free to either precede or follow the IO if critically right-dislocated. This prediction is confirmed by the examples in (33), where the IO aa Maria (‘to Mary’) of the ditransitive V dar (‘to give’) is able to precede the DO l’anel (‘the ring’) iff the latter is properly right-dislocated, as in (33b):

(33) EFFECTS OF RIGHT-DISLOCATION ON WORD ORDER

Trevigiano

a. Ghe ga-tu regaea cuando *{aa Maria} l’anel {aa Maria}?
DAT have\(_{2PS}\) given when *{to the Maria} the’ring {to the Maria}
‘When did you give Maria the ring?’

b. Ghe o ga-tu regaeà cuando, {aa Maria}, l’anel\(_{j}\), {aa Maria}
DAT cl\(_{j}\) have\(_{2PS}\) given when, # {to the Maria} # the’ring\(_{j}\), # {to the Maria}
‘The ring, when did you give to Maria?’

To conclude, the unchangeable declarative orders in (23) and (24) also exclude the possibility of Italian-like emarginazione (‘marginalisation’) in Trevigiano, while at the same time the compulsory status of the movement under consideration would be unexpected if it was a by-product of an optional dislocation (for more details on Italian emarginazione, refer to Antinucci & Cinque 1977, Cardinaletti 2001,2002, Samek-Lodovici 2015, a.o.). As a consequence, the distributional patterns followed by Trevisian clause-internal wh-words must be due to movement of the wh-word itself. Moreover, the mandatory status of this phenomenon suggests that we are dealing with genuine syntactic movement driven by the need to check a relevant feature, the nature of which I discuss tentatively in what follows, and then in detail in Chapter 3.

The mandatory status of Trevisian short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases clearly differentiates it from the marked optional movement of clause-internal wh-phrases observed in Contemporary Spoken French (refer to Tual 2017 for an experimental study in this area), as in (34):
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(34) OPTIONAL MOVEMENT OF CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-PHRASES

a. Unmarked declarative order: DO > IO
   T’as donné ton sac à Jeanne
   you’have given your purse to Jeanne
   ‘You gave your purse to Jeanne’

b. Unmarked Interrogative order: DO > wh-IO
   T’as donné ton sac à qui?
   you’have given your purse to who
   ‘Who did you give your purse to?’

c. Marked interrogative order: wh-IO > DO
   ? T’as donné à qui ton sac?
   you’have given to who your purse
   ‘Who did you give your purse to?’

Bearing in mind that the French unmarked declarative order is V > DO > IO > Adv, in Chapter 6 I shall claim that the optionality of movement in (34c) suggests that this should be treated as an instance of pragmatically-driven short-distance scrambling, rather than feature-checking driven syntactic movement, and shall characterise wh-in situ in (Contemporary Spoken) French as unmoved.

2.1.3 Which Spec is targeted by clause-internally moved wh-phrases?

The analysis of the movement of Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases as proper syntactic short movement raises at least two questions:

(i) which functional projection is targeted by this type of movement?
(ii) which feature triggers the movement under consideration and how is C checked in the absence of phonetically-detectable movement to the LP of the clause?

I shall address point (i) here, with discussion of (ii) left to §2.2 and Chapter 3. Let us first observe the linear position occupied by clause-internally moved wh-ADVs. In the presence of a synthetic verb form, such as Trevisian present tense, the targeted position appears to be situated below the cluster formed by the verb and the inverted subject clitic, as in (35):

(35) LINEAR POSITION TARGETED BY SHORT MOVEMENT

   Magni-tu cuando e sarese ___ ?
   eat=cl2ps when the cherries
   ‘When will you eat the cherries?’

The facts in (35) lead immediately to the first working hypothesis that I first mentioned in the Introduction of this Chapter, i.e. that Trevisian short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases targets the VP-periphery. As previously mentioned, Belletti (2004) argued that the VP has a periphery along the lines of (36):
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(36) **VP-PERIPHERY (as in Belletti 2004)**

\[ [CP \ldots [TP \ldots [[[TopP Top^0 [Foc^0 Top^0 \ldots VP \ldots]]]]]] \]

Various authors have suggested that Romance insiteness targets Foc\textsubscript{LOW}: Kato (2003; 2013) for Brazilian Portuguese, Belletti (2006) for French, Manzini (2014) for Northern Italian dialects. Given that Trevigiano has an Italian-like VP-periphery, as claimed in §2.1.1, Foc\textsubscript{LOW} is a suitable candidate for clause-internally moved wh-phrases to target, as illustrated in (37):

(37) **SHORT MOVEMENT TO FOC\textsubscript{LOW}**

\[ [CP \ldots [TP \ldots [TopP Top^0 [Foc\textsubscript{LOW} [wh-phrase] Foc^0\textsubscript{LOW} Top^0 \ldots VP \ldots]]]] \]

However, this straightforward hypothesis is challenged by the distribution of clause-internal wh-phrases in the presence of analytic verb tenses, such as the Trevisian present perfect (which in Trevigiano, as in all regional varieties of Italian spoken in Northern Italy, has the value of a simple past). In fact, in constructions with analytic verb tenses, clause-internal wh-phrases move below the linear position occupied by the active past participle, as in (38):

(38) **LINEAR POSITION TARGETED BY SHORT MOVEMENT (ii)**

\[ Ga-tu \text{ magnà } cuando e sarese ___ ? \]

\[ \text{have=you eaten when the cherries} \]

‘When did you eat the cherries?’

The linear position targeted by short movement in (38) constitutes a problem for the *Wh-to-Foc* analysis that I am pursuing here, at least superficially. In fact, if the wh-adverbial *cuando* (‘when’) moves into a VP-peripheral Spec, one would expect the active past participle to follow it linearly, as in the ungrammatical example in (39):

(39) **NON-MOVEMENT ANALYSIS OF THE PAST PARTICIPLE**

\[ * Ga-tu \text{ [Foc quando \ldots [vP magnà, [VP t, e sarese]]?} \]

\[ \text{have=you when eaten the cherries} \]

Fortunately the *Wh-to-Foc* hypothesis can be reconciled with the ungrammaticality of (39) in a relatively uncomplicated fashion. Cinque (1999) provided substantial cross-linguistic evidence for the treatment of adverbs as located in the Specs of rigidly-ordered functional projections (FPs) within IP. The position(s) occupied by adverbials is provided in (40); note that more than one FP can be active at the same time, as exemplified in Cinque’s Standard Italian example in (41):

(40) **LOCATION OF ADVERBIALS WITHIN IP**

\[ \ldots [TP \; T^0 \; [FP \; \text{adverbial} \; F^0] \ldots [[vP \; V^0 \; [VP \; V^0]]] \]
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(41) CO-OCCURRENCE OF TP-INTERNAL ADVs (adapted from Cinque 1999:45(1;3))

a. Da allora, non hanno di solito mica più sempre completamente rimesso since then neg have usually neg any longer always completely put tutto bene in ordine everything well in order ‘[…] they haven’t usually not any longer always put everything well in order’

b. [ solitamente X [ mica X [ già X [ più X [ sempre X …[VP ]]]]]]

The presence of an Italian-like IP-internal functional layer in which adverbials are externally-merged can also be observed in Trevigiano, as illustrated in (42):

(42) CO-OCCURRENCE OF TP-INTERNAL ADVs

Da lora, no i gà mia più sempre rimesso tuto ben a posto since then neg they have neg any longer always put everything well in order ‘Since then, they haven’t usually not any longer always put everything well in order’

Cinque also noted that in Italian ‘(active) past participles must move to the head to the left of tutto [‘all’]’ (p. 46). This claim can also be extended to Trevigiano, as illustrated in (43):

(43) POSITION OF TUTO WRT THE PAST PARTICIPLE

a. A gà magnà tuto she has eaten all ‘She ate everything’

b. * A gà tuto magnà she has all eaten

Under Cinque’s analysis, the active past participle in (43a) must be moved from its VP-internal position. I argue that tuto occupies the head of an FP located higher than vP (FP1 here), and the active past participle obligatorily moves to the head of the FP merged immediately above (FP2), as in (44):

(44) COMPULSORY MOVEMENT OF THE PAST PARTICIPLE PAST TUTO

Given (44), the order displayed in examples like (38) follows straightforwardly, as in (45):

(45) WH-TO-FOC AND MOVEMENT OF THE PAST PARTICIPLE

To summarise, my proposal is that Trevigiano and related varieties license instances of fake wh-in-situ, which are actually derived through short movement of the clause-internal wh-phrase. I have
On short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases: Wh-to-Foc

provided substantial evidence in favour of treating Belletti’s (2004) Foc<sub>LOW</sub>, in the low periphery of the clause, as the position targeted by this type of movement. In addition, I have claimed that the mandatory status of this movement strongly suggests that it must be feature-driven, i.e. syntactic movement, which I explore more in detail in §2.2. From my Wh-to-Foc analysis, it follows that the clause-internal Foc<sub>LOW</sub> must be compatible with both wh-phrases and foci, like the left-peripheral Focus<sub>HIGH</sub> (as widely discussed in Rizzi 1997, Rizzi & Boci 2017, a.o.). I shall argue in Chapter 3, however, that the feature that triggers left-peripheral movement into SpecFocus<sub>HIGH</sub> is unlikely to be the same as the feature that probes short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases into SpecFoc<sub>LOW</sub>.

2.2 Wh-to-Foc and C-checking: preliminary investigation

The Wh-to-Foc analysis detailed in §2.1.3 raises (minimally) three questions. The first one concerns the unexpected unavailability of Foc<sub>LOW</sub> for wh-in situ in Standard Italian. Two further questions concern the nature of the feature that triggers short movement into the Spec of Foc<sub>LOW</sub>, and the way in which C is checked in the absence of movement of any (overt) material to the CP-domain. I address these questions in the following sections, then provide a refined analysis in Chapter 3, based on an adaptation of Cable’s (2010) grammar of Q. What I shall claim is that, contra Rizzi (1990), interrogative wh-phrases are not positively specified for [q] and [wh]: [q] is indeed checked independently in C by the (silent) Q-particle, while wh-phrases are endowed with either an interpretable [foc] or an interpretable [wh] feature, depending on the context.

2.2.1 On [wh]- and [q]-features

Wh-words are used in interrogative sentences, though not exclusively. Observe the distribution of the wh-adverbial dove (‘where’) in the examples in (46):

(46) WH-WORDS IN ± INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES

a. Dove ve se-o conossui?
where you are<sub>cl</sub> met
‘Where did you meet?’

b. El ristorante dove che ve sé conossui
the restaurant where that you are met
‘The restaurant where you met’

While (46a) is an instance of interrogative, (46b) is a relative clause. Rizzi (1990) argued that wh-words are associated with both [+wh] and [+q] features. Their specification changes depending on the context, as outlined in Table 2.2:
2.2 Wh-to-Foc and C-checking: preliminary investigation

The analysis that assumes that wh-words have positive settings for both [wh] and [q], which I explore here but abandon later, has one major consequence for wh-questions: it requires that both features must be properly checked in the derivation to assure that the structure is correctly interpreted as an answer-seeking interrogative. Under these assumptions, Kato (2003) proposed a derivation along the lines of (48) for Brazilian Portuguese in situ questions such as (47). In her approach, the [q] and the [wh] features to be checked are located in the CP-domain and in Foc_{LOW}, respectively:

(47) WH-IN SITU (adapted from Kato 2003)  
Brazilian Portuguese  
Você viu quem?  
you saw who  
‘Who did you see?’

(48) DERIVATION OF BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE WH-IN SITU (adapted from Kato 2003)  
\[CP \ldots \varnothing_{+Q} \ldots [TP \text{ você viu } [\text{Foc quem } [\varnothing_{+WH} [\text{vP } ... <\text{quem}> ]]]]]

The derivation in (48) was extended to French wh-in situ in Belletti (2006). Unfortunately, however, I have reasons to believe that Wh-to-Foc is unavailable in Contemporary Spoken French, as I suggest in Chapter 6. In contrast, in my understanding, prima facie nothing rules out extension of (48) to Trevigiano, as outlined in (49):

(49) SEEMINGLY PLAUSIBLE DERIVATION OF TREVISIAN WH-IN SITU  
\[CP \ldots \varnothing_{+Q} \ldots \text{ga-tu visto } [\text{Foc ki } [\varnothing_{+WH} [\text{vP } ... ]]]

Nevertheless, a derivation of Trevisian wh-in situ along the lines of (49) fails to explain why insituness is excluded in closely-related Standard Italian but perfectly fine in the regional variety of Italian spoken (non-exclusively) in the Veneto region, as claimed in the Introduction. Undeniably, the contrast between Standard Italian and Trevigiano cannot be linked to the absence or presence of SCII, given that non-standard Italian and Brazilian Portuguese are clearly able to license insituness in the absence of SCII. In fact, wh-in situ in the absence of SCII is also attested in many Northern Italian varieties, as claimed in Manzini & Savoia (2005;2011) and discussed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. The answer to this puzzling phenomenon must instead be connected to the way(s) in which the features relevant to interrogative wh-movement are checked.
Miyagawa (2001) argued that languages that allow for wh-in situ check [+wh] TP-internally and only [+q] in C, while languages that require wh-fronting (such as English, Standard Italian, etc.) must check both features in C. In the spirit of Miyagawa’s work, it could be tempting to say that the difference between Standard Italian on the one hand and the non-standard variety and Trevisiano on the other is parametrised and resides in the locus where the relevant features are checked. However, Miyagawa’s explanation, which is adequate for pure in situ and pure fronting languages, might be insufficient to account for the optional character of Trevisian insituess.

In what follows, I shall argue that a finer explanation can be provided, which is linked to the complex structure of wh-words. I shall compare two different analyses: one proposed by Poletto & Pollock starting from their (2004) paper, which is crucially based on the morphosyntax of Northern Italian wh-doubling (as discussed in Chapter 1), and a more recent one, Cable’s (2010) work on QP-fronting. I shall argue that Poletto & Pollock’s analysis of wh-in situ as an instance of silent wh-doubling has a number of weaknesses that make it difficult to extend cross-linguistically (§2.2.2); my discussion will then result in a re-adaptation of Cable’s work on the grammar of Q. Crucially, I relate the seemingly-optional in situ/ex situ alternation found in Trevisiano to the existence of both strategies of QP-selection and Q(P)-adjunction, and claim that [q] is checked in C not by the wh-phrase itself but by the Q-particle (§2.2.3).

2.2.2 On bipartite wh-words

Starting from Poletto & Pollock (2004), an analysis of the internal structure of Northern Italian wh-words as bipartite has been proposed, as I shall outline here. This model, which relies on the existence of wh-phrases merged within big DPs of the clitic-phrase type, has some theoretical and data-related problems which, I believe, make it a theoretically-undesirable explanation for the seemingly-optional in situ/ex situ alternation found in Romance.

As argued in Part I of this work, many NIDs have wh-doubling (Poletto & Pollock 2004;2005, Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011), which makes their wh-questions unique in the Romance domain. An example of wh-doubling is provided in (50):

(50) WH-DOUBLING (Poletto & Pollock 2005:141(16))

\[
\text{Ngo \ fet \ majà ngont?} \\
\text{where do =you eat \ where} \\
\text{‘Where do you eat?’}
\]

Monnese

The two wh-words in configurations such as (50) do not give rise to a multiple-wh interpretation, but rather to a single-wh reading. In these varieties, wh-doubling co-exists with single wh-fronting of the type in (51a) and single wh-in situ, as in (51b), with no semantic change:

(51) Monnese

\[
\text{Ngo \ fet \ majà \ eat} \\
\text{where do=you \ eat} \\
\text{‘Where do you eat?’}
\]

(51a) Monnese

\[
\text{Ngo \ eat \ majà} \\
\text{where \ eat \ where} \\
\text{‘Where do you eat?’}
\]
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(51) IN SITU/EX SITU ALTERNATION (Poletto & Pollock 2005:136(2))

a. Ngo fet majà?
   where do=you eat

b. Fet majà ngont?
   do=you eat where

For the basis of instances of non-interrogative Romance clitic doubling as those in (52), which are argued to start out as complex DPs along the lines in (53) by some authors such as Kayne (1991) and Uriagereka (1996), Poletto & Pollock (2005) claim that the two wh-items found in cases of wh-doubling such as (50) must be merged within bi-partite interrogative clitic phrases, like those in (54):

(52) ROMANCE CLITIC DOUBLING (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2005:140(13))

a. Lo vi a Juan
   him saw1ps to Juan
   ‘I saw Juan’

b. Il me parle à moi
   he to.me speaks to me
   ‘He’s speaking to me’

(53) ROMANCE CLITIC DOUBLING: THE CLITIC PHRASE (Poletto & Pollock 2005:140(14))

[CIP a Juan [ lo ]]

(54) INTERROGATIVE CLPs IN NIDs (Poletto & Pollock 2005:141(17))

[CIP ngont [ ngo ]]

In Poletto & Pollock’s analysis shown in (54), the wh-clitic realises the head of the complex interrogative clitic phrase, whose Spec is occupied by the non-clitic wh-element. On the basis of this claim, the authors argue that sentences like (51a) and (51b) only differ from the overt wh-doubling exemplified in (50) in that the former has a null wh-clitic, as illustrated in (55a), and the latter a null non-clitic form, as in (55b):

(55) INTERROGATIVE CLPs IN NIDs (ii)

a. [[CIP ngont [ Ø ]]

b. [[CIP Ø [ ngo ]]

In their account, cases of wh-in situ like (56) are roughly derived as in (57). Remember that, in their remnant-IP movement analysis, both wh-in situ and wh-fronting target the CP. Crucially, in the case of single wh-in situ, the interrogative CIP moves to the lower portion of the CP, and then at the end of the derivation its silent head moves further to a position higher than ForceP:
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(56) **(APPARENT) WH-IN SITU**

Bellunese

Ha-tu parecià che?

have=you prepared what

‘What did you prepare?’

(57) **PROJECTIONS TARGETED BY INTERROGATIVE CLPs**

a. Input: tu ha parecià [ClP che [∅]]

b. ClP moves to Op1P, in the lower portion of the LP:

[Op1P [ClP che [∅]], Op10 [IP tu ha parecià ___]]

c. IP-internal elements move to higher FPs for feature-checking; subsequently, the silent part of ClP moves to SpecOp2P:

[Op2P ∅ [IP ha-tu parecià ___₁]₁ ... [Op1P [ClP che [___₂]], Op10 [IP ___₃]]]

A derivation along the lines of (57) can only account for the special properties of Bellunese and similar varieties, as I shall argue in Chapter 6. However, extending this analysis of wh-words as joined within clitic phrases to the wider cross-linguistic domain might not seem unreasonable at first glance. In what follows, I discuss this hypothesis, and then show why it should be rejected.

**On the illegitimacy of an extension of interrogative CLPs to all NIDs**

Wh-doubling is widely attested in NIDs, both in Lombard and in those Venetan varieties which license optional wh-in situ. An extension of Poletto & Pollock’s analysis of interrogative CLPs to Trevigiano (and beyond) does not therefore seem indesirable *per se*. However, this requires at least a modification of the proposed analysis. It appears redundant and unnecessary to posit the existence of both bipartite structures in (55), repeated here as (58): the existence of a special *silent clitic wh-word*, i.e. only of the structure in (58a), would be enough to account for the Trevisian facts under investigation.

(58) **EXTENDING CLPs TO TREVIGIANO: MINIMALLY-NEEDED INGREDIENTS**

a. [[ClP ngont [∅]]]

b. [[ClP ∅ [ngot] ]] → unnecessary

To exclude the structure in (58b) would mean that NIDs do not have a double series of phonologically identical wh-words, but only a silent wh-word which can (but does not necessarily) merge with an overt wh-word within an interrogative ClP, along the lines of (59b):

(59) **SEEMINGLY PLAUSIBLE EXTENSION OF INTERROGATIVE CLPs TO TREVIGIANO**

a. OPTION 1: bare wh-word: *cuando* (‘when’)

---

1The choice of *cuando* is arbitrary: it stands for any wh-word that surfaces either clause-internally or fronted.
b. OPTION 2: non clitic wh-word and silent wh-clitic merged within a CIP:

\[
\text{CIP} \\
\text{cuando} \quad \text{wh-clitic}
\]

This treatment of wh-words is more economical than that proposed by Poletto & Pollock. Moreover, for Trevigiano, where virtually all wh-words can be either fronted or clause-internally moved with no change in their phonological form, it provides a better explanation for the morphological identity: the bare wh-word is the same in both cases, but it merges within an interrogative CIP to be able to stay clause-internally. In this theoretical background, the main distinction between Standard Italian and Trevigiano would be the presence of a silent wh-clitic and the possibility of merging wh-words within complex interrogative CIPs in the latter, as in (59b), which is ruled out in Standard Italian. The fact that wh-words cannot be merged within interrogative CIPs in Standard Italian is not surprising, given that complex CIPs simply do not form part of the grammar of the language. In contrast, Trevigiano does have clitic doubling of the type seen in (52), though exclusively with datives, as in (60):

(60) **COMPULSORY DATIVE-DOUBLING**

\[
*(\text{Ghe}) \text{ go } \text{ prestà tutti i } \text{ me } \text{ schei a Toni} \\
*(\text{DAT}) \text{ have lent all the my money to } \text{ toni}
\]

'I lent all of my money to Toni'

Therefore, it is not clear how and why CIPs would be able to operate with any constituent in interrogatives, and apply only to DATIVEs in declaratives. Also, an analysis like (59) predicts that, while in Trevigiano it is possible for wh-words to stop in SpecFoc\text{LOW} and check C silently via sub-extraction of the null wh-clitic, as in (61), Standard Italian needs to front the wh-word and check both [wh] and [q] in C, along the lines in (62):

(61) **SEEMINGLY PLAUSIBLE EXTENSION OF INTERROGATIVE CLPs TO TREVI\text{GIANO (ii)**

\[
[\text{CP } \ldots \text{ Foc}\{\text{wh} \ldots \text{ ga-tu visto} \quad \text{Foc} \{\text{CIP} \text{ chi } [\ldots] \}, \text{ Foc}\{\text{wh} \ldots \text{ [vp } \ldots \text{ sterato]} \}][\ldots]][\ldots]
\]

(62) **UNAVAILABILITY OF INTERROGATIVE CLPs IN STANDARD ITALIAN**

\[
[\text{CP } \ldots \text{ chi} \text{, Foc}\{\text{wh} \ldots \text{ hai visto} \ldots \text{ [vp } \ldots \text{ sterato]} \}][\ldots][\ldots]
\]

A consequence of the analysis in (59) is that the parametrisation of Foc\text{LOW} in the spirit of Miyagawa (2001) as previously posited cannot be valid: under these assumptions, in Standard Italian all features related to interrogative wh-movement are checked in C not because of a negative setting of the capacity for Foc\text{LOW} to host movement of wh-phrases, but because the language has no wh-phrases able to merge within complex CIPs. In the Venetan variety of non-standard Italian, spoken where most speakers are natives of a Northern Italian dialectal variety alongside Italian, the felicity of insituness
could easily be attributed to the borrowing of dialectal-like bipartite wh-phrases in Italian. That language-specific inherent properties of wh-words might play a role in their distribution, i.e. in the position that they target, has already been convincingly proven. Lee (1991) and Finer (2014), for example, discuss Korean-English code-switching data suggesting that wh-words in code-switched sentences maintain the same distributional properties as in the original language. If the above analysis is correct, then the derivation of a non-standard wh-in-situ containing question is as given in (63):

\[
\text{(63) SEEMINGLY PLASUSIBLE EXTENSION OF INTERROGATIVE CLPs TO VENETAN ITALIAN}
\]

\[
[CP \ldots \emptyset, Foc_{\text{[q]}}, \ldots \text{hai visto} \quad \underbrace{[Foc_{\text{[wh]}}, [\text{vP} \ldots \_ \_]]}_{\text{sub-extraction}}]_{\text{Focus\_HIGH}}?]
\]

However, it is not clear how the features related to interrogative wh-movement, [q] and [wh], might be checked in different peripheries when a wh-phrase stays clause-internally, primarily because in the case of total fronting they must both be checked in C. In fact, proposing that wh-movement first targets Foc\_LOW to check one feature and then proceeds further to check some other feature in Focus\_HIGH would create a violation in terms of Criterial Freezing à la Rizzi (2004), since frozen-in-place elements cannot move further, and only sub-extraction out of them is possible (refer to §2.2.3 for a detailed discussion). Furthermore, although I believe that an analysis that assumes that the non-parametrisation of Foc\_LOW is the only responsible for Wh-to-Foc is on the right track, the treatment of fronted wh-phrases as bare wh-words is severely undermined by substantial data from languages with overt Q-particles, as discussed in Cable (2010). In §2.2.3, I briefly outline Cable’s analysis of wh-fronting and wh-in situ in languages with overt Q-particles. I then adopt it and discuss its consequences for the theory of Wh-to-Foc that I am developing.

### 2.2.3 The grammar of Q and consequences for optional wh-in situ

Cable (2010) explored the interrogative morphosyntax of Tlingit, a Northern American language spoken in Alaska, making crucial claims regarding the interaction between (phonetically-realised and silent) Q-particles and wh-words. I summarise his analysis in what follows and then apply it, with slight modifications, to Trevigiano. In a nutshell, I shall claim that the Trevisian optionality is connected to the presence of two strategies to integrate the silent Q-particle to wh-phrases, one leading to overt wh-fronting, the other to clause-internally moved wh-in situ.

**Cable’s (2010) ‘Grammar of Q’**

In Tlingit wh-questions, the wh-word must precede the main predicate of the wh-question, and is typically clause-initial. The wh-word is followed by the Q-particle sá, which either directly follows the wh-word or directly follows a phrase containing the wh-word. The remaining material in the
sentence typically follows the wh-word, with a strong tendency to follow the verb. An example is provided in (64), and a representation in (65):

(64) GENERAL FORM OF A WH-QUESTION IN TLINGIT
(Cable 2010:3(1), from Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 2000:138)

\[ Wáa \text{ sá} \text{ sh tudínookw i éesh? } \]
how Q he feels your father

‘How is your father feeling?’

(65) GENERAL FORM OF A WH-QUESTION IN TLINGIT (ii) (Cable 2010:4(2))
[S \ldots \ldots \text{wh-word} \ldots \text{sá} \ldots \text{Main Predicate} \ldots]

Cable’s main claims are that in Tlingit the structure of wh-words is composite and that wh-fronting is actually not an instance of fronting of the wh-word itself but of fronting of the Q-particle, which leads to somewhat parasitic pied-piping of the wh-word. In his account, fronted wh-words have the structure in (66):

(66) Q-PROJECTION

As in (66), in Tlingit a Q-particle takes its sister as its complement, with the result that a QP node immediately dominates the Q-particle and its sister. As a consequence, attraction of the Q-feature to the CP-domain entails that the entire QP projection is moved, as illustrated in (67):

(67) WH-FRONTING AS A SECONDARY EFFECT OF Q-MOVEMENT (Cable 2010:39(53))

On the basis of the analysis in (67), i.e. that wh-fronting languages are actually QP-fronting languages even when the Q-particle is silent, Cable proposes a typology of wh-in situ languages. His claim is that wh-in situ languages comprise at least two distinct syntactic types:
(i) languages where the Q-particle *adopts* to its sister and moves to C alone (such as Japanese, or Korean), which he calls *Q-adjunction languages*;

(ii) languages where the Q-particle takes its sister as complement, as in QP-fronting languages, but QP-movement occurs *covertly* (such as Sinhala), which he calls *Q-projection languages*.

In *Q-adjunction languages*, the Q-particle does not take its sister as complement, but rather adjoins to it. As a consequence, the node which immediately dominates the Q-particle and its sister is not a QP, but rather of the same type as the sister of Q, as outlined in (68):

(68) **Q-ADJUNCTION**

```
  Adjoin
  /   \      /
 /XP\   \     /
 |    |  \   |
 |XP--Q   |
 \      |
  \    ...
   \wh-word ...
```

In the case of Q-adjunction, Cable adopts Hagstrom’s (1998) treatment of Japanese wh-questions, along the lines of the diagram in (69):

(69) **HAGSTROM’S (1998) ANALYSIS OF JAPANESE WH-QUESTIONS** (from Cable 2010:39(52))

```
  CP
 /   |
/CP  |
|    |
|IP--|
|   Q
|   /
| C_Q
| Agree/
| Attract
\   |
 \   overt movement
  \   ...
   \wh-word ...
```

From (68), it follows that attraction by the Q-feature into the CP entails only that the Q-particle moves, while its sister, i.e. the wh-phrase, is left clause-internally. In a way, in languages of this type the Q-particle is more free: it does not enter a Spec-head configuration with any material in Spec and is able to move *alone* to C.

In contrast, in Q-projection in situ languages, the structure of wh-words is the same as that posited for Tlingit (66). In these languages, the only difference with respect to Tlingit lies in the timing of movement, which takes place here in *covert* syntax, along the lines of (70):
2.2 *Wh-to-Foc* and C-checking: preliminary investigation

(Cable 2010:86(3))

Following Cable’s convincing account, it is tempting to extend the analysis of wh-fronting in Tlingit as triggered by Q-probing to the fronting of wh-phrases in Trevigiano. I discuss this possibility in what follows, and then extend the analysis to the instances of insituness.

**Extending the theory of Q to Trevisian wh-fronting**

According to Cable, the Q-based analysis should be extended to wh-questions in all wh-fronting languages, i.e. according to his account, no language exists in which wh-questions display direct attraction into the LP of the wh-word alone. His claim is supported by robust cross-linguistic data that suggest that the Q-particles analysis should also be extended to languages in which these particles are not phonetically-realised, including data on intervention and the felicity of wh-phrases within islands to extraction which shall prove crucial in the discussion of some of the Trevisian data in Chapter 5. Let us therefore assume that Trevisian fronted wh-words have the structure in (71). Remember that I have thus far taken wh-words to be associated with a [wh;q] featural bundle, whence the [wh] feature in *Wh*\(^0\) and the [q] feature in the structural position occupied by the Q-particle. In Chapter 3, I shall actually claim that in direct wh-questions the featural specification of the wh-phrase that enters a relation with the silent Q-particle is [+foc] and that, while the [q]-feature is checked in C, the [foc]-feature is checked within T. For now, note that the Trevisian Q-particle, which carries the [q] feature, is null, as Cable posits for fronting languages like English:

(71) **FRONTED WH-WORDS AS QPs**

    Complementation
    
    Q\([q]\)
    WhP
    cuantoQ\([wh]\)

Note that, for short, I use the label WhP to refer to the lexical XP projected by the wh-phrase. Of course, WhPs can have different natures, but are mostly NPs/DPs or PPs in Romance. An analysis
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of fronted wh-words as (71) predicts that in Trevigiano the derivation of wh-fronting must be QP-fronting, taking place as shown in (72):

\[(72) \quad \text{WH-FRONTING AS A SECONDARY EFFECT OF Q-MOVEMENT} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Focus}_{\text{HIGH}} \\
\text{QP} \\
\quad \text{Q}_{[q]} \\
\quad \text{WhP} \\
\quad \text{cuando}_{[wh]} \\
\text{Focus}'_{\text{HIGH}} \\
\quad \text{Focus}^0_{\text{HIGH}} \\
\quad \text{IP} \\
\quad \text{Agree/Attract} \\
\end{array} \rightarrow \text{QP}_1
\]

Cable (2010) very canonically takes Rizzi’s (1997) SpecFocus to be the landing site of fronted wh-phrases, as I did in (72) for Trevigiano. Let us consider the case of (optional) insitu-ness.

**Extending the theory of Q to Trevisian wh-in situ**

If Trevigiano is to be considered a QP-language where wh-fronting is parasitic on Q-probing to C, as in (72), then a question arises regarding how QPs can be left clause-internally. A straightforward yet highly implausible explanation would consist in connecting this optional clause-internal QP-placement to an optionality in the *timing of movement*. In this framework, as in QP-languages that license answer-seeking wh-in situ felicitously, wh-words in Trevigiano would appear clause-internally if QP-fronting is delayed to LF; in all other cases, movement to C takes place before Spell Out, and leads to QP-fronting. However, this explanation fails to account for at least two facts: (i) the distributional properties of *SCI* which suggest that all interrogative movement to C does indeed take place before Spell Out (as I shall claim in Chapter 4), and (ii) the case of wh-words that do not display optionality in the situ-ex situ alternation. Consider for instance the case of *che* (‘what’) in (73):

\[(73) \quad \text{CHE ONLY FRONTED} \]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
a. \text{Ga-tu fato che?} \\
\quad \text{have=cl}_{2PS} \text{ done what} \\
\quad \text{‘What did you do?’} \\
b. * \text{Che ga-tu fato?} \\
\quad \text{what have=cl}_{2PS} \text{ done}
\end{array}
\]

An explanation of the in situ-ex situ alternation as an instance of optionality in the timing of movement would fail to explain the data in (73). It appears more convincing to posit that wh-words can be associated with different underlying structures, and can have different distributional properties. Given that the existence of overt Q-particles in many languages of the world is a clear indication that
Q-particles should also be added to the computation in languages where these have no phonetic form, it is tempting to analyse the in situ/ex situ alternation found in NIDs (and Romance in general) as an instance of the exceptional co-existence of both lexical strategies to join Q-particles to interrogative wh-words. That two semantically-related lexical or syntactic strategies might co-exist peacefully within a language is not surprising, and functions as an indicator of an intermediate step in the process of linguistic evolution, which will eventually result in the generalisation of either strategy at the expense of the other (Roberts 2007b, Ledgeway 2012, and many others). Under these assumptions, for Trevisian che to be only able to surface clause-internally is likely to indicate that this wh-word is one step ahead with regard to all other wh-words in a process that is plausibly moving in the direction of generalised wh-in situ, as I shall claim in Chapter 6.

Now consider the examples in (74):

(74) DISTRIBUTION OF COSSA (ordinary wh-word)  

a. Ga-tu fato cossa?  
    have=cl2PS done what  
    ‘What did you do?’

b. Cossa ga-tu fato?  
    what have=cl2PS done

Unlike che, ordinary wh-words such as cossa (‘what’) are able to merge within XPs with different inherent structures: QP-selected interrogative elements that are obligatorily fronted, as in (74b) and in the examples of QP-fronting discussed above, and Q-adjoining WhPs that stay clause-internally, as in (74a). I outline the structure of the latter in (75), again taking it to be a WhP:

(75) Q-ADJUNCTION

If my intuition is correct, Trevigiano is a mixed language, i.e. it is both Q-projecting and Q-adjoining at the same time. By extension, all languages that display optional wh-in situ should be analysed in the same way. In this theoretical background, it is the very existence of both strategies for joining wh-phrases and the (silent) Q-particle that makes both wh-in situ and (QP-)fronting available in Trevigiano. In the rest of this dissertation, I shall pursue this claim and shall treat optional wh-in situ as an intermediate stage in which both adjoining and projecting Q-particles exist, with interesting consequences for the treatment of wh-doubling, indirect wh-in situ and wh-in situ within islands, as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. I have claimed that another non-D-linked wh-word, parché (‘why’), is
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unable to surface clause-internally. However, the syntax of this element will not be discussed until Chapter 5, where I shall claim that the exceptional unavailability of parché in clause-internal position is not linked to the syntax of Q-particles but rather to ordinary, cross-linguistically valid properties of why-words (as discussed in Hornstein 1995, Rizzi 2001, Ko 2005, Stepanov & Tsai 2008, a.o.).

Following the discussion in this section, the derivation of Trevisian insituness can be tentatively taken to consist of the following steps:

1. the wh-word is of the Q-adjoining type and Wh-to-Foc takes place under Agreement with a relevant feature in Foc\textsubscript{LOW}^0, which I have so far taken to be [wh]. In Chapter 3, I shall provide extensive evidence that the relevant feature is in fact [foc]. Once Wh-Agreement has taken place, the Q-adjoining wh-phrase is probed into the Spec of Foc\textsubscript{LOW};
2. once the Q-adjoining wh-phrase is in Foc\textsubscript{LOW}, it meets the relevant (Wh-)Criterion and is frozen in place under Criterial Freezing (Rizzi 1997 and developments);
3. Under Cable’s (2010) assumption that QP-fronting targets the left-peripheral FocusP, Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}^0 must be the [q]-containing head relevant to the fronting of Q. Thus, Q-to-C must take place under Q-Agreement between Q itself and Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}^0. This movement out of the frozen-in-place wh-phrase is possible because it is an instance of sub-extraction, as I shall discuss shortly.

The tentative derivation proposed in (61) therefore needs to be modified as in (76):

\begin{equation}
\text{(76) WH-TO-FOC AND SUB-EXTRACTION OF Q INTO FOCUS\textsubscript{HIGH}}
\end{equation}
In Chapter 3, I shall actually argue in favour of [foc] as the triggering feature for clause-internal movement of wh-phrases. For the time being, I shall briefly discuss the legitimacy, in the framework of Criteria (Rizzi 2004 and further developments), of an analysis of wh-in situ which includes splitting of the complex wh-phrase during the derivation.

On the legitimate sub-extraction out of frozen wh-phrases

In cartographic terms, the left-peripheral FocusP (which I have been calling Focus_HIGH) is taken to be a criterial position, in the sense of Rizzi (1997) and further developments. Criterial positions are dedicated functional positions where scope-discourse features are encoded, which are regulated by Criteria. The Criteria are specific principles that require a special relationship known as Spec-head agreement with respect to certain features ([+wh] for questions, [+top] for topics, [+foc] for focus). Within criterial projections such as FocusP and TopicP(s), the functional head is endowed with the relevant scope-discourse feature, which acts as criterial probe, i.e. it attracts a criterial goal (phrase bearing the matching scope-discourse feature) into its Spec, as in (77). The pertinent Criterion is satisfied via the Spec-head agreement thus created:

(77) SPEC-HEAD CONFIGURATION WITHIN A CRITERIAL PROJECTION

\[
\text{[XP criterial goal [ criterial probe ]]}
\]

In this theoretical framework, an analysis of Foc_LOW as criterial appears straightforward: this VP-peripheral head must be endowed with a special Criterion that probes the wh-goal into its Spec. However, in standard cartographic terms, a phrase cannot pick up discourse-related properties from an intermediate position within an A’-chain. This was formulated in Rizzi (2004) as a principle that blocks phrases in the position where they satisfy a relevant Criterion, namely Criterial Freezing (78):

(78) CRITERIAL FREEZING (Rizzi 2004c)

A phrase meeting a Criterion is frozen in place.

As a result of Criterial Freezing, a phrase can be endowed with the discursive properties picked up from one and only one position. This might seem to constitute a problem for the analysis of Wh-to-Foc outlined here, whereby a part of the wh-phrase leaves the criterial Foc_LOW to check an additional feature in C. In fact, this is not problematic: while extraction of whole frozen elements fails systematically, sub-extraction out of frozen-in-place elements has been convincingly shown to be felicitous (Rizzi & Shlonsky 2007). Consequently, once wh-phrases are frozen-in-place in SpecFoc_LOW, nothing bans probing of the Q-particle and its sub-extraction into the C-domain.

\^[2]Here, following Cable’s (2010) discussion, I instead assume that the feature relevant to wh-questions is [q].
The analysis of Wh-to-Foc outlined so far, which is crucially based on the presence of a probing feature in Foc$_{\text{LOW}}^0$ and on the special relationship between wh-words and Q even in languages in which Q is not phonetically realised, has two main theoretical advantages. First, a derivation in terms of Wh-to-Foc that relies on the presence of Q-adjoining WhPs in Trevigiano versus their absence in Standard Italian accounts straightforwardly for the infelicity of wh-in situ in the latter: if all wh-phrases in Standard Italian join within QPs, and wh-fronting is parasitic to QP-fronting à la Cable (2010), then the unavailability of SpecFoc$_{\text{LOW}}$ as a landing site for Italian wh-words is explained. Second, an analysis of insituiness in terms of Wh-to-Foc that relies on the presence of both QP-selecting and Q-adjoining wh-words in Trevigiano eliminates the spurious notion of optionality in the in situ-ex situ alternation, a property that is problematic for any theoretical account. In fact, my account explains the seemingly-optimal alternation as a property that follows from how the Q-particle is merged within wh-words: the peculiarity of Trevigiano and optional in situ languages, I claim, is not optional wh-movement but rather the exceptional existence of two strategies for integrating the (silent) Q-particle to wh-words: in the case of QP-selection, QP-fronting applies, while in the case of Q-adjunction, the wh-phrase stays clause-internally and C is checked via sub-extraction of the (silent) Q into C. Consequently, while the peculiarity of Trevigiano resides in the presence of two strategies for joining Q, which should be analysed as a property that signals the presence of an intermediate linguistic step, Standard Italian is a very classic instance of a pure QP-language, whence the unavailability of wh-in situ. Similarly, Venetian Italian can borrow Trevisian Q-adjunction and leave wh-phrases clause-internally, plausibly as a result of code-switching phenomena.

Note that the notion of adjunction is not entirely compatible with a crtoigraphic approach. However, the strongest reason behind the decision to keep Q-adjunction here is that in Cable’s (2010) account this operation is crucial for the felicitous computation of the semantics of wh-questions, and its legitimacy is supported by robust cross-linguistic data from languages with phonetically-realised Q-particles. The legitimacy of the operation could very plausibly be preserved by positing that Trevisian WhPs can felicitously select QP as their internal argument, eliminating adjunction in favour of argument selection operated by wh-phrases. However, this is a minor detail that does not undermine the theory of Wh-to-Foc developed here, further investigations in this regard aside for further studies.

**Intermediate remarks**

The discussion outlined in this Chapter is likely to provoke a common question, namely whether Wh-to-Foc is actually the overt realisation of cyclic wh-movement through the edge of vP (in line with much generative work, starting from Chomsky 1995). To my understanding, it is not, first and foremost because my work is crucially based on the assumption that the vP/VP has a periphery à la
Belletti (2004), and that it is precisely one of these vP/VP-peripheral functional heads that probes clause-internal movement of wh-phrases. Note that I am not claiming that interrogative movement of Trevisian wh-phrases (or better, QPs) to the LP of the clause proceeds in one single step, violating successive-cyclicity, but simply that Trevisian fake wh-in situ is not an instance of cyclic movement that stopped at the edge of vP. In Chapter 3, I shall actually claim that Wh-to-Foc is an instance of focus-movement taking under Focus-Agreement between the [foc]-feature on the Q-adjoining wh-word and its correspondent in Foc\(^0\)\_LOW.

Thus far, extending Cable’s (2010) analysis of Q to Trevigiano, I have proposed that Trevisian fronted wh-words are actually QPs, and that clause-internal wh-words are merged within complex, Q-adjoining wh-phrases. I have also tentatively explained the exceptional distribution of the what-word che in terms of a developmental stage peculiar to this precise wh-word, which is no longer (or not yet) able to be selected by the silent Q-particle, and is only compatible with Q-adjunction. This of course raises a question about the morphosyntax of Trevisian D-linked wh-phrases, which can appear both fronted and clause-internally, with (for most speakers) a preference for fronting. Cable’s (2010) analysis of D-linked wh-phrases, based on Tlingit examples such as (79), is provided in (80):

(79) **TLINGIT D-LINKED WH-PHRASES (Cable 2010:116(32))**

\[
[\text{DP} \text{Aadóo yaagú }] \, sá \, \text{ysiteen}?
\quad \text{who} \, \text{boat} \quad \text{Q} \, \text{you.saw.it}
\quad \text{‘Whose boat did you see?’}
\]

(80) **TLINGIT D-LINKED WH-PHRASES: QP-SELECTION (Cable 2010:117(34))**

\[
\text{QP} \\
\, \text{DP} \quad \text{sá} \\
\quad \text{Aadóo yaagú}
\]

The extension of the analysis in (80) to Trevisian fronted D-linked wh-phrases is straightforward. Similarly, along the lines of the discussion outlined so far, the possibility for Trevisian D-linked wh-words to optionally surface clause-internally should be linked to the (partial) availability of Q-adjunction. Therefore, the QP-fronting derivation that should be posited for a Trevigiano question like (81) is one along the lines of (82):

(81) **FRONTED D-LINKED WH-PHRASE**

\[
\text{Trevigiano}
\]

\[
\text{Che} \quad \text{profesor}_i \quad \text{preferissi-tu} \quad \text{?}
\quad \text{what} \quad \text{professor} \quad \text{prefer-you}
\quad \text{‘Which professor do you prefer?’}
\]
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In this theoretical framework, the only explanation for the partial infelicity of D-linked wh-words in clause-internal position for some speakers must be that the Q-particle cannot be integrated in constructions that are not Q-selecting in the case of D-linked wh-phrases. Whether Q-adjunction to D-linked wh-words is being lost or acquired is unclear, though in Chapter 6 I shall suggest that languages seem to evolve in the direction of generalised Q-adjunction. A historical investigation would actually be required to answer this question, which I leave aside for further work.

For now, bearing in mind that what triggers Q-to-C is a \([q]\)-feature in the head of Focus_{\text{HIGH}}, let us move on to the identification of the feature responsible for the short movement that wh-phrases undergo clause-internally.
Chapter 3

Wh-to-Foc is focus-driven

In Chapter 2, I characterised the locus targeted by Trevisian short movement of wh-phrases as Foc\textsubscript{LOW}, within Belletti’s (2004) VP-periphery. I first provided evidence in support of the existence of a VP-periphery in Trevigiano, and then investigated the ways in which wh-phrases are able to surface either clause-internally or clause-initially, with specific focus on the mechanisms of C-checking that operate when no phonetically-overt movement to C is detectable. Crucially, I adopted an analysis à la Cable (2010), claiming that the apparent optionality observed in the in situ-ex situ alternation is actually better explained by assuming that it results from the existence of two means of integrating the silent Q-particle into wh-phrases: QP-projection, leading to fronting, and QP-adjunction, leading to insituness. I believe that this treatment of ‘optional insituness’ as the result of two strategies for integrating Q into wh-phrases ought to be extended to all languages in which wh-phrases surface either in the LP of the clause or within TP, with interesting theoretical consequences that I shall address in the following Chapters. However, my analysis is not sufficient to explain all the Trevisian facts, since it fails to account for the fact that Q-adjoining wh-phrases, which stay clause-internally as a result of Q being able to check C alone, do not undergo short movement in all languages that license wh-in situ. The working hypothesis behind this Chapter is that, if the feature to be checked in genuine wh-questions is [q], this is checked in C by the silent Q-particle, and that the feature responsible for short TP-internal movement must be a different one. Given that the targeted spec is that of a focal projection, I shall pursue the possibility that the feature relevant for Wh-to-Foc is [foc]. Crucially, this would predict that all languages that are able to license wh-in situ have Q-adjoining wh-phrases, and that wh-in situ is possible because the [q]-bearing Q-particle agrees with the [q]-feature in Focus\textsuperscript{0}\textsubscript{HIGH}, and undergoes movement into SpecFocus\textsubscript{HIGH} alone. With regard to [wh], I shall argue that its presence on the Q-particle ought to be posited only in the case of wh-doubling.
As for the theory of Wh-to-Foc which I develop further here, only a subclass of the languages that license wh-in situ also have short movement into SpecFoc_{LOW} probed by the [foc] feature in Foc_{0,LOW}. In a framework where wh-phrases are known to display striking behavioural similarities to focused constituents, it is not surprising that Q-adjoining structures, which are in fact complex WhPs, are able to agree with, and be probed by, a [foc]-feature. One question that arises is whether in QP-selecting wh-phrases, which are actually QPs, the [foc]-feature becomes somewhat irrelevant; I shall discuss this issue in Chapter 6. Trevisian wh-in situ must therefore be derived along the following lines:

(i) establishment of an Agree relation between the focus feature in Foc_{0,LOW} and the [foc]-feature of the Q-adjoining wh-phrase, probing thereof into SpecFoc_{LOW};
(ii) establishment of an Agree relation between Focus_{0, HIGH} and the [q]-feature in the Q-adjoining wh-phrase; movement of Q into SpecFocus_{HIGH}.

A prediction of the working hypothesis that I shall pursue here is that while both the (i) and (ii) stages occur in some wh-in situ languages, such as Trevigiano, other wh-in situ languages only have stage (i). Here, in the spirit of many authors who have argued in favour of focus movement (or non-wh-movement) of wh-phrases (Horvath 1986, Rochemont 1986, É. Kiss 1995, Bošković 1997, Ndayiragije 1999, Kahnemuyipour 2001, a.o.), I shall argue that the parallelism between the movement of focused elements and that of clause-internal wh-phrases indicates that Q-adjoining wh-phrases must be inherently focused and must undergo movement for focus purposes. Horvath (1986) claimed that, whenever languages have a special position for contrastively-focused constituents, this will also be available for wh-phrases, which she justifies on the basis of the interpretational similarities displayed by focused elements and wh-phrases. Here, I show that her claim is tenable for Trevigiano.

Alongside the analysis mentioned previously that take Brazilian Portuguese and French wh-in situ to be moved to SpecFoc_{LOW} (Kato 2003;2013 and Belletti 2006), it has also been proposed that insituness in some non-romance languages targets a low focal projection (be it Foc_{LOW} or the edge of vP), as widely discussed in Cheng & Bayer (2015). Studies that have adopted this approach include Jayaseelan (1996) for Malayalam, Mahajan (1990), Manetta (2010) and Dayal (2017) for Bangla and Hindi-Urdu, Aboh (2006) for Aghem, Sinopoulou (2008) for Greek, Kahnemuyipour (2001) for Persian. These works constitute the basis of the analysis of focus-driven Wh-to-Foc that I develop here.

Organisation of this Chapter

The Chapter opens with an overview of instances of Wh-to-Foc attested outside of the Romance family in §3.1: I shall discuss, in turn, Malayalam (§3.1.1), Bangla and Hindi-Urdu (§3.1.2), Bantu (§3.1.3), Greek (§3.1.4), and Persian (§3.1.5). This section is significantly inspired by Cheng & Bayer’s (2015) discussion, which to the best of my knowledge is the most detailed existing
3.1 A typologically interesting type between full moving and in situ languages

In their overview of current approaches to wh-in situ theories, Cheng & Bayer (2015) discuss a number of proposals that argue that what has been taken to be wh-in situ is actually overt wh-movement, albeit not into a Spec in C, but to a lower position to the left of VP/vP. These works, which I shall survey in what follows, were developed in the spirit of Kayne’s (1994) theory of a universal base whereby all languages are underlyingly head-initial, hence linear OV-orders are always derived.

3.1.1 Malayalam

Malayalam is a Dravidian SOV-language. Assuming an underlyingly head-initial VP directly dominated by a focus projection (FocP in his terms, very plausibly Belletti’s (2004) Foc\textsubscript{LOW}), Jayaseelan (1996) argues for overt wh-movement in this language. His discussion takes on Kayne’s (1994) universal head > complement order and assumes that the wh-phrases of Malayalam are first-merged in a post-verbal position, where only non focused elements can appear at Spell-Out. Since wh-phrases are intrinsically focused, they must undergo movement into the Spec of FocP to check the relevant \[foc\]-feature. According to Jayaseelan, the resulting structure in which the wh-phrase occurs to the immediate left of the verb, as in (1), looks like proper wh-in situ because the rest of the VP-internal material must be evacuated from VP:

(1) \textbf{WH-PHRASE TO THE IMMEDIATE LEFT OF V} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Malayalam}

(a) \textit{ninn-\textsubscript{DO} aar\textsubscript{wh-S} talliy?}  
you=\text{ACC} who beat\textsubscript{past}  
‘Who beat you?’

(b) \textit{awan\textsubscript{wh-S} ewiD\textsubscript{wh-ADV} pooyly?}  
he where went  
‘Where did he go?’

According to Jayaseelan, a strong empirical motivation for his claim is that the unmarked word order SOV changes into OSV \textit{iff} the subject is a wh-item, as in (2):

---

\textbf{3.1 A typologically interesting type between full moving and in situ languages}

overview of languages with TP-internally moved ‘in situ’ wh-phrases. Then, in §3.2, I present and discuss Kahnemuyipour’s (2001) claim in favour of non-wh-movement of clause-internal wh-phrases in Persian (§3.2.1), which I then extend to Trevigiano (§3.2.2). This approach have interesting consequences for the theory of Northern Italian insituness, as I argue in Chapter 6.
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(2) UNGRAMMATICALITY OF SOV WITH A WH-SUBJECT

(adapted from Jayaseelan 1996:7(1))

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{aar}\_\text{wh-s} \ \text{nin-ne}\_\text{DO} \ \text{tallyy}?
\who & \text{you}=\text{ACC beat}_{\text{past}}
\end{align*}
\]

On this account, the wh-subject moves to SpecFocP while the object must move higher (Jayaseelan calls this a VP-vacating movement). The example in (1a) is derived along the lines of (3):

(3) MALAYALAM WH-TO-FOC AND VP-VACATION OF THE OBJECT (Jayaseelan 1996:9(8))

For Jayaseelan, the question of whether the underlying order is Head-Complement or Complement-Head is actually irrelevant: in either case, VP-vacating movements and a FocP higher than VP are needed to derive the Malayalam facts. Other South Asian SOV-languages seem to be less strict than Malayalam. Nonetheless, most of them display a strong tendency to keep the wh-phrase to the immediate left of the verb at Spell-Out.

3.1.2 Bangla and Hindi-Urdu

According to work by Mahajan (1990), and more recently Dayal (2017), the word order for wh-phrases in SOV Hindi-Urdu is not as strict as in Malayalam. Malayalam shows no indication of any activation of the left CP-edge in extraction: if wh-phrases move, they usually stop at SpecFoc_{LOW}, but never at a left-peripheral Spec.

In Hindi-Urdu, finite complements often come to the right of the verb, as in (4):

(4) POSITION OF FINITE COMPLEMENTS WRT THE V

(adapted from Dayal 2017:159(1a))

\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \ \text{anu-ne kalam khariidaa} \\
& \text{a-ERG pen bought} \\
& \text{‘Anu bought a pen’}
\end{align*}
\]
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b. anu-ne kyaa khariidaa
   a-ERG what bought
   ‘What did Anu buy?’

There is evidence that wh-phrases can move higher than the pre-verbal position. Consider the following cases, where the wh-phrase is in pre-verbal position in the (a) examples, but in the neutral position in (b) examples for subjects and indirect objects:

(5) DISTRIBUTION OF WH-PHRASES WRT THE V (adapted from Dayal 2017:160(2)) Hindi-Urdu
   a. yeh kavitaa kis-ne likhii?
      this poem who-ERG wrote
      ‘Who wrote this poem?’
   b. kis-ne yeh kavitaa likhii?
      who-ERG this poem wrote

(6) DISTRIBUTION OF WH-PHRASES WRT THE V (adapted from Dayal 2017:160(3)) Hindi-Urdu
   a. tum-ne paisaa kis-ko diyaa
      you-ERG money who-DAT gave
      ‘Who did you give the money to?’
   b. tum-ne kis-ko paisaa diyaa
      you-ERG who-DAT money gave

According to Dayal (2017), both orders in (a) and (b) are acceptable, with a preference for the pre-verbal position. It has been claimed that the pre-verbal position is a focus position to which wh-phrases move (Kidwai 2000, Manetta 2010), with the alternative orders being derived through scrambling. Manetta posits the derivations in (8) and (10) for simple mono-clausal interrogatives questioning over subject and object positions, such as (7) and (9):

(7) SUBJECT QUESTION (Manetta 2010:8(27)) Hindi-Urdu
    hamid-ko kis-ne ma:ra:
    hamid-ACC who-ERG hit
    ‘Who hit Hamid?’

(8) DERIVATION OF HINDI-URDU SUBJECT QUESTIONS (adapted from Manetta 2010:8(28))

Note that in (8) a minimalist distinction between two types of features is made, namely the interpretable (i) and uninterpretable (u) features. This classification, introduced in Chomsky (1995), distinguishes between features that have semantic content and those that do not. What happens in
derivations such as (8) is that \( v^0 \) probes its domain, which includes its Spec, and values its uninterpretable [wh]-feature and EPP-feature via interaction with the moved wh-phrase in SpecvP \( \text{(Move, in minimalist terms)} \). \( C^v \) then probes its domain and values its uninterpretable [wh]-feature via interaction with the wh-phrase at the leftmost edge of vP, an operation called Agree. This operation values the uninterpretable Q-feature of the wh-phrase, hence building an LF that can be successfully interpreted as a direct question. The observed word order results from successive scrambling of the object, which allows the wh-phrase to surface in the pre-verbal position. When the questioned element is the object, the derivation of the simple question follows the same path, except that the subject is to be scrambled to yield the right word order:

(9) DIRECT OBJECT QUESTION (adapted from Manetta 2010:8(29))

\[
\text{hamid-ne kya: ci:z dekhi:}
\]

Hamid-\text{\textit{-ERG} what thing saw}

'What thing did Hamid see?'

(10) DERIVATION OF HINDI-URDU OBJECT QUESTIONS (adapted from Manetta 2010:8(30))

\[
\text{scrambling} \quad \text{Move} \\
\text{[CP } iQ \quad \text{Agree} \quad iQ \quad uwh} \\
\text{hamid-ne [vP, kya: ci:z [vP v dekhi:]]}
\]

A similar claim has been made by Jayaseelan (2001), who claims that the Q-operator resides in the Left Periphery of the clause, more precisely in ForceP, the phrase that encodes the illocutionary force of the sentence. From Force, Q binds the wh-phrase moved into the Spec of Foc\textsubscript{LOW}. For Cheng & Bayer (2015), Q plausibly checks an uninterpretable counterpart of Q within the wh-phrase. Regardless of the precise role played by Q, according to Jayaseelan (2001) and importantly for the purposes of this dissertation, wh-movement is split: the wh-phrase first moves to a low focal projection \( \text{Foc}_{\text{LOW}} \), and then comes under the control of a Force head which is base-generated. Thus, in contrast to what I have claimed so far for Trevigiano, there is no movement to SpecCP in Hindi-Urdu. I shall later claim that movement (rather than base-generation) of a silent Q-particle in Trevigiano is indeed required. Note that works like Manetta’s fall into the Minimalist Program, where vP is considered a phase-head, hence is a good candidate to host clause-externally moved wh-phrases. I would suggest that SpecvP is the Minimalist counterpart of the Spec\text{Foc}_{\text{LOW}} position adopted in non-minimalist works such as this dissertation.

For Cheng & Bayer (2015), the evidence discussed so far means that South Asian wh-in situ is actually an instance of overt movement to the left edge of VP/vP. There is in fact no evidence for wh-movement to the CP-domain in these languages, with the sole exception of the V2-language Kashmiri. Consequently, the South Asian languages are argued to form a ‘typologically interesting
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and significant type between full moving and in-situ languages’ (p. 21). In this regard, Trevigiano appears to be the Romance counterpart of the languages under consideration.

3.1.3 Bantu languages

A similar discussion of proper wh-in situ as opposed to clause-internal wh-phrases moved to Foc\textsubscript{LOW} has also been carried out in the Bantu linguistics literature. It has been claimed for many Bantu languages that non-subject wh-phrases surface immediately after the verb. In Zulu, as in other Bantu languages, the word order in the unmarked case is (S) V (IO) (DO), with locative and temporal adjuncts following the arguments, as in (11):

(11) UNMARKED WORD ORDER (Cheng & Downing 2012:247(1))

\text{Zulu}

\begin{verbatim}
ú-Sip'ú-phék’ín-ku:khu kwá-m’izoló)
1-Sipho1SUBJ-cooked9-chicken17-1sgyesterday
’Sipho cooked chicken at my place yesterday’
\end{verbatim}

Nonetheless, word order is often flexible, and information structure plays a central role in licensing alternative word orders. For example, since early works on Aghem such as Hyman (1979) and Watters (1979), it has been known that in many Bantu languages certain focused elements must occur Immediately After the Verb (in so-called IAV-position). In Zulu, according to Cheng & Downing (2012), this requirement holds for new information focus (à la Belletti 2004): both question words and answers corresponding to the question words need to appear in IAV position, as in (12):

(12) IAV POSITION (FOCUS OF NEW INFORMATION) (Cheng & Downing 2012:248(3))

\text{Zulu}

\begin{verbatim}
a. Canonical order: V IO DO
bá-níkéú-Siphóí-má:li)
2SUBJ-give1-Sipho9-money
‘They gave Sipho money’

b. Non-canonical order showing obligatory IAV focus: V DO IO
\begin{verbatim}
Question: bá-m-níké:-nǐ)ú-Síphó)?
2SUBJ-1OBJ-give-what1-Sipho
‘What did they give to Sipho?’
\end{verbatim}
c. Answer: bá-m-níké:i-má:liú-Síphó)
2SUBJ-1OBJ-give9-money1-Sipho
‘They gave money to Sipho’
\end{verbatim}

Aboh (2006), published as Aboh (2007), argues for a focus-movement analysis of non-subject wh-phrases in Aghem: in his account, the ‘immediately after the verb’ position is the low focus position

\footnote{In Cheng & Downing (2012), parentheses indicate prosodic phrasing, while the numbers in the glosses refer to noun agreement classes. I keep both, although they are not relevant to my discussion.}
\footnote{A focused DO precedes the IO, and is resumed by an object agreement prefix on the verb (bolded).}
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(Foc\textsubscript{LOW}). Much of the literature (Hyman 1979, Watters 1979, a.o.) has argued that focused constituents and wh-phrases must occur in a position right-adjacent to the verb in Aghem. The position, which has been argued to be unrelated to Case, can host any focused category or wh-phrase. The unmarked order of constituents in Aghem is provided in (13):

(13) **UNMARKED DECLARATIVE ORDER**
    (adapted from Aboh 2007:89(23), originally in Hyman 2005:1)\textsuperscript{3}

    Ti-bvú ti-bighà mó zi kí-bé né
dogs two P1 eat fufu today

    ‘The two dogs ate fufu today’

    From (13) it follows that the unmarked declarative order in Aghem is $S > Aux > V > (Focus) > O > Adj$. Now observe the position occupied by the focused constituents in (14):

    (14) **POSITION OCCUPIED BY FOCUSED CONSTITUENTS**
        (adapted from Aboh, 2007:90(24), originally in Hyman, 2005:1 & Biloa 1997:46)

    a. Énáo mò án ’sóm zi [bé-kó]
        Inah Past in farm eat fufu
        ‘Inah ate FUFU in the farm’
    b. Å mò zi [énáo] bé-kó án ’sóm
        expl Past eat Inah fufu in farm
        ‘INAH ate fufu in the farm’
    c. Ti-bvú ti-bighà mó zi [né] bé-kó
dogs two Past eat today fufu
        ‘The two dogs ate fufu TODAY’
    d. Fil a-mo-zi [ang wo] be’-ko
        friends SM-P2-eat with hand fufu
        ‘It was with (their) hands that the friends ate fufu’

    Compared to its unmarked counterpart in (13), example (14a) illustrates that a contrastively focused object (bé-kó) needs to follow the verb (zi). The subject occurs in the canonical pre-verbal position, while the locative adjunct án ’sóm (‘in the farm’) is displaced to a pre-verbal position, which forces the object to occur last in the sentence. In contrast, the position of the focused subject in (14b), following the verb and preceding both the theme (bé-kó) and the locative PP (án ’sóm), indicates that the focus position is non-sentence-final. Note also that the canonical subject position is filled by an expletive (á), which is never realised when a proper subject occupies this position. Similarly, the examples in (14c) and (14d) respectively show that a focused adjunct or PP immediately follows the verb. In both cases, the focused constituent occurs in a different position than the one it occupies in the unmarked case. Interestingly, Hyman (2005) argues that Aghem wh-phrases occur in the same focus position as the focused constituents in (14), i.e. immediately after the verb. Observe the examples in (15):

\textsuperscript{3}I oversimplify the spelling of Aghem here. I hope Aghem speakers will forgive me.
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(15) WH-PHRASES IN IAV POSITION (adapted from Aboh 2007:90(25))

a. Tī-bvū ti-bighà mò zi \[zīn\] bē-kō?
dogs two Past eat when fufu
‘When did the two dogs eat fufu?’

b. Ā mò zi [ndúghō] bē-kō né \[?\]
expl Past eat who fufu today QM
‘Who ate fufu today?’

Aboh explains that unlike other Bantu languages, Aghem excludes both total wh-fronting, as in (16a), and proper wh-in situ, i.e. clause-internal wh-phrases in their first-merge position, as in (16b):

(16) UNGRAMMATICALITY OF TOTAL FRONTING AND REAL WH-IN SITU

(15) (adapted from Aboh 2007:90(26), originally in Biloa 1997:48)

a. * [Ndugho] a-mo zi ki-be?
who SM-P2 eat fufu
‘Who ate fufu?’

b. * Fil a-mo-zi ki-be [enzin]?
friends SM-P2-eat fufu how

Aghem therefore resembles Trevigiano to a significant degree, with the exception of wh-fronting, which is felicitous in the latter but not in the former. Along the same lines as my own conclusions for Trevigiano, the Aghem data lead Aboh to conclude that there is a fixed position immediately after the verb that unambiguously marks focus. This is further confirmed by data reported in Hyman (2005), who claims that Aghem has an optional focus marker, nó, which realises the post-verbal focal head (Foc \[\text{LOW}^{0}\]) and scopes over the element immediately to its left, in SpecFoc \[\text{LOW}^{0}\]. Observe the examples in (17), where the low focus marker scopes over the verb and the object, respectively:

(17) LOW FOCUS MARKER: NŌ (Aboh 2007:91(29), originally in Hyman 2005:1)

a. Tī-bvū ti-bighà mò zi nó bē-kō
dogs two Past eat Foc fufu
‘The two dogs ATE fufu’

b. Zi bē-kō nó
eat fufu Foc
‘Eat FUFU’

Unlike Trevigiano, the Bantu verb precedes the focused element. Aboh (2007) proposed that in Bantu verb movement past the focal projection is motivated by the requirement for the verb to raise to an aspect position. That the verb necessarily precedes constituents or wh-phrases moved to the VP-peripheral position is, in his account, a consequence of verb movement, as illustrated in (18). Note that according to Aboh, the fact that the verb moves across the focus marker in Foc \[\text{LOW}^{0}\] is not theoretically problematic, since Foc \[\text{LOW}^{0}\] is not an appropriate landing site for a verb that is probed by the aspectual head, hence it does not count as a proper intervener.
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(18) DERIVATION OF EXAMPLE (17b) (Aboh 2007:94(36a))

With regard to questions, Aboh’s representation of the subject-question in (19), which I reproduce in (20), provides a useful summary of what has been claimed so far. Note that the S checks the [foc]-feature under the low Foc head (not realised here), while an expletive in SpecTP checks the EPP-feature in T0:

(19) AGHEM SUBJECT QUESTION (Aboh 2007:99(45a), originally in Biloa 1997:48)

À mò zì ndúghó bë-kó?
expl Past eat who fufu
‘Who ate fufu?’

(20) DERIVATION OF AGHEM SUBJECT QUESTIONS (adapted from Aboh 2007:99(45b))

Cheng & Downing (2012) actually argue in favour of a non-FocusP analysis for Bantu: they claim that everything in the verb phrase except for the wh-phrase must be evacuated, which makes Bantu languages similar to Malayalam at the descriptive level. In other words, although wh-phrases in some Bantu languages are associated with focus, they are nonetheless in situ. However, the data discussed in Aboh (2007) undeniably suggest that FocLOW is indeed at play, at least in Aghem.

3.1.4 Greek (multiple wh-questions)

Clause-internally moved wh-phrases also exist in non-Romance languages other than those discussed in Cheng & Bayer (2015). Sinopoulou (2008) proposed an account of Greek multiple wh-questions where the clause-internal wh-phrase targets Belletti’s (2004) FocP. In Greek, wh-phrases can be fronted, as in (21a), or can surface clause-externally, as in (21b):

94
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(21) WH-PLACEMENT IN GREEK (adapted from Chiou & Vlachos 2017:11)

a. Ke pja nomizis oti idhe?
   and who-ACC think-2SG that saw-3SG
   ‘And, whom do you think s/he saw?’

b. Ke nomizis oti idhe PJA?
   and think-2SG that saw-3SG who-ACC

Greek wh-fronting has been argued to give rise to information-seeking questions, i.e. questions in which the value of the variable discharged by the wh-phrase is not known to the utterer of the question. This reading contrasts with that of in situ wh-questions such as (21b), which are usually analysed as facilitating the echo interpretation, i.e. one where the utterer is not seeking information, but rather for a confirmation of something that has already been said (Tsimpli 1998, Carnie 2006, a.o.). More recently, although Roussou et al. (2013) have claimed that both configurations are felicitous with either the information-seeking or echo-question reading, Vlachos (2014) maintains that it is not syntax that distinguishes between the two readings, but Phonological Form (PF), which assigns a distinct prosody to each interpretation. For this reason, I shall not discuss wh-in situ in Greek single wh-questions, focusing instead solely on multiple wh-questions.

Sinopoulou (2008) argues that Greek is an English-type language in that in multiple wh-questions one wh-phrase must be fronted while the other stays clause-internally, as in (22), in the position where the corresponding DP would appear in a single question, as in (23):

(22) WH-PLACEMENT IN MULTIPLE WH-QUESTIONS

(adapted from Sinopoulou 2008:224(6))

Greek

a. Pjos agorase ti?
   who.NOM bought.3RD.SG what.ACC
   ‘Who bought what?’

b. * Pjos ti agorase?
   who.NOM what.ACC bought.3RD.SG

c. * Agorase pjos ti?
   bought.3RD.SG who.NOM what.ACC

(23) Greek (Sinopoulou 2008:224(7))

Pjos agorase to vivlio?
who.NOM bought.3RD.SG the book.ACC
‘Who bought the book?’

Moreover, Sinopoulou claims that non-fronted wh-elements in matrix multiple questions do not remain in situ, but move to a higher structural position. Assuming that the canonical subject position is SpecvP, and given the linear orders observed in (24), Sinopoulou claims is that the clause-internal wh-phrases in Greek multiple questions must precede all vP-internal constituents:
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(24) MOVEMENT OF CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-PHRASES  
(adapted from Sinopoulou 2008:225(8-11))

a. Pote agorase ti o Janis?  
when bought.3RD.SG what.ACC the Janis.NOM  
‘When did John buy what?’

b. Tinos edose ti o Janis?  
who.GEN gave.3RD.SG what.ACC the Janis.NOM  
‘Who did John give what?’

c. Pote doulepse pou i Anna?  
when worked.3RD.SG where the Anna.NOM  
‘When did Anna work where?’

d. Pjos ide pou tin tenia?  
who.NOM watched.3RD.SG where the movie.ACC  
‘Where did who watch the movie?’

e. Pjos estile ti tis Marias?  
who-NOM sent-3RD.SG what-ACC the Mary-GEN  
‘Who sent Mary what?’

On the basis of the similarities between focus and wh-constructions, it is proposed that in situ wh-elements move to Foc\textsubscript{LOW}. Hence, multiple questions are treated like clause-internal focus, which is just one of the three positions that focus can occupy in Greek, as in (25):

(25) GREEK FOCUS CONSTRUCTIONS (Sinopoulou 2008:229-230(23-25))

a. Clause-initial focus  
TON JANI filise i Maria  
the Janis.ACC kissed.3RD.SG the Maria.NOM  
‘Mary kissed JOHN’

b. Clause-internal focus  
Filise TON JANI i Maria  
kissed.3RD.SG the Janis.ACC the Maria.NOM

c. Clause-final focus  
(i Maria) filise (i Maria) TON JANI  
the Maria.NOM kissed.3RD.SG the Maria.NOM the Janis.ACC

For Sinopoulou, the fact that clause-internal focus fails to exhibit the unmarked word order indicates that it is not literally in situ, i.e. in its first-merge position. She claims instead that these peculiar focused constructions display typical A’-properties (weak cross-over effects and reconstruction effects, a.o.) and are pronounced with the main stress on the post-verbal focus, but without an intonational break after it, which she takes as evidence that what follows the clause-internal focus is not right-dislocated but rather occupies a vP-internal position.

The same derivation is posited for clause-internal wh-phrases in multiple wh-questions, for reasons that I shall partially list in what follows. In Sinopoulou’s analysis, given Rizzi’s (1997) claim that one and only one focus can appear within the same clause, the fact that the presence of a focused
constituent in a multiple wh-question gives rise to ungrammaticality in Greek, as in (26), constitutes clear evidence that the lower wh-phrase undergoes focus movement:

(26) *O JANIS pote pige pou?
    the Janis.NOM when went.3RD.SG where
    ‘When did JOHN go where?’

Sinopoulou argues that the same ungrammaticality arises in the case of single wh-in situ. A second, more convincing argument comes from Tsimpli’s (1998) work, where the conclusion that wh-in situ is focused is based strongly on the observation that clause-internal wh-phrases are not permitted within embedded interrogatives. She claims that wh-elements introducing embedded questions are not focused in Greek, as illustrated by their felicitous coexistence with a focused constituent, as in (27):

(27) O JANIS anarotjeme ti tha kani
    the Janis.NOM wonder.1ST.SG what.ACC will do.3RD.SG
    ‘I wonder what JOHN will do’

Similarly, Tsimpli claims that the reason why in situ wh-phrases cannot be licensed within embedded questions, as in (28), is that wh-in situ cannot satisfy the wh-selectional requirements of verbs like wonder, clearly indicating that Greek wh-in situ does not involve simple [+wh] elements but rather [+wh;+foc] phrases. Therefore, Greek wh-in situ must necessarily be focused.

(28) *Anarotjeme tha kani ti
    wonder.1ST.SG will do.3RD.SG what.ACC
    ‘I wonder what he/she will do’

This argument will fit nicely in the theory of embedded wh-in situ that I develop in Chapter 5, where I argue that [wh] is the feature to be checked by fronted wh-phrases. To conclude, Sinopoulou’s claim is further supported by the intonational properties of multiple questions, where the clause-internal wh-phrase bears focal stress, while the fronted wh-phrase is pronounced with a flat intonation. In contrast, fronted wh-phrases in single wh-interrogatives are claimed to carry the nuclear pitch accent of the sentence.

The hypothesis that the clause-internal wh-phrase moves overtly to Foc_LOW, just as focused elements do, is compatible with the arguments laid out so far. Consequently, a derivation along the lines in (30) is proposed for the matrix multiple wh-question in (29):
Wh-to-Foc is focus-driven

(29) MULTIPLE WH-QUESTION (Sinopoulou 2008:238(44))

\[ \text{Pjos agorase ti?} \]
\[ \text{who.NOM bought.3RD.SG what.ACC} \]
\[ \text{‘Who bought what?’} \]

(30) DERIVATION OF GREEK MULTIPLE WH-QUESTION (adapted from Sinopoulou 2008:239(45))

The fronted and clause-internal wh-phrases differ in that only the latter bears a focus feature, which checks the uninterpretable [foc]-feature in Foc\(^0\). According to Sinopoulou, it is the EPP-feature in Foc\(^0\) that triggers overt movement of the clause-internal wh-phrase into SpecFocP. Similarly, C\(^0\) probes the wh-subject pjos, with which it agrees. As a consequence, the wh-phrase undergoes wh-movement into SpecCP, probed by the EPP-feature in C\(^0\).

3.1.5 Persian

Mirdamadi (2018) explores the syntax of wh-interrogatives in Persian and, in the spirit of Kahnemuyipour (2001), argues in favour of the movement of clause-internal wh-phrases into SpecFoc\(_{LOW}\). I shall present Mirdamadi’s data and analysis here, and leave the discussion of Kahnemuyipour (2001) for §3.2, which will constitute the basis of my discussion of the nature of Trevisian Wh-to-Foc.
Mirdamadi argues that in Persian, an SOV language, wh-phrases can fairly freely appear in three domains in the hierarchical structure, namely the pre-verbal position, the position between the subject and the COMP ke ('what'), and the clause-initial (scope) position. All three positions can be exploited in long-distance construeds, such as those in (31):

(31) DISTRIBUTION OF WH-PHRASES (Mirdamadi 2018:40(2))

a. Pre-verbal position
   Fekr mikoni (ke) Hasan chi kharid?
   think.2sg that Hasan what bought.3sg
   ‘What do you think that Hasan bought?’

b. Under-ke position
   Fekr mikoni (ke) chi Hasan <i> kharid?
   think.2sg that what Hasan bought.3sg

c. Scope position
   Chi fekr mikoni (ke) Hasan <i> kharid?
   what think.2sg that Hasan bought.3sg

Mirdamadi’s main concerns are how optional wh-movement from one domain to another domain can be accounted for, as well as how selection is satisfied so that wh-elements are correctly assigned scope regardless of the position that they occupy in the clause. He compares the position occupied by the PP in double object declarative constructions, such as those in (32), with their position in wh-interrogatives, such as those in (33):

(32) POSITION OF PP IN DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS

(Mirdamadi 2018:55(26))

a. Hasan ketab-RA gozasht ru miz
   Hasan book-RA put.3sg on table
   ‘Hasan puts the book on the table’

b. Hasan ketab-RA ru miz gozasht
   Hasan book-RA on table put.3sg

(33) POSITION OF PP IN DOUBLE OBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS

(Mirdamadi 2018:55(27))

a. * Hasan ketab-RA gozasht koja?
   Hasan book-RA put.3sg where
   ‘Where did Hasan put the book?’

b. Hasan ketab-RA koja gozasht?
   Hasan book-RA where put.3sg

In the declaratives in (32), the PP can surface either before or after the verb. In contrast, in interrogatives such as those in (33), wh-adverbial koja (‘where’) cannot occur post-verbally. Along

---

4 RA is a differential object marker whose primary function is to mark the accusative object.
Wh-to-Foc is focus-driven

the same lines as Kahnemuyipour (2001), Mirdamadi proposes that wh-phrases are first-merged post-verbally, then obligatorily moved into the Spec of a functional projection to the left of the verb, SpecFocP. If wh-elements move from the post-verbal position to the pre-verbal position, a question arises as to why wh-phrases do not always remain in the low Foc position. In fact, as Mirdamadi correctly points out, if the movement to the low focal projection is triggered by a [foc] or [wh] feature, it must be subject to Criterial Freezing. As such, it must be inactivated in SpecFoc, hence becoming unable to move further into the Spec of any higher criterial projection. As a solution, Mirdamadi proposes that wh-movement to the LP of the clause does not pass through an intermediate step in the low FocP: for him, FocP is not merged in these cases, and wh-phrases move straight to the LP. Subsequently, building on Karimi & Taleghani (2007), he posits the existence of a wh-operator in C, with which wh-phrases enter an Agree relation through feature movement; wh-phrases inherently contain two features, [foc] and [wh]: the former is responsible for triggering wh-movement into the Spec of a criterial focus head, and the latter establishes the Agree relation with the operator in C. To conclude, Mirdamadi tentatively analyses the cases in which the wh-phrase appears between the subject and the COMP ke, such as (31b), as cases of German-like partial wh-movement where wh-phrases are scrambled to an intermediate position in the hierarchical structure.

Mirdamadi’s theory of FocLOW being only optionally merged is unfortunately not easily tenable from a theoretical point of view; a theory à la Karimi & Taleghani, where the peculiar movement properties of the wh-phrases that are first-merged post-verbally are attributed to their peculiar lexical properties seems much more convincing. Moreover, Mirdamadi regretfully does not develop Kahnemuyipour’s (2001) theory of focus movement of clause-internal wh-phrases; this approach is central to the theory of Wh-to-Foc developed in this dissertation, and is outlined in §3.2.

3.2 The short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases is focus-movement

Building on published works on Serbo-Croatian, Hungarian, Basque, Aghem and Kirundi (Horvath 1986, Rochemont 1986, É. Kiss 1995, Bošković 1997, Ndayiragije 1999, Stjepanovic 1999, a.o.), Kahnemuyipour (2001) argues in favour of focus movement of clause-internal wh-phrases in Persian. I discuss this movement, which in Kahnemuyipour’s account targets SpecvP in §3.2.1 and extend the analysis to Trevisian Wh-to-Foc in §3.2.2.

3.2.1 Kahnemuyipour’s (2001) work on Persian focus movement

Kahnemuyipour (2001) suggests that Persian should not be analysed as either a language with syntactic wh-movement to the Spec of CP or a proper wh-in situ language. He argues instead that
3.2 The short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases is focus-movement

Persian ought to be classified with languages in which wh-phrases are argued to undergo focus movement (especially Serbo-Croatian, for which Bošković 1997;2000 has argued that wh-elements undergo what he calls non-wh-movement). For him, this focus position coincides with the position targeted by contrastively focused elements, ‘directly above vP’ (p. 41). Kahnemuyipour (2001) explains that at first glance wh-phrases in Persian might seem to be located in the position in which they are first-merged, as in (34a):

(34) POSITION OCCUPIED BY THE DO (adapted from Kahnemuyipour 2001:46(6))  

a. Declarative linear order  
\( Ălî yê ketêb xêr-id \)  
‘Ali bought a book’

b. Interrogative linear order  
\( Ălî ci xêr-id? \)  
‘What did Ali buy?’

However, the situation changes when it comes to wh-adjuncts, similarly to what we saw in Tревигиано. Compare the declarative in (35a) with its interrogative counterparts in (35b-c):

(35) POSITION OCCUPIED BY ADVERBIALS (adapted from Kahnemuyipour 2001:46(7))  

a. Declarative linear order  
\( Ălî ye sa’aʿet pis raft xune \)  
‘Ali went home an hour ago’

b. Interrogative linear order: Adv\(_{\text{Time}}\)  
\( Ălî key raft xune? \)  
‘When did Ali go home?’

c. Interrogative linear order: Adv\(_{\text{Place}}\)  
\( Ălî ye sa’aʿet pis koja raft? \)  
‘Where did Ali go an hour ago?’

While a pre-verbal wh-adverbial of Time also occupies a pre-verbal linear position in declaratives, a wh-adverbial of Place appears to be first-merged post-verbally, before surfacing pre-verbally, as in (35c): wh-adverbials of Place must undergo movement, as shown in (36):

(36) MOVEMENT OF clause-internal WH-ADV OF PLACE (35c)  
\( Ălî ye sa’aʿet pis koja, raft _____ i? \)
Wh-to-Foc is focus-driven

In fact, an in situ counterpart of questions such as (35c) exists, which receives an echo reading. Again, this very much resembles the Trevisian data. The movement observed for the wh-adv of Time is also present in the case of post-verbal arguments. Observe the distribution of the IO of a ditransitive verb in (37a), with respect to its interrogative counterpart in (37b):

(37) POSITION OCCUPIED BY IOs (Kahnemuyipour 2001:47-48(10))

a. Declarative linear order
   Hassan ketab-o dad (be) aeli
   Hassan book-OM gave (to) Ali
   ‘Hassan gave the book to Ali’

b. Interrogative linear order
   Hassan ketab-o be ki dad?
   Hassan book-OM to who gave
   ‘Who did Hassan give the book to?’

Because of the movement pattern of wh-phrases that are first-merged post-verbally, Kahnemuyipour argues in favour of generalised movement of wh-phrases to a pre-verbal position, even when that movement is not detectable in the phonetic string, such as the wh-DO in (38):

(38) MOVEMENT OF CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-DO (34b)

\[ \text{Ali ci } x\text{ar-id?} \]

For Kahnemuyipour, in all Persian wh-questions the wh-phrase undergoes syntactic movement to a focus position above vP, SpecvP, as shown in (39):

(39) MOVEMENT OF PERSIAN CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-PHRASES INTO vP (34b)
3.2 The short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases is focus-movement

Note that Kahnemuyipour takes the DO to be first-merged pre-verbally, contra Kayne’s (1994) claim that all languages are underlyingly SVO. Moreover, for the correct wh-phrase > verb order to be derived, it must be assumed that Persian finite verbs do not move higher than \( v^0 \). The presence of both the trace of the subject and the moved wh-phrase in Spec\( vP \), the theta-position where subjects are externally-merged, is also not theoretically desirable. Therefore, in my theory of Trevisian insituness I shall instead assume that the periphery of \( vP \) is the landing site for movement of clause-internal wh-phrases. Assuming that the short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases that I showed in (39) does take place, Kahnemuyipour then proceeds to prove that the movement under consideration is indeed triggered by a focus feature (as opposed to a wh-feature, which he claims is responsible for total fronting to the CP), and that the functional projection is Spec\( vP \), and not a higher one.

Arguments in favour of focus movement

With the unmarked declarative order in (37a), repeated here as (40), in mind, observe (41), where the IO \( be \, \text{ali} \) (‘to Ali’) is contrastively focused:

(40) POSITION OCCUPIED BY THE IO IN DECLARATIVES

(adapted from Kahnemuyipour 2001:47(10))

Hassan ketab-o dad (be) ali
Hassan book-OM gave (to) Ali
‘Hassan gave the book to Ali’

(41) POSITION OCCUPIED BY A CONTRASTIVELY-FOCUSED IO

(adapted from Kahnemuyipour 2001:49(12b))

Hassan ketab-o (be) ali dad
Hassan book-OM (to) Ali gave
‘Hassan gave the book to ALI (and not, for example, to Hossein’

The contrast between (40) and (41) illustrates that contrastively-focused IOs move from the post-verbal position in which they are first-merged to the pre-verbal position, exactly as wh-IOs do. On this basis, ? maintains that it is reasonable to propose that movement of wh-phrases in Persian is indeed focus movement. Similar approaches whereby wh-phrases undergo focus movement had been proposed previously, more specifically for languages such as Serbo-Croatian (Stjepanovic 1999), but also Hungarian, Basque, Aghem and Kirundi (Horvath 1986, Rochemont 1986, È. Kiss 1995, Ndayiragije 1999, a.o.). For these authors, the parallelism between the movement of focused elements and wh-phrases indicates that the latter must be inherently focused and must undergo movement for focus purposes. For Horvath, for instance, whenever languages have a special position for contrastively-focused constituents, this should also be available for wh-phrases. She explains this property by building on the interpretational similarities displayed by focus and wh-phrases: in
contrast to simple new information focus, contrastive focus operates over a closed set; similarly, the value of wh-phrases is drawn from an inferable set of items, inherently delimited by the truth value of the question itself. I shall return to Horvath’s claim in §3.2.2.

Arguments in favour of movement to SpecvP

To understand how far above the finite verb the projection targeted by focus movement lies, Kahnemuyipour (2001) observes the position(s) occupied by manner adverbs, on the assumption that these adjoin to vP. He argues that sentences such as those in (42) and (43), where a manner adverb co-exists with a clause-internal wh-phrase, provide a way to determine the exact landing site of the focus movement under investigation:

(42) DISTRIBUTION OF QUICKLY AND A CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-PHRASE  
(Persian)  
(adapted from Kahnemuyipour 2001:50(13))

a. Declarative order  
Æli ba  sor’aet ræft  mødrese  
Ali  with speed  went school  
‘Ali went to school quickly’

b. Interrogative order (i)  
Æli  ba  sor’aetADV koja  ræft?  
Ali  with speed  where  went  
‘Where did Ali go quickly?’

c. Interrogative order (ii)  
?? Æli  koja  ba  sor’aetADV ræft?  
Ali  where  with  speed  went

(43) DISTRIBUTION OF GENTLY AND A CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-PHRASE  
(Persian)  
(adapted from Kahnemuyipour 2001:50(14))

a. Declarative order  
Æli  ketab-o  arum  gozast ru  miz  
Ali  book-OM  gently  put  on  table  
‘Ali gently put the book on the table’

b. Interrogative order (i)  
Æli  ketab-o  arumADV koja  gozast  
Ali  book-OM  gently  where  put  
‘Where did Ali gently put the book?’

c. Interrogative order (ii)  
Æli  ketab-o  koja  arumADV gozast  
Ali  book-OM  where  gently  put
3.2 The short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases is focus-movement

According to Kahnemuyipour, the movement of the wh-phrase to a position between the manner adverb and the verb, as in the (b) example, is clear indication that focus movement targets a Spec of vP. The acceptability of the question decreases if the wh-phrase is moved higher than the position occupied by the manner adverb, as in the (c) examples. Given that Persian has massive scrambling and relatively free word order, Kahnemuyipour takes this fact as evidence that the position occupied by the manner adverb might constitute a sort of barrier to focus movement of the wh-phrase. This account clearly falls within a decades-long tradition that takes adverbs to be adjuncts (Pollock 1989, Iatridou 1990, Johnson 1991, Bowers 1993, Ernst 2002, Fowlie 2013, 2014). Cinque (1999) provided robust empirical evidence in favour of the idea that adverbs are directly-merged in specialised, hierarchically-ordered functional projections within the domain of inflection. Cinque presented an elaborate functional structure for the clause, i.e. the former TP, which I reproduce in (44):

(44) THE FINE STRUCTURE OF TP (from Cinque 1999:90(106))

\[
\text{[Mood}^{\text{SpeechAct}} \text{[Mood}^{\text{Evalitative}} \text{[Mood}^{\text{Evidential}} \text{[Mod}_\text{Epistemic} \text{[T(Past)} \text{[T(Future)} \text{[Mood}_\text{Irrealis} \text{[Mod}_\text{Necessity} \text{[Mod}_\text{Possibility} \text{[Asp}_\text{Habitual} \text{[Asp}_\text{Repetitive(I)} \text{[Asp}_\text{Frequentative(I)} \text{[Asp}_\text{Celerative(I)} \text{[Asp}_\text{Volitional} \text{[Mod}_\text{Obligation} \text{[Mod}_\text{Ability/Permission} \text{[Asp}_\text{Celerative(I)} \text{[T(Anterior)} \text{[Asp}_\text{Terminative} \text{[Asp}_\text{Continutive} \text{[Asp}_\text{Perfect} \text{[Asp}_\text{Retrospective} \text{[Asp}_\text{Proximative} \text{[Asp}_\text{Durative} \text{[Asp}_\text{Generic/progressive} \text{[Asp}_\text{Prospective} \text{[Asp}_\text{SgComplettive(I)} \text{[Asp}_\text{PlComplettive} \text{[Voice} \text{[Asp}_\text{Celerative(II)} \text{[Asp}_\text{SgComplettive(II)} \text{[Asp}_\text{Repetitive(II)} \text{[Asp}_\text{Frequentative(II)} \text{[Asp}_\text{Celerative(II)} ]]])]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]}]

The evidence for this hierarchy, further developed in Cinque (2006), came from converging facts regarding the cross-linguistic ordering of adverbs, auxiliaries, particles and suffixes. Cinque’s treatment of adverbs expresses important properties of adverbial syntax better than most competing approaches, so I take it to be correct for the purposes of my analysis. In the light of the large body of literature on what was formerly called the IP (Pollock 1989, Chomsky 1989, Belletti 1990, Cardinaletti 2004, a.o.), I assume that the clausal domain contains (at least) the FPs in (45):

(45) THE FINE STRUCTURE OF THE SPLIT-IP

\[
\text{[SubjP Sub}^0 \text{[TP}^0 \text{[AgrOP AgrO}^0 \text{[vP v}^0 \text{[VP . . .]]]]]}

In (45), the VP and vP are the loci where verb-selected arguments are first-merged, and they are responsible for theta-role assignment. Nominative Case is assigned in SpecSubjP to the subject (which also moves there for the EPP, the principle according to which all clauses must contain a subject, be it phonetically realised or not), while accusative Case is checked covertly in SpecAgrOP. TP is the layer where all the functional structure posited by Cinque (1999) lies. According to Kahnemuyipour, the position targeted by clause-internally moved wh-phrases is the Spec circled in (46):
An analysis whereby clause-internally moved wh-phrases target the position in (46) is therefore also tenable in a framework where adverbs are not adjuncts. In addition, SpecvP is undeniably a good candidate to host movement of the wh-phrase, since in phase theory (Chomsky 1998 and related work) it is taken to be a phase-edge, i.e. a Spec targeted by wh-phrases in their successive-cyclic movement to the CP-domain. Nonetheless, theoretical developments that are more recent than Kahnemuyipour’s strongly suggest that a refinement of Kahnemuyipour’s theory is in order. There are at least two of these developments: first, under Criterial Freezing (Rizzi 2006 and related work), a projection where a relevant feature is checked, here [foc], is a criterial one, and therefore one from which a goal, once probed and frozen-in-place, cannot escape (contra Kahnemuyipour, which takes focus movement into SpecvP to be merely an intermediate step on the way to Rizzi’s (1997) FocusP); second, we now know that there is a periphery above vP, as posited in Belletti (2004), which contains a focal projection. Furthermore, it seems rather implausible for SpecvP, which hosts the trace of the moved subject, to be able to host wh-phrases simultaneously, and even more implausible for it to be the target of focus movement. Making $\text{Foc}_{\text{LOW}}$ the actual target of Kahnemuyipour’s focus movement makes more sense than having [foc] checked in the Spec of a theta-role assigning projection, vP.

Note that I shall not discuss another test for focushood of moved wh-phrases that was used by Kahnemuyipour, namely their ability to violate Superiority, because it is only relevant for multiple wh-questions, which are ruled out in Trevigiano. Superiority is a condition on the application of transformations, first formulated in Chomsky (1973), which states that a transformation which in principle can apply to two constituents in the structure has to apply to the one that is structurally superior, i.e. subject over all other verbal arguments, verbal arguments over non-selected arguments.

### 3.2.2 The role of [foc] in Trevisian fake insituness

In this section, I shall provide evidence to show that Wh-to-Foc should be treated as focus movement (as opposed to proper wh-movement), before showing how Trevisian moved wh-in situ is derived.
3.2 The short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases is focus-movement

There are two major arguments in favour of focus-driven movement of clause-internal wh-phrases. The first comes from the distribution of wh-adverbials and wh-IOs which, as I claimed in Chapter 2, do not surface in their first-merge site, but instead after the linear position targeted by the active past participle (see §2.1.2). A second argument in favour of focus movement is linked to Horvath’s (1986) claim that the parallelism between the movement of focused elements and wh-phrases indicates that the latter must be inherently focused. I develop this argument in what follows, claiming that Trevisian contrastive focus displays the same clause-internal movement patterns as wh-phrases.

The parallelism between contrastive focus and clause-internally moved wh-phrases

In languages like Standard Italian, a focused constituent naturally occupies a low position in the clause, where the sentence stress falls. However, it is also possible for focused elements to move and fill a high left-peripheral position, where they bear a particular pitch accent, as in (47):

(47) DISTRIBUTION OF CONTRASTIVELY-FOCUSED CONSTITUENTS Standard Italian

(adapted from Bianchi 2013:193(1))

a. A: Gianni ha invitato Lucia
   John has invited Lucy
   ‘John invited Lucy’

b. B: pro ha invitato [MaRlna],
   pro has invited Marina
   ‘He invited Marina’

c. B: [MaRlna], pro ha invitato ___
   Marina pro has invited
   ‘Marina he invited’

It is commonly assumed that focus in the low position, as in (47b), can either carry new information or be used in contrast/correction contexts, while the high position in (47c) can only be used in contrast/correction contexts. Since Jackendoff (1972) and Chomsky (1976), it has been assumed that the factor that triggers movement of a constituent to the CP of the clause is focus itself, and that this movement may be delayed until after Spell-Out in the case of clause-internal focus. The strongest piece of evidence in favour of covert focus movement was the observation that it gives rise to so-called Weak Crossover effects. In generative syntax, crossover is the term used to refer to a relation between two elements across another element that interferes with their relation, as in (48):

(48) WEAK CROSSOVER EFFECT IN THE CASE OF FOCUS FRONTING

a. * His, wife loves JOHN

b. LF: * JOHN, [ his, wife loves ___ ]

(48) is an instance of weak crossover that appears at LF: the focused element is moved across the pronoun his, and co-indexation between the two is impossible, which cannot be due to a violation of
Condition C, namely that an R-expression is free. In fact, binding theory has nothing to say about the possibility of co-reference between a fronted focus and a personal pronoun. Since JOHN is moved to an A’-position, his cannot be A-bound by it. Moreover, since his does not c-command the trace of the focused element, his cannot bind it. Still, co-reference between the two is impossible. This case is different from that of strong crossover, which occurs in configurations where a wh-phrase or quantificational NP undergoes A-movement across a pronominal that c-commands the extraction site.

However, as Bianchi (2013) observes, the alternation between focus in situ and focus fronting raises a serious problem for the feature-driven approach to movement on which this dissertation is based. In fact, it is not clear why the [foc]-feature triggers overt movement in only a subset of cases. This problem is particularly pertinent in cartographic studies, in which each aspect of interpretation has a dedicated syntactic configuration, in which Criteria (in the sense of Rizzi 1996 and much related work) are met. For instance, we systematically expect a constituent bearing the [foc]-feature to move into the Spec of a dedicated Focus projection, where it satisfies the Focus Criterion. According to Rizzi (1997), in the resulting structure the moved constituent in Spec constitutes the focus, while the complement of Focus 0 is the presupposition, as illustrated in (49):

(49) THE FOCUS-PRESUPPOSITION CONFIGURATION

It is precisely this Focus projection that implements the proper focus-presupposition partition, more precisely Focus$^{\text{HIGH}}$. This projection, according to studies such as Belletti (2004), Rizzi (2006) and Bocci (2013), is only able to host constituents that are focused contrastively. A contrastively-focused element is one that is contrasted with at least one distinct and contextually salient alternative (such as in example (47c)). Conversely, Focus$^{\text{HIGH}}$ cannot host constituents that bear a focus of new information. This second type of focus, as already in Chapter 2, is encoded in Belletti’s (2004) VP-peripheral Foc$^{\text{LOW}}$. According to Belletti, the VP-periphery is typically activated in Italian subject inversion structures, which display the non-canonical VS order, such as those in (50):

(50) SUBJECT-INVERSION STRUCTURES

a. Question: Chi è partito / ha parlato?
   Who is left / has spoken
   ‘Who left / spoke?’

b. Answer: È partito / ha parlato Gianni
   is left / has spoken Gianni
The most restrictive hypothesis that has been adopted in the literature is that this association is bi-directional: whenever a constituent is contrastively-focused, as in (47), it is licensed in the dedicated left-peripheral projection, Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}. This hypothesis, which pursues the aim of a fully transparent mapping at the interface whereby one position is associated to one and only one interpretation, was adopted in Belletti (2004). Belletti proposed that the cases of contrastive focus in situ are actually fake instances of insituness. In her analysis, the focused constituent is indeed raised to Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}, but its movement is masked by movement of the remnant-IP to a higher topic position, as in (51):

\begin{equation}
\text{FOCUS MOVEMENT + REMNANT-IP MOVEMENT (adapted from Bianchi 2013:194(3))}
\end{equation}

\[
[CP [XP [IP pro ha invitato t] X^0 [FocusP [MaRina], [Foc^0 \dots tP ]]]]
\]

Regardless of the status of the derivation in (51), it must be emphasised that the debate concerning the optionality of focus movement crucially rests on the assumption that the fronted and in situ focus positions are semantically equivalent. Interestingly, Bianchi (2013) provided evidence that the availability of the fronted focus position is actually more constrained than the in situ position, as exemplified by a specific use of contrastive focus, namely corrective focus. Observe (52):

\begin{equation}
\text{CORRECTIVE FOCUS (adapted from Bianchi 2013:197-8(7))}
\end{equation}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[a.] A: Gianni è andato a Londra?
\item[b.] B: No, pro è andato a BerLino (non a Londra)
\item[c.] B’: # No, a BerLino pro è andato (non a Londra)
\end{enumerate}

In the answer to a yes-no question, only an in situ focus is possible, while a fronted focus is inappropriate. For Bianchi, the crucial factor is whether the corrected proposition has already been introduced in the conversational common ground: if not, fronted focus is not appropriate. In light of the empirically-motivated distinction between mere contrastive and corrective focus, Bianchi argues that what Italian focus movement displays is restricted optionality. The major consequence of this analysis is that the less restricted interpretation of the in situ focus position undermines the idea that a clause-internal focus actually involves focus fronting to the LP of the clause followed by movement of the remnant-IP. We thus appear to be forced to abandon the ideal bi-directional ‘one position–one interpretation’ mapping, and we are confronted, once again, with real (yet restricted) optionality.

The Trevisian situation is even more complex. On the whole, with regard to the distribution of new information, contrastive and corrective focus, Trevigiano resembles Standard Italian, as described in Bianchi (2013): only the clause-internal position is available for new information and corrective focus,
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while both insituness and fronting are possible with contrastively-focused constituents. However, in
Trevigiano, not only can both new information (53) and contrastive focus (54) be expressed clause-
internally, but both can (but do not have to) appear moved from their first-merge position. Observe
the movement of a contrastively-focused IO and of an adverbial in (55b) and in (56b), respectively:

(53) NEW INFORMATION FOCUS

a. A: Chi ze-o che gà ciamà ae dieze de sera?
   who is-clmpt that you has called at the ten of evening
   ‘Who called you at 10 p.m?’

b. B: Me gà ciamà Toni
   me has called Toni
   ‘Toni called me’

(54) CORRECTIVE FOCUS (IN SITU?)

a. A: Go sintio che Giani el gà invità a Marina
   have1PS heard that John cl3PS has invited the Mary
   ‘I heard that John invited Mary’

b. B: No, el gà invità A MARIA, no a Marina
   cl3PS has invited THE MARY not the Marina
   ‘No, he invited MARY, not Marina’

(55) CLAUSE-INTERNAL FOCUSED IO

a. A: I me gà dito che te gè prestà el libro a Piero
   they me have told that cl2PS DAT have lent the book to Piero
   ‘I’ve been told you lent your book to Piero’

b. B: No, ghe gò prestà A TONI el libro, no a Piero
   no DAT have1PS lent TO TONI the book not to Piero
   ‘No, I lent the book TO TONI, not to Piero’

c. B’: No, ghe gò prestà el libro A TONI, no a Piero
   no DAT have1PS lent the book TO TONI not to Piero

(56) CLAUSE-INTERNAL FOCUSED ADVERBIAL

a. A: I me gà dito che te si ndaa al circo jeri
   they me have told that cl2PS are gone to the circus yesterday
   ‘I’ve been told you went to the circus yesterday’

b. B: No, son daa SABO al circo, no jeri
   no am gone SATURDAY to the circus not yesterday
   ‘No, I went to the circus ON SATURDAY, not yesterday’

c. B’: No, son daa al circo SABO, no jeri
   no am gone to the circus SATURDAY not yesterday

The first hypothesis raised by the movement in (55b) and (56b) is that Trevisian corrective focus is
able to target SpecFocLow, like new information focus can, as shown in (57):

5Since I am not interested in focus fronting here, I shall not make a distinction between contrastive and corrective focus.
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(57) CLAUSE-INTERNAL FOCUS MOVEMENT

a. \[ [TP \ pro \ ghe \ gò \ [FP \ prestà \ [\text{Foclow} \ A \ \text{TONI} \ [VP \ t, \ el \ libro \ ___ \ \text{IO} \ ]]]] \]

b. \[ [TP \ pro \ son \ [FP \ daa \ [\text{Foclow} \ SABO_{ADV} \ [VP \ t, \ al \ circo \ ___ \ \text{ADV} \ ]]]] \]

At first glance, this hypothesis might appear theoretically undesirable, since one consequence would be that the VP-peripheral focus projection can encode both types of focus. However, remember that the evidence provided in Bianchi (2013) and discussed above crucially fails to support a deterministic mapping of the one position-one interpretation type for focus: if in Italian Foc\textsubscript{LOW} encodes new information focus, Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} contrastive focus and the in situ position both contrastive and corrective focus, nothing rules out the possibility that some languages might be able to encode both new information and contrastive focus in Foc\textsubscript{LOW}.

In fact, the hypothesis that Trevisian clause-internal contrastive focus might target SpecFoc\textsubscript{LOW}, as clause-internally moved wh-phrases do, appears well justified semantically. As mentioned previously, Horvath (1986) argues that whenever a language has at its disposal a specialised projection for contrastively-focused constituents, this projection is also available for wh-phrases. She explains this property on the basis of the interpretational similarities displayed by focus and wh-phrases. In contrast to simple new information focus, in fact, contrastive focus operates over a closed set and, in a similar fashion, the value of wh-phrases is drawn from an inferable (hence closed) set of items, inherently delimited by the semantics of the question itself. The fact that Trevigiano can make use of SpecFoc\textsubscript{LOW} to derive contrastive focus constitutes further evidence for the idea that clause-internal wh-phrases undergo focus movement. Data similar to the patterns found in Trevigiano have actually already been discussed in Sinopoulou (2008) for Greek multiple wh-questions, in which both wh-phrases and focused constituents can move to Foc\textsubscript{LOW}, as in §3.1.

Trevisian insituness and the roles of [foc], [q], and [wh]

Chomsky (2000) argues that overt fronting of wh-phrases is triggered by an EPP feature of the interrogative C. In this version of the theory, Chomsky rejects his previous feature-based theory (Chomsky 1995), to the point that he rejects feature-based movement altogether. Feature-checking via movement is replaced by a relationship of long-distance agreement, called Agree. Consequently, the EPP ceases to play a role in feature-checking, as it did in the preceding development of the theory; instead, this approach goes back to the early days of the theory, when it was simply the case that certain heads were required to have a Spec. What happens in the derivation of interrogatives is that the functional head, C\textsuperscript{0}, carries an uninterpretable Q-feature, \(u[Q]\), and probes for a matching goal. The wh-phrase carries an interpretable Q-feature, \(i[Q]\), which checks the uninterpretable feature of C\textsuperscript{0}. Consequently, the C\textsuperscript{0} and the wh-phrase enter an Agree relation, and the wh-phrase is attracted into SpecCP, as in (58):
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(58) Q-AGREEMENT LEADING TO WH-FRONTING

Focus movement to foc\textsubscript{LOW} can be treated in an analogous way. Let us imagine that foc\textsubscript{LOW} carries an uninterpretable focus feature, [u][foc]. This Agree\textsubscript{foc} with the interpretable focus feature of the focused phrase, [i][foc]. As such, Focus-agreement is correctly created, as in (59):

(59) FOCUS-AGREEMENT LEADING TO FOCUS MOVEMENT OF THE WH-PHRASE

The [foc]-feature on the wh-word is activated because it is relevant in the computation: I shall later argue that, in a number of limited cases, the feature that is activated on wh-phrases is [wh].
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instead. The presence of an uninterpretable \[foc\]-feature in the VP-peripheral Focus head is very plausible, given my previous discussion of low focus movement in Trevigiano. Furthermore, since focus movement of the clause-internal wh-phrase is compulsory in Trevigiano, there must also be an EPP-feature in \( \text{Foc}^0 \text{LOW} \).

A derivation of Trevisian short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases as shown in (59) might seem fallacious. In fact, it is not clear how the interrogative C is checked in such cases, nor why wh-phrases might carry a \([q]\)-feature in the case of wh-fronting and a \([foc]\)-feature in the case of focus-movement. However, I think there is a straightforward way to reconcile this with the theory developed so far. Remember the structure of Q-adjoining wh-phrases, proposed in Cable (2010) for some in situ languages. I adapt it in (60), in the light of my claim that the wh-phrase carries a \([foc]\)-feature; since the \([wh]\)-feature is not relevant here, I take it to be unvalued:

(60) Q-ADJOINING WH-PHRASES

![Diagram of Q-ADJOINING WH-PHRASES]

The role of the unvalued \([wh]\)-feature might seem trivial here, but evidence to support its presence comes from the Northern Italian mechanism of wh-doubling. Q-particles do not usually undergo morphological changes depending on the wh-phrase with which they interact. In contrast, the higher elements of wh-doubling do change depending on the doubled wh-phrase, as in (61), except with Type C doubling, in which the doubling is carried out by an operator, as in (62):

(61) WH-DOUBLING TYPE C (Poletto & Pollock 2004:284(2))

- a. Ch’et fat qué?
  what’have=you done what
  ‘What have you done?’
- b. Ngo fet majà ngont?
  where do=you eat where
  ‘Where do you eat?’

(62) WH-DOUBLING TYPE C (Manzini & Savoia 2005:190(154))

- a. ke ma ‘portet ki?
  ke to.me bring2PS what
  ‘What are you bringing to me?’
To my understanding, wh-doubling of the type in (61) could be treated as an instance of a Q-particle carrying overt [wh]-features inherited from the wh-phrase itself, while doubling as in (62) is a mere overt realisation of the Q-particle, with inaudible [wh]-features: plausibly, in this type of wh-doubling the [wh]-feature fails to be realised phonetically at Spell-Out. For now, let us posit that the [wh]-feature somehow percolates onto the Q-particle, under c-command, and then the possibility of realising it phonetically is parametrised at PF. One might argue that it is implausible for a language to have both silent and phonetically-realised instances of both the Q-particle and the [wh]-features. However, given that matrix wh-doubling is always optional and is not compatible with all types of wh-phrases, the languages that permit this strategy are clearly at an intermediate step in their evolution towards generalised single wh-in situ and single wh-fronting, hence it is not implausible that overt [wh]-features on the Q-particle might be undergoing the same process. If my intuition is correct, then Q-adjoining wh-phrases must actually have the feature specifications in (63):

(63) Q-ADJOINING WH-PHRASES (ii)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{WhP} \\
\text{Q} \\
\text{i}[q];[],[\text{[wh]}] \\
\text{wh-phrase} \\
\text{Wh'} \\
\text{Wh}^0 \\
\text{i}[\text{foc}];[],[\text{[wh]}]
\end{array}
\]

In Chapter 5, I shall claim that [wh] plays a crucial role in the felicity of doubled wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions, and that it only gets valued if the context requires it. Following the discussion presented so far, the derivation of clause-internal focus movement of wh-phrases must take place in two different steps, namely:

(1) Wh-to-Foc

The uninterpretable [q]-feature in Foc\textsubscript{LOW}^0 probes for a matching goal. The Q-adjoining wh-phrase carries an interpretable [wh]-feature, hence an agreement relation is created with the focus head, via the Mechanism of Agree. The EPP-feature in Foc\textsubscript{LOW}^0 attracts the matching wh-phrase into its Spec, via Move. A proper spec-head configuration is created and the Focus Criterion is satisfied. Therefore, WhP is frozen. This is illustrated in (64):
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(64) **FOCUS-AGREEMENT LEADING TO FOCUS MOVEMENT OF THE WH-PHRASE (ii)**

![Syntax tree diagram](image)

(2) **C-checking**

The uninterpretable \([q]-feature in Focus^0_{\text{HIGH}}\) probes for a matching goal. The silent Q-particle of the Q-adjoining wh-phrase carries an interpretable \([q]-feature, hence an agreement relation is created with the focus head, via the Mechanism of Agree. The same process cannot be posited between Focus^0_{\text{HIGH}} and the [wh]-feature that the Q-particle has inherited from the wh-phrase: according to Cinque & Rizzi's (2010) *One feature-One head* principle, each morphosyntactic feature corresponds to an independent syntactic head with a specific slot in the functional hierarchy. Consequently, I believe that only \([q]\) needs to be checked in C, while [wh] is present yet not valued because it is irrelevant (in this context). Subsequently, the EPP-feature in Focus^0_{\text{HIGH}} attracts the matching Q-particle into its Spec, via Move. A proper spec-head configuration is created and the Q-Criterion (or Wh-Criterion in Rizzi (1996)) is satisfied. I illustrate step (2) in (65). Note that Move out of the frozen-in-place WhP, as in (65), is possible under Criterial Freezing because it is an instance of sub-extraction. In addition, it is possible that not only [wh] but also [foc] is transmitted to the Q-particle, which first checks the low [foc] feature and then the highest feature, [q]. This would make the attracted element the highest in the complex structure, which is possibly more desirable theory-wise. I am afraid I do not have a definite answer at the present time; however, and rather luckily, this would only constitute a minor modification of the theory. Finally, I would like to observe that the implementation of the [wh]-feature, transmitted
to the Q-particle and valued only if necessary, reconciles the theory of \textit{Wh-to-Foc} with much generative work that assumes that wh-phrases carry both [q] and [wh]-features.

\begin{equation}
(65) \quad \text{C-CHECKING FOLLOWING WH-TO-FOC}
\end{equation}

\begin{itemize}
\item \text{Focus}\textsubscript{HIGH}
\item \text{Focus}'\textsubscript{HIGH}
\item \text{Focus}\textsubscript{HIGH}^0
\item \text{[EPP];i}u\text{[q]}
\item \text{SubjP}
\item \text{Subj'}
\item \text{Subj}^0
\item \text{Foc}\textsubscript{LOW}
\item \text{WhP}
\item Q
\item [\text{[q]};[\text{[wh]}}
\item \text{wh-phrase}
\end{itemize}

I am aware that the need for features to have an \textit{output effect} à la Chomsky (1995) could constitute an argument against the extension of Cable’s (2010) grammar of Q to NIDs: the mere insertion or exclusion of the [foc]-feature on wh-phrases might be enough to justify their total fronting or TP-internal movement, respectively. Under such assumptions, a wh-phrase associated to [foc;wh;q] would undergo focus movement to SpecFoc\textsubscript{LOW}, while a [wh;q] wh-phrase would move all the way to SpecFocus\textsubscript{HIGH}. Positing that the EPP-feature is realised only in Foc\textsubscript{0}\textsubscript{LOW} in the first case and only in Focus\textsubscript{0}\textsubscript{HIGH} in the second case would probably be enough to account for the way in which the relevant feature in C is checked in the absence or presence of overt movement. Nonetheless, I am convinced that the phenomenon of wh-doubling is not trivial and clearly suggests that wh-phrases are not inserted in the structure in their bare form, but rather integrated within more complex projections, whose features undeniably play a major role in the derivation of wh-questions, as I shall discuss further in Chapter 5. I briefly discuss the case of QP-fronting in what follows.

**Intermediate Conclusions**

In this Chapter, I have provided robust cross-linguistic evidence showing that clause-internal wh-phrases are able to move to Belletti’s (2004) VP-peripheral focal projection, which I call Foc\textsubscript{LOW}. I also
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claimed that an analysis in these terms is supported by the movement properties of Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases and also by the availability of SpecFoc_{LOW} for contrastively-focused constituents in Trevigiano. Subsequently, on the basis of my claim that Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases are Q-adjoining structures à la Cable (2010), I argued that the derivation of Trevisian ‘insituness’ is composed of two main stages: Focus-agreement and attraction of the complex WhP into SpecFoc_{LOW}, followed by Q-agreement and attraction of the silent Q-particle into SpecFocus_{HIGH}.

Although it is not the main focus of this dissertation, I would like to briefly address the case of total wh-fronting, or rather QP-fronting. In Chapter 2, I argued that the in situ-ex situ alternation observed in Trevigiano is better captured if we assume that this language has both of Cable’s (2010) strategies to unite the silent Q and wh-phrases: Q-adjunction, leading to (moved or unmoved) wh-in situ, and QP-projection, which leads to QP-fronting. In light of the discussion presented in this Chapter, I suggest that Trevisian QP-projections have the refined structure in (66). Remember Chomsky’s (1995) assumption that the insertion of formal features must have some output effect. Since I have been claiming that Focus_{HIGH} is only associated to an EPP and [q]-features, an output effect is clearly unavailable for [foc], hence the impossibility of inserting/valuing [foc] on the wh-phrase follows logically. The same observation applies to [wh], and its absence from the Q-particle is, I believe, demonstrated by the fact that wh-doubling is always of the Q-adjoining type: to the best of my knowledge, no case of fronted overt doubling is in fact attested in the literature.

(66) Q-PROJECTION

Note that assuming that Focus_{HIGH} is merely associated to a [q]-feature is in keeping with a great deal of existing literature which, starting from Rizzi (1997), has taken wh-phrases to be incompatible with focused constituents because they are in competition for the same structural position, SpecFocus_{HIGH}. Indeed, if we assume that the left-peripheral focus-head is associated with a [q]-feature in matrix interrogatives and a [foc]-feature in embedded interrogatives, the complementary distribution of fronted wh-phrases and focus in the former is predicted.
The consequence of a structural analysis of fronted wh-phrases such as that shown in (66) is that QP-fronting must be derived as in (67):

(67) Q-AGREEMENT LEADING TO QP-FRONTING

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Focus}^\text{HIGH} \\
\text{Focus}^0 \text{HIGH} \\
\text{[EPP]}x[q] \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{QP} \\
\text{Q} \\
\text{WhP} \\
\text{wh-phrase} \text{[[foc]]} \text{[[wh]]}
\end{align*}
\]

The uninterpretable [q]-feature in the interrogative Focus\(^0\)\text{HIGH} probes for a matching goal. QP carries an interpretable [q]-feature, hence an Agree relationship between the two is established. As a consequence of the EPP-feature in Focus\(^0\)\text{HIGH}, QP is attracted into SpecFocus\text{HIGH}. A proper spec-head configuration is hence created, and the Q(Wh)-Criterion is satisfied. Needless to say, the movement under consideration proceeds successive-cyclically, passing through the edge of each relevant phase it encounters, namely vPs and (when relevant) CPs. To conclude, let me point out that Kotek (2014), a study of English and German simple and multiple wh-questions based on an adaptation of Cable’s (2010) theory of QP, argues that the previously-assumed strict correlation between intervention and superiority in English, à la Pesetsky (2000), is incorrect. In her account, intervention occurs whenever the relation between a wh-word and the Q-particle associated to it is disrupted at LF. This happens for example in superiority-violating questions, inside overt and covert pied-piping constituents, and in superiority-obeying questions whenever covert wh-movement is restricted to a position below an intervener. Furthermore, in Kotek’s words, intervention can be avoided in superiority-violating questions when the in situ wh-word is given wide scope above an
3.2 The short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases is focus-movement intervener through non-interrogative movement. This non-interrogative movement is very similar to *Wh-to-Foc*, first and foremost in its targeted position: the edge of vP (or a higher Spec, in case of *Wh-to-Foc*). In a way, Kotek needs short non-wh-movement to derive the semantics of wh-in situ. I believe that the evidence from Trevigiano provides further support for her claim.
Chapter 4

On Subject-clitic Inversion and nominative clitics

The analysis of Trevisian wh-in situ in terms of Wh-to-Foc that I developed in Chapters 2 and 3 has theoretical consequences that I shall address in this Chapter. Crucially, an explanation of insituuness in terms of clause-internal focus movement requires an investigation of the status of SClI, a major component of the interrogative syntax of languages such as Trevigiano, the treatment of which is in turn closely linked to the morphosyntax of declarative and interrogative Northern Italian clitics.

Since Brandi & Cordin (1989), Burzio (1986) and Rizzi (1986), the unstressed subject pronouns found in NIDs have been considered clitics, i.e. they are syntactic heads, unlike their French pre-verbal counterparts, which have been treated as either phonological clitics (Kayne 1983) or as weak pronouns (Cardinaletti & Starke 1999), i.e. maximal projections. More recent works (Poletto 2000, Goria 2004, Roberts 2007a;2010, a.o.) have also essentially continued this type of approach. These clitic forms have been considered to be realisations of Inflection, which has contributed to the analysis of NIDs as null-subject languages, on a par with Italian, contra recent works by Cardinaletti & Repetti (2008;2010) where Northern Italian pre-verbal and post-verbal subject clitics are analysed as the same lexical items, and different morphological forms of proclitics and enclitics are explained phonologically. In these accounts, the status of NIDs as null-subject languages is reconsidered, whence the claim that NIDs are not full pro-drop languages (they allow pro only in the persons in which no clitic pronoun appears). According to Cardinaletti & Repetti, this approach allows the different distribution of subject pronouns in proclisis and enclisis to be explained without the need for the widely-debated two-paradigm hypothesis. Despite the fact that their discussion is rather appealing, the approach has one major problem: the enclitic placement of the interrogative series of clitics, which is unexpected under Kayne’s (1994) assumption that cliticisation always applies in a leftward fashion. Because of
this, I shall instead continue the tradition that takes clitics to be an inflectional class that realises phi-features in T (or in C, in the case of interrogatives), using Trevisian data to propose minimal modifications of this sort of approach.

To the best of my knowledge, the major existing analysis of the morphosyntax of Northern Italian SClI is the approach outlined in the remnant-IP movement works (Poletto & Pollock 2004) and further developments; refer to Chapter 6 for details), in which SClI is analysed as the result of complex, pre-Spell Out computations. However, this type of analysis is incompatible with my theory of Wh-to-Foc, as I shall argue in this Chapter.

Organisation of this Chapter

In §4.1, I deal with the existing analysis of SClI as an instance of overt movement of TP-internal material to the LP of the clause. Crucially, I first describe the mechanisms that are claimed to be the origin of SClI in these accounts, and then discuss their theoretical complexity, reduced learnability, and non-applicability to most Northern Italian varieties. Subsequently, I shall provide a detailed presentation of the Trevigiano data (§4.2), and argue instead in favour of a very classical treatment of SClI as an instance of verb movement to C. In doing so, I shall sketch a primitive analysis of the phenomenon based on Roberts’ (2007a) discussion of French V-to-C movement as triggered by phi-features that, in the residual V2 environment of the LP of questions, C fails to pass to T (§4.3).

4.1 SClI as overt phrasal movement (Poletto & Pollock 2015)

Poletto & Pollock (2000, and further developments) analyse SClI as the result of pre-Spell Out phrasal movement (contra Sportiche 1993, Kayne 1994, Friedmann 1997, who take the movement in question to take place covertly). Crucially, this approach is based on the assumption that wh-in situ is actually an instance of wh-movement to the lower portion of the CP, followed by computations that displace all other IP-internal elements (including the V and the S) to higher functional projections. Note that despite the substantial improvements to the theory of Northern Italian wh-movement offered by each of the studies of remnant-IP movement after Poletto & Pollock (2000) (and Munaro et al. 2001), the core arguments on which the discussion was originally based have remained unchanged over the years. For this reason, here I systematically refer to the first work in the series; however, for more fine-grained derivational accounts of Northern Italian interrogative wh-movement, the reader should refer to more recent works such as Poletto & Pollock (2009).

I summarise Poletto & Pollock’s arguments in favour of analysing SClI as overt phrasal movement in (§4.1.1 and .3), then discuss the applicability of this approach to varieties other than the Bellunese
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type (§4.1.4), which I consider both empirically and theoretically undesirable. This discussion will constitute the basis of §4.2 and §4.3, where I argue that Trevisian SClI should be treated as an instance of verb movement to the LP, triggered by phi-features in C that are realised phonetically as nominative enclitics in the presence of proper spec-head configurations.

4.1.1 SClI is overt movement

Poletto & Pollock’s (2000) first argument in favour of analysing SClI as an instance of overt movement of IP-internal material to the LP of the clause comes from the interrogative syntax of Monnese, a Lombard dialect (Benincà & Poletto 1997;2004). In Monnese, SClI triggers fa-support in virtually all contexts where English needs do-support, as in (1):

(1) FA-SUPPORT (Poletto & Pollock 2000:122(16))

\[\text{Ngo fa-l ndà?} \]
\[\text{where does-he go} \]
\[\text{‘Where is he going?’} \]

For Poletto & Pollock, the only difference between fa- and do-support is that fa-support does not occur in negative contexts, because in Romance, but not in English, main verbs cross over the position that hosts Negation (Zanuttini 1997, Pollock 1989). That aside, Monnese fa and English do have the exact same distribution, whence the proposed common analysis: no author has ever suggested do-support should be analysed as covert movement, so Poletto & Pollock argue that fa-support, which is the shape that SClI takes in Monnese, should also be analysed as an instance of overt movement of TP-internal elements to the CP.

Their second argument comes from the dialect spoken in Rodoretto di Prali, in North Western Italy. Pralese allows co-ordinated structures between SClI questions and wh-structures with an overt COMP, as illustrated in (2). Under the widely-accepted assumption that co-ordination always occurs between identical structures, the presence of qu’ (‘that’) in the second clause signals that the CP-layer is realised in both, providing evidence that SClI must involve overt computations into the CP field:

(2) CO-ORDINATED QUESTIONS (Poletto & Pollock 2000:123(17))

\[\text{L’achat-te tu ou qu’ tu l’achat pa?} \]
\[\text{if’buy-you or that’ you it’buy not} \]
\[\text{‘Are you going to buy it or not?’} \]

The third argument in favour of overt movement to the CP-domain comes from the left-peripheral ‘new information’ particle pa found in Fassano, a North Eastern NID (Poletto 2000). In this variety, SClI is possible only if the V crosses over the position occupied by pa. If the verb stays lower, there is no SClI. Compare the examples in (3):

...
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(3) INTERACTION OF PA AND SCLI (Poletto & Pollock 2000:124(18))

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. | Olà vas-t pa?  
 where go=you pa  
 ‘Where are you going?’ |
| b. | Olà pa tu vas?  
 where pa you go |
| c. | * Olà pa vas-t?  
 where pa go=you |
| d. | * Olà tu vas pa  
 where you go pa |

According to Poletto & Pollock, the contrast in (3) can be explained successfully iff it is assumed that SCLI overtly moves the V and the subject clitic to a left-peripheral position higher than pa.

In the next section, I present the data that inspired Poletto & Pollock’s analysis of SCLI as phrasal movement to the CP-domain (supporting previous analyses such as Hulk 1993, Kayne 1994, Sportiche 1993), contra many generative claims in favour of head movement.

4.1.2 SCLI is phrasal movement

Poletto & Pollock’s approach to Northern Italian wh-in situ is based on the important properties shared by SCLI in NIDs and in French. These authors assume that the derivation of Northern Italian wh-questions operates exclusively within the CP: because the interrogative syntax of NIDs shares many properties with that of French, it is also claimed that SCLI is an instance of overt movement to C in the latter. Subsequently, they lay out two major arguments based on Romance data in support of their claim that the movement in question is phrasal, i.e. not head movement of verb and clitics. The first argument relies on Kayne’s (1994) and Sportiche’s (1993) analyses of nominative (henceforth, NOM) clitics, which are claimed to head specialised functional projections distinct from that of the verb. Under these assumptions, for Poletto & Pollock it is impossible for questions such as (4) to be derived via verb movement alone:

(4) NON-NOMINATIVE CLITICS AND SCLI (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2000:125)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Te l’a-t-il donné?  
 to.you it’has-t-he given  
 ‘Did he give it to you?’ |

One of Kayne’s (1991) claims, which constitutes Poletto & Pollock’s second argument in favour of phrasal movement, is that non-NOM clitics do not need to be analysed as adjoined to V, as witnessed by languages where these can be separated from the V by various maximal adverbial phrases. Some relevant examples are provided in (5):
(5) INSTANCES OF NON-NOMINATIVE CLITICS SEPARATED FROM THE VERB

a. Literary French
   Il a dû en fort bien parler
   he must have of.it very well spoken
   ‘He must have spoken very well of it’

b. Classical French
   Ils ont été affligés de ne vous point voir
   they have been sorry of ne you not see
   ‘They were very sorry because they could not see you’

c. Modern Triestino
   Nol se gnanca vedi
   not.it se not.even see
   ‘You can’t even see it’

d. Calabrian
   Un ti manco canusciu
   not you at.all know
   ‘I don’t know you at all’

If, in the spirit of Sportiche (1993) and Kayne (1994), the clitics in (6a) also head a projection different from that of the verb, Poletto & Pollock argue that it is impossible to posit movement of the V alone among the overt left-peripheral computations at work in questions like (6b):

(6) INTERACTION OF NON-NOMINATIVE AND NEGATIVE CLITICS WITH THE VERB
(Poletto & Pollock 2000:126(20) & 127(21))

French

a. Pierre ne lui a pas parlé
   Pierre ne to.him has not spoken
   ‘Pierre didn’t speak to him’

b. Pierre ne lui a-t-il pas parlé?
   Pierre ne to.lui has-t-he neg spoken
   ‘Didn’t Pierre speak to him?’

Third, as pointed out by Kayne (1994), claiming that clitics adjoin to the V fails to explain why referential expressions are banned within words (a self hater vs *a(n) it/her/you hater). Finally, Hulk (1993), Kayne (1994) and Terzi (1999) argued on the assumption that in imperatives the V undergoes head-movement to C, that for the clitics in a sentence like (7a) to be stranded by the V is proof that no verb movement applies in clauses like (7c):

(7) CLITICS IN IMPERATIVES (Poletto & Pollock 2000:128(22))

French

a. Donne le lui!
   give it to.him
   ‘Give it to him!’
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b. * Le lui donne!
   it to.him give

c. Le lui donnera-t-il?
   it to.him will.give-t-he
   ‘Will he give it to her?’

Hulk (1993) and Terzi (1999) showed that in sentences like (7) the insertion of the negative head ne blocks head movement, as in (8):

(8) NEGATIVE HEAD AND VERB MOVEMENT (Poletto & Pollock 2000:128(23))

   French

   a. * Ne donne le lui pas!
      ne give it to.him not
      ‘Don’t give it to him!’

   b. Ne le lui donne pas!
      ne it to.him give not

   c. Ne le lui donnera-t-il pas?
      ne it to.him will.give-t-he not
      ‘Won’t he give it to him?’

   ‘Won’t he give it to him?’

If head movement was at play in sentences such as (7b) and (7c), sentences like (8c) would be ungrammatical. On this basis, and using the arguments summarised above, Poletto & Pollock take SCII to be phrasal movement to the CP, in line with Hulk (1993), Kayne (1994) and Sportiche (1993). However, unlike the latter three authors, Poletto & Pollock analyse Northern Italian and French SCII as the result of overt, pre-Spell Out computations.

4.1.3 Arguments in favour of remnant movement

An analysis of SCII as overt phrasal movement, which for Poletto & Pollock is required on the basis of the data that I summarised in the preceding sections, is only possible if it is assumed to be the result of remnant movement. Take a French question like (8c), repeated here as (9):

(9) SCII AND NON-NOMINATIVE CLITICS (Poletto & Pollock 2000:129(27))

   Ne le lui donnera-t-il pas?
   ne it to.him will.give-t-he not
   ‘Won’t he give it to him?’

   ‘Won’t he give it to him?’

Under the assumption that for Poletto & Pollock, the clitics and the verb move as a constituent in questions like (9), the derivation must be as shown in (10):

(10) DERIVATION OF QUESTION (9) (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2000:130(28))

   Input: [pas [il ne le lui donnera]]

   a. [il ne le lui donnera], [pas [ t ]]
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b. il [pas t_i] [ne le lui donnera, t_j]

c. [ne le lui donnera, t_j] il [pas t_i t_k]

Poletto & Pollock’s analysis of SCII has tangible consequences for the derivation of Northern Italian wh-in situ. Take a Bellunese question like (11), whose derivation I provide in (12), following Poletto & Pollock:

(11) DERIVATION OF BELLUNESNE WH-IN SITU (Munaro 1999:50(1.56))

Ha-tu parecià che?
have=you prepared what
‘What did you prepare?’

(12) Input: [IP tu ha parecià [CIP che, Ø]]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{WhIP} \\
\text{Spec} \rightarrow \text{Wh1'} \\
\vdots \\
\text{SCII} \\
\text{GroundP} \\
\text{Ground'} \\
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{IP} \rightarrow \text{F}^0 \\
\text{tu} \rightarrow t_1 t_k \\
\text{PartP_k} \\
\text{parecià [CIP t_j t_o]} \\
\text{TopP} \\
\text{Top'} \\
\text{Wh2P} \\
\text{WhP'} \\
\text{Wh'} ightarrow t_{IP}
\end{array}
\]

The stages in the derivation are summarised in (a) to (e):

(a) Merge Wh2P and IP and attract che to SpecWh2P;
(b) Merge Top and Wh2P and attract the Participle Phrase (here, PartP) to SpecTopP;
(c) Merge GroundP and attract tu to SpecGroundP;

\(^{1}\text{Note that here I use a later development of the theory, Poletto & Pollock (2004), because of their analysis of wh-phrases as merged within CIPs, as discussed in Chapter 3.}\)
(d) Merge Force and GroundP and attract the remnant-IP to SpecForce;
(e) Merge Wh1\(^0\) and ForceP and attract \(\varnothing\) to Wh1\(^0\).

The stages that are strictly relevant to SClI, which I highlighted in the representation above, are: (c), attraction of the interrogative clitic to SpecGround, and (d), movement of the remnant-IP to SpecForce. I explicitly did not outline the motivation for the various stages in (a) to (e), which are not the subject of my discussion; the reader will find a detailed account of these stages in Poletto & Pollock (2000) and further developments.

### 4.1.4 A Bellunese-like property

The analysis in (12) has substantial theoretical consequences. First and foremost, for SClI to be derived as pre-Spell Out movement of the remnant-IP, following prior movement of the interrogative subject clitic to C, all computations related to wh-movement must target the CP, which is not impossible per se, but is clearly incompatible with the Lombard and Trevisian data presented and discussed in the previous Chapters.

**Trevisian SClI cannot be phrasal movement**

Poletto & Pollock’s analysis is incompatible with the data on Trevisian Wh-to-Foc. Crucially, in a derivation where all movements occur at the level of CP, the need for clause-internal wh-phrases to move from the position in which they are externally-merged would not only be unnecessary, but also problematic at the empirical level. A derivation such as (12) incorrectly predicts the felicity of orders such as DO > wh-IO, DO > wh-adv and IO > wh-adv, which are all excluded in languages like Trevigiano, as illustrated in (13):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Example (Trevisiano)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. DO &gt; wh-IO</td>
<td>*Ghe ga-tu dato i schei a chi? DAT have=you given the money to who ‘To whom did you give the money?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. DO &gt; wh-adv</td>
<td>*Magni-tu e ultime fragoe quando? eat=you the last strawberries when ‘When are you eating the last strawberries?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. IO &gt; wh-adv</td>
<td>*Ghe i ga-tu dati a Toni quando? DAT them have=you given to Toni when ‘When did you give them to Toni?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compare the incorrect order in (13c) with its grammatical counterpart in (14):

(14) CORRECT INTERROGATIVE ORDER

\[ \text{Trevigiano} \]

Ghe i ga-tu dati quando a Toni?
DAT them have=you given when to Toni

If \textit{SCI} is analysed as an instance of overt phrasal movement to the LP, then stage (b) of the derivation predicts the order in (13c), as illustrated in (15):

(15) INCORRECT ORDER PREDICTED BY PASSAGE (b):

To derive the correct \textit{wh-adv} > IO order (\textit{cuando a Toni}, ‘when to Toni’) for Trevigiano, an unmotivated topicalisation (or movement of that sort) of the IO would be required \textit{prior} to the movement of the remnant-IP, to a position higher than the highest one affected by remnant movement. Thus, the derivation would be done as shown in (16):

(16) IMPLAUSIBLE DERIVATION OF IO > wh-Adv

(i) Topicalization of the IO:

Regardless of whether we take FP to be situated high in the IP or in the CP, lower than WhP2, a topical movement of this sort would be poorly motivated, and hence ruled out by Economy.
(ii) Movement of the remnant-IP following wh-movement, then movement of the PartP and of the subject clitic. Note that this approach, which assumes that the subject clitic moves to the CP from the clausal domain, does not account for the morphological alternations that declarative clitics display in interrogatives.

In §4.2.2 I discuss Trevisian examples that superficially seem to favour the analysis of SClI as an instance of phrasal movement. I shall then reconcile these data with my theory of Wh-to-Foc and with generative works that take SClI to be an instance of V-to-C movement (den Besten 1983, Kayne 1983, Rizzi & Roberts 1989, a.o.).

Remnant movement: a last resort derivation

It is not only the data that suggest that an analysis of Trevisian wh-in situ as an instance of wh-movement targeting CP followed by remnant-IP movement is not on the right track; theory-internal reasons also exist. A derivation such as that in (12) is opaque and includes theoretical complexities that raise the issue of learnability. Since Webelhuth (1992), the term remnant movement has been used to refer to movement of a maximal projection from which extraction of a sub-part has previously taken place in the derivation, as sketched in (17):
4.2 SCII as overt verb movement: evidence from Trevigiano

I have claimed that Trevigiano has compulsory SCII in root answer-seeking wh-questions, regardless of the position occupied by the wh-phrase, as illustrated in (18):

(18) MATRIX SCII IN WH-QUESTIONS

a. {Cuando} vien-tu catarne {cuando}?
   {when} come=you visit=us {cuando}
   ‘When do you plan on visiting us?’

b. *{Cuando} te vien catarne {cuando}?
   {when} you come visit=us {cuando}

The requirement for SCII in root interrogatives also applies to polar questions, as in (19):

(19) MATRIX SCII IN YES/NO QUESTIONS

a. Vien-tu catarne?
   come=you visit=us
   ‘Do you plan on visiting us?’
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I have also claimed that Trevigiano displays a very classic *root/embedded asymmetry*, as illustrated in the long-distance and indirect questions in (20) and (21), respectively:

(20) SClI IN LONG-DISTANCE QUESTIONS
Trevigiano

a. * Pens-eo che vegnara-tu catarne?
   think=he that come\textsubscript{FUT}=you visit=us
   ‘Does he think that you will come to visit us?’

b. Pens-eo che te vegnara catarne?
   thinks=he that you come\textsubscript{FUT} visit=us

(21) SClI IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS
Trevigiano

a. *A she vol saver se vien-tu catarne
   wants=he know if come=you visit=us
   ‘She wants to know whether you’re going to visit us’

b. A she vol saver se te vien catarne
   wants=he know if you come=visit=us

However, these statements need some refinement, since SClI is actually also excluded: (a) in the higher clause of indirect wh-questions; (b) in doubly-filled COMP questions; and (c) when construed with the wh-word parché (‘why’). I discuss these in what follows. With regard to (a), note that SClI is actually possible in the higher domain of indirect polar questions, as in (22):

(22) INDIRECT POLAR QUESTIONS ARE REQUIRE SClI
Trevigiano

Te domandi-tu se-l vegnara catarne?
ask=you if=he come\textsubscript{FUT} visit=you
‘Are you wondering whether he will visit you?’

Notes on the contexts where SClI is excluded

Manzini & Savoia (2011) claim that, typologically, no direct correlation between the realisation of SClI and the ability to license wh-in situ is observed in languages other than French. However, the infelicity of SClI in the contexts in (a) to (c) must have some significance for its characterisation. Let us start with (a), indirect wh-questions, which ahve a higher clause that is inconsistent with SClI, as in (23). In fact, the presence of SClI in the higher clause, as in (23b), is compatible with a polar question reading, just not with a wh-question interpretation:

(23) INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS ARE INCONSISTENT WITH SClI
Trevigiano

a. A she vol saver *cuando* che te vien catarne
   wants=he know when that you come=visit=us
   ‘She wants to know when you’re visiting’
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b. Vo-ea saver \textit{cuando} che te vegnarà catarne?
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{wants=\textit{she} know when that you come$_{\text{FUT}}$ visit us} \\
  \textit{‘She wants to know when you’re visiting’}
  \end{itemize}
\checkmark \textit{‘Does she want to know if you’re visiting?’}

Indirect wh-questions in Trevigiano are only compatible with a wh-phrase in the embedded LP, as in (24a), or in the clause-internal position, as in (24b). Total fronting to the matrix periphery is categorically excluded, as in (24c):

(24) DISTRIBUTION OF WH-PHRASES IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS

\begin{enumerate}
  \item A se domanda che libro che' \textit{ga scrito} sto ano
\begin{itemize}
  \item she \textit{REFL} \textit{asks} \textit{what book} that=\textit{he} has written this year
  \textit{‘She wonders which book he wrote this year’}
\end{itemize}
  \item A se domanda sel ga scrito che libro sto ano
\begin{itemize}
  \item she \textit{REFL} \textit{asks} \textit{what book} \textit{se=he} has written this year
\end{itemize}
  \item * Che libro a se domanda che' \textit{ga scrito} sto ano
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{what book} \textit{she \textit{REFL} \textit{asks} that=\textit{he} has written this year}
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{itemize}
  \item It has been known for decades that a wh-phrase moved to the C-system of an indirect question cannot be moved further. Observe Lasnik & Saito’s (1992) examples in (25):
  \begin{enumerate}
    \item a. Bill wonders [[which book] Q [ \textit{John published} \_ \textit{this year} ]]
    \item b. * Which book does Bill wonder [ \_ Q \textit{John published} \_ \textit{this year} ]
  \end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

The contrast in (25) has been explained in numerous ways: \textit{inactivation} à la Bošković (2008) (the wh-phrase carries an uninterpretable Q-feature checked in a criterial position, thus making the phrase inactive for movement); an extension to the A’-system of the inactivation approach to A-chains à la Chomsky (1995); or Criterial Freezing à la Rizzi (2006;2010) (the wh-phrase in (25a) satisfies a criterion, hence is frozen in place). The derivation proposed for Trevisian wh-fronting is repeated here as (26):

(26) QP-FRONTING INTO THE SPEC OF $\text{FOCUS}_{\text{HIGH}}$

\begin{itemize}
  \item It has been known for decades that a wh-phrase moved to the C-system of an indirect question cannot be moved further. Observe Lasnik & Saito’s (1992) examples in (25):
  \begin{enumerate}
    \item a. Bill wonders [[which book] Q [ \textit{John published} \_ \textit{this year} ]]
    \item b. * Which book does Bill wonder [ \_ Q \textit{John published} \_ \textit{this year} ]
  \end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

The contrast in (25) has been explained in numerous ways: \textit{inactivation} à la Bošković (2008) (the wh-phrase carries an uninterpretable Q-feature checked in a criterial position, thus making the phrase inactive for movement); an extension to the A’-system of the inactivation approach to A-chains à la Chomsky (1995); or Criterial Freezing à la Rizzi (2006;2010) (the wh-phrase in (25a) satisfies a criterion, hence is frozen in place). The derivation proposed for Trevisian wh-fronting is repeated here as (26):

(26) QP-FRONTING INTO THE SPEC OF $\text{FOCUS}_{\text{HIGH}}$
In my analysis, once QP is probed into the Spec of Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}, its final criterial position, it is frozen and cannot move further. Under these assumptions, let us consider (27):

(27) \[ \alpha \text{ A se domanda [} \beta \text{ Q [QP che libro]} \text{ che [ el gà scrito ___ sto ano ]} \]

The absence of SCII in indirect wh-questions proves that in the absence of pre-Spell Out interrogative movement to a clausal domain \( \alpha \) SCII cannot occur within \( \alpha \), and that a very classic root/embedded asymmetry is at play in Trevigiano. In (27), \( \beta \) is the clausal domain in which all criteria are met, but its embedded nature bans SCII within it; in contrast, nothing prevents SCII from being realised in the higher \( \alpha \) domain, which is a matrix clause, modulo the absence of interrogative movement to \( \alpha \). Let us now consider (ii), the case of wh-questions with a \textit{doubly-filled} COMP, such as (28). It appears that the overt realisation of the COMP blocks SCII:

(28) \textbf{NO SCII IN DOUBLY-FILLED COMP QUESTIONS} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Trevigiano}

\begin{enumerate}
    \item * Cuando che \textit{viene} tu catarne?
    \hspace{1cm} \textit{When are you visiting us?}'
    \item Cuando che te \textit{viene} catarne?
    \hspace{1cm} \textit{When you visit us?}
\end{enumerate}

The data in (28) suggest that the two elements must compete for the same structural position, i.e. SCII must target the LP of the clause, as I shall argue in §4.2.2. Note that while a fronted wh-phrase \textit{need not} be construed with the COMP, the realisation of the COMP is restricted to those cases in which overt material is realised in the Spec of Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}, as in (29):

(29) \textbf{A MATRIX COMP NEEDS A FILLED SPEC} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Trevigiano}

\* che te \textit{viene} catarne cuando?

\hspace{1cm} that you come visit=us when

While the movement of the verb is independent of the overt realisation of moved material in Spec, the COMP can be activated \textit{iff} an overt spec-head configuration is created.

Let us now turn to (iii), the special behaviour of Trevisian why-word \textit{parché}, which constitutes evidence that SCII is closely linked to the presence of pre-Spell Out wh-movement to the root clause. Trevigiano has two why-words, parcossa and parché: while the former is a regular wh-word generated TP-internally and then raised to the LP (hence always construed with SCII), the latter is an ordinary why-word (in the sense of Rizzi 2001, Shlonsky & Soare 2011), as I discuss in detail in Chapter 5. In fact, there are empirical reasons to believe that \textit{parché} is merged directly in the LP, whence its incompatibility with SCII. An interesting phenomenon can be observed in bi-clausal questions, which suggests that treating SCII as the result of interrogative movement to the root LP might be on the right track. In fact, while in bi-clausal environments a fronted parcossa can be construed both with the
high and the low clause and always triggers SCI\textsubscript{II}, as in (30a), parché regularly excludes SCI\textsubscript{II} when it is construed with the matrix V, as in (30b), and it exceptionally yet obligatorily triggers SCI\textsubscript{II} when it is extracted from the lower clause, as in (30c):

\begin{enumerate}
\item Fronted parcossa: short and long construal
\begin{align*}
\text{Parcossa dizi-tu che a ze vignua?} \\
\text{parcossa say=you}\text{\textsubscript{2PS} that she is come}
\end{align*}
‘Why is x such as she came and you are saying x?’
‘What is x such as you are saying that she came because of x?’
\item Fronted parché: short construal
\begin{align*}
\text{Parché te dizi che a ze vignua?} \\
\text{parché you}\text{\textsubscript{2PS} say that she is come}
\end{align*}
‘Why is x such as she came and you are saying x?’
\item Fronted parché: long construal
\begin{align*}
\text{Parché dizi-tu che a ze vignua??} \\
\text{parché say=you}\text{\textsubscript{2PS} that she is come}
\end{align*}
‘What is x such as you are saying that she came because of x?’
\end{enumerate}

The lack of SCI\textsubscript{II} in Trevigiano does indeed seem to be triggered by wh-movement (or, in the analysis of Trevisian wh-questions outlined in Chapter 2 and 3, QP-movement). In fact, however, the trigger for SCI\textsubscript{II} cannot be wh-movement alone, because this question-formation strategy is also compulsory in polar interrogatives. As a consequence, I shall claim that what triggers SCI\textsubscript{II} is interrogative movement more generally, and argue in favour of the presence of a silent IP-internal polarity operator that moves to C overtly in polar questions (§4.3.3).

\subsection{Non-nominative clitics and SCI\textsubscript{II}}

I have claimed that, SCI\textsubscript{II} must be the result of overt movement to the LP of the matrix clauses at least in Trevigiano and related varieties, and that this movement appears to be linked to the morphologically-expressed or silent realisation of interrogative movement in the matrix domain, and perhaps parasitic on it. In my model, clause-internal wh-words target Focus\textsubscript{LOW}, whereas sentence initial wh-words target Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}. Observe the questions in (31):

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ga-tu magnà [Focus\textsubscript{LOW} cuanto [el dolse ___]]?
\begin{align*}
\text{have=you eaten when the cake}
\end{align*}
‘When did you eat the cake?’
\item [Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} Cuando [ga-tu magnà el dolse ___]]?
\begin{align*}
\text{when have=you eaten the cake}
\end{align*}
\end{enumerate}
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Following (31), the position targeted by SClI must lie somewhere between SpecFocus\textsubscript{HIGH} and the FP targeted by the active past participle, as shown in (32):

(32) SpecFocus\textsubscript{HIGH} > SClI > past participle > Fo\textsubscript{LOW}

(32) is compatible with a very classic analysis of SClI as an instance of T-to-C movement (den Besten 1983, Kayne 1983, Rizzi & Roberts 1989), along the lines in (33):

(33) T-TO-C MOVEMENT

\[ \text{[ForceP Force}^0 \text{ ... [FocusP wh-phrase [ V+S ... [IP ... past participle ...]]]]} \]

In line with much cartographic work (Rizzi 1997 and further developments), Focus\textsuperscript{0} is a good candidate for T-to-C movement of the SClI type: the NOM clitic and the inflected V adjoin within IP (as a complex head); they are then attracted to Focus\textsuperscript{0 HIGH}, where they create a Spec-head configuration with the wh-phrase in SpecFocus (if any). Other works (Roberts 2010) actually assume that the interrogative NOM clitic in SClI realises a left-peripheral inflectional category and triggers V-to-C movement of the verb (along with non-NOM clitics).

Trevisian examples like (31) seem compatible with both analyses: I shall argue in favour of Roberts’ approach later in this Chapter. The patterns observed in the doubly-filled COMP questions in §4.2, along with the complementary distribution of the that-COMP che and SClI, also support the intuition that SClI targets the head of Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}.

More on the implausibility of phrasal movement

Examples like (34) and (35), where the dative (DAT) and accusative (ACC) clitics seem to form a unit with the V+S cluster might appear problematic for the V-to-C analysis that I am developing here:

(34) ACC\textsubscript{cl} > V > NOM\textsubscript{cl}

a. [ Te ga-eo ] visto cuando?
you has=he seen when
‘When did he see you?’
b. Cuando [ te ga-eo ] visto?
when you has=he seen

(35) DAT\textsubscript{cl} > V > NOM\textsubscript{cl}

a. [ Ghe ga-tu ] dato cuando el reajo?
him have=you given when the watch
‘When did you give him the watch’
b. Cuando [ ghe ga-tu ] dato el reajo?
when him have=you given the watch

Also observe the instance of right-dislocation in (36):
4.2 SCII as overt verb movement: evidence from Trevigiano

\[ (36) \quad \text{DAT}_{cl} > \text{ACC}_{cl} > V > \text{NOM}_{cl} \]

\[ a. \quad \text{[ Ghe o ga-tu ] dato cuando, el reajo?} \]
\[ \text{him it have=you given when, the watch} \]
\[ \text{‘The watch, when did you give (it) to him?’} \]

\[ b. \quad \text{Cuando [ ghe o ga-tu ] dato, el reajo?} \]
\[ \text{when he it have=you given, the watch} \]

If one assumes that there is a clitic field à la Sportiche (1996), i.e. a hierarchically-organised set of pronominal and negative clitic positions in the high IP, the instances of SCII in (34) to (36), where the inverted V+S\(_d\) cluster is preceded by proclitics of various types, suggest that Trevisian SCII might be phrasal movement after all. However, for SCII to be phrasal movement, a derivation along the lines of the remnant-IP movement analysis (Poletto & Pollock 2000, Munaro et al. 2001 and related works) would be required, which I claimed is incompatible with the linear position occupied by Trevisian clause-internal wh-words. What is more, the fact that some varieties derive SCII in the way that the varieties described by Poletto & Pollock’s do does not imply that all varieties do the same. It is not implausible that Trevigiano and related varieties might derive wh-questions differently. For this reason, in what follows I shall reconcile the data in (34) to (36) with the hypothesis that Trevisian SCII is an instance of movement of a complex verbal head.

4.2.2 Complex verbal-head to C

Observe (37), the declarative counterpart of example (36):

\[ (37) \quad \text{NOM}_{cl} > \text{DAT}_{cl} > \text{ACC}_{cl} > V \text{ (declarative)} \]
\[ \text{Te ghe o ga dato luni, el reajo} \]
\[ \text{you him it have given Monday, the watch} \]
\[ \text{‘The watch, you gave (it) to him on Monday’} \]

In (37), the declarative NOM clitic precedes the dative and accusative clitics, unlike the interrogative NOM clitic, which follows both dative and accusative, as in (38):

\[ (38) \quad \text{DAT}_{cl} > \text{ACC}_{cl} > V > \text{NOM}_{cl} \text{ (interrogative)} \]
\[ \text{Ghe o ga-tu dato luni, el reajo} \]
\[ \text{him it have=you given Monday, the watch} \]
\[ \text{‘The watch, did you give (it) to him on Monday?’} \]

In addition, the two NOM clitics are in complementary distribution, as illustrated in (39):

\[ (39) \quad \text{COMPLEMENTARY DISTRIBUTION OF NOMINATIVE CLITICS} \]
\[ \text{* Te ghe o ga-tu dato luni, el reajo} \]
\[ \text{you him it have=you given Monday, the watch} \]
The respective order of NOM and non-NOM clitics is summarised in (40):

(40) \[ \{\text{DECLARATIVE NOM}_{\text{cl}}\} > \text{DAT}_{\text{cl}} > \text{ACC}_{\text{cl}} > \{\text{INTERROGATIVE NOM}_{\text{cl}}\} \]

A preliminary analysis that I shall later reject is that the two forms in (39) actually head the same functional projection, and that the different distribution of nominatives in declaratives and interrogatives (as in 40) must be the consequence of verb movement. This hypothesis has two major weaknesses: it does not account for the different placement of declarative and interrogative NOM clitics (proclisis vs enclisis), and it also fails to explain the morphological variations between the two series. Nonetheless, let us explore this possibility and the predictions it raises.

**Are declarative and interrogative NOM clitics the same?**

For the time being, I shall try to investigate the hypothesis, which I shall abandon later, that declarative and interrogative NOM clitics are the same elements. Under the assumption that the NOM clitic adjoins to the verb and moves with it to C, as a complex head, the derivation of SClI would minimally consist of the stages in (41):

(41) a. \( V \) moves to \( \text{Subj}^0 \) to satisfy its clitic nature (I take Northern Italian subject clitics to be the morphological realisation of Cardinaletti’s (2004) \( \text{Subj}^0 \), as in Rizzi 2016):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[SubjP} \ V+S_{\text{cl}} \ [\text{DativeP} \ \text{Cl}_{\text{DAT}} \ [\text{AccusativeP} \ \text{Cl}_{\text{ACC}} \ldots [\text{TP} \ t_v] ]]]
\end{array}
\]

b. \( V+S_{\text{cl}} \) move to the LP:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[ForceP} \ldots V+S_{\text{cl}} \ldots [\text{SubjP} \ t_v+S \ [\text{DativeP} \ \text{Cl}_{\text{DAT}} \ [\text{AccusativeP} \ \text{Cl}_{\text{ACC}} \ldots [\text{TP} \ t_v] ]]]}
\end{array}
\]

This hypothesis is compatible with claims that non-NOM clitics do not adjoin to \( V \), unlike nominatives (Kayne 1991, Poletto & Pollock 2000, Pollock 2003). However, under the assumptions that SClI is head movement to C and that only NOM clitics adjoin to the verb, a derivation like that in (41), in which the non-NOM clitics stay behind, incorrectly predicts that the orders in (42) should be possible:

(42) **IMPOSSIBLE ORDERS DERIVED VIA T-TO-C MOVEMENT**

a. *Ga-tu \[ [\text{IP} \ ghe \ o \ dato \ cuando, \ el \ reojo? ] \]

\[ \text{have}=\text{you}\] \[ \text{him} \ \text{it} \ \text{given} \ \text{when}, \ \text{the} \ \text{clock} \]

b. *Cuando ga-tu \[ [\text{IP} \ ghe \ o \ dato, \ el \ reojo? ] \]

\[ \text{when} \ \text{have}=\text{you}\] \[ \text{him} \ \text{it} \ \text{given}, \ \text{the} \ \text{clock} \]

To properly derive questions like (42) via head movement of the verb to C, we would need to posit that the V moves along with non-NOM clitics as a complex, clitic-adjoining head, i.e. that contra Kayne (1991), Poletto & Pollock (2000) and Pollock (2003) non-NOM clitics do adjoin to the verb. As claimed in §4.1, Kayne (1991), Poletto & Pollock (2000) and Pollock (2003) argue that non-NOM clitics cannot be
adjoined to V because of examples like (5), partially repeated here as (43), where the proclitic forms are separated from the V by (maximal) adverbial phrases:

(43) INSTANCES OF NON-NOMINATIVE CLITICS SEPARATED FROM THE VERB

a. Modern Triestino
   Nol se [ganca vedi
         not.it REFL not.even see
   ‘You can’t even see it’

b. Calabrian
   Un ti [manco canusciu
         not you at.all know
   ‘I don’t know you at all’

However, as Luigi Rizzi (pc.) suggested, the classic Kaynean examples in (43) do not necessarily suggest that non-NOM clitics do not adjoin to the verb; they could be more simply explained in terms of movement properties of the verb. Adopting Cinque’s (1999) idea that there is a functional field for adverbs within TP, and that different verbs in different varieties are attracted to functional heads at different levels in the structure, it is possible to claim that lexical verbs in languages like Modern Triestino and Calabrian are simply not able to move past the adverbs ganca and manco, respectively. In languages like Standard Italian and Trevigiano, meanwhile, the lexical verb is able to move further, to a position higher than the counterparts of ganca and manco, as in (44) and (45):

(44) VERB-MOVEMENT PAST NEMMENO

a. Non lo si vede nemmeno
   not it si see even
   ‘You can’t even see it’

b. Non ti conosco nemmeno
   not you know at.all
   ‘I don’t even know you’

(45) VERB-MOVEMENT PAST GNANCA

a. No seo vede ganca
   not se=it see even
   ‘You can’t even see it’

b. No te conoso ganca
   not you know even
   ‘I don’t even know you’

It thus seems reasonable to posit the existence of complex V-heads in Trevigiano. Although I cannot do justice to the complexity of the IP-internal clitic field here, the outline in (46) shall be sufficient to derive all the facts concerning clitics and their interaction with the finite verb that I need to capture:
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(46) MINIMALLY-NEEDED CLITICISATION SITES WITHIN IP
    \[ \text{SubjP} \text{ cl}_\text{NOM} \text{ [ClP cl}_\text{DAT} \text{ ClP cl}_\text{ACC} \text{ [TP ...]]]} \]

If we maintain the hypothesis that declarative and interrogative subject clitics are the same elements, to derive a complex verb-head such as [\( \text{ghe o gà} \) (DAT ACC does)], one needs to posit that in declaratives the \( V \) moves as high as the position headed by the DAT clitic, along the lines in (47):

(47) \[ \text{SubjP cl}_\text{NOM} \text{ [ClP [v ghe[o[gà]] [ClP t}_v \text{ [TP ...t}_v \text{ ...]]]} \]

In contrast, in interrogatives, before moving to \( C \), the [\( \text{ghe o gà} \)] head has to move further, to the position headed by the subject clitic, as in (48):

(48) \[ \text{SubjP [v[ghe[o[gà]]]tu]} \text{ [ClP Spec t}_v \text{ [ClP t}_v \text{ [TP ...t}_v \text{ ...]]]} \]

The consequence of the analysis in (47) and (48), where both NOM and non-NOM clitics adjoin to the verbal head, is that a derivation such as that proposed in (26) for Trevisian wh-questions needs further improvements, such as those in (50). However, a derivation of this type fails to account for the morphological variations displayed by subject clitics in interrogatives, and is problematic under Kayne’s (1994) assumption that cliticisation is always left-adjunction. To provide a concrete example, I use the Trevisian question in (36b), here (49). Note that I systematically analyse cases of QP-fronting for derivational ease.

(49) Cuando ghe o ga-tu dato?
When DAT ACC have=NOM given
‘When did you give (it) to him?’

(50) QP-FRONTING AND V-TO-FOCUS MOVEMENT

\[ \text{Trevigiano} \]
Therefore, I shall instead pursue a different hypothesis concerning the nature of NOM clitics, i.e. that they head distinct functional projections.

**NOM clitics: the morphological alternation is not trivial**

It has been argued that many NIDs display two incomplete series of NOM clitics, one used in declaratives and one in interrogatives (Renzi & Vanelli 1983, Poletto 2000, Manzini & Savoia 2005 a.o.). While the assertive clitics are proclitic in nature, the interrogative ones are enclitic. Additionally, in most cases the forms of the two series are not syncretic. Table 4.1 displays the paradigms of NOM clitics in Trevigiano. The forms that are not at the disposal of all speakers are shown in brackets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ASSERTIVE</th>
<th>INTERROGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1PS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(io)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PS</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PS</td>
<td>elM / aF / -</td>
<td>eoM / eA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PP</td>
<td>lM / eF</td>
<td>lM / eF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two possible ways of accounting for the data in Table 4.1. The first is to assume that there is only one series of subject clitics, which change in form during the derivation (see Cardinaletti & Repetti 2008;2010 or Manzini 2012 for recent claims along these lines). The second option is to posit that there are actually two different series of clitics that head different functional projections. The first hypothesis is weak, first and foremost because it fails to explain the fact that the finite verb cliticises to the NOM clitic in different ways depending on the clause type (proclisis in declaratives vs. enclisis in interrogatives), but also because it cannot account for the fact that certain forms exist in interrogatives but not in declaratives. If we were dealing with the same clitics that simply change in form, we would not expect some of them to be phonetically-realised in interrogatives in the absence of a declarative form. However, this possibility is not excluded if we analyse NOM clitics not as bona fide pronouns but rather as an inflectional class, as I shall argue in what follows.

The hypothesis that the NOM clitics in (40) head two different projections quickly raises the undesirable prediction, which I shall argue against, that both might be generated in the clitic field in the high IP, as in (51):

(51) TWO NOM CLPS IN THE HIGH IP?

$$[[\text{SubjP} \{\text{cl}_{\text{NOM}}\} \text{CIP} \text{cl}_{\text{DAT}} \text{CIP} \text{cl}_{\text{ACC}} \{\text{SubjP} \{\text{cl}_{\text{INT}}\} \text{TP} \ldots ]]]]$$
If the IP-internal double NOM clitic-phrase analysis in (51) was right, then SClI would be an IP-internal phenomenon, as shown in (52):

(52) **SClI AS AN IP-INTERNAL PHENOMENON**
    
    \[
    \text{[SubjP clNOM \{\text{ClP clDAT \{\text{ClP clACC \{SubjP V-clINT \{TP <V> \ldots\}}}}\}}\]
    \]

    An analysis of SClI as in (52), whereby the V is attracted to the head of the interrogative S-projection to satisfy its clitic nature, could provide support to claims cited above that non-NOM clitics do not adjoin to the verb, and would also almost effortlessly derive orders such as (53):

(53) **SClI AS AN IP-INTERNAL PHENOMENON (ii)**
    
    \[
    \text{[SubjP clNOM \{\text{ClP \{\text{ClP ghe \{\text{ClP o \{SubjP ga-tu \{TP <V> dato \ldots\}}}}\}}}}\]
    \]

    However, positing the presence of two positions for NOM clitics within IP brings with it at least two problems. First, unlike CP, IP is not a field where Force is checked, so the fact that the choice between the two projection would be made before the CP-field enters into the computation would be very difficult to justify theoretically. Second, the IP-internal-SClI hypothesis fails to account for the root/embedded asymmetry, which is a cross-linguistically robust phenomenon. A further significant problem relates to the very nature of NOM clitics, which I discuss below.

**NOM clitics are not pronouns: on clitic activation**

Following previous studies of Romance clitics, Poletto & Pollock (2000) claim that interrogative subject clitics are merged within vP and then moved to a cliticisation site in the high IP, where they are ‘frozen’ and cannot move further, unless they move as bigger chunks, i.e. undergo phrasal movement. However, to my understanding, there is no need to posit that Trevisian NOM clitics are externally-merged within vP, then moved, unlike their non-NOM counterparts.

There are empirical reasons for claiming that NOM clitics (of both series) are *functional heads* activated iff relevant material is inserted in the Spec of the FP that they head. This approach, which I shall develop here and in the following section, is crucially based on the assumptions that (i) declarative and interrogative NOM clitics are not the same elements, and (ii) they are not real pronouns, but rather an inflectional class. In a way, my claim is that both series of NOM clitics are a sub-product of well-formed spec-head agreement within dedicated NOM(inative) Phrases, which leads to the Spell Out of the featural bundle in NOM⁰, as shown in (54):
Let us first examine the case of assertive NOM clitics, which, following Rizzi (2016), I take to be the morphological realisation of Subj$^0$. I argue that the clitic head is activated iff a lexical subject is moved to SpecSubjP, as in (55a), or pro is externally-merged, as in (55b). Note that I follow Rizzi (2016) in preferring the traditional analysis whereby in null-subject languages the EPP is satisfied by expletive pro, a non-referential occurrence of the null pronominal, over the alternative analysis in which null-subject languages have no filler at all (according to which the EPP would be parametrised, and the notion of expletive pro becomes superfluous). In fact, according to Rizzi, while the classical analysis makes null-subject and non null-subject languages fully parallel, this parallel is broken in the alternative approach. Furthermore, expletive pro can be seen as a formal device to express the aboutness property in the absence of an overt subject: not only does pro formally satisfy the subject criterion, but, being deficient in terms of referential content, it also triggers a vacuous interpretation of aboutness, whence the interpretation of the event as not being about a particular argument. Here, I assume that the interpretable property that agrees with the subject of the utterance, which is then attracted into SpecSubjP, is phi-set. Two spec-head configurations are possible, which lead to the realisation of phi-features on Subj$^0$ as a NOM clitic in PF, along the lines of (55):

(55) SPEC-HEAD AGREEMENT AND ACTIVATION OF DECLARATIVE NOM CLITICS

a. Lexical category in SpecSubjP:

\[
[\text{SubjP} \text{ XP } [\text{Subj}^0 \chi] \rightarrow \text{CliticNOM} ]
\]

b. Expletive pro in SpecSubjP:

\[
[\text{SubjP} \text{ pro } [\text{Subj}^0 \chi] \rightarrow \text{CliticNOM} ]
\]

If my analysis in terms of clitic activation in (55) is right, declarative subject clitics are the result of the Spell Out of phi-features activated by the referential subject in SpecSubjP, or a non-referential phi-feature in the case of the expletive. The analysis of the proclitic series as a morphological realisation of phi-features is in line with existing accounts such as Rizzi (1986b) and Brandi & Cordin (1989), and also with Poletto’s (2000) analysis of NIDs, in which clitics that realise phi-features are argued to be one type among several found in Northern Italy, and with Roberts (2007a).

This approach has a crucial theoretical consequence, which I have taken for granted throughout this dissertation: that NIDs (at least those of the Trevisian type) are classic instances of pro-drop
languages, contra authors who take NOM clitics to be real pronominal forms and argue in favour of partial pro-drop (Cardinaletti & Repetti 2008/2010 and Manzini 2012). The subject-clitic activation analysis that I put forward offers two major advantages, which I shall investigate in what follows. First, its extension to interrogative clauses perfectly accounts for the morphological variations displayed by NOM clitics in the interrogative paradigm. Second, it explains the peculiar behaviour of Northern Italian NOM clitics, which are not real subject pronouns but the Spell Out of the Subj\textsuperscript{0}, unlike French counterparts, as described in Roberts (2007a), which are real pronouns and have the same distribution as Trevisian non-clitic nominatives.

In §4.3, I present Roberts’ (2007a) analysis of French interrogative NOM clitics as an inflectional class, and then extend it to my discussion of Trevigiano.

### 4.3 Phi-features on C (an adaptation of Roberts 2007)

In the previous section I claimed that Trevisian NOM clitics are not pronominal elements, moved from within vP to the clitic field in the higher portion of IP, but rather the overt realisation of the phi-features in Subj\textsuperscript{0}. These features, I argue, are activated and pronounced at Spell Out when the insertion of an element in the Spec, be it a regular referential category or pro, creates a well-formed spec-head configuration in SubjP. I shall now argue in favour of a similar analysis for the interrogative paradigm of NOM clitics.

#### 4.3.1 Notes on left-adjunction

The assumption that head movement is always left-adjunction à la Kayne (1994) entails that proclisis of the verb to non-NOM clitics is expected. The complex V-head in (56) must therefore be derived via cyclic movement of the finite V through each clitic head, resulting in a structure like (57). Note that under the assumption that NOM clitics constitute two series, they cannot adjoin to the verbal head, which satisfies its clitic nature by moving to the DAT clitic projection, but no higher:

(56) \[ \text{te [}, \text{ghe o gà ] dito} \]
\[ \text{cl}_{\text{NOM}} \text{ cl}_{\text{DAT}} \text{ cl}_{\text{ACC}} \]
\[ \text{have said} \]
\[ \text{‘You told him (that)’} \]

(57) TREVISIAN COMPLEX VERBAL HEAD
In the spirit of Kayne (1975), I assume that non-NOM clitics are argumental elements that are externally-merged in the canonical argument position, and later moved to the clitic field in the higher portion of IP, à la Sportiche (1999). However, unlike both of these authors, I claim that NOM clitics are not pronominal but inflectional elements, and hence do not move out of vP. Nonetheless, in the derivations sketched here, I shall entirely omit the movement patterns of non-NOM clitics from the representations, to avoid unhelpful intricacies. Another general assumption that I make here is that in Trevigiano, as in other NIDs, the finite, inflected verb moves to T (Manzini & Savoia 2005, Roberts 2010, a.o.). Manzini & Savoia (2005) provide robust evidence for this analysis of Northern Italian inflected verbs, gathered from dialects that show low non-clitic negation which the finite V systematically precedes. Their claim is further validated by the Trevisian data, where the clitic negation no can (but does not have to) be construed with a lower non-clitic negation, mia, as in (58):

\[(58) \quad \text{PREVERBAL NEGATION} \rightarrow \text{NOMINATIVE CLITIC} \quad \text{Trevigiano}\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{No te} & \quad \text{ghe o gà (mia) dito} \\
\text{neg cl295 him it have neg said} & \\
\text{‘You did not tell him (that)’}
\end{align*}
\]

Moreover, the fact that Trevisian NOM clitics follow the preverbal negation, as in (58), suggests that these are fully integrated into the clitic cluster that is proclitic on the finite verb, unlike those found in languages like French, as illustrated in (59):

\[(59) \quad \text{NOMINATIVE CLITIC} \rightarrow \text{PREVERBAL NEGATION} \quad \text{French}\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Il ne te} & \quad \text{l’a pas dit} \\
\text{he neg you it has neg said} & \\
\text{‘He did not tell you (that)’}
\end{align*}
\]

Under these assumptions, we can posit the existence of a NegP of the type in (60) in Trevigiano:

\[(60) \quad \text{TREVISIAN NegP}\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NegP} & \\
(\text{mia}) & \text{Neg’} \\
\text{no}
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, the correct derivation of (58) is assured iff one assumes that verb movement passes from \(v^0\) to \(T^0\) in one step, and then moves higher to cliticise, without cyclically moving through \(\text{Neg}^0\). Straightforwardly, the behaviour of Trevisian negation follows from Kayne’s ban on right-adjunction, i.e. to satisfy its clitic nature, the negative head must adjoin as a proclitic higher than the previously-created complex verbal head. The very special status of the negative clitic, which I shall not discuss further, is confirmed by the fact that its presence somehow ‘blocks’ \(\text{SCL}^0\) in interrogatives, as in (61):
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(61) **NEGATION EXCLUDES SClI**

a. No te ghe o gà dato?
   neg cl\textsubscript{2PS} him it have given
   ‘Didn’t you give it to him?’

b. ?? No ghe o ga-tu dato?
   neg it have=cl\textsubscript{2PS} given

The procliticisation of the negative head must therefore be done along the lines of (62):

(62) **CLITICISATION OF THE CLITIC NEGATION**

```
SubjP
  pro
  Subj'
  Subj\textsuperscript{0}
    no
    te\textsubscript{NOM}

ClP\textsubscript{DAT}
  v
  ghe\textsubscript{DAT}
  v
  o\textsubscript{ACC}
  gà

Cl'

CIP\textsubscript{ACC}
```

The lack of SClI when construed with matrix negation is bound to be linked to its operator nature, which probably disrupts the residual V2 environment in C in order to have an element in an operator position (the subject clitic) on which to cliticise. Regardless of the reasons behind the special syntax of negative interrogatives, it seems clear that the negative clitic is independent of the complex verbal head and cliticises higher. In fact, if negation joined the verbal head during the computation and was incorporated into it, nothing would ban its movement to C. In this work, for the sake of simplicity, I shall not go into detail regarding the structurally complex interactions between Romance clitics and the verb, preferring less technical representations where the V adjoins to clitics in a way that is perhaps theoretically-undesirable. However, I believe that these simplified representations are sufficient for the purposes of this work; Roberts (2010) provides a detailed analysis of the technicalities of Romance cliticisation for those interested.

4.3.2 Roberts’ (2007) analysis of French

Roberts (2007a) argues that, in the context of SClI, French is a consistent null-subject language. In addition, similarly to Zribi-Hertz (1994) and Sportiche (1999), he claims that the subject clitic that is
apparently enclitic on the verb in C in these contexts is in fact a realisation of the phi-features of C. Roberts’ analysis successfully accounts for the limited distribution of French enclitic subject pronouns with respect to proclitics (Cardinaletti & Starke 1999, Sportiche 1999), as in (63-64), while accounting for the phenomenon of t-epenthesis, as illustrated in (65):

(63) **CO-ORDINATED SUBJECTS IN PRE-VERBAL vs POST-VERBAL POSITION**

(adapted from Roberts 2007:53(54), *apud* Sportiche 1999:202)

a. Il ou elle connait bien le problème
   he or she knows well the problem
   ‘He or she knows the problem well’

b. * Mange-t-il ou (t-)elle?
   eats=he or (t=)she?

(64) **OMISSION IN THE SECOND CONJUNCT OF A COORDINATED STRUCTURE**

(adapted from Roberts 2007a:43-44(55), *apud* Cardinaletti & Starke 1999:167)

a. Il aime les choux, mais – ne les mange que cuits?
   he likes the cabbages, but – not them eats but cooked

b. * Aime-t-il les choux, mais – ne les mange que cuits?
   likes=t=he the cabbages, but – not them eats but cooked?
   ‘Does he like cabbage, but only eats it cooked?’

(65) **EPENTHESIS OF /t/**

A-t-il vu Marie?
has=t=il seen Mary

French t-epenthesis is a phonological process that consists in the addition of of /t/ in the context of **SCII**. This occurs between a verb ending in a vowel and a pronoun beginning with a vowel, such as 3PS il a (‘he has’), which surfaces as a-t-il (‘has he?’) once inverted. In a theory that analyses interrogative subject pronouns as simple instances of inverted assertive pronominal forms, the phenomena in (63) to (65) would be unexplained. According to Roberts, in French examples such as (66), the subject clitic is clearly enclitic on the verb in C:

(66) **THE NOM CLITIC MOVES TO C WITH THE V**

As-tu vu Marie?
have=you seen Mary
‘Did you see Mary?’

This is shown by the impossibility of inserting material of any kind between the V+S cluster. In English, it is marginally possible to insert parenthetical material between an inverted auxiliary and the subject, as in (67a-67b), while in the same constructions French rejects interpolation, as in (67c) (note that the structure is better with lexical subjects):
(67) INTERPOLATION BETWEEN AN INVERTED AUX AND THE SUBJECT
(adapted from Roberts 2007a:42(51;52))

a. ? Has, by the way, John seen Mary?
b. ?* Have, by the way, you seen Mary?
c. ** As, à propos, tu vu Marie?
   have, by the way, you seen Mary

In previous work, later published as Roberts (2010), the author proposed a general account of cliticisation in which C, a phase head, is a target for cliticisation. Accordingly, assuming that subject pronouns might cliticise directly to C from the position where they are first-merged, i.e. the Spec of vP, is rather problematic. In Chomsky’s (2005) view that subject phi-features are features of C, which C ‘withholds’ from T in the residual V2 environment of questions, Roberts argues that there is no reason to think that T also has a V-attracting feature in this environment. Consequently, if T fails to attract V, then straight V-to-C movement can be posited and, by the Strict Cycle, the V moves before the subject moves from SpecvP. The condition known as Strict Cycle, formulated in Chomsky (1973), states the following:

**Strict Cycle Condition** (Chomsky 1973:51)

No operation can apply to a domain dominated by a cyclic node α in such a way as to affect solely a proper subdomain of α dominated by a node β which is also a cyclic node.

Although there is disagreement as to what counts as a cyclic node, it is often assumed that every XP is a cyclic node. Assuming that head movement is always left-adjunction à la Kayne (1994), proclisis of the subject to the verb in C is expected, contrary to fact. As a result, Roberts proposes an alternative analysis to the one that takes enclitics to be proper pronouns.

**A residual V2 environment**

Following Chomsky’s (2005) assumption that the phi-features of T are actually features of C, Roberts (2007a) builds on Zribi-Hertz’s (1994) and Sportiche’s (1999) investigation of French SClI and proposes that the CP of French interrogatives is a residual V2 environment in which C does not pass its features to T. Consequently, the phi-features are realised as enclitics, in C. For Roberts, French enclitics can be thought of as realisations of C_{F}, where F is whatever feature best characterises C in residual V2 configurations (in a way, a conjugaison interrogative à la Pollock 2006). Observe (68):

(68) INVERTED ‘JE’: LEXICAL VERBS vs AUXILIARIES

a. * Mangerai-je des fruits au souper?
   eat=je some fruit at dinner
   ‘Shall I eat fruit at dinner?’
b. Suis-je en train de tomber malade?
   am=I PROGR falling sick
   ‘Am I falling sick?’

c. Pourrais-je avoir mal compris?
   could=I have badly understood
   ‘Could I have misunderstood (this)?’

In interrogatives with SCII, French has no overt realisation of the 1PS enclitic with the majority of lexical verbs, as in (68a), while marginal highly-formal occurrences of this enclitic form are attested with auxiliaries, as in (68b), and with modals, as in (68c). In Roberts’ words, the contrast in (68) is unsurprising if French enclitics constitute an inflection class, but would be unexplained if this was a regular pronominal paradigm. The properties previously observed in (63), (64) and (67) follow straightforwardly from Roberts’ analysis: interpolation, coordination and ellipsis are operations that cannot affect affixes independently of stems, whence their ungrammaticality under the assumption that French enclitics are the morphological realisation of phi-features on C. In addition, there is marginal evidence that the presence of an interrogative ending of this class causes stem allomorphy on the modal verb pouvoir (‘can’), as in (69), a typical property of inflection (Zwicky & Pullum 1983):

(69) JE PEUX / PUIS-JE ALTERNATION (Roberts 2007a:45)
    a. Puis-je?
       Can-I?
    b. * Peux-je?

Roberts also provides an explanation for the ungrammaticality of structures like (70), which indirectly supports the analysis of the Trevisian data that I shall outline in §4.3.3:

(70) LEXICAL SUBJECT IN C (Roberts 2007a:43(53))
    * A Jean vu Marie?
       has John seen Mary?
       ‘Has John seen Mary?’

The grammatical version of (70) is (71), where the lexical subject precedes the V in C:

(71) LEXICAL SUBJECT IN C (ii) (Roberts 2007a:45(56))
    Jean a-t-il vu Marie?
    John has-3sg seen Mary

According to Roberts, the contrast between (70) and (71) is explained under the assumption that, in the absence of phi-features in T, there is no Agree relation between T and the subject, and therefore no attraction of the subject to SpecTP. Instead, the Agree relation clearly holds between the set of phi-features in C and the subject, which may (but does not have to) be attracted to SpecCP, giving rise to complex inversion.
4.3.3 An application of Roberts’ analysis to Trevigiano

Roberts’ (2007a) idea that French enclitics in contexts of subject-clitic and complex inversion are in fact a manifestation of the phi-features associated with a residual V2 CP-layer that triggers inversion can be rather successfully extended to a number of NIDs, notably the Venetan dialects, where a distinct clitic paradigm is found in inversion contexts (Renzi & Vanelli 1983, Poletto 2000, Roberts 2010).

Following Rizzi (1986), Brandi & Cordin (1989) and Poletto (2000), Roberts (2007a) concludes that the properties of the seemingly proclitic subjects of certain NIDs are better captured if they are analysed as the realisation of phi-features (contra many authors who argue that Northern Italian clitics are not inflectional but real pronouns, such as Manzini & Savoia 2005, Cardinaletti & Repetti 2008, Manzini 2012, a.o.). This analysis, which for Trevigiano I explained in terms of featural Spell Out following the creation of a relevant spec-head configuration in Cardinaletti’s (2004) SubjP (§4.2.2), has theoretical consequences for the analysis of enclitics, which are again explained in detail in Roberts (2007a). Following Roberts, the fact that the proclitic series realises phi-features entails that the interrogative C realises phi-features twice over, although in his words one could actually regard proclitics as a realisation of a D-feature à la Manzini & Savoia (2005), and the interrogative conjugation as realising Q and phi-features. However, I believe that there is a straightforward solution to this problem, and that the relevant features are in both cases a phi-set (plus [q] in the case of interrogatives).

Phi-features: either in T or in C

Observe (72). If the head [\textasciitilde v te \textasciitilde ga\textasciitilde eo \textquoteleft ACC has\textquoteright] moves to C as a consequence of the probing phi-features contained within it, then in the absence of a null lexical subject, pro can be posited to either be canonically located in SubjP, as in (72a), or to be attracted by the EPP into the Spec of the left-peripheral projection targeted by the V, as in (72b):

(72) POSSIBLE POSITIONS OF pro

a. \texttt{[CP te ga\textasciitilde eo [TP pro ciam\textasciitilde a?]]}
\hspace{1cm}you has\textasciitilde he pro called
\hspace{1cm}‘Did he call you?’

b. \texttt{[CP pro te ga\textasciitilde eo [TP ciam\textasciitilde a?]]}
\hspace{1cm}pro you has\textasciitilde he called

Similarly to Zribi-Hertz (1994) and Sportiche (1999), Roberts argues that in SClI contexts the presence of a null subject should also be posited for French, as illustrated in (73):

(73) FRENCH INTERROGATIVES: LEFT-PERIPHERAL pro (Roberts 2007a:47(58))

\begin{tabular}{l}
pro a\textasciitilde t\textasciitilde il vu Marie?
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
pro has\textasciitilde 3sg seen Mary
\end{tabular}
For Roberts, the null subject in (73) occupies the left-peripheral Spec of the verb that bears interrogative inflection, where it is attracted by the EPP feature associated with the residual V2 environment. EPP is, in Roberts’ words, another feature ‘withheld’ from T in the case of residual V2. Remember the French examples in (70) and (71), repeated here as (74):

(74) LACK OF phi-features IN T COMPELS SUBJECT-MOVEMENT TO C

a. * A Jean vu Marie?  
   has John seen Mary?  
   ‘Has John seen Mary?’

b. Jean a-t-il vu Marie?  
   John has-3sg seen Mary

Roberts attributes the difference in felicity between the examples in (74) to the absence of phi-features in T, whence the need for the subject to move to SpecCP. There are robust empirical reasons to believe that the subject of interrogatives is not attracted into TP in Trevigiano either. Observe the declarative clause in (75), where the lexical subject is attracted into SpecSubjP and activates the phi-features in $\text{Subj}_0$, which consequently surfaces as the declarative NOM clitic:

(75) NOMINATIVE CLITIC ACTIVATION

Giani el te $\text{gà ciamà}$  
John he you has called  
‘John called you’

If, prior to V-to-C movement, the subject of interrogatives passed through SpecSubjP, one would expect the declarative clitic to be activated in interrogatives as well, as shown in (76a), which is not the case. Note that the lexical subject also cannot arise along with the declarative clitic (which would require phrasal movement), as in (76b), nor can it move to C on its own, leaving the declarative clitic stranded, as in (76c):

(76) a. * [v, Te [ga]],-eo [$\text{Subj}_P$ Giani el $\text{ciamà}$ ]?  
    you has=cl John cl called  
    ‘Did John call you?’

b. * [Giani el], [v, te [ga]],-eo [$\text{Subj}_P$ $\text{ciamà}$ ]?  
    John cl you has=cl called

c. * Giani, [v, te [ga]],-eo [$\text{Subj}_P$ $\text{el ciamà}$ ]?  
    John you has=cl cl called

The absence of a declarative clitic very strongly suggests that, in interrogatives, the subject is not probed into SpecSubjP at any point in the derivation. As a consequence, there is no need to posit that phi-features are realised twice over in interrogatives (Roberts 2007a), or that the features that probe the subject into SpecTP are different from those that probe it into SpecCP (D-features à la Manzini & Savoia 2005): the relevant features are realised either in $\text{Subj}_0$ or in $\text{C}_0$ and non-cyclic movement of the subject into SpecCP is at play in interrogatives.
Lexical subjects and \textit{SCII}\footnote{Belletti \citeyear{2004}}

Although I have so far treated Trevigiano and French in similar ways, there are reasons to believe that the lexical subject that precedes \textit{SCII} does not necessarily occupy the same structural position in the two languages. In fact, while French allows the interpolation of a lexical subject between a fronted wh-element and \textit{SCII}, as in (77a), Trevigiano does not, as in (77b):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(77)] FELICITY OF WH-WORD > LEXICAL S > \textit{SCII}
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Quand Jean a-t-il vu Marie?
when John has-t-he seen Mary
‘When did John see Mary?’
\item b. * Cuando Giani gaeo visto a Maria?
when John has=cl seen the Maria
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

Quite clearly, the contrast in (77) suggests that, while a fronted wh-phrase and a lexical subject moved to C do not compete for the same structural position in French, they do in Trevigiano. This variation can be attributed to the fact that only Trevigiano is \textit{consistently} a null-subject language, in both declaratives and interrogatives. Consequently, while French lexical subjects \textit{must} move into SpecCP, Trevisian ones can stay lower. Regardless of the way(s) in which the EPP is satisfied in the absence of subject movement into SpecCP, it is nonetheless clear that Trevigiano has a TP-internal post-verbal position for lexical subjects that is unavailable in French, as in (78):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(78)] FELICITY OF A POST-VERBAL SUBJECT
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Ga-eo visto a Maria Giani?
has=cl$_{3PS,M}$ seen the Mary John
‘Did John see Mary?’
\item b. * A-t-il vu Marie Jean?
has-t-cl seen Mary John
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

The position occupied by the post-verbal subject in (78a) cannot be Foc$_{LOW}$, because the post-verbal subject does not compete for this position with a clause-internal wh-word, which it follows, as in (79):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(79)] WH-PHRASES AND POST-VERBAL SUBJECTS DO NOT COMPETE FOR SPECFOC
\begin{enumerate}
\item Te ga-eo ciamà cuando Giani?
you has=cl called when John
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

It is tempting to propose either that the lexical subject does not leave SpecVP, or that it targets Belletti’s \citeyear{2004} VP peripheral lowest Top, which is argued to host dislocated elements, as in (80):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(80)] Te ga-eo ciamà [Foc \textit{cuando} Foc$_{0}$ [\textit{Top} Giani Top$_{0}$ [\textit{VP} ...]]]
\end{enumerate}

Note that, despite the marginal availability of SpecFocus$_{HIGH}$ for fronted lexical subjects in the absence of a fronted wh-phrase, as in the example in (81a), the felicity improves if the lexical subject is dislocated, as shown in (81b):
4.3 Phi-features on C (an adaptation of Roberts 2007)

(81) **FELICITY OF A FRONTED LEXICAL SUBJECT**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>? Giani te ga-eo ciamà?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John you has=cl called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Did John call you?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Giani, te ga-eo ciamà?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John # you has=cl called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘John, did he call you?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My claim is further supported by the observation that, if a fronted subject is clearly uttered as an independent intonational phrase, wh-fronting is perfectly grammatical, as in (82):

(82) **FELICITY OF A FRONTED LEXICAL SUBJECT** (ii)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giani, quando te ga-eo ciamà?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John, # when you has=cl called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘When did John call you?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, note that for my clitic activation analysis to function correctly, the presence of *phonetically-realised* or *silent* material in SpecFocus$_{HIGH}$ must be posited. This is unproblematic for wh-questions: in the case of QP-fronting, there is overt material in Spec, while in the case of wh-in situ I have argued in favour of *overt* movement into SpecFocus$_{HIGH}$ of the silent Q-particle of QP-adjoining wh-phrases. Fetchingly, also the solution to the case of polar questions such as (83) is actually straightforward, and is fully-consistent with my clitic activation analysis:

(83) **SCLI IN POLAR QUESTIONS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghe o ga-tu dato?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Him it have=cl$_{2PS}$ given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Did you give it to him?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed, robust cross-linguistic evidence is attested showing that polar particles are phonetically realised in some languages (Mandarin Chinese, Finnish, etc.), and that these move to C from their first-merge position within the IP-field (Larson 1985, Huang 1991, Huang & Li & Li 2009, Jayaseelan 2012, Holmberg 2015, a.o.). Given the need for interrogative movement to target the matrix LP for SCLI to occur, as discussed above, I argue that there must be a silent polar particle in Trevigiano which functions as an interrogative operator and lands in the Spec of Focus$_{HIGH}$, hence giving rise to a spec-head configuration that correctly activates the phi-features in Focus$_{0}^{HIGH}$. These assumptions entail that SpecFocus$_{HIGH}$, which in interrogatives is endowed with a [q]-feature should be considered as a site for operators, whether they are QPs or polar/Q-particles.

A note on subject questions

I would like to add one further observation regarding subject questions, which are known to be incompatible with regular wh-syntax in NIDs (Benincà 1994, Munaro 1999, Shlonsky 2014, a.o.), as in the Trevisian example in (84):
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(84) **UNGRAMMATICALITY OF SClI IN SUBJECT QUESTIONS**

* Chi ciam-eo i pompieri?  
who calls=he the firemen  
‘Who’s calling the firemen?’

Under the assumptions made in this Chapter, if Cardinaletti’s (2004) SubjP is an obligatory head in the clausal spine and there is a Subject Criterion à la Rizzi (2006), the derivation of (84) would necessarily involve a step in which chi (‘who’) is probed into SpecSubjP by whatever featural set is involved in the satisfaction of the Subject Criterion. While in normal questions the residual V2 CP-layer does not pass its phi-features to T, in this specific case the transmission is forced by the presence of a wh-subject. Under Criterial Freezing (Rizzi 2006), once chi reaches SpecSubjP, it is frozen in place, hence it cannot be extracted from the clause. This analysis predicts that, while I-to-C movement is blocked, the question should be nonetheless grammatical if the language has a mechanism other than SClI for checking C. Under my analysis of clause-internal wh-phrases as Q-adjoining constituents, Q is expected to be able to move overtly and to correctly check Q in the absence of a CP of the residual V2 type. This is confirmed by Trevisian questions such as (85):

(85) **SUBJECT QUESTIONS EXCLUDE SClI**

Chi ciam i pompieri?  
who calls the firemen  
‘Who’s calling the firemen?’

In (85), V-to-C movement does not occur because the presence of the wh-subject, i.e an operator in an operator position, disrupts the residual V2 environment in C. However, C is correctly checked by the silent Q-particle, along the lines of (86):

(86) \[ CP Q [SubjP [WhP ___Q [WhP chi ]] ciama i pompieri ]]? \]

The non-realisation of phi-features in Subj\(^0\), despite the presence of chi in SpecSubjP, follows from the observation that there is no overt declarative EXPL pronoun in Trevisiano. Grimshaw (1997) assumes that a syntactic operator must occupy the Spec of a functional projection: therefore, subjects are obligatorily moved to SpecSubjP, the position in which they get NOM and are frozen in place. Once they reach SpecSubjP, no additional structure is needed.

A straightforward solution to the Freezing problem is provided by interrogative it-clefts, which are a widely-attested question formation strategy in NIDs. It is possible that in interrogative it-clefts subject extraction does not pass through SpecSubjP because the wh-subject is exceptionally probed by the copula. As a consequence, the derivation does not fail (87):
4.3 \textit{Phi}-features on C (an adaptation of Roberts 2007)

(87) SUBJECT IT-CLEFT

\begin{quote}
\textit{Trevigiano}

Chi ze-o che vien?
who is=it that comes
‘Who’s coming?’
\end{quote}

Further evidence in favour of my analysis is provided by the marginal acceptability of subject questions with \textit{SCII} in the case of verbs such as \textit{vigner} (‘to come’), as in (88):

(88) SUBJECT QUESTION WITH UNERGATIVE VERB

\begin{quote}
\textit{Paduan}

? [Chi] vegn=eo [chi]?
who comes=he who
‘Who’s coming?’
\end{quote}

The subject of verbs such as \textit{vigner} is traditionally assumed to have started out as an internal argument (Burzio 1986). Consequently, the marginal felicity of (88) can be explained in terms of Strict Cycle. If the verb moves first, it is not blocked and the residual V2 environment is not disrupted: in the absence of \textit{phi}-features in \textit{Subj}0, it normally undergoes V-to-C movement. Subsequently, the wh-word is (optionally) attracted to SpecFocus$^{\text{HIGH}}$ or stays clause-externally, as in (88). On the basis of the discussion of \textit{nominal Fin} in Rizzi & Shlonsky (2007), Shlonsky (2014) suggested that in languages which have questions with an overtly-filled \textit{COMP}, the \textit{COMP} realises nominal Fin. Nominal Fin is a special Fin head endowed with nominal features, and hence able to satisfy the Subject Criterion. The presence of this head constitutes a ‘skipping strategy’ for nominal subjects, which are exceptionally able to bypass the criterial Spec of \textit{Subj}: indeed, subjects in these languages can move directly from VP to C, and hence avoid Criterial Freezing. Paduan, a Venetan dialect, has an overt that-\textit{COMP} that realises the nominal Fin in indirect subject questions, as shown in (89):

(89) DOUBLY-FILLED COMP IN INDIRECT SUBJECT QUESTIONS (Shlonsky 2014:68(14))

\begin{quote}
\textit{Paduan}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. No so chi che zè rivà
\textit{neg I.know who Fin has come}
‘I don’t know who came’
\item b. No so chi che gà magnà (la torta)
\textit{neg I.know who Fin has eaten (the cake)}
‘I don’t know who ate (the cake)’
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}

In contrast, in direct questions targeting the subject, doubly-filled COMP questions are impossible, while cleft structures are fine, as shown in (90):

(90) MATRIX SUBJECT QUESTIONS (Shlonsky 2014:69(15))

\begin{quote}
\textit{Paduan}

\begin{itemize}
\item a. * Chi che gà magnà la torta?
\textit{who Fin has eaten the cake}
‘Who ate the cake?’
\end{itemize}
\end{quote}
b. Chi zé che gà magnà (la torta)  
who is Fin has eaten (the cake)  
‘Who ate the cake?’ Literally: ‘Who is it that ate the cake?’

Shlonsky argues that the Paduan situation can be summarised as follows: nominal Fin, which is realised overtly by the that-COMP che, must be activated to enable subject extraction (as in the examples in 89); however, an overt Fin is only possible in embedded contexts, as shown in (90). Clefts, which involve subordination under a copula, are therefore a formal solution to the joint requirements that che must be active to allow subject extraction and that che is only possible in embedded questions. A similar strategy is provided by long-distance questions, such as (91), in which long extraction of the subject is made possible by the presence of the overt that-COMP:

(91) LONG EXTRACTION OF THE SUBJECT (adapted from Shlonsky 2014:69(17))  
Paduan

Chi gheto dito che gà magnà la torta?  
who have=you said Fin has eaten the cake  
‘Who did you say that ate the cake?’

Interestingly, Shlonsky observes that short extraction of the subject is marginally possible without a clef and without an overt that-COMP with unaccusative verbs, as in (92):

(92) SHORT EXTRACTION OF THE SUBJECT WITH UNACCUSATIVE VERBS  
Paduan

(Shlonsky 2014:70(18))

Chi zé rivà?  
who is arrived  
‘Who arrived?’

Since Burzio (1986), unaccusative verbs have been known for a very peculiar property: they are the only ones that allow free inversion, i.e. VS orders, as shown in (93):

(93) FREE INVERSION OF THE SUBJECT WITH UNACCUSATIVE VERBS  
Paduan

(Shlonsky 2014:70(19))

Riva un omo  
arrives a man  
‘A man is arriving’

For Shlonsky, an expletive pro fills SpecSubjP in (93), and hence allows the subject to skip this criterial position on its way to the CP; differently, no pro is available with unergative and transitive verbs, which require nominative Fin to be merged.

Trevigiano clearly behaves like Paduan. Therefore, an analysis of its that-COMP as a nominative Fin seems desirable. In this dissertation however, I have treated the that-COMP of matrix doubly-filled COMP questions as the head of Focus_{HIGH}, and the that-COMP of embedded questions as the head of
QembP. This analysis was based both on the distributional properties of wh-phrases in matrix and embedded contexts. However, I do not believe that these approaches are incompatible: indeed, it is possible to think that certain features of Fin raise to higher left-peripheral projections if necessary. I leave the question open for further investigations.

Intermediate remarks

In this Chapter, I have argued that Trevisian clitics (and, by extension, those in similar varieties) are of two types: pronominal, in the case of non-NOM clitics, and inflectional, in the case of nominatives. I have also argued that while non-NOM pronouns behave like regular clitics that are first-merged within vP and then moved to their cliticisation site in the clitic field in the high IP, NOM clitics do not move. In fact, they are the sub-product of a spec-head configuration that has been correctly created within a phi-containing phrase (either SubjP or Focus$_{HIGH}$), which leads to the Spell Out of the phi-set. This approach, I claimed, correctly captures the proclitic/enclitic nature of the two types of clitics: while pronouns canonically left-adjoin to the verb à la Kayne (1994), inflectional clitics are in fact suffixes, i.e. they appear in enclisis. This analysis, partially inspired by Roberts’ (2007a) work on French enclitics, is also compatible with the morphological variations displayed by NOM clitics in interrogatives, while accounting for the lack of certain forms in a very traditional way: indeed, while gaps are not expected in pronominal paradigms, inflectional gaps are unsurprising. As a consequence of the proposed clitic activation analysis, I have claimed that Trevisian SClI is an instance of I-to-C movement triggered by phi-features in Focus$^0$, which C fails to pass to T because the interrogative LP of Trevigiano is a residual V2 environment (Chomsky 2005). Concretely, I have argued that the verb does indeed adjoin to non-NOM clitics, forming a complex V-head, and then either stays in IP or, in the absence of phi-features in the interrogative T, moves further to C. We can tentatively attribute the forms and featural specifications in (94) to the declarative NOM clitics found in Trevigiano:

(94) DECLARATIVE NOMINATIVE CLITICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Specifications</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+1; -2; -PL; +REF]</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-1; +2; -PL; +REF]</td>
<td>/te/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-1; -2; -PL; -F; +REF]</td>
<td>/(e)l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-1; -2; -PL; +F; +REF]</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-1; -2; -PL; -REF]</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+1; -2; +PL; +REF]</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-1; +2; +PL; +REF]</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-1; -2; +PL; -F; +REF]</td>
<td>/i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-1; -2; +PL; +F; +REF]</td>
<td>/e/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In (94), I used a feature system that classifies the grammatical persons in binary terms, along with a specification for ± plural, ± feminine and ± referential (to distinguish between expletive and non-expletive pronouns). In the interrogative paradigm in (95), also the \([q]\)-feature is taken into consideration. Note that /e/ is elided with verbal forms that end in the same sound:

(95) INTERROGATIVE NOMINATIVE CLITICS

\[
\begin{align*}
[+1; -2; -PL; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
[-1; +2; -PL; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow /\text{tu}/ \\
[-1; -2; -PL; -F; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow /\text{e}o/ \\
[-1; -2; -PL; +F; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow /\text{e}a/ \\
[-1; -2; -PL; -REF; +Q] & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
[+1; -2; +PL; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
[-1; +2; +PL; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow /(\text{e})o/ \\
[-1; -2; +PL; -F; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow /(\text{e})i/ \\
[-1; -2; +PL; +F; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow /\text{e}(\text{i})/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

In addition, the interrogative forms in (96) can also be available for some speakers construed with auxiliaries and modals:

(96) INTERROGATIVE NOMINATIVE CLITICS (ii)

\[
\begin{align*}
[+1; -2; -PL; +REF; +Q] & \rightarrow /\text{jo}/ \\
[-1; -2; -PL; -REF; +Q] & \rightarrow /\text{e}(\text{i})/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

Under the assumption that the \(\phi\)-features in either T or C to include person, number and referential specification, while interrogative NOM clitics are also endowed with a \([q]\)-feature, the observed morphological alternations between the two series follow. As suggested by Ur Shlonsky (pc.), the marginal availability of the 1PS and EXPL interrogative clitics with auxiliaries and modals suggests that these lighter verbs could be attracted to left-peripheral projection different from that to which lexical verbs raise; plausibly, this left-peripheral head is endowed with a richer \(\phi\)-set. This prediction is indeed supported by cross-linguistic data discussed in De Crousaz & Shlonsky (2003): in Franco-Provençal, verbs in the suffix-bearing tenses raise higher than verbs in the simple present in interrogatives. For this reason, the 3PS subject clitic \(i\) is obligatory in why-questions when construed with the present tense, while it is ungrammatical in the company of conditional inflection and optional with the future tense form, as shown in (97):
DeCrousaz & Shlonsky explain the pattern in (97) on the basis of the existence of a feature in the pattern of interrogative SClI in Standard French, which is disallowed systematically with a first person pronoun, as shown in (98):

(98) DISTRIBUTIONAL PROPERTIES OF THE 1PS PRONOUN IN INTERROGATIVES

(De Crousaz & Shlonsky 2003:426-27(21))

a. * Viens-je?
   come-I
   ‘Am I coming?’

b. Viens-tu?
   come-you
   ‘Are you coming?’

c. (?) Venais-je?
   comeIMPERF-I
   ‘Was I coming?’

d. Viendrai-je?
   comeFUT-I
   ‘Will I come?’

d. Viendrais-je?
   comeCOND-I
   ‘Would I come?’

c. (?) Venais-je?
   comeIMPERF-I
   ‘Was I coming?’

The restriction in (98) is not observed in the future, conditional, and imperfect forms. Inversion with a 1PS pronoun is indeed perfectly licit with these verb forms, as shown in (99):

(99) DISTRIBUTIONAL PROPERTIES OF THE 1PS PRONOUN IN INTERROGATIVES (ii)

(adapted from De Crousaz & Shlonsky 2003:427(22))

a. Viendrai-je?
   comeFUT-I
   ‘Will I come?’

b. Viendrais-je?
   comeCOND-I
   ‘Would I come?’

c. (?) Venais-je?
   comeIMPERF-I
   ‘Was I coming?’

For DeCrousaz & Shlonsky, the contrast between (98) and (99) follows from two properties: first, the fact that the different persons of the verb are associated with hierarchically ordered positions and
that, in French, the position occupied by the 1PS pronoun is higher than that of other persons; second, the fact that in French verbs in the present tense cannot move as high as the first person position. This high movement is indeed restricted to the suffix-bearing forms, such as those in (99). The asymmetrical movement properties between suffix-bearing and non suffix bearing verbal forms is well-justified form the perspective of French historical morphology: only the future and the conditional are compounds that evolved from the fusion of a lexical infinitive and the present indicative/imperfect form of habere (‘to have’) in late Latin (Roberts 1992).

Before moving on to the next section, I would like to formulate some thoughts on cliticisation. These are only preliminary but, I hope, can constitute an interesting starting point for future research. Throughout, I have taken for granted that there is a clitic field in the high IP, in the spirit of Sportiche (1999), and that the finite verb moves there once all clitics have cliticised into their relevant clitic projections. However, I do not think this is tenable under Chomsky’s (1973) Strict Cycle nor under Kayne’s (1994) assumption that cliticisation is always left adjunction. Therefore, I would like to sketch an alternative proposal. Observe the structure in (100), in which the strict ban for right adjunction predicts that α is the clitic element, while β is the host (whence the β-label on the higher node):

(100) LEFT-ADJUNCTION

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{clitic} \\
\alpha \quad \beta
\end{array}
\]

Under Strict Cycle and the assumption that non-NOM clitics are somehow externally-merged within vP, we can posit that what moves first is the finite V, followed by the ACC clitic, and then the DAT, along the lines of (101):

(101) STRICT CYCLE

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{moves first} = V \\
\text{moves second} = \text{cl}_{\text{ACC}} \\
\text{moves third} = \text{cl}_{\text{DAT}} \\
\ldots
\end{array}
\]

It follows that the passages that are relevant for cliticisation in (101) must be at least three: (i) the verb (β) moves to T; (ii) the ACC clitic (α) left-joins to the verb, hence forming β₂; (iii) the DAT clitic (γ) left-joins to β₂, hence forming β₃. The resulting structure should look along the lines of (102):
(102) **COMPLEX VERBAL HEAD** (examples in (17))

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (G) {\text{ghe}};
  \node (A) {\alpha} child {node (B) {\beta}};
  \node (C) {\beta_2}
  \edge from (B) to (C); \edge from (A) to (C);
  \node (D) {\beta_3} child {node (E) {\gamma}};
  \node (F) {\theta}
  \edge from (E) to (F);
  \node (G) {\text{gà}};
\end{tikzpicture}
\]

If the finite V moves first, what left-joins must be the pronouns, not the V. The fact that what moves to ensure cliticisation are the pronouns is not surprising: indeed, while the V can survive alone in the structure, clitics are not able to do so. Observe (103), in which under I take the NOM clitic to be an element of SubjP throughout the derivation, i.e. an inflectional clitic, not a pronominal element moved to SubjP from its external-merge site in vP.

(103) **V NEED NOT CLITICS TO SURVIVE**

\begin{verbatim}
Giani el magna
John cl3PS.M eats
‘John’s eating’
\end{verbatim}

Although the declarative series of NOM clitics is commonly analysed as a proclitic one, there are reasons to believe that it is not. First of all, given my claim that the NOM is generated higher in the structure than the V, there is no need for the V to cliticise into it to satisfy its clitic nature. Moreover, if the complex verbal head moved as high as SubjP, one would expect it to left-adjoin to the NOM clitic (\(\theta\)), incorrectly predicting proclisis, along the lines of (104):

(104) **IMPOSSIBLE ORDER PREDICTED IF NOMs WERE SYNTACTIC CLITICS**

\[
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (G) {\text{te}};
  \node (A) {\alpha} child {node (B) {\beta}};
  \node (C) {\beta_2}
  \edge from (B) to (C); \edge from (A) to (C);
  \node (D) {\beta_3} child {node (E) {\gamma}};
  \node (F) {\theta}
  \edge from (E) to (F);
  \node (G) {\text{gà}};
\end{tikzpicture}
\]

In addition, in the presence of a COMP, this is pronounced as a unit with the the clitic, as in (105):

(105) **NOMs ARE INDEPENDENT FROM THE V (ii)**

\begin{verbatim}
A me gà dito ch=(e)l magna in continuo
cl3PS.F me has said that=he eats all the.time
‘She told me he’s always eating’
\end{verbatim}
It therefore follows that NOM clitics cannot be adjoined to the V; indeed, their nature does not require syntactic cliticisation. Declarative NOM clitics do have a clitic nature, but only a phonological one: indeed, they are pronounced as a unit with what precedes, not with what follows. The case of non-NOM clitics is totally different, as their survival depends on the finite V to which they left-adjoin.

To summarise, I have claimed that the V moves to T alone and that, differently from non-nominatives, declarative NOM clitics are independent from the V. Consequently, when the V moves to C, it only moves along with non-NOM clitics (if any). Therefore, I claim that the cliticisation process involved both in the formation of the complex verbal head and in V-to-C movement is proclisis throughout, as illustrated in (20) and (21), respectively:

(106) DECLARATIVE PROCLISIS

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{proclisis } 1 = o \ gà \\
\text{proclisis } 2 = \text{ghe}
\end{array}
\]

(107) INTERROGATIVE PROCLISIS

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{proclisis } = \text{tu} [+\text{phi;} +\text{Q}] \\
\text{ghe}
\end{array}
\]

That non-NOM clitics where different from NOM clitics has already been observed in Roberts (2010), though he takes NOM clitics to be moved from a vP-internal position. Though I do not think that Roberts’ conclusion is false, since it accounts brilliantly for the data of languages like French, it would be interesting to verify whether the data from other (Northern Italian) pro-drop languages with NOM clitics are accounted for by my clitic activation analysis. The difference between Roberts’ clitics and those of Trevigiano, I claim, is that only the former are pronominal in nature.
Chapter 5

More on Trevisian wh-in situ

In this Chapter, I shall explore some properties of Trevisian wh-in situ that go beyond the central topic of this dissertation, but are worth discussing nonetheless: (i) the puzzling felicity of clause-internal why-words, (ii) the case of wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions, and (iii) the morphosyntax of wh-in situ inside (and outside) of islands to extraction. Indeed, although here I shall only discuss the data and provide some provisional answers, I believe that the phenomena described in this Chapter provide further evidence in support of the theory of Trevisian wh-in situ that I have developed in the previous Chapters. Note that the three sections of this Chapter are self-contained and can be read in any order.

Organisation of this Chapter

The Chapter opens with a discussion, in §5.1, of the puzzling behaviour of one of the why-words of Trevigiano, parcossa, which is unexpectedly able to appear clause-internally. Making use of cross-linguistic data from NIDs, and particularly of the historical data discussed in Munaro (2005) (§5.1.1), I overview the distributional properties of Trevisian why-words (§5.1.2-3), and claim that while parché is a regular why-word externally-merged directly in the LP of the clause (as discussed in Rizzi 2001), parcossa starts out TP-internally and (only optionally) moves to the LP, like ordinary wh-words. In §5.2, I study the morphosyntax of wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions, which is licensed in Trevigiano under what looks like a semantically-void if-COMP, seWH. Making systematic comparisons with the morphosyntax of overt wh-doubling, which is another strategy for the felicitous licensing of wh-in situ (§5.2.1), I claim that seWH is actually an interrogative head that licenses an interrogative operator in the Spec of Rizzi & Boci’s (2017) QembP. The role of seWH is to ensure the correct setting of QembP as [+wh] in the absence of
interrogative agreement with the clause-internal wh-word (§5.2.3). Finally, in §5.3, I claim that only strong islands are indeed islands to extraction in Trevigiano (§5.3.1), and adopt Cable’s claim that wh-in situ within a strong island is only felicitous if the whole island is selected by Q(P), while island-trapped wh-phrases are bare (§5.3.2). Then, I show that weak islands are actually neither island to extraction nor for Q-agreement and can, but need not, adjoin to the silent Q-particle as a whole (§5.3.3).

5.1 The strange case of clause-internal why

Trevigiano has two why-words: parché and parcossa. Cross-linguistically, ‘why’ has been argued to be externally-merged directly in the Left Periphery (Rizzi 1990;2001, Hornstein 1995, Ko 2005, Stepanov & Tsai 2008, Thornton 2008, Shlonsky & Soare 2011, a.o), so it is not expected to appear clause-internally. Here, I shall argue that Trevisian parché displays the distributional properties of a well-behaved ‘why’-word, while parcossa can also surface clause-internally. This peculiar property of parcossa, I argue, is due to the fact that it is first-merged TP-internally, not in the LP of the clause. I shall also show how the availability of a TP-internal why-word in Trevigiano can be explained by Munaro’s (2005) analysis of Central Venetan parcossa as a counterpart of the what-word cossa in its adverbial, pragmatically-specialised use, conveying a surprise/disapproval meaning à Munaro & Obenauer (2002). References to the morphosyntax of why are rare in the literature on NIDs. I provide an overview of some existing works in §5.1.1, before presenting the Trevisian data (§5.1.2), with special focus on the peculiarities of Trevisian parcossa with respect to the general semantics and syntax of Central Venetan parcossa, as described in Munaro (2005).

5.1.1 Distribution of why-words in Northern Italian varieties

Munaro (1999) discusses the case of Bellunese varieties, which display the two forms parché and come mai, both of which are only felicitous when fronted. There also exists an analytic form par far che (literally, ‘to do what’), which systematically surfaces clause-internally. This property, Munaro says, is probably linked to the presence of the wh-word che, which is incompatible with wh-fronting.

Poletto & Vanelli (1993) investigate the distribution of Northern Italian parché with respect to the embedding COMP of indirect wh-interrogatives. They observe anomalous behaviour in some varieties spoken in the Veneto, Romagna and Piedmont regions, where the presence of a fronted parché is incompatible with the embedded COMP, the presence of which is otherwise obligatory with all other wh-words. Observe examples (1) to (3):

---

1This section is based on Bonan & Shlonsky (2017), a preliminary investigation done in collaboration with Prof. Ur Shlonsky and presented at the 50th meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (SLE) (Zürich, 10-13 September 2017). A handout of the presentation has been made permanently accessible here: https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:97426.
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(1) Venetan of Cereda di Cornedo (Vicenza) (adapted from Poletto & Vanelli 1993:109(13a))

Disime parche voli parti
tell-me why want\textsubscript{3PP} leave
‘Tell me why you want to leave’

(2) Piedmontese (adapted from Poletto & Vanelli 1993:109(13b))

Dime perche a mangiu én pom
tell-me why eat\textsubscript{3PP} an apple
‘Tell me why they’re eating an apple’

(3) Romagnolo of Cesena (adapted from Poletto & Vanelli 1993:110(13c))

Dim parche t megn la mela
tell-me why you eat the apple
‘Tell me why you’re eating an apple’

Poletto & Vanelli argue that (1) to (3) are not instances of a highly-exceptional treatment of parché, but rather evidence that this wh-word is actually made up of two elements: par, which occupies the position of an interrogative element, and che, a COMP. Further evidence in favour of this analysis, they say, is provided by the data from Central Venetan and Friulian varieties, where why-words other than parché are used (parcossa and parcè, respectively). In these varieties, where the doubly-filled COMP is the norm, why-words do require the presence of an overt that-COMP, as in (4) and (5):

(4) Central Venetan (adapted from Poletto & Vanelli 1993:110(14a))

Dime parcossa che ti ze ‘nda via
tell-mewhy that you are gone away
‘Tell me why you left’

(5) Friulian (adapted from Poletto & Vanelli 1993:110(14b))

No sai parce che tu ses lat vie
NEG know\textsubscript{1PS} whythat you are gone away
‘I don’t know why you left’

Some varieties where parché is construed with an overt that-COMP also exist, as in (6) and (7). In these varieties, according to the authors, parché is exceptionally re-analysed as a chunk:

(6) Venetan of Portogruaro (adapted from Poletto & Vanelli 1993:110(15a))

Dime parche che te cori cussi
tell-me why that you run this.way
‘Tell me why you’re running this way’

(7) Venetan of Cencenighe (adapted from Poletto & Vanelli 1993:110(15b))

Dime parche ch el magna
tell-me why that he eats
‘Tell me why he’s eating’
Poletto (1993) defines parché as ‘a puzzling case of missing inversion’ (p. 125). Observe the infelicity of SCII in (8):

(8) NO SCII WITH PARCHE (adapted from Poletto 1993:125(56))

a. Parché Carlo sta casa?
   why Carlo cl3PS stays home
   ‘Why is Carlo staying at home?’

b. * Parché stalo casa?
   why stays=he at.home
   ‘Why is he staying at home?’

According to Poletto, the ungrammaticality of inversion in (8) can be interpreted either as deriving from a condition on inversion itself, or as a true violation of the requirement to move the inflected verb to the C-domain. A test for V-to-C movement is the (im)possibility of realising a subject NP directly after the fronted wh-phrase. If the inflected V moves to C, it is predicted that NOM Case cannot be assigned to SpecAgr, hence a subject NP in that position is ungrammatical. If the inflected V remains in its position, then NOM Case is available in SpecAgr, and a subject NP is grammatical. As a consequence, (8b) is argued to be a true violation of the wh-criterion, because the inflected V is not in a spec-head configuration with the wh-phrase parché. Paduan parché also behaves exceptionally in embedded interrogatives, where it is incompatible with the insertion of the that-COMP, which is otherwise obligatory with all other wh-words. Paduan also has parcossa, which behaves as expected with respect to the wh-criterion. In fact, a matrix parcossa triggers inversion and is construed with a COMP in embedded questions, as illustrated in (9):

(9) SCII AND OVERT EMBEDDED COMP WITH PARCOSSA (adapted from Poletto 1993:126(59-60))

a. Parcossa zelo sta casa?
   why is=cl3PS stayed home
   ‘Why did he stay at home?’

b. * Parcossa el ze sta casa??
   why cl3PS is stayed at.home

c. No so parcossa che el ze sta casa
   NEG know1PS why that cl3PS is stayed at.home
   ‘I don’t know why he stayed at home’

From (9) it follows that the exceptional behaviour of parché depends on some idiosyncratic property of the wh-word in itself: quite clearly, a wh-word with exactly the same meaning triggers inversion in root questions. Poletto (1993) proposes an approach that is slightly different from that in Poletto & Vanelli (1993), namely that the idiosyncratic properties of parché are dependent on the wh-word itself, which is composed of a preposition, par (‘for’), and a that-COMP, che. The speakers analyse this wh-word as the coalescence of a P and a COMP, hence both the Spec and the C-head are occupied, and there is no need for SCII.
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Interesting historical data from Munaro (2005)

Munaro (2005) analyses the development of the distributional properties of the two what-words, ché and cossa, in some Northern Venetan dialects. The survey covers the period from the 16th to the 20th century. The data show that cossa initially had an exclusively nominal use, then gradually took up the function of an interrogative operator. According to Munaro, this is a consequence of the process of semantic bleaching that began in the 18th century. The development of cossa appears closely connected to the change in the distributional properties of the wh-word ché in root questions: initially, it occupied the sentence-initial position, while in all modern varieties it only appears clause-internally. By 1880, cossa had completely lost its nominal function, and substituted and took over the role of ché in interrogatives. In the second half of the 18th century, a doubling construction with sentence-initial cossa and clause-internal ché appears. In 1930, ché had disappeared almost completely from the sentence-initial position, and started to appear clause-internally even in single wh-questions. Today, clause-internal ché prevails over sentence-initial cossa.

This diachronic pattern, Munaro argues, has interesting implications for the distribution of the why-words parché and parcossa. During the 18th century, while previously-nominal cossa takes over the wh-word function, the preposition par (‘for’) and cossa merge into the wh-word parcossa, which begins to be attested as an alternative to parché. In the 19th century, both forms are attested, but only parcossa is construed with negation, i.e. in contexts that express the speaker’s attitude concerning the event referred to, as in (10):

(10) CO-OCCURRENCE OF PARCOSSA AND THE NEGATION (adapted from Munaro 2005:41(27))

E parcossa no t’a-tu tol t la ombrela?
and why NEG you’have=cl2PS taken the umbrella
‘And why didn’t you take the umbrella?’

During the 20th century, parché becomes the most frequently used why-word, while parcossa only appears associated with pragmatically-marked interpretations. Today, unlike other adverbial wh-words, parché and parcossa always surface sentence-initially. While the former can be used in neutral questions and is incompatible with subject-clitic inversion, parcossa must be construed within a cleft interrogative to get a neutral question reading. An example is provided in (11):

(11) NEUTRAL CLEFT QUESTION CONTAINING PARCOSSA (adapted from Munaro 2005:44(34))

Parcossa ze che no te ve anca li?
why is that NEG cl2PS go also you
‘Why don’t you go as well?’

In the absence of a cleft structure, parcossa displays a highly-exceptional property: it is compatible both with proclitic and enclitic subject pronouns. In the former case, the sentence tends to be
interpreted as an echo question, while enclisis is used in pragmatically-marked contexts to express the speaker’s evaluation of the event. Compare the examples in (12):

(12) DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS CONVEYED BY PARCOSSA (adapted from Munaro 2005:44(35))

a. Parcossa no te ve anca ti?
   why NEG cl₂PS go also you
   ‘Why (the hell) don’t you go too?’

b. Parcossa no ve-to anca ti?
   why not go=cl₂PS also you

Munaro explains that the uses of parcossa in (12) are plausibly related to the availability of the same kind of interpretation in questions with cossa, both in Central and in Northern Veneto. Today, parcossa is no longer attested in Northern Veneto, unlike in Central Veneto. The decline of this wh-word coincides with the spreading of the clause-internal wh-strategy. Parcossa, which was only used in pseudo-questions, has disappeared from Northern Veneto following the development of the pragmatically-specialised sequences in (13):

(13) NORTHERN ITALIAN PRAGMATICALLY-SPECIALISED QUESTIONS (from Munaro 2005:45(38))

a. Neutral wh-question requiring an answer
   Magne-tu che?
   eat=cl₂PS what
   ‘What are you eating?’

b. Speaker’s surprise/reproach about what the person is eating: cossa is a DO
   Cossa magne-tu (che)!!
   what eat=cl₂PS (what)
   ‘What the hell are you eating?!’

c. Speaker’s annoyance at the mere fact of eating: cossa is an adjunct
   Cossa magne-tu (a ste ore)!!
   why eat=cl₂PS (at these hours)
   ‘Why the hell are you eating (at this time)??’

In Central Veneto, however, a string containing a transitive verb, such as the one in (14), can have any one of the three interpretations:

(14) CENTRAL VENETAN CONSTRUCTION (adapted from Munaro 2005:46(39))

   Cossa magni-to a ste ore?
   what eat=cl₂PS at these hours
   ‘Why/what (the hell) are you eating?’

Because of (14), Munaro argues that Central Venetan parcossa must have survived to express the adverbial reading of cossa. This, according to him, is confirmed by the fact that parcossa, unlike parché, triggers the pseudo-question reading if construed with SClI.
5.1.2 Distributional properties of Trevisian why-words

As previously argued in this dissertation, almost all non-D-linked wh-words in Trevigiano can surface either sentence-initially or clause-internally, with the exception of che (‘what’), which can only appear fronted. The same can be said of D-linked wh-phrases, although some speakers have a preference for the sentence-initial position for these. In addition, all wh-phrases are systematically construed with SCII in root questions, regardless of the position in which they surface. I shall claim that parcossa fits perfectly into this picture, while parché is exceptional both in terms of movement properties and with respect to its incompatibility with SCII.

Munaro (2005) argues that Central Venetan parcossa can be associated with a neutral question meaning iff it is construed within a cleft question. For him, parcossa is excluded from the clause-internal position and, when fronted, receives an echo interpretation in the absence of SCII and a surprise/disapproval interpretation (in the sense of Munaro & Obenauer 2002) if construed with SCII. In what follows, I shall illustrate that Trevisian parcossa only partially fits into Munaro’s description.

The syntax of parcossa

Trevisian parcossa obligatorily triggers SCII, as in (15), and is perfectly acceptable clause-internally in the true (as opposed to echo) question reading, as illustrated in (16):

(15) PARCOSSA REQUIRES SCII

a. * Parcossa si-tu ndàa al marcà?
   why is=C2PS goneF to.the market
   ‘Why did you go to the market?’

b. Parcossa te si ndàa al marcà?
   why C2PS is goneF to.the market

(16) PARCOSSA IS FELICITOUS CLAUSE-INTERNALLY

Si-tu ndàa parcossa al marcà?
is-youC2L goneF parcossa at.the market
‘Why did you go to the market?’

Parcossa can also be licensed successfully in cleft interrogatives. Clefts are structures that make use of a bi-clausal syntax to express a single proposition. The mono-clausal sentence and its clefted counterpart, although not necessarily interchangeable in all discourse contexts, have been argued to have the same truth-values (Lambrecht 1988, Karssenberg & Lahousse 2018). Clefts consist (minimally) of a quasi-argumental pronoun (Reeve 2010), the copula, the focused element and a relative-like clause. The relative-like part of clefts contains a syntactic gap which is co-indexed with the focalised element; a long-distance dependency is hence established within clefts. Both declarative and interrogative clefts exist, as exemplified in the French examples in (17):
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(17) REGULAR CLEFTS

a. C’est [mon père], qui ___ est allé à la messe ce matin
c’COP my father who is gone to the mass this morning
   ‘It’s my father that attended Mass this morning’

b. C’est [qui], qui ___ est allé à la messe ce matin?
c’COP who that is gone to the mass this morning
   ‘Who is it that attended Mass this morning?’

Examples like (17) are what I refer to as regular it-clefts. These are possible and quite productive in Trevigiano, as I argued in Bonan (2017a). Interestingly, Trevigiano has a second type of clefts, which I call reverse, where the focused constituent precedes the copula, as in (18). These are associated with a contrastive focus interpretation. Observe that reverse clefts, although possible in the interrogative form, are categorically excluded in French declaratives, as illustrated in (19):

(18) reverse clefts

a. [Me pare], zé che ___ zé ndà messa sta matina (not my mother!)
cOP my father that is gone mass this morning (NEG my mother)
   ‘It’s my father that attended Mass this morning (not my mother)!’

b. [Chi], zé che ___ zé ndà messa sta matina?
   who COP that is gone mass this morning

(19) reverse clefts

a. * [Mon père], c’est qui ___ est allé à la messe ce matin
   my father c’COP that is gone to the mass this morning

b. [Qui], c’est qui ___ est allé à la messe ce matin?
   who c’COP that is gone to the mass this morning

Trevisian parcossa can appear in both regular and reverse cleft-questions, as illustrated in (20a) and (20b), respectively:

(20) parcossa is felicitous in it-clefts

a. Ze-o parcossa che te me ciami a ste ore?
cOP=clEXPL parcossa that cl2PS call me at these hours
   ‘Why are you calling me so late?’

b. Parcossa ze-o che te me ciami a ste ore?
   parcossa COP=clEXPL that cl2PS call me at these hours

To conclude, note that in embedded questions parcossa must be construed with an overt that-COMP, as in (21):

(21) embedded parcossa requires an overt comp

Me domando parcossa *(che) l me gà dito che no l me ama pi
myself ask parcossa that cl3PS me has said that NEG cl2PS me loves anymore
   ‘I wonder why he told me he doesn’t love me anymore’
Thus, parcossa appears to have the exact same distribution as all other regular wh-phrases. In what follows, I shall claim that the same conclusion cannot be drawn for parché.

**The syntax of parché**

Trevisian parché fits perfectly in the description of its Northern Italian counterparts overviewed in §5.1.1. Differently from parcossa in fact, it excludes SCII, as in (22):

\[(22) \; \textit{PARCHÉ IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH SCII} \]
\[\text{Trevigiano} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad * \text{Parché} \; \text{si-tu} \; \text{ndàa} \; \text{al} \; \text{marcà?} \\
& \quad \text{parché} \; \text{are=}\text{cl}_{2PS} \; \text{goneF} \; \text{to.the} \; \text{market} \\
& \quad \text{‘Why did you go to the market?’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Parché} \; \text{te} \; \text{si} \; \text{ndàa} \; \text{al} \; \text{marcà?} \\
& \quad \text{parché} \; \text{cl}_{2PS} \; \text{are}\text{goneF} \; \text{to.the} \; \text{market}
\end{align*}
\]

Parché is very marginal clause-internally, as in (23). Also, it is ungrammatical in regular clefts, as illustrated in (24a), and slightly less degraded in reverse clefts, as in (24b):

\[(23) \; \textit{PARCHÉ IS VERY DEGRADED CLAUSE-INTERNALLY} \]
\[\text{Trevigiano} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{??} & \quad \text{Si-tu} \; \text{ndàa} \; \text{parché} \; \text{al} \; \text{marcà?} \\
& \quad \text{are=}\text{cl}_{2PS} \; \text{gone=}\text{cl}_F \; \text{parché at.the} \; \text{market}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(24) \; \textit{PARCHÉ IS EXCLUDED IN CLEFTS} \]
\[\text{Trevigiano} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad * \text{Parché} \; \text{ze-o} \; \text{che} \; \text{te} \; \text{me} \; \text{ciami a} \; \text{ste} \; \text{ore?} \\
& \quad \text{parché} \; \text{COP=}\text{cl}_{EXPL} \; \text{that} \; \text{cl}_{2PS} \; \text{call me} \; \text{at these} \; \text{hours} \\
& \quad \text{‘Why are you calling me so late?’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad ?? \; \text{Ze-o} \; \text{parché} \; \text{che} \; \text{te} \; \text{me} \; \text{ciami a} \; \text{ste} \; \text{ore?} \\
& \quad \text{COP=}\text{cl}_{EXPL} \; \text{parché that} \; \text{cl}_{2PS} \; \text{call me} \; \text{at these} \; \text{hours}
\end{align*}
\]

The ungrammaticality of Trevisian parché in cleft structures is rather puzzling and the reasons behind it would be worth exploring; however, I shall leave is investigation aside for further work. To conclude, note that an embedded parché can (but does not have to) be construed with the that-COMP, as in (25):

\[(25) \; \textit{EMBEDDED PARCHÉ DOES NOT NEED AN OVERT COMP} \]
\[\text{Trevigiano} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Me} \; \text{domando} \; \text{parché} \; \text{(che)} \; \text{l} \; \text{me} \; \text{gà} \; \text{dito} \; \text{che} \; \text{no} \; \text{l} \; \text{me} \; \text{ama} \; \text{pi} \\
& \quad \text{myself} \; \text{ask} \; \text{parché} \; \text{that} \; \text{cl}_{3PS} \; \text{me} \; \text{has} \; \text{said} \; \text{that} \; \text{NEG} \; \text{cl}_{3PS} \; \text{me} \; \text{loves} \; \text{anymore} \\
& \quad \text{‘I wonder why he told me he doesn’t love me anymore’}
\end{align*}
\]

In light of the discussion in §5.1.1, It seems safe to conclude that, while parcossa is systematically analysed as a chunk by Trevisian speakers, both the analytic and the synthetic forms are available for parché, as exemplified in (26):

\[(26) \; \textit{EMBEDDED PARCHÉ DOES NOT NEED AN OVERT COMP} \]
\[\text{Trevigiano} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Me} \; \text{domando parché} \; \text{(che)} \; \text{l} \; \text{me} \; \text{gà} \; \text{dito} \; \text{che} \; \text{no} \; \text{l} \; \text{me} \; \text{ama} \; \text{pi} \\
& \quad \text{myself} \; \text{ask} \; \text{parché} \; \text{that} \; \text{cl}_{3PS} \; \text{me} \; \text{has} \; \text{said} \; \text{that} \; \text{NEG} \; \text{cl}_{3PS} \; \text{me} \; \text{loves} \; \text{anymore} \\
& \quad \text{‘I wonder why he told me he doesn’t love me anymore’}
\end{align*}
\]
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(26) TWO AVAILABLE ANALYSES OF PARCHÉ  

Trevigiano

a. \([\text{par}]_{\text{WH}} + *([\text{che}]_{\text{COMP}}) = \text{parché}\)  
b. \([([\text{par}]_{\text{WH}} + [\text{che}]_{\text{COMP}})]_{\text{WH}} + *([\text{che}]_{\text{COMP}}) = \text{parché che}\)

To summarise, parché is never licensed clause-internally and is not compatible with SCII, whereas parcossa can surface either in the clause-initial or in the sentence initial position, and makes SCII obligatory. Therefore, while parcossa behaves like any ordinary wh-word, parché displays all the properties of a regular why-word. In §5.1.3, I claim that this prediction is further confirmed by the position occupied by lexical subjects with respect to the two why-words under consideration.

5.1.3 The position of lexical subjects in questions with parché and parcossa

It has been argued that in Standard Italian, perché (‘why’) is the only wh-word that can be directly followed by a lexical subject (Rizzi 2001 and related works). Indeed, Italian regular wh-words like quando (‘when’) cannot be followed directly by a lexical S, as in (27b); in the presence of perché two positions are available for lexical subjects, namely directly following perché, as in (28a), or the post-verbal position, as in (28b):

(27) DISTRIBUTION OF FRONTED WH-WORDS WRT A LEXICAL SUBJECT  

Standard Italian

a. \(\text{Quando ha parlato Gianni?}\)  
   when has spoken Gianni  
   ‘When did Gianni speak?’

b. \(* \text{Quando Gianni ha parlato?}\)  
   when Gianni has spoken

(28) DISTRIBUTION OF PERCHE WRT A LEXICAL SUBJECT  

Standard Italian

a. \(\text{Perché ha parlato Gianni?}\)  
   perché has spoken Gianni  
   ‘Why did Gianni speak?’

b. \(\text{Perché Gianni ha parlato?}\)  
   perché Gianni has spoken

Unlike Trevigiano, Standard Italian lacks SCII and cannot license wh-phrases clause-internally, although it has generalised subject-inversion in wh-questions. In the Trevisian examples, in the presence of parcossa a lexical subject is only felicitous in the structure if it is right-dislocated, as in (29a). In effect, parcossa does not allow a lexical subject to immediately follow it, as in (29b):

(29) DISTRIBUTION OF PARCOSSA WRT A LEXICAL SUBJECT  

Trevigiano

a. \(\text{Parcossa canta a your mother}\)  
   parcossa sings=clPS # your mother  
   ‘Your mother, why is she singing?’
5.1 The strange case of clause-internal *why*

b. *Parcossa* to mama cant- ea?
   parcossa your mother sings=clPS
   ‘Why is your mother singing?’

In this respect, once again, *parcossa* behaves like any other ordinary wh-word, as in (30):

(30) DISTRIBUTION OF CUANDO (‘WHEN’) WRT A LEXICAL SUBJECT

   a. Cuand o cant- ea, to mama?
      when sings=clPS, # your mother
      ‘Your mother, when is she singing?’
   b. *Cuando* to mama cant- ea?
      when your mother sings=clPS
      ‘When is your mother singing?’

Rather unsurprisingly, the behaviour of *parché* appears to be different. In fact, in combination with this wh-word a lexical subject can exceptionally make use of two structural positions: the left-dislocated one (like with all other wh-words), as in (31a), or the position immediately after the wh-word, as in (31b):

(31) DISTRIBUTION OF PARCHE WRT A LEXICAL SUBJECT

   a. Parché a canta, to mama?
      parché clPS sings, # your mother
      ‘Your mother, why is she singing?’
   b. Parché to mama a canta?
      parché your mother clPS sings
      ‘Why is your mother singing?’

In almost every sentence, Trevigiano *parché* looks like Standard Italian *perché* as described in Rizzi (2001). I wish to argue here that the special behaviour of Trevisian *parché* provides both new supporting evidence for the claim that ‘why’ is merged directly in the LP, and not moved there from a TP-internal position. I propose that, similarly to Italian *perché* and unlike all other wh-phrases in Trevigiano, *parché* can be analysed as externally-merged directly in the LP of the clause. Consequently, the different behaviour of Trevisian *parcossa* can be attributed to the fact that it is externally-merged TP-internally and then only (optionally) moved to the LP, as any other regular wh-word. My claim that *parcossa*, in contrast to *parché*, is moved to the LP of the clause and not externally-merged there generates a number of predictions with regard to its interaction with intervening quantificational elements, such as negation and focus. I address this issue in §5.1.4.

5.1.4 The interaction of *parché* and *parcossa* with negation and focus

In the previous section, I have posited that the distributional properties of the two why-words in Trevigiano, *parché* and *parcossa*, are closely linked to the positions in which the two are externally-
merged, and from where they can (or cannot) be moved. The intervention data that I present in this section will confirm this hypothesis.

**Incompatibility with negation**

Rizzi (2001) argued that *why* is compatible with negation in the clause, as in (32a), as opposed to adverbials such as *how*, which are not, as in (32b):

(32)  
- a. Why didn’t you fix the car?  
- b. *How didn’t you fix the car?  

The ungrammaticality of (32b) is attributed to a violation in terms of syntactic *locality*, i.e negation intervenes and blocks the formation of the *how*-chain. In contrast, (32a) is grammatical because *why* is not paired with a TP-internal trace c-commanded by negation, hence no intervention occurs. Interestingly, while Trevisian *parché* behaves like Italian *perché*, *parcossa* displays an adverbial-like incompatibility with negation, as in (33):

(33)  

The data in (33) suggest that *parché* is indeed externally-merged higher than negation, while *parcossa* moves from a position that lies under the scope of negation, hence the *parcossa*-trace chain violates Relativized Minimality (RM) (Rizzi 1990 and further developments). RM is a means of accounting for locality conditions on movement, namely the claim that a moving element cannot move over the top of a like element:

**RELATIVIZED MINIMALITY**

Given the sequence \(x \ldots Z \ldots Y\), a local relation between \(x\) and \(Y\) is disrupted when \(Z\) structurally intervenes between \(x\) and \(Y\). Intervention is defined hierarchically through c-command: \(Z\) structurally intervenes between \(x\) and \(Y\) when \(Z\) c-commands \(Y\) and \(Z\) does not c-command \(X\).

Government by a constituent in an \(A’\)-position is blocked if there is an intervening element in an \(A’\)-specifier, government by a constituent in an \(A\)-position is blocked when there is an intervening element in an \(A\)-position, while government by a head is blocked by intervening heads. Remember that an \(A’\)-position is a position not occupied by an argument, while an \(A\)-position is a position occupied by an argument.
Further evidence in favour of my claim is provided by the interpretation of Trevisian why-words in bi-clausal constructions, where in the absence of negation both parcossa and parché can be construed either with the high or low clause, as in (34):

(34) **PARCHE AND PARCOSSA IN BI-CLAUSAL STRUCTURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Fronted parcossa: short and long construal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parcossa dizi-tu che no a ze vignua?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parcossa say=cl$<em>{2PS}$ that NEG cl$</em>{3PS,F}$ is come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓‘What is the reason x such as you are saying that she came?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓‘What is x such as you are saying that she came because of x?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Fronted parché: only short construal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parché te dizi che no a ze vignua?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parché cl$<em>{2PS}$ say that NEG cl$</em>{3PS,F}$ is come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓‘What is the reason x such as you are saying that she came?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗‘What is x such as you are saying that she came because of x?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Fronted parché: only long construal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parché dizi-tu che a ze vignua?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parché say=cl$<em>{2PS}$ that cl$</em>{3PS,F}$ is come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗‘What is the reason x such as you are saying that she came?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓‘What is x such as you are saying that she came because of x?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that when parché is construed with the embedded clause, and thus moved from the lower LP, as in (34c), it is exceptionally construed with SCLI in the higher clause. As I pointed out in Chapter 4, this exceptional behaviour constitutes supporting evidence for my hypothesis that in all instances of SCLI verb movement to C is triggered by overt interrogative movement (of a whole QP, a Q alone, or a yes/no operator) to the LP of the clause. I summarise the situation in (35) and (36):

(35)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>SC: [CP parcossa$_i$ + SCLI [TP ___ [CP che [TP ...]]]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>LC: [CP parcossa$_i$ + SCLI [TP ___ [CP ___ che [TP ___ ...]]]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(36)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>SC: [CP parché$_j$ [TP te dizi [CP che [TP ...]]]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>LC: [CP parché$_j$ + SCLI [TP ___ [CP ___ che [TP ...]]]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern observed in (34) changes in the presence of negation. With negation in the matrix clause, parcossa is ungrammatical whether construed with the high or the low clause, as illustrated in (37a), while it is only compatible with a short construal when the negation appears within the embedded clause, as in (37b):

(37) **INTERVENTION BY NEGATION AND PARCOSSA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Negation in the higher clause: ungrammatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Parcossa no dizi-tu che a ze vignua?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parcossa NEG say=cl$<em>{2PS}$ that cl$</em>{3PS,F}$ is come</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\[ \not \text{‘What is the reason x such as you are NOT saying that she came?’} \]
\[ \not \text{‘What is x such as you are saying that she DID NOT came because of x?’} \]

b. Negation in the lower clause: only short construal

Parcossa dizi-tu che no a ze vignua?
parcossa say=clPS that NEG clPS,F is come
\[ \text{‘What is the reason x such as you are NOT saying that she came?’} \]
\[ \not \text{‘What is x such as you are saying that she DID NOT came because of x?’} \]

The intervention effects observed in (37) are compatible with the hypothesis that Trevisian parché is externally-merged within TP, as in (38):

(38) NEGATION IN THE LOWER CLAUSE

a. SC: \[ \text{CP parcossa}_1 + \text{SCII [TP [CP [TP NEG …]]]} \] \[ \rightarrow \text{no intervention} \]

b. LC: \[ \text{CP parcossa}_1 + \text{SCII [TP [CP [TP NEG …]]]} \] \[ \leftarrow \text{XXX} \]

Parché can instead be construed with the high clause even in the presence of matrix negation, as in (39), and can be construed with both clauses with embedded negation, as in (40). Note that when it is construed within the high clause, parché is incompatible with SCII (40a), as expected, but does not trigger SCII when extracted from the embedded domain (40b):

(39) PARCHÉ AND INTERVENTION BY MATRIX NEGATION

Parché no te dizi che a ze vignua?
parché NEG clPS say that clPS,F is come
\[ \text{‘What is the reason x such as you are NOT saying that she came?’} \]
\[ \not \text{‘What is x such as you are saying that she DID NOT came because of x?’} \]

(40) PARCHÉ AND INTERVENTION BY EMBEDDED NEGATION

a. Parché te dizi che no a ze vignua?
parché clPS say that NEG clPS,F is come
\[ \text{‘What is the reason x such as you are NOT saying that she came?’} \]

b. Parché dizi-tu che no a ze vignua?
parché say=clPS that NEG clPS,F is come
\[ \text{‘What is x such as you are saying that she DID NOT came because of x?’} \]

These facts, which again suggest that the analysis of Trevisian parché as a regular why-word is correct, are summarised in (41) and (42):

(41) NEGATION IN THE HIGHER CLAUSE

a. SC: \[ \text{CP parché [TP NEG [CP [TP …]]]} \] \[ \rightarrow \text{no intervention} \]

b. LC: \[ \text{CP parché [TP [TP NEG [CP [TP …]]]} \] \[ \leftarrow \text{XXX} \]
5.1 The strange case of clause-internal *why*

(42) NEGATION IN THE LOWER CLAUSE
   a. SC: \([CP \textit{parché} \ [\textit{TP} \ [CP \textit{che} \ [TP \textit{NEG} \ldots]]]]\) \(\rightarrow\) no intervention
   b. LC: \([CP \textit{parché} + \textit{SCI} \ [\textit{TP} \ [\ldots] \ [CP \textit{che} \ [TP \textit{NEG} \ldots]]]]\) \(\rightarrow\) no intervention

(In)compatibility with focus

One of the main reasons leading Rizzi (2001) to posit that elements such as Italian *parché* or *come mai* (‘how come’) are first-merged in SpecIntP it that they do not require T-to-C movement. The existence of an IntP in the LP was first stipulated on the basis of the observation of the unusual distribution of the Italian COMP *se* (‘if’), which introduces indirect yes/no questions, as in (43):

(43) POSITION OF *SE* WRT TOPICS (Rizzi 2001:289(9a))

\[
\text{Non so se, a Gianni, avrebbero potuto dirgli la verità} \quad \text{NEG know}^1_{PS} \text{if to Gianni could}^3_{PP} \text{have tell.him the truth} \\
\text{‘I don’t know if to Gianni, they could have said the truth’}
\]

Because of the distribution of *se* with regard to focus (which can only follow *se*) and topics (which can occur on both sides of it), Rizzi argued that the position of IntP is that shown in (44):

(44) THE LP OF THE CLAUSE (adapted from Rizzi 2001:289(10))

\[
[\text{Force}^0 \ [\text{Top}^0 \ [\text{Int}^0 \ [\text{Top}^0 \ [\text{Foc}^0 \ [\text{Top}^0 \ [\text{Fin}^0 \ [\ldots]]]]]]]]
\]

Evidence that elements like Italian *parché* fill a position distinct from and higher than the position targeted by other matrix wh-words comes from the fact that they can co-occur with focus, as in (45):

(45) DISTRIBUTION OF *PERCHE* WRT FOCUS (direct question) (Rizzi 2001:293(23a))

\[
\text{Perché QUESTO avremmo dovuto dirgli, non qualcos’altro?} \quad \text{why THIS should}^3_{PP} \text{have tell.him not something’else} \\
\text{‘Why THIS we should have said to him, not something else?’}
\]

Furthermore, on a par with *se*, a focused constituent cannot precede *parché*. Given that regular wh-phrases are incompatible with a focused element in matrix questions, which Rizzi interprets as proof that both compete for the Spec of Focus\textit{HIGH} in matrix questions, the contrast with (45) is directly accounted for if *parché* is externally-merged in SpecIntP, while ordinary wh-phrases are moved from their first-merge position into SpecFocus\textit{HIGH}, i.e. lower than IntP. Rizzi also argues that in indirect questions wh-phrases do not need to move to SpecFocus\textit{HIGH}, whence their compatibility with a preceding focused constituent. He claims that in contrast, no root/embedded asymmetry is found with *parché*, which is compatible with a following focus in both main clauses, as (45), and embedded clauses, as (46):
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Mi domando perché QUESTO avremmo dovuto dirgli, non qualcos’altro
I wonder why THIS should we have said to him, not something else
‘I wonder why THIS we should have said to him, not something else’

It is argued that these special distributional properties follow from the assumption that in both root and embedded questions special adverbial wh-operators like Italian perché are first-merged directly in SpecIntP. Int0 is a head that is inherently endowed with interrogative features and that inherently select a clausal [int]-operator: for these reasons, no verb-inversion is needed with perché, and IntP cannot function as the landing site of movement but is uniquely compatible with the elements base-generated there (but see Shlonsky & Soare 2011 for a movement analysis of left-peripheral why-words).

The Italian data can help with the analysis of the syntax of Trevisian why-words, even though the two languages exploit the left-peripheral and clause-internal focal projections rather differently. One of these differences concerns the use of the clause-internal focal projection for contrastively-focused constituents in Trevigiano (which is actually more natural an option with respect to total focus-fronting), as discussed in Chapter 3. Nonetheless, typically, a clause-internal focus is very degraded within a wh-question, as in (47):

(47) UNGRAMMATICALITY OF FOCUS WITHIN DIRECT WH-QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ?? Quando ghe ga-tu dato I POMI a Gianni?</td>
<td>‘When did you give THE APPLES to Gianni?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ?? Quando ghe ga-tu dato i pomi A GIANNI?</td>
<td>‘When did you give the apples TO JOHN?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degradation in (47) should be interpreted as related to the impossibility of correctly sending either of the wh-phrase or the focused element for interpretation before Spell Out: no matter which is sent first, the second will cross over the other (or its trace) in any case. Since both are quantificational elements, crossing chains result in ungrammaticality. In fact, if the claim made in Chapter 3 is correct, and the interrogative C systematically has a [q]-feature (checked by the fronted QP/Q-particle), the ungrammaticality of a focused constituent follows logically, and an explanation in terms of crossing chains becomes redundant. However, and again rather predictably, a clause-internal focus is indeed compatible with perché, as in (48):

(48) GRAMMATICALITY OF FOCUS IN PARCHE-QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Parché te ghe ga dato I POMI aa Maria?</td>
<td>‘Why did you give THE APPLES to Mary?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 The strange case of clause-internal why

b. *Parché te ghe ga dato i pomi AA MARIA?
parché you=cl2PS DAT have given the apples TO.MARY
‘Why did you give the apples TO MARY?’

In (48), the focus-chain is not disrupted by parché, which is not moved. It is possible, then, that the presence of parché in SpecIntP, and with the [int/q] feature checked in Int\(^1\), the interrogative Focus\(_{HIGH}\) is exceptionally endowed with a [foc]-feature. While in Italian this configuration comes with an EPP feature which forces overt movement of the focused constituent into SpecIntP, as seen in (46), a lack of the EPP in C can explain the case of Trevisian covert focus fronting.

As would be predicted on the basis of the discussion presented so far, parcossa also has the same distribution as any other ordinary wh-phrase with regard to its incompatibility with focus, as in (49):

(49) UNGRAMMATICALITY OF FOCUS WITHIN PARCOSSA-QUESTIONS

Trevigiano

a. *Parcossa ghe ga-tu dato I POMI aa Maria?
parcossa DAT have=cl2PS given THE APPLES to.the Maria
‘Why did you give THE APPLES to Mary?’

b. *Parcossa ghe ga-tu dato i pomi AA MARIA?
parcossa DAT have=cl2PS given the apples TO.MARIA
‘Why did you give the apples TO MARY?’

The incompatibility of focus with parcossa is also observed when parcossa surfaces clause-internally, as in the examples in (50):

(50) UNGRAMMATICALITY OF FOCUS WITHIN PARCOSSA-QUESTIONS (ii)

Trevigiano

a. *Ghe ga-tu dato parcossa I POMI aa Maria?
DAT have=cl2PS given parcossa THE APPLES to.the Maria
‘Why did you give THE APPLES to Mary?’

b. *Ghe ga-tu dato parcossa i pomi AA MARIA?
DAT have=cl2PS given parcossa the apples TO.MARIA
‘Why did you give the apples TO MARY?’

The data in (49) and (50), which constitute further supporting evidence in favour of my analysis of Trevisian parcossa as externally-merged within TP, also confirm my claim that clause-internal contrastively-focused constituents are moved to SpecFoc\(_{LOW}\), as discussed in Chapter 3. In my theory in fact, it is clear that a clause-internal wh-phrase and a contrastive focus compete for the same structural projection, where they check the u[foc]-feature in Foc\(_{\delta,LOW}\). For two like elements to verify one feature would be unfounded under any feature-checking theory which I am aware of.

**Concluding remarks**

I have argued that while Trevisian parché behaves just like its Italian counterpart perché (the only difference being that subject-inversion is optional in Italian and excluded in Trevigiano), Trevisian...
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*parcossa* gives every indication that it is externally-merged within TP and then optionally raised to the LP of the clause, like ordinary wh-words. Some languages distinguish morphologically between reason-why and purpose-why (Stepanov & Tsai 2008). In these languages, purpose-why can be merged in the functional field of the clause and then moved to the LP, while reason-why is always merged higher. However, it is often tricky to distinguish between the two interpretations. As Stepanov & Tsai correctly point out, purpose answers can virtually always be formulated as reason answers, but the reverse is not true. It is therefore interesting to note that Trevisian *parcossa* can indeed have a *pure reason* meaning, as illustrated in (51):

(51) **TREVISIAN PARCOSSA CAN HAVE A PURE REASON MEANING**

```
But-ei parcossa i persegerhi, de sta stajon?
blossom=cl3PM parcossa the peach.trees, in this season
‘Why are the peach trees blossoming so early?’
```

It thus appears that there is no obvious semantic division of labour between *parché* and *parcossa* and that both can ask reason questions. Furthermore, note that some languages distinguish between a lexically-restricted *why* and the single (non-D-linked) *why*-word. Cross-linguistically, complex wh-phrases such as ‘for what reason’ do indeed display movement properties, as *parcossa* does. However, it seems far-fetched to consider *parcossa* as the lexically-restricted version of *parché*. I believe that a plausible explanation for the existence of two non-D-linked why-words in Trevigiano can come from Munaro’s (2005) analysis, whereby Central Venetan *parcossa* takes over the pragmatically-marked meaning of adverbial *cossa* (‘what’). Although the speakers of the variety of Trevigiano described in my dissertation do not use adverbial *cossa* productively, and I am not aware of any historical work on the development of *parcossa*, the Central Venetan data discussed by Munaro are sufficient to posit that Trevisian *parcossa* must have originated from the joining of the preposition *par* (‘for’) and *cossa* in its adverbial use. This prediction is supported by contrasts such as that in (52), where it is clear that the surprise/disapproval interpretation is only available with *parcossa*, not with its left-peripheral counterpart *parché*:

(52) **TREVISIAN PARCOSSA CAN CONVEY A SURPRISE/DISAPPROVAL MEANING**

```
a. Parché te osi cussi?
parché cl2PS cry like.that
‘Why are you screaming like that?’
b. Parcossa osi-tu cussi?(!)
parcossa cry=cl2PS like.that
‘Why (on Earth) are you screaming like that(!)?’
```

My conclusion is that Trevisian *parcossa* is a full-blooded *why*-word that is merged in a low position, inside TP, from which it optionally undergoes movement to the LP. Note, however, that the possibility
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for this why-word to appear clause-internally is highly-exceptional, but not unique. Indeed, to the
best of my knowledge, clause-internal why-words have been attested in at least two Lombard NIDs,
namely Borghese (Manzini & Savoia 2005) and Mendrisiotto (Poletto & Pollock 2009). Examples are
provided in (53):

(53) CLAUSE-INTERNAL WHY-WORDS
   a. *Borghese (Manzini & Savoia 2005:588(154))
      al fi: per ke?
      it doSPP why
      ‘Why do you do this/are you doing this?’
   b. Mendrisiotto (Poletto & Pollock 2009:14(49))
      Ta vet via parché?
      you go away why
      ‘Why are you going away?’

NIDs in which a fronted why-word co-exists peacefully with $SCll$ are also rather puzzlingly attested
in Manzini & Savoia (2005) (pp. 514). One hypothesis, yet to be tested, is that why-words in these
languages are exceptionally merged TP-internally and then moved to the LP of the clause, like Trevisian
parcossa.

5.2 On wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions

Starting from van Riemsdijk & Williams (1986), a great deal of work in formal grammar has
assumed the existence of a $Doubly$-filled $COMP$ filter in languages such as English. This filter is a
grammatical tool that rules out the co-occurrence of a wh-phrase and a $COMP$ within the same
projection of the CP domain, as in (1):

(1) Standard English
   a. I wonder [CP who $\varnothing$ [ she saw ]]
   b. * I wonder [CP who that [ she saw ]]
   c. * I wonder [CP who whether [ she saw ]]

The traditional account of examples such as (1) have been that COMP-deletion must obtain so as to
satisfy the filter. Interestingly, however, some languages appear to violate the Filter systematically,
including most NIDs. In Chapter 1, I claimed that one of the peculiarities of Trevigiano is that it allows
wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions, as in (2):

(2) SE$_{WH}$ LICENSES WH-IN SITU IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS
   a. Me domando [ se $te$ gâ magnâ cossa ]
      myself ask $se$$_{WH}$ cl$_{2PS}$ have eaten what
      ‘I wonder what you ate’
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b. A se domanda [ se-l vegnarà quando ]
   cl3PS.F herself asks seWH=cl3PS comeFUT when
   ‘She wonders when he’s going to come’

Trevisian embedded insituness is only possible in the presence of seWH, which in the previous Chapters I have treated as a semantically-vacuous COMP. In fact, differently from its yes/no homophonous, which has the same meaning of English COMP if, seWH leaves intact the interpretation of the indirect wh-question. Nonetheless, despite its lack of semantic import in fact, its absence unapologetically leads to ungrammaticality, as in (3):

(3) AN EMBEDDED WH-WORD IS UNGRAMMATICAL IN THE ABSENCE OF SEWH   Trevigiano
   * Me domando [ te gà magnà cossa ]
      myself ask cl2PS have eaten what
      ‘I wonder what you ate’

I therefore conclude that the role of seWH must be purely syntactic, and also that it cannot be the same if-COMP that also introduces yes/no questions. I address the latter issue in §5.2.2. Interestingly, and to the best of my knowledge, there are only two Northern Italian structures that license felicitously embedded insituness: Trevisian seWH, and Venetan/Lombard wh-doubling. Given the discussion of wh-in situ as involving overt movement of the Q-particle that I outlined in Chapters 2 and 3, one might think that seWH is in fact an overt realisation of the Trevisian Q-particle. However, in what follows I shall claim that such an analysis can only account for the data of wh-doubling, while the Trevisian facts are better explained by analysing seWH as an interrogative element first-merged directly in the head of QembP.

Interestingly, all varieties that have embedded wh-in situ have one major property in common: they systematically violate the doubly-filled COMP filter, as illustrated by the Trevisian example in (4):

(4) AN EMBEDDED FRONTED WH-WORD REQUIRES COMP   Trevigiano
   Me domando [ cossa *(che) te gà magnà ]
      myself ask what that you have eaten
      ‘I wonder what you ate’

Note that a fronted wh-word is not possible when construed with seWH, as in (5):

(5) SEWH IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH WH-FRONTING   Trevigiano
   * Me domando [ cossa se te gà magnà ]
      myself ask what seWH cl2PS have eaten
      ‘I wonder what you ate’

The varieties that allow both wh-doubling and single insituness also systematically realise the embedded that-COMP when construed with single wh-fronting, as illustrated in (6). However, no COMP is realised in case of doubling wh-fronting, as in (7):
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(6) *Strozzense* (adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:593(156))

a. **di-m**  **’koza **(ke) te ‘fe  
‘Tell me what you’re doing / you do’

b. **me se**  **do’mande n’d**  ***(k) i ‘va**  
‘I myself ask where that they go’

(7) *Strozzense* (adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:592(156))

**me se**  **do’mande ’koza **(‘ke) i ‘fà ko’zè  
‘I myself ask what (*that) they do what’

In what follows, I discuss how these data can be accounted for light of my theory of wh-in situ.

### 5.2.1 Thoughts on the syntax of se<sub>WH</sub> and wh-doubling

In Chapter 3, I claimed that wh-doubling is an exceptional case of Q-adjunction with overtly-realised [q] and [wh]-features on the Q-particle. In contrast, I analysed all ordinary cases of single wh-in situ as instances of Q-adjoining wh-phrases with silent [q] features in Q, and an unvalued (hence silent) [wh]-feature. I illustrate both cases in (8):

(8) a. Covert features in Q = no wh-doubling:

\[ [WhP \emptyset_{q\cup wh} [WhP \text{wh-phrase } ]] \]

b. Overt features in Q = overt wh-doubling:

\[ [WhP Q_{q\cup wh} [WhP \text{wh-phrase } ]] \]

My analysis, of course, entails that the varieties that display wh-doubling can have a [wh]-feature to be checked also in the matrix LP. In addition, the optional status of wh-doubling signals that the LP of these varieties is at an intermediate evolutionary stage in which [q] is not yet the sole feature responsible for wh-fronting.

The fact that embedded wh-doubling does not require the embedding COMP to be overtly realised constitutes further evidence for my claim that the higher doubling elements of wh-doubling, despite their wh-like forms, are not proper wh-phrases. In fact, in all the languages under consideration here a fronted wh-phrase is systematically construed with an overt COMP. To analyse Trevisian se<sub>WH</sub> as an exceptional overt realisation of the [q] features on Q-particle would incorrectly predict two facts: that Qembp is endowed with a Q-feature, and that an overt realisation of Q is able to perform actions that its silent counterpart is not able to do. However, overt and silent realisations of the very same element should never be expected to have different syntactic properties: it is therefore not clear how an overt realisation of the fronted Q could save an otherwise infelicitous structure, unless we assume
that the phenomenon is linked to a matrix/embedded asymmetry, as suggested by Ur Shlonsky (pc.). Indeed, whatever explanation we adopt for the phenomenon of wh-doubling, it is in fact extremely clear that while single insituness is sufficient in matrix questions, as in (9), the same cannot be said of embedded insituness, which must always be doubled, as in (10):

(9) *Strozzense* (Manzini & Savoia 2005:589(154))

(ndo) l pur’ti-f indo’c?
where it bring=you2PP where
‘Where are you bringing it?’

(10) *Strozzense* (adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:593(156))

’so ‘mia *(se) por’ta-t *(ko’ze)
know1PS NEG *(what) bring-you2PS what
‘I don’t know what to bring you’

It is therefore tempting to suggest that an overt doubling element is actually somewhat different from what at first glance seem to be a phonetically-null doubling element. I discuss this in §5.2.3.

To conclude, a note on embedding COMP.s. Violation of the doubly-filled COMP filter appears to be a necessary but not sufficient condition for a variety to be able to license embedded wh-in situ. This claim is confirmed by most Lombard varieties attested in Manzini & Savoia (2005:592-593), where an embedding that-COMP is compulsory in the case of fronting, but no seWH-like COMP exists, hence indirect single wh-in situ is impossible. Further evidence comes from Contemporary Spoken French, as illustrated in (11):

(11) INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS

\begin{itemize}
\item a. Il veut savoir quand *(que) tu pars
   he wants know when *(that) you2PS leave
   ‘He wants to know when you’re leaving’
\item b. *Il veut savoir tu pars quand
   he wants know you2PS leave when
\item c. *Il veut savoir si/que tu pars quand
   he wants know si/que you2PS leave when
\end{itemize}

Indirect wh-questions in Contemporary Spoken French are incompatible with an overt embedding COMP (11a). On the basis of the discussion carried out so far, one would not expect French to be able to license indirect wh-in situ, which is confirmed by (11b-c). Predictably, the unavailability of a COMP in cases of wh-fronting to the embedded LP, as in (11a) prevents the variety from having a COMP associated with insituness, as in (11c). As an aside, observe that in rural French an embedded COMP actually is available in the case of wh-fronting, as in (12):
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(12) **VIOLATION OF THE FILTER**

*Rural French*

Il veut savoir quand que tu pars  
he wants know when that you leave
‘He wants to know when you’re leaving’

If my approach is on the right track, the predictions that result from (12) are that either this variety does not have a se\_WH-like element for indirect wh-in situ and fails to license it, or it does, and indirect insituness is possible. Similarly, it has been claimed that Belgian French has an if-COMP similar to the one found in Trevigiano (Boeckx et al. 2000), as in (13):

(13) **SE\_WH-LIKE ELEMENT** (Boeckx et al. 2000:60(10))  

*Belgian French*

Pierre a demandé si tu as vu qui  
Pierre has asked if you have seen who
‘Pierre asked who you saw’

Consequently, we expect this variety to have an overt COMP in constructions involving fronting. I am not yet able to say whether this is indeed the case, though these predictions should certainly be tested further.

Se\_WH is homophonous with its yes/no counterpart, as in (14); similarly, the that-COMP used in the case of wh-fronting in indirect questions is identical to the one used in long-distance construals, as in (15):

(14) **IF-COMP IN YES/NO QUESTIONS**  

*Trevigiano*

Me domando se l me ciamarà  
myself wonder if cl\_3PS,M me call\_FUT
‘I wonder whether he’ll call me’

(15) **THAT-COMP IN LONG-DISTANCE QUESTIONS**  

*Trevigiano*

Penso che l me ciamarà  
think\_1PS that cl\_3PS,M me call\_FUT
‘I think he’s going to call me’

Data such as (14) and (15) arise a question about the structural position(s) occupied by the if-COMP and the that-COMP in the structure, and about whether these are the same element used in different contexts or not. In what follows, I shall argue that they are not, and that the structural position occupied by COMPs in indirect wh-questions is significantly lower than posited for ordinary that- and if-COMPs in Rizzi (1997;2001).
5.2.2 Functional elements in the lower Left Periphery

$se_{WH}$ is different from its high yes/no counterpart (henceforth, $se_{YN}$), and appears to realise a low left-peripheral head: despite the morpho-phonological equivalence, the two are distinct COMPs that head two different functional projections in the LP of the clause. The same is true for $che$ (‘that’): even at first glance, it is clear that the $che$ construed with wh-fronting in indirect wh-questions is located much lower than its declarative homophone. Recall the structure of the Left Periphery, which I repeat in (16):

(16) THE LEFT PERIPHERY (as in Rizzi & Bocci 2017:8(29))

[ Force ] [ Top* ] [ Int ] [ Top* ] [ Focus ] [ Top* ] [ Mod ] [ Top* ] [ Qemb ] [ Fin ] [ IP ... ] ] ] ]]

As mentioned in §5.1.4, Rizzi (2001) argued that the interrogative head $se$ (‘if’) in Standard Italian yes/no questions occupies the head of Int(errogative)P. To understand where the two if- and that-COMPs sit in the structure in Trevigiano, let us turn to their distribution(s) with respect to topics and focus. Observe the distribution of a topic like $sto$ $libro$ (‘this book’) with regard to $se_{YN}$, as in (17), and $se_{WH}$, as in (18):

(17) DISTRIBUTION OF $se_{YN}$ WRT TOPICAL ELEMENTS

a. Me domando, $[sto$ libro], se te o gâ za leto
   myself ask$_{1PS}$ this book se cl$_{2PS}$ it have already read
   ‘This book, I wonder whether you’ve already read (it)’

b. Me domando se, $[sto$ libro], te o gâ za leto
   myself ask$_{1PS}$ se this book cl$_{2PS}$ it have already read

(18) DISTRIBUTION OF $se_{WH}$ WRT TOPICAL ELEMENTS

a. Me domando, $[sto$ libro], se te ghe o gâ regaeà a chi
   myself ask$_{1PS}$ this book se cl$_{2PS}$ DAT it have given to who
   ‘This book, I wonder who you gave (it) to’

b. ?? Me domando se, $[sto$ libro], te ghe o gâ regaeà a chi
   myself ask$_{1PS}$ se this book cl$_{2PS}$ DAT it have given to who

From (17) and (18) it follows that topics can either directly precede or follow $se_{YN}$, but only directly precede $se_{WH}$. If a topic is placed after $se_{WH}$, the sentence is degraded. This seems to suggest that, while $se_{YN}$ might be the counterpart of Italian $se$, $se_{WH}$ lies lower in the structure. The situation is summarised in (19):

(19) \text{topic} > se_{YN} > \text{topic} > se_{WH} > *\text{topic}

Similarly to what was observed in (18), in the presence of a fronted wh-phrase, a topical element can only directly precede the wh-phrase. If it is placed between the wh-word and the COMP $che_{WH}$ or after the COMP, the question is very degraded, as in (20):
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(20) DISTRIBUTION OF CHE\textsubscript{WH} WRT TOPICAL ELEMENTS  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Me domando, [sto libro], dove che te o gà leto myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} this book where che cl\textsubscript{2PS} it have read  
This book, I wonder where (that) you read (it)'
  \item ?? Me domando Dove, [sto libro], che te o gà leto myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} where this book che cl\textsubscript{2PS} it have read
  \item ? Me domando dove, [sto libro], te o gà leto myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} where che this book cl\textsubscript{2PS} it have read
\end{enumerate}

Consequently, che\textsubscript{WH} appears to occupy a position similar to that of se\textsubscript{WH}, which is further confirmed by the fact that only se\textsubscript{Y/N} can be surrounded by topics, while the COMP\textsubscript{s} of indirect wh-questions cannot, as in (21):

(21) DISTRIBUTION OF IF- AND THAT-COMP\textsubscript{s} WRT TOPICAL ELEMENTS  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Me domando, [sto libro], se, [jeri], te o gà leto myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} this se\textsubscript{Y/N} yesterday cl\textsubscript{2PS} it have read  
This book, yesterday, I wonder if you read (it)'
  \item * Me domando, [sto libro], se, [jeri], o gà leto chi myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} this se\textsubscript{WH} yesterday it has read who
This book, yesterday, I wonder who read (it)'
  \item * Me domando, [sto libro], chi che, [jeri], o gà leto myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} this book who che\textsubscript{WH} yesterday it has read
\end{enumerate}

As predicted by the distribution of se\textsubscript{Y/N} and se/che\textsubscript{WH} with regard to topics, a focused constituent can only follow se\textsubscript{Y/N}, as in (22), while it must precede se\textsubscript{WH} and the wh-phrase + che cluster, as in (23) and (24):

(22) DISTRIBUTION OF SE\textsubscript{Y/N} WRT FOCUS  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Me domando se STO LIBRO te gà leto (no staltro) myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} se THIS BOOK cl\textsubscript{2PS} have read (NEG the.other)  
‘THIS BOOK I wonder if you read (not the other one)’
  \item * Me domando STO LIBRO se te gà leto (no staltro) myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} THIS BOOK se cl\textsubscript{2PS} have read (NEG the.other)
\end{enumerate}

(23) DISTRIBUTION OF SE\textsubscript{WH} WRT FOCUS  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Me domando STO LIBRO se o gà leto chi myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} THIS BOOK se it has read who
‘THIS BOOK I wonder who read’
  \item * Me domando se STO LIBRO o gà leto chi myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} THIS BOOK it has read who
\end{enumerate}

(24) DISTRIBUTION OF CHE\textsubscript{WH} WRT FOCUS  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Me domando STO LIBRO chi che o gà leto myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} THIS BOOK who che it has read
‘THIS BOOK I wonder who read’
\end{enumerate}
More on Trevisian wh-in situ

b. * Me domando chi STO LIBRO che o gâ leto myself ask1PS who THIS BOOK che it has read

c. ?? Me domando chi che STO LIBRO o gâ leto myself ask1PS who che THIS BOOK it has read

All the data discussed in this section suggest that se\textsubscript{Y/N} is hosted by a high left-peripheral head that can indeed be surrounded by topics but only followed by focus, like Int\textsuperscript{0} in Standard Italian, whereas se\textsubscript{WH} and che\textsubscript{WH} must be merged within an interrogative projection that can only be preceded by focus and topics. This interrogative that-COMP lies much lower in the structure than its declarative homophonous counterpart, which I take to realise the head of ForceP, following Rizzi (1997).

A summary of the distribution of the COMPs under investigation is provided in (25):

(25) DISTRIBUTION OF INTERROGATIVE IF- AND THAT-COMPs WRT TOPICS AND FOCUS

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{se}\textsubscript{Y/N} > \text{focus} > \text{topic} \\
\text{focus} > \text{topic} > \text{se}\textsubscript{WH} \\
\text{focus} > \text{topic} > \text{che}\textsubscript{WH}
\end{array}
\]

Consequently, it seems safe to state that se\textsubscript{Y/N} canonically realises Int\textsuperscript{0}, like its Italian counterpart discussed is Rizzi (2001), while se\textsubscript{WH} heads a very low left-peripheral functional projection, situated lower than the last topical projection. In line with Rizzi’s (1997) discussion of Italian indirect wh-questions, revised in Rizzi & Bocci (2017), I suggest that this position is QembP\textsuperscript{2}. The situation is summarised in (26):

(26) THE TREVISIAN LEFT PERIPHERY

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{ForceP} \text{ che} \textsubscript{WH} \text{ or se} \textsubscript{WH} \text{ FinP} \text{ Fin} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{IP} \ldots]]] \\
[\text{TopP} \text{ Top} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{TopP} \text{ Top} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{FocusP} \text{ Focus} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{TopP} \text{ Top} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{ModP} \text{ Mod} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{TopP} \text{ Top} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{IntP} \textsubscript{Y/N} \text{ Int} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{TopP} \text{ Top} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{FinP} \text{ Fin} \textsuperscript{0} [\text{IP} \ldots]]]]]]]]
\end{array}
\]

5.2.3 SE\textsubscript{WH} licenses an interrogative operator in SpecIntP

Given my claim that both the embedded COMP che of indirect questions and se\textsubscript{WH} are first-merged within QembP, a purely interrogative projection, let us turn back to the question of the nature of se\textsubscript{WH}, as compared to doubling elements in wh-doubling constructions. In Chapter 3, I claimed that wh-doubling elements are actually instances of Q-particles that result from the phonetically-overt realisation of both [q] and [wh]-features. The [wh]-feature on interrogative wh-words is usually

\footnote{In indirect wh-questions in NIDs, the obligatory presence of the COMP with fronted wh-phrases suggests that the targeted functional projection might actually be FinP. Indeed, in the approach developed by Rizzi starting from his (1997) paper, the left-peripheral projections relevant for complementation are ForceP and FinP. In a further developments of the theory, Shlonsky (2014) argued that the that-COMP of Paduan (and by extension, Northern Italian) embedded wh-questions are overt realisations of so-called Nominative Fin, à la Rizzi & Shlonsky (2007) (refer to Chapter 4 for further details). Another possibility is that the COMP under consider is indeed generated in FinP, but then raises to QembP (or even higher, if necessary). I leave the investigation of this observation for future works.}
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unvalued because, in the context of matrix wh-questions, it lacks an output effect (in the sense of Chomsky (1995)). However, in some NIIs, both [q] and [wh] can optionally need to be checked in C: in these peculiar environments, the [wh]-feature on the wh-word has an output effect and hence must be valued. Subsequently, the valued [wh]-feature is transmitted to the Q-particle, which results in the phenomenon of wh-doubling. In §5.2.1, I claimed that my analysis of wh-doubling has interesting consequences for the theory of Northern Italian indirect wh-questions. Indeed, while single wh-in situ is ruled out in these constructions, doubling wh-in situ is instead felicitous: to my understanding, this phenomenon is predicted under the assumption that the Q-particle of single wh-in situ, contrary to that of wh-doubling, lacks the [wh]-feature needed to check the uninterpretable [wh]-feature in Qemb. If we were dealing with the phonetically-realised and null forms of the exact same element, we would expect both to have the same syntactic properties, contrary to fact.

In Standard Italian indirect wh-questions, when a focused element is present, it lands in the Spec of FocusH, while the wh-phrase moves to the lower portion of the LP, into SpecQembP. The positions occupied by the elements under consideration are illustrated in (27):

(27) DERIVATION OF A FOCUS-CONTAINING WH-QUESTION (Standard Italian)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mi domando …} & \quad \text{[FocusH] A GIANNI …} \text{[QembP che cosa …} \text{[TP abbiano detto …} \text{[TP]} \\
\text{I wonder} & \quad \text{TO JOHN} \quad \text{what} \quad \text{have3PP said}
\end{align*}
\]

‘TO JOHN I wonder what they said (not to Piero)’

As discussed in Rizzi (1997) and further developments, constructions such as (27) are only felicitous in Standard Italian if the focused element is an IO and the wh-phrase is a DO. In contrast, focus-containing indirect wh-questions are productive, and are felicitous regardless of the syntactic role of the elements involved, as in (28):

(28) TREVISIAN FOCUS-CONTAINING INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS

a. Vojo saver EL GATO a chi che i gheo gà dato (, no el can!)

\[\text{want1PS know THE CAT to who that cl3PPM DAT it have given not the dog} \]

‘I want to know THE CAT to whom they gave it (not the dog!)’

b. Me domando A TO MAMA chi che ghe gà dato da bevar (, no a lu!)

\[\text{I wonder TO YOUR MUM who that DAT has given to drink not to him} \]

‘I wonder TO YOUR MUM who gave drinks (not to him)’

c. Vojo saver DOPO SENA chi che te gà visto (, no stamatina!)

\[\text{want1PS know AFTER DINNER who that cl2PS have seen not this.morning} \]

‘I want to know AFTER DINNER who you saw (not this morning)’

Now, the higher clausal domain of indirect interrogatives displays declarative syntax, while the lower presents typical embedded syntax: ScII is ruled out. Consequently, on the basis of my discussion in Chapter 4, we do not expect the embedded CP to have residual V2 syntax: the phi-features in C
must have been correctly transferred to T, hence excluding verb movement to C. It is not uncommon for a language to have V2 syntax only in certain contexts and not in other, and asymmetries between V2 in matrix and non-V2 in embedded clauses are observed in most V2 languages (den Besten 1983, Haegeman 1996, Samo 2018, a.o.). Given that the interpretation of indirect wh-questions is not the same as that of direct questions, i.e. not a set of alternatives on the wh-word but rather declarative-like semantics, it is possible to imagine that the matrix verb selects is an embedded question whose LP is very similar to that of declaratives, with the sole exception of the activation of QembP in the lower portion of the periphery. Consequently, my model predicts that the embedded FocusHIGH bears a [foc]-feature, not a [q]-feature. Indeed, embedded questions do not require an answer, and the felicitous co-occurrence of a wh-phrase and a focused constituent is guaranteed by the fact that the movement of the wh-phrase into QembP is not proper focal movement but rather mere wh-movement required to check a [wh]-feature, as in (29):

(29) **THE LP OF TREVISIAN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS**

\[ \text{LP} =/[\text{ForceP} \ldots [\text{FocusHIGH} \text{Focus}^0_{[\text{foc}]} \ldots [\text{QembP} \text{Qemb}^0_{[\text{wh}]} \text{FinP} \text{Fin}^0_{[\text{IP} \ldots]}]]]]] \]

The featural specifications in (29) predict the following: (i) that languages like Trevigiano, where the adjoined Q-particle is always silent (covert wh-doubling), only check [q] in C (as claimed in Chapter 3); (ii) that Northern Italian languages with overt Q-particles, i.e languages with wh-doubling, can check both [q] and [wh] in C, though not systematically; (iii) as a result of this, in indirect wh-questions, overt wh-doubling, which carries the [wh]-feature transmitted via percolation by the wh-word, is able to check the interrogative feature in QembP alone, through fronting of the Q-particle (while [q] is exceptionally not valued because it is does not have an output effect in this precise context); (iv) in contrast, in the absence of wh-doubling, the silent Q-particle solely endowed with a [q]-feature is insufficient to check [wh] in QembP alone, and the computation fails. Note that, given the lack of a [q]-feature to be checked in C in this type of question, it is unnecessary (and hence not permitted) for Trevisian wh-phrases to join the Q-particle. From (iv) it follows that, among the varieties in which only silent Q-particles are available, only those that are able to license an interrogative operator independently of wh-doubling will be able to license embedded wh-in situ felicitously. One of these languages, I claim, is Trevigiano, where the existence of the inherently interrogative head seINT is sufficient to license an interrogative operator in SpecQembP, hence correctly marking the sentence as interrogative. I illustrate how the [wh]-feature in QembP is checked in the presence of overt wh-doubling in (31), using the Lombard example in (30):

(30) **Strozzenese (adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:593(156))**

\[ \text{IPS} \text{NEG} \text{[what]} \text{bring-you2PS what} \]

\[ \text{know1PS NEG } \text{(se)} \text{ por-ta-t (ko'ze) } \]

\[ \text{I don’t know what to bring you’} \]
5.2 On wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions

(31) QEMB-CHECKING THROUGH WH-DOUBLING

'so 'mia …

(32) illustrates how the se\textsubscript{WH} licenses an INT-operator in SpecQemb\textsubscript{P}, thereby marking the embedded sentence as interrogative in the absence of an [i[wh]] feature in Q. The main difference with respect to the case of overt wh-doubling in (31) is that the wh-phrase here fails to pass its [wh]-feature to the Q-particle, hence the inherently [+wh] head se\textsubscript{WH} is needed to mark the embedded clause as interrogative:

(32) QEMB-CHECKING THROUGH SE\textsubscript{WH}

Concluding remarks

In Chapter 3, following Cable (2010), I claimed that wh-in situ is possible when the Q-particle adjoins to a wh-phrase, while wh-fronting is actually fronting of a wh-phrase selected by a QP-projection. Subsequently, I argued that what makes optional insituness possible is the availability of
both strategies for joining the Q-particle to wh-phrases, and that Northern Italian wh-doubling is an overt instantiation of [q]- and [wh]-features on the Q-particle itself. In this section, I have claimed that what makes wh-doubling different from single wh-in situ is the [wh]-feature which, only in the former, is able to be valued an percolate into the Q-particle. My claim is supported not only by the morphological form of wh-doubling elements, which closely resembles that of wh-phrases, but also by the morphosyntax of indirect wh-phrases. It seems plausible to assume that the varieties with overt wh-doubling have both Trevisian strategies to integrate the silent Q-particle, namely Q-adjunction and Q-projection, plus a third strategy whereby the Q-particle not only has [q]-features but is also specified positively for [wh]. Here, I have claimed that embedded wh-in situ is highly exceptional and is only felicitous in varieties that are able to check the [wh]-feature in QembP. It has been claimed, beginning with Rizzi (1997), that this functional projection, which sits very low in the LP of the clause, hosts wh-phrases in indirect wh-questions. Evidence in favour of this claim comes not only from the distribution of wh-phrases in focus-containing indirect wh-questions in both Standard Italian and Trevigiano, but also from the distribution of the embedding that-COMP and of the interrogative head seWH in Trevigiano.

The productivity of focus-containing indirect wh-questions in Trevigiano raises the question of locality: how can focus and wh-phrases, two quantificational elements, co-exist within the same question without giving rise to a violation? In most cases, crossing quantificational chains, or at best nesting quantificational chains, should be involved here. However, I believe that there is no real need to posit that the quantificational chains under consideration are indeed incompatible with one another: given the semantics of indirect wh-questions, which unlike genuine wh-questions are not answer-seeking, it seems legitimate to posit that the two types of questions are associated to different LPs. Indeed, I have claimed that embedded questions have a declarative-like LP with an active QembP: consequently, these are characterised by a [+foc] Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} plus an interrogative projection in the lower portion of the LP, QembP, specified positively for [wh].

Under the assumption that syntactic operations are performed only if necessary, insertion of a Q-particle in the case of indirect wh-questions appears unnecessary, modulo the cases of overt wh-doubling where the presence of an overtly-realised [wh]-feature on the Q-particle plays a role. The role of the overt Q-particle, I claim, is to check the interrogative feature in QembP, hence licensing embedded wh-in situ felicitously. Once the [wh]-feature in QembP is checked correctly, the coalesced ForceP is marked as interrogative and the LP can expand further, virtually limitlessly, without the structural distance between ForceP and QembP being problematic. Recall that the primary role of the complementiser system is the expression of force, crucially distinguishing between various clause types (declarative, interrogative, exclamative, etc.) and finiteness, distinguishing at least between finite and non-finite clauses. Force and Finiteness can be thought of as two distinct heads closing off the
complementiser system at the top and bottom end, with the need for two distinct functional positions becoming clear when the intermediate topic and focus field is activated. According to Rizzi (2001), it is possible for Force and Finiteness to coalesce into a single head in the simple cases, expanding only when required. Under this assumption, I believe, the structural distance between $Q_{emb}$ and Force is of no concern for proper marking of the latter as interrogative to take place.

5.3 On wh-in situ within islands

Starting from Ross (1967), syntactic structures that prevent extraction to varying degrees have been referred to as islands. Cross-linguistically, extraction of wh-phrases out of strong islands appears to be forbidden, while weak islands often partially allow extraction. With regard to the availability of island-trapped wh-in situ, there appears to be a clear-cut divide in NIDs: the varieties that have been claimed to derive wh-in situ TP-internally (regardless of whether focus movement is present or not) systematically allow island-trapped insituness (Manzini & Savoia 2005 and this dissertation), while Bellunese and like varieties do not (Munaro 1999, Munaro et al. 2001, a.o.). In this section, which only provides a preliminary analysis of the phenomenon of Trevisian wh-in situ within islands to extraction, I tentatively propose that island-internal wh-in situ is different from wh-in situ outside of strong islands. In fact, while wh-phrases fail to merge the Q-particle when trapped inside an island, hence being exceptionally bare, QP-selection of the whole island and (overt or covert) massive pied-piping thereof do seem to take place. In contrast, I claim that weak islands are not real islands in Trevigiano and, while their clausal nature prevents QP from selecting them, wh-phrases within them are able to correctly join to the silent Q-particle.

5.3.1 Trevisian strong islands and the puzzling optionality of SCII

If the right context is provided, Trevigiano can felicitously license wh-phrases inside syntactic islands. Observe the instances of strong islands in (1) to (3), which I delimit using double square brackets:

(1) **WH-IN SITU WITHIN A SUBJECT ISLAND**

_**Context:** You work in a bookshop in a commercial street. Rumours say that some clients of the clothes shop down the street left without paying this morning. You overhear a colleague of yours discussing this with a friend. However, he’s actually saying something about the grocery store next door, so you think he might have got the wrong information. You ask:

`E te gà dito che [[ i clienti de chi ]] no i gà pagà?`

`cl_{3PPF} you_{2PS} have said that the clients of whom NEG cl_{3PPM} have paid`

‘Who is $x$, such that $x$ is someone’s client, and you’ve been told that $x$ didn’t pay?’

---

193
More on Trevisian wh-in situ

(2) **WH-IN SITU WITHIN A COMPLEX-NP ISLAND**

*Context:* A friend of yours went to the animal fair last weekend, as he does every year. He’s a cattle raiser who attends the fair just to bid and try to buy the heaviest pig - and usually succeeds. You meet him at the bar and ask:

(Eora,) te gà comprà [[ un porsel che pesa *cuanto* ]]?

(so) cl_{2PS} have bought a pig that weighs how much

‘What is the weight of x, where x is a pig and you bought x?’

(3) **WH-IN SITU WITHIN AN ADJUNCT ISLAND**

*Context:* Your friend Giacomo is very ill-tempered and tends to overreact easily and leave without greeting anyone. You get to the bar where Giacomo and you go every evening, and notice that he’s not there, which is strange because he usually leaves way later. You smile to a common friend and ask:

(Eora,) el zé partìo [[ sensa saedur chi ]] , sto giro?

(so) cl_{3PS,M} is left without greeting who this round

‘Who is x, such that he left without greeting x?’

A first hypothesis suggested by cases such as (1) to (3) is that wh-phrases trapped inside islands cannot be the same as wh-phrases outside islands: if the Q-particle was joined and checked C overtly, SClI would be expected, and for the Q-particle to escape the island would constitute a violation, which should result in ungrammaticality. Plausibly, island-contained wh-phrases are bare and only their [wh]-feature is relevant for the derivation of the question, which is checked using an island-escaping technique, such as feature movement. It has been argued that feature movement is derivationally ‘lighter’ than phrasal movement, and that it can escape islands without creating violations. An influential account of island-trapped insiteness along these lines is Soh (2005), who claims that Chinese *nominal* wh-in situ, which systematically take scope across an island, must be treated differently form *adverbial* wh-in situ, which might not). Under the assumption that Chinese wh-in situ involves generalised covert raising à la Huang (1982), Soh explains the asymmetry between wh-nominals and wh-adverbials in terms of covert feature movement, which is more unconstrained, as opposed to covert phrasal movement.

The prediction that only feature movement of [wh] is involved in the derivation of wh-in situ trapped inside an island, which I shall slightly modify later on, is supported by the observation that, very canonically, wh-phrases cannot escape strong islands, as in (4):

(4) **INFELICITOUS EXTRACTIONS OUT OF STRONG ISLANDS**

a. * De *chi* i e te ga dito che [[ i clienti ]] no i gà pagà?

b. * *Cuanto* i te gà comprà [[ un porsel che pesa ]] ?
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c. *Chi el ze partio [[ senza saeudar ]]?

Note that the questions in (4) would be ill-formed even in the presence of SCII. Interestingly though, the questions in (1)-(3) are also grammatical when construed with SCII, as in (5):

(5) SCII IN CONSTRUCTION WITH ISLAND-CONTAINED WH-IN SITU

Trevigiano

a. Te ga-e dito che [[ i clienti de chi ]] no i gà pagà?
you2PS have=clPPM said that the clients of whom NEG clPPM have paid

b. (Eora,) ga-tu comprà [[ un porsel che peza cuanto ]]?
so have=clPPM bought a pig that weights how.much

c. (Eora,) ze-o partio [[ senza saeudar chi ]], sto ‘èjiro?
so is=clPPM left without greeting who this round

In my model, for (5) to be possible, overt interrogative movement to the LP of the clause must be involved. Therefore, I shall henceforth try to fit Q into the computation.

5.3.2 Massive pied-piping of strong islands

Cable (2010) argues that one of the most interesting similarities between the Q-particles of Tlingit and Sinhala, respectively sá and da, concerns their behaviour with regard to islands to extraction. What Cable argues is that, when the Q-particle is located outside of the island, it is accessible to the matrix C, which results in structural felicity. Cable uses these data to support his theory that wh-words are not relevant in the computation of wh-questions, i.e. agreement is established between C and Q, while the matrix C bears no syntactic relationship to the wh-operator itself. In fact, that the wh-word remains inside the island appears to have no bearing on the well-formedness of the sentence.

Kishimoto (2005), in line with Hagstrom (1998), argues that in Sinhala wh-questions a wh-word may be contained inside an island iff the Q-particle is merged outside the island. In complex-NP islands, the Q-particle must be merged to the right of the head of the relative clause, as in (6):

(6) INTERACTION BETWEEN Q-PARTICLE AND COMPLEX-NP ISLAND

Sinhala

(Cable 2010:33(38), originally in Kishimoto 2005:29)

a. Oyaa [[ Chitra kaa-ta dunna CP] pota NP] da kieuwe?
you Chitra who-DAT give book Q read
‘Who did you read the book that Chitra gave?’

b. * Oyaa [[ Chitra kaa-ta da dunna CP] pota NP] kieuwe?
you Chitra who-DAT Q give book read

The same condition is argued to be at play in wh-questions in Tlingit, where the wh-phrase may be contained inside an island to extraction iff the Q-particle sá is merged outside of it. Recall
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that, as argued in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, while Sinhala is a Q-projection language where QP-fronting occurs after Spell Out (giving rise to wh-in situ), in Tlingit QP-fronting occurs before Spell Out. Consequently, when an island is selected by QP, it is pied-piped as a whole, as in (7):

(7)  INTERACTION BETWEEN Q-PARTICLE AND COMPLEX-NP ISLAND

Tlingit (Cable 2010:33(39))

a. [ [ Wáa kwligeyi CP xáat NP ] sá i tuwáa sigóo? ]
   how it.is.big.REL fish Q your spirit it.is.happy
   ‘How big a fish do you want?’ (Literally: A fish that is how big do you want?)

b. * [ [ Wáa sá kwligeyi CP xáat NP ] i tuwáa sigóo? ]
   how Q it.is.big.REL fish your spirit it.is.happy

c. * [ [ Wáa kwligeyi CP sá xáat NP ] i tuwáa sigóo? ]
   how it.is.big.REL Q fish your spirit it.is.happy

(7b) and (7c) illustrate that the Tlingit Q-particle sá can occur neither within the relative clause, nor before its head: QP must select the whole strong island.

Application to Trevisian strong islands

The behaviour of wh-in situ within islands in Trevigiano is very interesting and should be examined here. First of all, the infelicity of out-of-island extraction suggests that strong islands do indeed block extraction in this language, which results in two predictions: (i) that Q-particles also cannot escape islands, hence the presence of SClI in examples such as (8a) ought to be explained in terms of movement of material external to the island itself, and (ii) that the absence of SClI in (8b) must be related to a similar mechanism.

(8)  WH-IN SITU WITHIN A COMPLEX-NP ISLAND

Trevisiano

a. (Eora,) ga-tu comprà [ [ un porsel che peza cuanto ] ]?
   (so) have=cl comprà a pig that weights how.much

b. (Eora,) te gà comprà [ [ un porsel che peza cuanto ] ]?
   (so) cl comprà a pig that weights how.much

One hypothesis worth pursuing is that the element responsible for SClI in (8a) is the Q-particle which, as argued in Cable (2010) for Tlingit, is able to enter the computation by exceptionally adjoining to the whole wh-containing island. I have so far claimed that Trevigiano is able to license insituness thanks to the availability of Q-adjunction; under this assumption, the felicity of a question as (8a) is not surprising. Observe (9), in which the silent Q adjoins to the complex-NP, which has the status of a strong island. For Q to be able to adjoin here is not surprising because, despite its complexity, the constituent is nevertheless nominal in nature. Consequently, Q-Agreement is correctly established between the uninterpretable Q-feature in Focus\(^0\)\(^{\text{HIGH}}\) and its interpretable counterpart on the silent Q-particle. Because of the presence of EPP in Focus\(^0\)\(^{\text{HIGH}}\), the goal is attracted into SpecFocus\(^{\text{HIGH}}\). Note
that the head of the focus projection hosts the verb, which has been attracted by the left-peripheral phi-features (the interrogative NOM clitic) within it.

(9) **Q-ADJUNCTION TO THE STRONG ISLAND + Q-AGREEMENT**

Accounting for (8b) might seem more complex. However, I believe that Cable (2010) offers a straightforward solution based on the Tlingit examples of massive pied-piping of strong islands, an operation that he refers to as *pied-piping past island* (see §5.3.4 for a discussion). The idea that (8b), where a wh-word is trapped within the strong island in the absence of **SClI**, might be an instance of covert pied piping of the whole island seems supported by the data in (10):

(10) **MASSIVE PIED-PIPING OF A STRONG ISLAND**

The sentence in (10) closely resembles the Tlingit examples discussed above. Although it is degraded, I actually believe that it proves that it is possible for Trevisian QPs to select strong islands; the examples also favour an analysis of islands like (8b) as being likely selected by QP, with the lack of **SCII** attributed to highly-exceptional covert QP-fronting. In fact, if only Q-adjunction was at play, **SCII** would be expected, contrary to fact. Subsequently, a question that contains a QP-selected strong island must be derived as shown in (11): following Q-Agreement between the uninterpretable feature in **Focus**\(^0\)\(^{\text{HIGH}}\) and the interpretable Q-feature of the silent Q-particle, the island-containing QP is attracted by the EPP into SpecFocus\(^{\text{HIGH}}\) and the Q-criterion is satisfied. **SCII** normally takes place.
(11) **QP-SELECTION OF A STRONG ISLAND + OVERT MASSIVE PIED-PIPING**

If QP-movement takes place covertly, then SCII does not take place and the island is pronounced in situ. It is not clear why covert movement is exceptionally preferred in the case of a QP-selected strong island, in a language like Trevigiano where interrogative movements always take place before Spell Out. However, this phenomenon, which could probably be attributed to computational complexity, is not limited to Trevigiano. Observe the Lombard data in (12), from Manzini & Savoia (2005):

(12) *Grumellese* (adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:587(157))

- a. Dig-ëi che gé egnit [[i amis de chi]]?
  - say=them that is come the friends of whom
  - ‘For which x, such as x is someone’s friend, they say that x came?’
- b. Ta pjah [[i liber ch’i pàrla de cohè]]?
  - you like the books that they speak of what
  - ‘For which x, such as x is a topic, you like books about x?’
- c. L’e ndâf iyja [[hènha haludà chi]]?
  - he’s gone away without greeting who
  - ‘For which x, such as x is a person, you left without greeting x?’

In *Grumellese*, which systematically requires SCII in matrix clauses, the status of SCII seems uncertain when a strong island enters the computation. It would be interesting to study the status of massive pied-piping in such languages like ; however, what is sure, is that Trevigiano is not the only NID which exceptionally allows QP-fronting to be delayed to LF when the constituent selected by QP is a strong island. I shall leave the investigation of the phenomenon for further work.
5.3 On wh-in situ within islands

5.3.3 Wh-phrases are bare within strong islands, but not within weak islands

I have claimed that wh-phrases are bare within strong islands, i.e. they do not adjoin to the silent Q-particle. Here, I shall claim that the situation is different with weak islands for extraction: wh-words are indeed able to adjoin to the silent Q-particle normally, and so are islands iff their nature is nominal. Note that I exclude wh-islands from this discussion because multiple wh-questions are impossible in Trevigiano, and the presence of se in indirect yes/no questions makes them ambiguous between the (correct) polar reading and the single wh-reading (which disrupts the island). Let us look instead at the examples of a negative island in (13) and a factive island in (14):

(13) NEGATIVE ISLAND

Context: Your wife is very picky when it comes to choosing the best holiday destination. You’ve been discussing where to go during Easter break for some weeks, and earlier this morning you overheard her complaining about some of the eligible destinations with your daughter on the phone. You go see your daughter and ask:

(Eora, sintimo,) te ga-ea dito che [ no a vol ndar dove ]?

(14) FACTIVE ISLAND

Context: Your daughter is a hoarder, and her room is always messy, so last week you had her throw away most of her belongings. She’s been sad since, and you feel guilty. You ask her:

Te pianze-o el cuor [ de ver butà cossa ], sopratuto?

Since both types of weak islands can be construed with SCII, it can legitimately be hypothesised that weak islands are of a different type to strong islands, and indeed that they permit Q-adjunction to the in situ wh-word and Q-Agreement between the Q-feature in Focus\text{HIGH} and the island-trapped wh-word. The Q-adjunction within island analysis in (16) is supported by the possibility of extracting the wh-word from the island itself, as in (15):

(15) FELICITOUS WH-EXTRACTIONS OUT OF WEAK ISLAND

a. Dove, te ga-ea dito che [ no a vol ndar ___ ]?
b. Cossa, te pianze-o el cuor [ de ver butà ___ ]?

A questions such as (13) must therefore be derived along the lines of (16):
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(16) Q-AGREEMENT ACROSS WEAK ISLAND

\[
\text{Force}^{\text{INT}} \quad \text{Force}' \\
\text{Force}_{+[\text{INT}]} \quad \text{Focus}_{\text{HIGH}} \\
Q_{j}[Q] \quad \text{Focus}' \\
\text{Focus}_{[\text{TT}],j}[\text{[Q]}} \quad \text{SubjP} \\
\text{te ga-ea} \quad \text{Subj}' \\
\text{overt Q-movement} \quad \text{Agree/Attract} \quad \text{Subj}^0 \quad \text{TP} \\
dito che [ no a vol ndar [WhP <Q_{j}[Q]> [WhP dove ]]]
\]

In (15a), where the lack of SCI\textsubscript{II} is predictably unacceptable, QP-projection selecting the island-contained wh-phrase and overt QP-fronting must be at play, as shown in (17):

(17) Q-AGREEMENT ACROSS WEAK ISLAND + QP-FRONTING

\[
\text{Force}^{\text{INT}} \quad \text{Force}' \\
\text{Force}_{+[\text{INT}]} \quad \text{Focus}_{\text{HIGH}} \\
\text{QP} \quad \text{Focus}' \\
Q_{j}[Q] \quad \text{Focus}_{[\text{TT}],j}[\text{[Q]}} \quad \text{SubjP} \\
\text{te ga-ea} \quad \text{Subj}' \quad \text{overt QP-fronting} \quad \text{Agree/Attract} \quad \text{Subj}^0 \quad \text{TP} \\
dito che [ no a vol ndar [QP_{j}[Q] ]]
\]

To conclude, note that wh-in situ within weak islands can also be licensed in the absence of SCI\textsubscript{II}, provided the island is a \textit{nominal}, as in (19):
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(18) WH-IN SITU WITHIN WEAK ISLANDS IN THE ABSENCE OF SCII

a. ?? a te gā dito che [TP no a vol ‘ndar dove ]?
   cl3PS,F you have said that NEG cl3PS,F wants go where
b. te pianze el cuor [TP de ver butà cossa ]?
   you cries the heart to have thrown.away what

Although the judgements are often tricky, it appears that the absence of SCII in instances such as (18a) forces its interpretation as an echo question. It is tempting to analyse (18b) as an instance of QP selecting the whole island, and then exceptionally moving to C after Spell-Out, similarly to what was suggested for strong islands. However, it is not immediately clear why (18a) requires SCII, suggesting that QP-selection does not apply. Observe (19):

(19) MASSIVE PIED-PIPING OF WEAK ISLANDS

a. * [TP no a vol ‘ndar dove ] te ga-ea dito che ___j?
   NEG cl3PS,F wants go where you has=cl3PS,F said that
b. ? [TP de ver butà cossa ] te pianze-o el cuor ___j?
   to have thrown.away what you cries=clEXP, the heart

Under the assumption that a fronted island must be selected as a whole by QP, there appears to be a selectional requirement at play, namely that the constituent selected by QP is a nominal. Unlike in (19a) in fact, the island in (19b) is a nominal, hence can be selected by QP and can undergo QP-fronting. Note that fronting of the clausal island in (19a) would be just as bad if the whole CP was selected by QP, as illustrated in (20):

(20) MASSIVE PIED-PIPING OF WEAK ISLANDS (ii)

* [CP che no a vol ‘ndar dove ] te ga-ea dito ___j?
  that NEG cl3PS,F wants go where you has=cl3PS,F said

A reasonable suggestion would actually be that Trevisian weak islands are in fact neither islands for extraction nor for Q-Agreement, and that their (in)ability to be selected as a whole by QPs is dependent on the selectional requirement of QPs for their internal complement to be a nominal, as formulated in (21):

(21) SELECTIONAL REQUIREMENTS OF QP

A QP must select a constituent as its internal argument. Minimally, the selected constituent must contain a wh-phrase and be nominal in nature.

5.3.4 English limited pied-piping vs Trevisian Tlingit-like syntax

What led Cable (2010) to posit that the Q-based analysis of Tlingit ought to be extended to all other wh-fronting languages is the observation that these languages exhibit the same grammatical patterns
that in Tlingit can only be explained by that approach. These patterns relate to the ill-formedness of, in turn, (i) P-stranding (where P refers to both pre-positions and post-positions), (ii) possessor extraction and (iii) determiner extraction. Observe the ungrammatical extractions in the Tlingit examples in (22):

(22) **INAPPROPRIATE LINEAR ORDERS IN WH-QUESTIONS**

a. No Q between a postposition and its complement (Cable 2010:44(64))
   i. *Aadóo teen sá yeegoot?
      who Q you.went
      ‘Who did you go with?’
   
   ii. *Aadóo sá teen yeegoot?
       who Q with you.went

b. No Q between a possessor and the possessed NP (Cable 2010:44-45(67))
   i. *Aadóo yaagú sá yaagú?
      who boat Q you.saw.it
      ‘Whose boat did you see?’
   
   ii. *Aadóo sá yaagú yaagú?
       who Q boat you.saw.it

c. No Q between a D and its NP complement (Cable 2010:45(72))
   i. *Daakw keitl sá asháa?
      which dog Q it.barks
      ‘Which dog is barking?’
   
   ii. *Daakw sá keitl asháa?
       which Q dog it.barks

In all these sentences, Cable claims, the infelicitous wh-extraction could only take place from a base structure where a QP intervenes between a functional head, F, and a phrase that F selects for. This type of extraction violates the formal requirement that he calls the *QP-Intervention Condition*:

(23) **THE QP-INTERVENTION CONDITION** (Cable 2010:57(107))

A QP cannot intervene between a functional head F and a phrase selected by F. Such an intervening QP blocks the selectional relation between F and the lower phrase.

In this section, I shall claim that both the QP-intervention data and the syntax of wh-in situ within strong islands in Trevigiano provide supporting evidence in favour of my analysis of Trevisian wh-fronting as an instance of QP-fronting. In (24) to (26), I illustrate the application of the QP-intervention condition using examples from Trevigiano, where structures of the types given in (22) below are predictably ill-formed. Observe that the exceptional felicity of (22a) in English is explained by Cable in terms of the unusual lexical properties of English Ps; refer to Cable (2010:100-112) for a detailed discussion of the issue.
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(24) ILL-FORMEDNESS OF P-STRANING

\[
\text{[QP [DP } \text{chì} \text{] Q, go-i\theta \text{ da dirgheo who have=cl}1\text{PS to say.DAT.it to}} \text{impossible PP, violates QP-intervention condition}
\]

‘To whom am I supposed to say this?’

(25) ILL-FORMEDNESS OF POSSESSOR EXTRACTION

\[
\text{[QP [DP de } \text{chì} \text{] Q, ga-tu\text{ leto have=cl}2\text{PS read i libri the books}} \text{impossible DP, violates QP-intervention condition}
\]

‘Whose books did you read?’

(26) ILL-FORMEDNESS OF D-EXTRACTION

\[
\text{[QP [DP che \text{] Q, ga-tu\text{ leto have=cl}2\text{PS read i libri the books}} \text{impossible DP, violates QP-intervention condition}}
\]

‘Which books did you read?’

For structures such as (24) to (26) to be well-formed, QP must select the whole PP/DP in case of QP-fronting or, in a mixed language like Trevigiano, QP- in the case of fronting and Q alone if the whole constituent containing the wh-operator stays clause-internally. I illustrate this in (27), using the case of the PP in (24):

(27) RELATIONS OF Q WITH A PP CONTAINING A WH-PHRASE

a. Ill-formed QP-selection (resulting in a violation of the QP-intervention condition)
\[
* \text{[PP a [QP Q [DP chì]]]}
\]

b. Well-formed relations

i. QP-selection (leading to QP-fronting)
\[
\text{[QP Q [PP a [DP chì]]]}
\]

ii. Q-adjunction (leading to wh-in situ)
\[
\text{[PP [PP a [DP chì]] Q]}
\]

As previously mentioned, the parallelism between the Tlingit data and patterns observed cross-linguistically led Cable (2010) to propose that all wh-fronting structures must receive the Q-based analysis. In this approach, the ill-formedness of island-contained wh-in situ is not explained in terms of the islandhood of the base position of the wh-phrase, but rather in terms of constraints on the placement of Q. Accordingly, Cable argues, the empirical motivation for classifying those structures
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as islands to extraction is weakened. I believe that the Trevisian data support this claim, and the
discussion below should constitute further evidence in favour of extending the grammar of Q to
languages with phonetically-null Q-particles as well.

Recall that in Tlingit an interrogative wh-word can appear inside of a fronted QP-selected island.
These configurations, which Cable refers to as pied-piping past islands (PPPI), have the form shown in
(7), repeated here as (28):

(28)  PIED-PIPING PAST ISLAND

\[
[ [ Wáa kwligeyi \text{CP} ] xáat_{NP} ] sá i tuwáa sigóo? \\
\text{how it.is.big,REL fish Q your spirit it.is.happy} \\
\text{‘A fish that is how big do you want?’}
\]

The structure in (28) is the same as the structure that I posited for Trevisian wh-in situ within
strong islands. However, not all QP-fronting languages allow PPPI, as illustrated by the English
examples in (29):

(29)  ILLICIT PIED-PIPING PAST ISLAND (Cable 2010:144(5))

\[
a. * [DP A fish [CP that is how big ]] do you want? \\
b. * [DP A book [CP that who wrote ]] did you buy?
\]

To explain the unexpected unavailability of (29) in English, even though it has QP-fronting, Cable
proposes that the constraints governing pied-piping in languages like English follow from a single
requirement that is absent from Tlingit-like languages, namely that the Q-particle and the wh-word
must Agree. Cable formulates this requirement as in (30):

(30)  THE NATURE OF LIMITED PIED-PIPING (Cable 2010:144(14))

\[
\text{If the Q-particle must Agree with the wh-word it c-commands, then a wh-word cannot be} \\
\text{dominated in the sister of Q by islands or lexical categories. Thus limited pied-piping languages} \\
\text{are those where Q/wh-Agreement must occur.}
\]

The definition in (30) is based on Cable’s more general assumption that probing and agreement
cannot apply across islands, which he explains on semantic grounds. Therefore, if we assume that
limited pied-piping languages require Q/wh-Agreement, we correctly predict that these languages
cannot permit pied-piping past islands: the domination of the wh-phrase by an island located within
the sister of Q would prevent Agreement between the Q-particle and the wh-word, as in (31). Cable
argues that in a language like English where the Q-particle bears an interpretable but unvalued Q-
feature (\(iQ[\_]\) in the derivation below), at LF the presence of a syntactic island between the Q-particle
and the wh-phrase blocks the Q-particle from receiving a value for the Q-feature. As a consequence,
structures of this sort crash at the LF interface.
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(31) ILLICIT PIED-PIPING PAST ISLAND IN ENGLISH
(example (29a) above, from Cable 2010:148(15))

(32) LICIT PIED-PIPING PAST ISLAND IN TLINGIT
(example 28 above, from Cable 2010:148(16))

On the contrary, in languages like Tlingit where the Q-particle is lexically-endowed with a valued Q-feature (indicated as \(iQ^{+}\) in the derivation), the presence of an island between the Q-particle and the wh-word does not affect the interpretability of the structure at LF, as illustrated in the grammatical example in (32):

Since languages without Q/wh-Agreement, such as Tlingit, permit pied-piping past islands, it seems plausible to posit that Trevigiano does not require Agreement between the silent Q-particle and the wh-word. This property provides evidence in support of my claim that the Force in Trevigiano is inherently interrogative and does not need checking; what is more, not only does it support to the analysis of Trevigiano as a QP-language, but it also suggests that I am on the right track in proposing that a [wh]-feature must be at play in wh-doubling configurations, where [wh]-features are clearly visible on the Q-particle and island-trapped wh-in situ is not legit. Languages might also exist in which the relationship between Q and the wh-phrase does not merely involve the Q-feature but also a wh-feature. I believe that it is indeed Cable’s Wh/Q-Agreement mechanism that is responsible
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for the transmission of [wh]-features to the Q-particle, which is theoretically more desirable than
the mechanism of feature percolation that I posited earlier. As a consequence, for instances of overt
wh-doubling, it seems indeed legitimate to assume the existence of an unvalued interpretable [wh]-
feature on the wh-word, and of its uninterpretable counterpart in Q, as shown in (33). I shall call this
mechanism bi-directional Wh/Q-Agreement:

(33) BI-DIRECTIONAL WH/Q-AGREEMENT (wh-doubling)
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Concluding remarks

Questions containing syntactic islands are often strongly presuppositional, and can be either
uttered as a follow-up to a preceding utterance, i.e. almost as an echo question, or as a consequence of
the set of beliefs of the speaker, who is clearly convinced that the event in question must have taken
place. Nonetheless, these are real questions, hence the syntax of Trevisian island-trapped wh-words
and the surprising lack of SCII clearly sets the behaviour of island-trapped wh-words apart from that
of free clause-internal wh-words, which are always construed with SCII.

In this Chapter, I have investigated the morphosyntax of Trevisian islands to extraction, crucially
claiming that only strong islands block extraction, while weak islands are not islands at all: the
Trevisian facts strongly suggest that no islandhood is at play when a wh-word is located within a
weak island, since neither Q-Agreement nor QP-fronting are blocked. In contrast, strong islands
do indeed block both extraction and Q-Agreement, and any wh-word within them is exceptionally
bare: either QP selects the whole island, or the computation fails. Basing my discussion on a cross-
linguistic comparison with Cable’s (2010) Tlingit and Sinhala data, I have argued that Trevigiano
can exceptionally delay QP-fronting to LF if the selected constituent is an island, provided that
island is a nominal. I have also claimed that Cable’s notion of Wh/Q-Agreement, which explains the
(un)availability of pied-piping across island cross-linguistically, can be slightly improved to also
account for the case of Northern Italian wh-doubling. In fact, assuming that these languages have
bidirectional Wh/Q-Agreement in the case of wh-doubling offers a straightforward explanation for
the phonetically-audible (and highly-exceptional) presence of wh-features on the Q-particle.
Before moving on to Chapter 6, I would also like to point out that Cable’s classification of languages into two groups based on their status with regard to the Agreement between wh-phrases and Q also correctly predicts the contrasts observed in (34) and (35):

(34)  **WH-IN SITU IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS**  
  a. * What do you wonder I bought where?
  b. What do you wonder where I bought ___?

(35)  **WH-IN SITU IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS**  
  a.  
  Trevigiano
  Me domando *(se) a lo gà comprà dove
  me ask se_{WH,3PS,F} it has bought where
  ‘I wonder where she bought it’
  b.  
  Strozzense (adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:593(156))
  ‘so mia *(se) por’ta-t (ko’zE)
  know_{1PS} NEG *(what) bring-you_{2PS} what
  ‘I don’t know what to bring you’

In English, where the silent Q-particle is subject to Wh/Q-Agreement but no [wh]-feature is involved in the mechanism, the indirect wh-interrogative is infelicitous in the presence of a clause-internal wh-phrase: wh-fronting to the embedded LP is required. What makes English different from Trevigiano is the presence of an inherently-interrogative head in the former, but not in the latter, which is able to check Rizzi & Bocci’s (2017) QembP, as I discussed in §5.2. As a consequence, languages with overt wh-doubling, where Wh/Q-Agreement involves both [q] and [wh] and the [wh]-feature on the Q-particle is morphologically visible, are expected to be unable to perform pied-piping past islands. This prediction is correct, at least for languages like Bellunese (as described in Munaro 1999), where wh-in situ is not felicitous within islands to extraction, but also for Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) Lombard varieties, where only single wh-in situ is felicitous within islands, while wh-doubling fails.

To conclude, note that in a system in which the featural specification of Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} changes on the basis of the type of clause ([+foc] in declaratives and [+q] in interrogatives), it is actually possible to dispense with Rizzi’s (1997) claim that wh-phrases (QPs) and focused constituents compete for the same structural position. In fact, it is plausible to think that what is targeted by interrogative wh-phrases in matrix questions is actually IntP, an inherently interrogative projection. This type of approach would probably be theoretically sensible and would only leave phi-features in the interrogative Focus head, which would be responsible for the attraction of the verb to C, and Q-features in Int, which would be responsible for Q-agreement. However, an analysis along these lines would to an extent undermine my idea that interrogative NOM clitics are phi-features that are pronounced once a correct Spec-head configuration is created in Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}. Since this point is not per se problematic for the theory developed here, I shall leave aside further investigations in this regard for future work.
Part III

Towards a Typology of Romance
Wh-in situ
Chapter 6

On the theory of Romance wh-in situ

In Part I of this work, I overviewed the morphosyntax of Northern Italian wh-in situ. On the basis of the somewhat complex distributional patterns displayed by clause-internal wh-phrases, I suggested a primitive classification of Northern Italian dialects (NIDs) into major groupings, which I will henceforth label *types*. These are the following:

**TYPES OF NORTHERN ITALIAN WH-IN SITU**

- **Type I**: Trevigiano and similar varieties;
- **Type II**: Lombard and similar varieties;
- **Type III**: Bellunese and similar varieties.

The *types* can be identified on the bases of complex interactions among properties of Northern Italian insituness. The crucial variables are listed below:

**DISTRIBUTIONAL PROPERTIES OF WH-IN SITU: VARIABLES**

- (in)felicity of D-linked wh-phrases clause-internally;
- presence or absence of a *sentence-finality requirement* (the need for sentence internal wh-phrases to occupy the edge of the sentence in the phonetic string);
- presence or absence of short movement;
- iff short movement is present, its mandatory vs optional status thereof;
- (in)felicity of wh-phrases in long-distance and/or indirect wh-questions;
- (in)felicity of wh-phrases inside weak and/or strong syntactic islands.

Crucially, *type III* varieties are those that have the D-linking, short movement, embedded, and island variables set negatively, but the sentence-finality variable set positively. In contrast, *type II* varieties have all variables set positively, modulo those of short movement and of the sentence-finality
requirement. Finally, note that the only major divide between type II and type I varieties is that the short movement variable is set positively, and associated with a mandatory status, only in the latter.

My proposal is that the interactions observed among the distributional variables above are so regular in Northern Italian insituness (and beyond) that to not take them into consideration in establishing a solid theoretical account of the morphosyntax of optional wh-in situ would be a major conceptual error. My claim so far has been that Trevigiano and similar varieties have fake wh-in situ, which I analysed in terms of focus movement into a VP-peripheral Spec. My proposal here will be to apply a slightly-modified version of Wh-to-Foc to type III varieties as well, and to posit the existence of unmoved wh-in situ in type II varieties (in the sense of Manzini & Savoia 2005, though with different theoretical implementations). How a tripartite way to derive Northern Italian wh-in situ is possible, and parametrised, will follow from the observation of the projections that are exploited by wh-in situ and its featural properties.

Organisation of this Chapter

The Chapter opens with an investigation of published works on the morphosyntax of Northern Italian (and more generally Romance) wh-in situ. In §6.1.1, I provide an overview of the remnant-IP movement analysis (Poletto & Pollock (2000), Munaro et al. 2001 and related works), followed by a discussion of Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) claim of real wh-in situ (covert movement analysis) in §6.1.2. Then, in §6.1.3, I comment on the non-applicability of both analyses to the Trevisian data. In §6.2, I provide a brief excursus on the morphosyntax of wh-in situ in a number of Romance varieties spoken outside of Northern Italy, claiming that the distinction into types that I have developed for NIDs seems to generally hold for Romance as a whole. To conclude, in §6.3 I discuss the consequences of my theory of Wh-to-Foc for the theory of Northern Italian wh-in situ, and suggest that we analyse the differences observed between types of insituness as dependent on a number of (possibly parametrised) variables ranging from the positions available for clause-internal wh-phrases to the strategies for integrating the silent Q-particles into the computation.

6.1 Unifying analyses: moving further!

Over the years, two major, conflicting treatments have been proposed for wh-in situ in NIDs. Some authors claim that Northern Italian insituness is derived exploiting a projection in the low CP, and hence that it is an instance of fake insituness (Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015): overt wh-movement of clause-internal wh-words does indeed take place, but is masked by further syntactic computations. I discuss these works, which I classify under the label of remnant-IP movement analysis,
in §6.1.1. Other authors, however, have argued in favour of real Chinese-like insituness in NIDs, i.e. lack of wh-movement of any kind before Spell Out (Manzini & Savoia 2005:2011). I overview this proposal, which I call the covert movement hypothesis, in §6.1.2.

I argue that, while my analysis in terms of Wh-to-Foc can be applied to all languages which, like Trevigiano, derive wh-in situ through focus movement within TP (type I), the remnant-IP movement analysis accounts perfectly for the data from Bellunese-like varieties (type III), and Lombard-like varieties (type II) fit perfectly into Manzini & Savoia’s account. However, as I shall show, none of these existing theoretical treatments is able to account for the special behaviour of Trevigiano and similar type I varieties. As a consequence, in §6.3.1, I shall argue that a unified derivation is not sufficient to explain all of the behavioural patterns observed in NIDs, proposing instead a more flexible model where linguistic types derive (real or fake) wh-in situ by making different use of the focal projection within the clausal domain. Furthermore, in the spirit of Chomsky’s (2001) Uniformity Principle, I argue in favour of an analysis of type III wh-in situ as a constrained instance of Wh-to-Foc.

6.1.1 Left-peripheral fake insituness

In Chapters 2 and 3 I argued that, starting from Poletto & Pollock (2000) and Munaro et al. (2001), it has been claimed that Northern Italian insituness is the result of wh-movement to the CP. Observe the Bellunese question in (1):

(1) **WH-IN SITU TYPE III** (Poletto & Pollock 2000:118(5))

Ha-tu parecià che?

have=you prepared what

‘What did you prepare?’

In the remnant-IP movement analysis, clause-internal wh-words such as che (‘what’) of example (1) do not stay in their external-merge position, but rather undergo A’-movement to a functional projection in the lower portion of the LP, as shown in (2):

(2) **WH-IN SITU TYPE III** (simplified derivation)

Input: [IP tu ha parecià che]

a. *First step*: Wh-movement to a functional projection higher than IP (here, XP)

[XP che] X^0 [IP tu ha parecià ___]

b. *Second step*: Movement of the remnant-IP to a higher functional projection (YP)

[YP [IP tu ha parecià ___] Y^0 [XP che, X^0 ___]]

Consequently, Bellunese-like languages are taken to display instances of fake insituness: as shown in (2), the wh-element is first moved, then its movement is masked by further computations that
target higher portions of the LP, including movement of the remnant-IP. The remnant-IP movement analysis is based on factors including:

(i) Kayne’s (1998) claim that there cannot be covert movement of any kind;
(ii) the assumption that the different sequences displayed by French and Bellunese (and perhaps others) at Spell Out cannot be random and must reflect the interplay of the invariant structure of the CP-domain. I develop this point in what follows.

Point (ii) refers to the morphological similarity between two what-words in French and Bellunese (respectively, que and che), and to their close connection with \textit{SCII}. Observe the examples in (3) to (6). Distributionally, \textit{que} is the only wh-word in French that is only felicitous clause-initially, as in (3):

(3) \textit{QUE} vs. OTHER NON-D-LINKED WH-Words  
\textbf{French}  
\begin{enumerate}
\item Tu vas où ?
\quad you$_{2PS}$ go where
\quad ‘Where are you going?’
\item Où (est-ce que) tu vas ___ ?
\quad where (est-ce que) you$_{2PS}$ go
\item * Jean a acheté que?
\quad Jean has bought what
\quad ‘What did Jean buy?’
\item Qu’a Jean acheté ___ ?
\quad what has John bought
\end{enumerate}

In contrast, Bellunese \textit{che} is incompatible with fronting, as in (4), like most non-D-linked wh-words of this variety:

(4) \textit{CHE}: ONLY CLAUSE-INTERNALLY  
\textbf{Bellunese}  
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ha-tu magnà che?
\quad have=you$_{2PS}$ eaten what
\quad ‘What did you eat?’
\item * Che ha-tu magnà ___ ?
\quad what have=you$_{2PS}$ eaten
\end{enumerate}

However, despite the (apparent) distributional differences displayed by \textit{que} and \textit{che}, both wh-words are \textit{obligatorily} construed with \textit{SCII}. \textit{SCII}, always required in genuine questions in Bellunese (Munaro 1999, see examples 3 & 4), is wholly incompatible with clause-internal wh-phrases in French, as in (5), yet compulsory when construed with a fronted \textit{que}, as in (6):

(5) INCOMPATIBILITY OF WH-IN SITU & \textit{SCII}  
\textbf{French}  
\begin{enumerate}
\item Où vas-tu?
\quad where go=you$_{2PS}$
\quad ‘Where are you going?’
\end{enumerate}
b. * Vas-tu où?  
go-you where  

(6) _QUE_: ONLY FRONTED & IN CONSTRUCTION WITH _SCII_  
_French_

a. Qu’a-t-il acheté?  
what’has-t-he bought  
‘What did he buy?’  
b. * Que il a acheté?  
what he has bought

Because of these striking morphosyntactic similarities between French _que_ and Bellunese _che_, and given the invariable structure of the CP-domain, Poletto & Pollock argue that both wh-elements must target the same Spec in the lower portion of the LP. In this framework, the reason why _que_ appears clause-initially, while _che_ occupies a clause-internal position at Spell Out, is that only the latter requires complex computations to take place after wh-movement, with these computations moving all IP-internal elements to the CP-domain (including the inverted verb-subject cluster), as shown in (7):

(7) REMNANT-IP MOVEMENT ANALYSIS: BELLUNESI vs. FRENCH (simplified)

Bellunese: _[CP ha-tu magnà] [FP _che_] … [IP _mangè_]_
French: _[CP [CP [FP _que_] … [IP _mangè _]]]_

A derivation similar to that of Bellunese wh-in situ is also posited for French strings such as _Tu as mangé quoi?_ (‘What did you eat?’), where the wh-phrase appears clause-internally. The cross-linguistic differences between Bellunese and French, and especially the puzzling status of _SCII_, are attributed to the presence of a _truncated_ CP-domain in the latter. The original studies, especially Poletto & Pollock (2009), provide details on the proposed derivation of French wh-in situ.

Why wh-movement?

In addition to the similarities between French _que_ and Bellunese _che_ and their relationship with _SCII_, at least four other phenomena that inspired the analysis of the clause-internal wh-words in Bellunese and similar languages as _moved_. Three are related to the syntactic properties of Bellunese insituness, while the fourth one is linked to the morphosyntax of wh-doubling in NIDs:

(i) the impossibility of wh-in situ in embedded questions, as in (8):

(8) WH-IN SITU IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS (Munaro 1999:69(1.95))  
_Bellunese_

a. No so _quando che i-é rivàdi_  
NEG know when _that they=are arrived_  
‘I don’t know when they arrived’
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b. *No so (che) i-é rivàdi quando
   NEG know (that) they=are arrived when

According to Poletto & Pollock (2000), this property and the observation that SCII is exclusively a root phenomenon follow from the fact that, in embedded contexts, feature checking via (remnant) movement is unnecessary and is thus ruled out by Economy: the matrix V is sufficient to identify the type of sentence. In their account, SCII targets SpecForce, hence its absence in embedded contexts is predicted. On the contrary, in matrix questions, the remnant is attracted into SpecForce by the [int]-feature in Force⁰.

(ii) Bellunese shows both strong and weak island effects (Munaro 1999), as in (9):

(9) **WH-IN SITU WITHIN ISLANDS**

(adapted from Munaro 1999:74(1.105 & 1.107))

Bellunese

a. *Te piase-lo [i libri che parla de che ]?
you₂ps like=it the books that speak of what
‘What is x, such that you enjoy books about x?’

b. ?? No te-te-ricorda [andé che von comprà che ]?
   NEG you₂ps=you=remember where that have₁PP bought what
   ‘What is x, such that we bought x and you don’t remember where?’

The claim is that, if Bellunese clause-internal wh-words were situated in the Spec of a TP-internal functional projection, it would be difficult to account for their infelicity inside syntactic islands.

(iii) the different orders occupied by arguments in Bellunese declaratives and interrogatives prove that insituness obeys a sentence-finality requirement, as in (10):

(10) **SENTENCE-FINALITY REQUIREMENT**

(adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015:139(2))

Bellunese

a. Al ghe a dat al libro a so fradel
   he DAT has given the book to his brother
   ‘He gave the book to his brother’

b. * Ghe ha-lo dat che a so fradel?
   DAT has=he given what to his brother
   ‘What has he given to his brother?’

c. Ghe ha-lo dat che, a so fradel?
   DAT has=he given what, to his brother
   ‘To his brother, what did he give?’

In Poletto & Pollock’s (2015) terms, the V-selected IO in instances of insituness such as (10c) is necessarily ‘de-accented’ in Bellunese che-questions, although not in statements like (10a). Accordingly, if che in examples like (10c) was in the ordinary DO-position in which il libro (‘the
book’) is located in (10a), it would be difficult to understand the need for dative complements such as a so fradel (‘to his brother’) to be right-dislocated.

On the basis of the above observations, and similar to the analysis carried out in previous studies, Poletto & Pollock (2015) conclude that strings like Bellunese A-tu magnù che? (have=you eaten what, ‘What did you eat?’) and French Tu as mangé quoi? (you have eaten what) are misleading. They claim that both the Bellunese and the French examples result from a ‘conspiracy’ involving wh-movement and further movement of the remnant-IP. For them, neither language allows actual insituness, i.e. wh-words in the position in which they are externally-merged.

When the whole IP moves to the Left Periphery

Let us examine how insituness that includes wh-movement to the CP is derived. Keep in mind that this account crucially rests on the idea that, when a bipartite wh-phrase is merged, each of its elements must check dedicated left-peripheral projections, as claimed in Chapter 2. Recall too that the two parts of bipartite wh-phrases can both be phonetically-realised, or else either one of the two can be null. The derivation of overt wh-doubling is shown in (11)1:

\[(11)\] OVERT WH-DOUBLING (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2009:7(19))

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mendrisiotto} \\
Sa & \quad ta \quad fet \quad cusè \\
\text{what you do what} \\
\text{‘What are you doing?’}
\end{align*}
\]

Example (11) is an instance of type A wh-doubling: the fronted element is a wh-clitic (as described in Chapter 1). The derivation proposed in Poletto & Pollock (2009:7(21)) is reproduced in (12)2:

\[(12)\] Input: \[IP \ ta \ fet \ [sa \ cusè ]\]

a. The first step of the derivation is movement of the clitic part of the complex wh-phrase (sa) to the interrogative CIP (Clitic Phrase) within IP. Remember that CIP is located in the higher portion of IP, right below the subject position:

\[IP \ sa \ ta \ fet \ [<sa> \ cusè ]\]

b. During the second step, the derivation starts to make use of the CP. An operator projection called Op1P (in earlier works, Wh1P) is in fact merged to IP. Subsequently, \[ cusè \] is

---

1For the sake of clarity, I shall first use an instance of wh-doubling in Mendrisiotto (Poletto & Pollock 2009). However, the Mendrisiotto example will not be sufficient for our purposes, since this variety does not have SClI in genuine questions. Consequently, a Bellunese instance of wh-in situ will be analysed, and an explanation provided for why D-linked wh-phrases are not felicitous clause-internally in this variety. The following derivations that I shall discuss are taken from earlier work, Poletto & Pollock (2000), meaning that the labels used by the authors are slightly different. Nonetheless, the reader should not find it difficult to understand the mechanisms behind these derivations, since only minor details of the remnant-IP movement analysis have changed over the years.

2Poletto & Pollock use traces. Here, I prefer to use copies to make the complex derivation easier to understand.

3In the input, the doubling wh-items (sa and cusè) are merged as a complex wh-phrase, the predecessor of CIPs.
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attracted to SpecOp1:
\[
[\text{Op1P} \text{cusè} \text{Op1}^0 [\text{IP} [ \text{sa} [ \text{ta fet} [ \text{<sa cusè> } ]]]]
\]

c. Step three is when ForceP and Op1P are merged. The remnant-IP is then attracted to SpecForce. Movement of the whole IP is justified by the need to check the interrogative force of the clause:
\[
[\text{ForceP} [\text{IP} [ \text{sa} [ \text{ta fet} [ \text{<sa cusè> } ]]] F^0 [\text{Op1P} \text{cusè} \text{Op1}^0 \text{<IP> }]]]
\]

d. To conclude, in step four a higher operator projection, Op2P (in earlier works, Wh1P) is merged to ForceP. Sa, the wh-clitic, is then attracted to Op2:
\[
[\text{Op2P} \text{sa} \text{Op2}^0 [\text{ForceP} [\text{IP} [ \text{<sa> [ \text{ta fet} [ \text{<sa cusè> } ]]] F^0 [\text{Op1P} \text{cusè} \text{Op1}^0 \text{<IP> }]]]]]
\]

In (11), the clause-internal wh-word could have been null (Sa ta fet ṭǝ, what you do ṭ). However, I exemplified the derivation using the overt wh-item cusè for the sake of clarity. At this point, one might wonder why the equivalent SClI-less question is not possible in French with a wh-clitic like que, as in the example in (13):

(13) French (Poletto & Pollock 2009:7(20))

* Que tu manges?
  what you eat
  ‘What are you eating?’

According to Poletto & Pollock (2009), the differences between (11) and (13) lie in the base position of clitics: in NIDs, subject clitics are lower in the IP than they are in French. It follows that the wh-clitic position to which the wh-clitic moves as a phrase is higher than subject clitic ta (‘you’) in Mendrisiotto but lower than French tu, as shown in (14):

(14) [[IP S-cl  > CIPWH > S-cl  > Wh-clitic ]
     french   NIDs]

Because of the various intervening heads, the wh-clitic que does not reach its high Wh1 position in French but sa-like Northern Italian wh-clitics do. The derivation for type B wh-doubling, when the fronted wh-item is non-clitic, is slightly different. Extending Cardinaletti & Starke’s (1999) tripartition to wh-items, Poletto & Pollock (2009) proposed that weak wh-words like indua (‘where’), cusa (‘what’) and cuma (‘how’) move within IP, to the right of the inflected verb, to a specific position for weak elements. Thus, a question like (15) has the derivation in (16):

(15) Mendrisiotto (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2009:8(24))^4

    Cusa ta  fet cusè?
    what you do what
    ‘What are you doing?’

^4As in example (11), the clause-internal wh-item cusè in (15) could be phonetically silent.
Input: \([\text{ip} \text{ ta fet } [\text{cusa cusè}]]\) (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2009:8(25))

a. First step: attract \textit{cusa} to interrogative WeakP(phrase) within \textit{ip}:
\([\text{ip} \text{ ta fet } \textit{cusa} [\text{<cusa> cusè}]]\]

b. Second step, the first of all the left-peripheral operations: merge Op1P and IP and attract \textit{cusè} to SpecOp1P:
\([\text{op1p} \textit{cusè} \text{ op1}^0 \text{ip} \text{ ta fet } \textit{cusa} [\text{<cusa cusè}>]]\]

c. Third step: merge ForceP and Op1P and attract the remnant-IP to SpecForce. This operation checks the interrogative force of the clause:
\([\text{forcep} \text{ ip} \text{ ta fet } \textit{cusa} [\text{<cusa cusè}>] \text{ force}^0 [\text{op1p} \textit{cusè} \text{ op1}^0 \text{ip}]]\]

d. Fourth step: Merge Op2P and ForceP and attract \textit{cusa} to Op2:
\([\text{op2p} \textit{cusa} \text{ op2}^0 \text{forcep} \text{ ip} \text{ ta fet } \textit{cusa} [\text{<cusa cusè}>] \text{ force}^0 [\text{op1p} \textit{cusè} \ldots]]\]

Let us now explore how questions with mandatory SClI are derived under these theoretical assumptions. Similarly to earlier versions of the theory, what Poletto & Pollock (2009) claim is that the linear order of ‘in situ’ wh-questions must be derived via movement of the remnant-IP past the wh-word, to a dedicated left-peripheral position. For this to be possible in a language like Bellunese, \textit{SCII} must be \textit{overt phrasal remnant movement} targeting a left-peripheral projection that is situated between a low and a high wh-position. In this work, the projection under discussion is ForceP, as shown in (17):

\[(17) \qquad \text{[op2p wh-phrase [forcep scil [groundp <s> [topp remnant-ip [op1p wh-phrase <ip>]]]]]} \quad \text{FRONTED} \quad \text{IN SITU}\]

Turning to the two additional projections, GroundP and TopP, the former is taken to be targeted by the NOM subject clitics, and the latter by the remnant-IP chunk. Observe that, in the wh-doubling Mendrisiotto example in (11), the subject clitic did not move to GroundP prior to movement of the remnant-IP to Force. The claim is that this is possible because subject clitics in Mendrisiotto is located in a very low position.

Since the analysis developed by Poletto & Pollock is crucially based on the comparison between French and Bellunese wh-questions, let us first examine the derivation of SClI in the former, using \textit{Où est-il allé?} (where is-he gone, ‘Where did it go?’) as an example of wh-fronting. The derivation is provided in (18):

\[(18) \qquad \text{input: [il est allé où]} \]

a. In the first step, Op1P is merged to IP and the wh-word is attracted to SpecOp1P. Note that in French, unlike what was proposed for Mendrisiotto, the wh-phrase is not externally-merged IP-internally in the Spec of an interrogative CIP:
\([\text{op1p où op1}^0 [\text{il est allé <où}>]]\)
b. In step two, TopP and Op1P are merged, and the participial phrase (trace of the wh-phrase included) is attracted to SpecTopP:
\[ [\text{TopP } \text{[allé <où>]} \text{ Top}^0 [\text{Op1P où Op1}^0 [\text{il est <allé où>}] ] ] \]

c. In step three, G(ground)P and TopP are merged. The subject clitic is attracted to SpecGP:
\[ [\text{GP il G}^0 [\text{TopP [allé <où>]} \text{ Top}^0 [\text{Op1P où Op1}^0 [\text{<il> est <allé où>}] ] ] ] \]

d. The fourth step consists in merging ForceP and GP and then attracting the remnant-IP to SpecForce. Note that the remnant-IP has the form: [<il> est <allé où> ]; here, I only reproduce the V, for the sake of clarity:
\[ [\text{ForceP [est]} \text{ Force}^0 [\text{GP il G}^0 [\text{TopP [allé <où>]} \text{ Top}^0 [\text{Op1P où Op1}^0 [\text{<IP>}] ] ] ] ] \]

e. Finally, in the fifth step, Op2P and ForceP are merged, and the wh-phrase is attracted to SpecOp2P:
\[ [\text{Op2P où Op2}^0 [\text{ForceP [est]} \text{ Force}^0 [\text{GP il G}^0 [\text{TopP [allé <où>]} \text{ Top}^0 [...]]] ] ] \]

Unlike French, Bellunese has generalised SCII. Since this variety has wh-doubling, it is claimed that its ‘in situ’ wh-questions are derived via movement of the wh-phrase to Op1P, and then further movement of the covert wh-part from Op1P to Op2P. With single wh-fronting, the reverse situation is observed: the wh-part that stays in Op1P is silent, while the part that moves further to Op2P is phonetically realised.

Let us examine the derivation of the question in (19). Poletto & Pollock (2000:135) assume that the wh-word andé is merged in a complex wh-phrase, [andé Rest⁶], as in (20):

(19)  *Bellunese* (Poletto & Pollock 2000:117(2))

Se-tu ‘ndat andé?
are=you gone where
‘Where did you go?’

(20)  Input: [IP tu sé ‘ndat [ andé Rest ]]

a. In the first step of the derivation, Op1P and IP are merged, and the complex wh-phrase, [ andé Rest ], is attracted to SpecOp1P. Note that, in this early work, the presence of interrogative ClPs had not yet been posited. However, this does not have a major impact on the derivation:
\[ [\text{Op1P [ andé Rest ] Op1}^0 [\text{IP tu sé ndat <andé Rest>}] ] \]

b. In step two, TopP and Op1P are merged. The participial phrase that includes the trace of the complex wh-phrase, [ ‘ndat <wh> ], is attracted to SpecTopP. For the sake of clarity, I will write the copy of the wh-phrase merely as <wh>:
\[ [\text{TopP [ ndat <wh> ] Top}^0 [\text{Op1P [ andé Rest ] Op1}^0 [\text{IP tu sé < ndat <wh> >}] ] ] \]

---

5 I choose an example of insitueness because it is most relevant for my discussion.
6 Restrictor is the silent part of complex wh-phrases, as posited before the analysis in terms of ClPs was developed.
c. In the third step, G(round)P and TopP are merged, and the subject clitic ‘tu’ is attracted to SpecGP:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
[\text{GP } \text{tu } G^0 ]_{\text{TopP}} [\text{ndat } <\text{wh}> ] \text{Top}^0 [\text{Op}1\text{P } [\text{andé } \text{Rest} ] \text{Op}1^0 ]_{\text{IP } [\text{<tu> sé } \ldots ]}
\end{array}
\]

d. In step four, ForceP and GP are merged, and the remnant-IP is attracted to SpecForce. Here, for clarity, the remnant-IP only consists of the V se (‘are’); the detailed version is [IP <tu> sé <ndat> <wh> ]:

\[
[\text{ForceP } ]_{\text{IP } \text{<tu> }} \text{Force}^0 [\text{GP } \text{tu } G^0 ]_{\text{TopP}} [\text{ndat } <\text{wh}> ] \text{Top}^0 [\text{Op}1\text{P } [\text{andé } \text{Rest} ] <\text{IP}> ]
\]

e. In the last step of the derivation, Op2P and ForceP are merged, and Rest is attracted to SpecOp2P:

\[
[\text{Op}2\text{P } \text{Rest } \text{Op}2^0 ]_{\text{IP } \text{<tu> }} F^0 [\text{GP } \text{tu } G^0 ]_{\text{TopP}} [\text{ndat } <\text{wh}> ] \text{Top}^0 [\text{Op}1\text{P } [\text{andé } <\text{Rest} > <\text{IP}> ]
\]

In this account, the main distinction between the two languages is that Bellunese has two (incomplete) classes of clitics, an assertive series (2-3PS, 3PP) and a non-assertive paradigm (all persons, 1PS excluded), while French does not. The non assertive paradigm is, in Poletto & Pollock’s words, ‘morphologically somewhat heavier’ than its assertive counterpart. Consequently, the authors assume that the former is merged in SpecAgrS and is associated with a [+Ground] feature. The latter, meanwhile, are argued to be spellouts of Agrs\(^0\), i.e. real clitic heads. It follows that when GroundP is merged, non-assertive clitics in Bellunese are attracted to the CP-domain. In contrast, Standard French only has a set of (weak) nominative pronouns that only optionally bear the [+Ground] feature: when GroundP is merged, a [+Ground] element must be attracted there to delete an uninterpretable feature; French nominative pronouns are [+Ground] only in these precise cases. With regard to D-linked wh-words, which in Bellunese are always construed with SCII and can only appear sentence-initially, it is possible to attribute this property to the fact that these are not associated with a silent Restrictor that can check Op2P alone: the D-linked wh-phrase has to move to SpecOp2P at the very end of the derivation.

6.1.2 IP-internal real insituless

Manzini & Savoia (2005;2011) were heavily critical of the remnant-IP movement hypothesis, both for theory-internal and for data-related reasons. The former include the fact that the labels used in these works (GroundP, OpP, NIP, etc.) are ‘reconstructed backwards from the required movements, rather than motivated by genuinely independent needs’ (Manzini & Savoia 2011), and the observation that the proposed analysis faces the restrictiveness problem that is generally imputed to Kaynian movement, i.e. that Chomsky’s (1995) Economy Principle, according to which movement is possible only if necessary, does not hold. In what follows I overview the Lombard data that according to Manzini & Savoia prove that the remnant-IP movement derivation is not suitable for NIDs.
Evidence against wh-movement

Manzini & Savoia (2011) presented data-related arguments against a derivation of Northern Italian insituness that involves overt movement to the CP, such as the remnant-IP movement hypothesis. The first argument is that, unlike Bellunese, Lombard dialects show no sensitivity to islands in the case of single wh-in situ, as in (21):

(21) WH-IN SITU WITHIN ISLANDS (adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:587(157))

a. Subject island
   Dìg-ei che gé egnìt [[ i amis de chi ]]?
say=them that is come the friends of whom
   ‘For which x, such as x is someone’s friend, they say that x came?’

b. Complex-NP island
   Ta pjah [[ i liber ch’i pàrla de cohè ]]?
you like the books that they speak of what
   ‘For which x, such as x is a topic, you like books about x?’

c. Adjunct island
   L’è ndàj ivja [[ hènha haludà chi ]]?
he’s gone away without greeting who
   ‘For which x, such as x is a person, you left without greeting x?’

Examples of island-contained insituness like those in (21) suggest that no wh-movement takes place before Spell Out. Interestingly, however, if the clause-internal wh-phrases in (21) are doubled by their left-peripheral counterpart, island effects appear, as in (22):

(22) WH-DOUBLING IN ISLANDS (adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:587(157))

Grumellese

a. * De chi, dìg-ei che gé egnìt [[ i amis de chi ]]?
   of whom say=them that is come the friends of whom

b. * De kòha, ta pjah [[ i liber ch’i pàrla de cohè ]]?
   of what you like the books that they speak of what

c. * Chi, l’è ndàj ivja [[ hènha haludà chi ]]?
   who he’s gone away without greeting who

According to Manzini & Savoia, the contrast between examples like (21) and (22) clearly proves that, while in the case of single insituness no wh-movement takes place in overt syntax, in the case of wh-doubling the higher, doubling wh-element is clearly moved, hence the ungrammaticality of the extractions in (22). Note that in the examples in (22) my choice of the position in which the wh-doubling element is internally-merged is completely arbitrary; my only aim is to signal that
wh-movement of the doubling wh-item is assumed to start out IP-internally. Whatever the initial position of the fronted doubling wh-item, the Lombard data studied by Manzini & Savoia are in clear contrast with those discussed in Poletto & Pollock (2000) and related works.

Another argument that clearly establishes a definite division between the Bellunese-like and Lombard dialects is that in the latter insituness is not exclusively a root phenomenon. In Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) corpus, embedded insituness is in fact widely attested, both in in long-distance questions (23) and in indirect wh-questions (24):

(23) **WH-IN SITU IN LONG-DISTANCE QUESTIONS**

(adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:591(155))

a. Krèdet [ che al hàbe’ indàf’ indoé ]?

   think$_{2PS}$ that he has$_{SUBJ}$ gone where

   ‘Where do you think he went?’

b. (Kòha) pènhet [ che l’abe’ fà’ kohè ]?

   (what) think$_{2PS}$ that he has$_{SUBJ}$ done what

   ‘What do you think he did?’

(24) **WH-IN SITU IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS**

(adapted from Manzini & Savoia 2005:591(156))

a. Öle hai’ [ indó’ l’é ndàf (indoé) ]

   want$_{1PS}$ know where he’is gone (where)

   ‘I want to know where he went’

b. Domànde-ga [ kòha’ l’a fà’ (kohè) ]

   ask=him what he’has done (what)

   ‘Ask him what he did’

Finally, whereas in the Bellunese-like varieties that inspired the remnant-IP movement analysis D-linked wh-phrases are not felicitous clause-externally (§1.3.2), no distributional asymmetry is observed between D-linked and non-D-linked wh-words in Lombard. In addition, Manzini & Savoia argue that there exists no direct correlation between the availability of SCIl as a question formation strategy and insituness, both of the regular and of the wh-doubling types. Indeed, as claimed in Chapter 1 of this work, no NID displays French-like behaviour in this regard. In the varieties spoken in the Northern Italian domain, both SCIl and lack of SCIl are possible in genuine questions; however, unlike French, these varieties are very consistent in their treatment of SCIl and either require or exclude SCIl as a question-formation strategy, independently of the linear position occupied by the wh-phrase(s).

**Northern Italian insituness is real insituness**

On the basis of the data summarised in §6.1.2, Manzini & Savoia conclude that Northern Italian insituness must be real: for them, in overt syntax, clause-internal wh-phrases in NIDs stay in their
first-merge position. The explanation provided for the unique data found in Bellunese and similar
languages (as described in Munaro 1999, Poletto & Pollock 2000, Munaro et al. 2001, a.o.) is that, in
the context of micro-variation among closely-related grammars, it is plausible that in some grammars
there are factors that impel wh-movement in embedded sentences but not in others. Manzini &
Savoia also argue that different sensitivities to islands can be explained more effectively if they are
taken to be related to conditions on LF interpretive construals, not on movement operations. In this
theoretical background, the choice between wh-in situ and wh-movement in NIDs is simply a classic,
parametrised distinction between, scope construal on the one hand (in case of insituness) and overt scope
(wh-fronting) in the other. Consequently, wh-doubling grammars can be explained as exceptionally
requiring an overt lexicalisation of both the scope marker and the variable.

6.1.3 The Trevisian data in the theory of Northern Italian wh-in situ

The theoretical model for the study of Romance wh-in situ that I call the remnant-IP movement
hypothesis accounts for the data from Bellunese and similar languages (including Standard French),
but fails to predict the possibility of, perhaps among other phenomena: (a) non clause-final insituness,
(b) embedded insituness, and (c) island-contained insituness. In the previous Chapters, I claimed that
(a) to (c) are actually attested in Northern Italian dialects; in §6.2, I shall argue that these phenomena
are also observed outside the Northern Italian domain. Another phenomenon to add to that list
is the felicitous licensing of D-linked wh-phrases clause-internally, which is possible in type I
and type II languages, but not in the varieties discussed in the works under consideration (type III).
Clearly, justifying the presence of (a), i.e. non-sentence final insituness, in languages like Trevigiano
that display systematic short wh-movement of clause-internal wh-words like Trevigiano, would be
problematic if the wh-phrases into consideration were indeed moved to the LP of the clause. In fact, to
explain the Trevisian wh-IO > DO order observed in ‘in situ’ questions in the case of ditransitive verbs,
as well as the lack of a prosodic break between the two elements, one would at least have to posit
an unjustified topicalisation of the DO prior to wh-movement, so that the DO can stay TP-externally
when the remnant-IP raises to the LP. I discuss these issues in what follows, along with the presence of
(b) and (c) in type I and type II varieties: if the grammars of languages of this type required mandatory
movement of clause-internal wh-phrases to the low portion of the CP, then the felicity of wh-extraction
should be guaranteed (at least) for embedded questions and weak islands. Consequently, these would
display total wh-fronting rather than wh-in situ, contrary to the attested data.

On the other hand, a model like the covert movement hypothesis, where clause-internal wh-
phrases stay in their first-merge position, correctly predicts most of the patterns of Northern Italian
data discussed in Part I, namely the availability of: (a) non sentence-final insituness, (b) embedded
insituness, and (c) island-contained insituness. The availability of D-linked wh-phrases clause-
internally is also accounted for. However, as like remnant-IP movement analysis, this approach fails to predict a further feature, (d), namely the availability of clause-internally moved wh-phrases. Quite clearly, a derivation of wh-in situ that assumes that wh-phrases stay in the position in which they are externally-merged is not incompatible with the availability of short-distance scrambling, i.e. optional IP-internal movement of the wh-phrase (like the movement that I shall posit for French and Spanish in §6.2). However, this type of model fails to account for mandatory short movement, i.e. proper syntactic movement within TP.

In this dissertation I have presented and discussed novel data from Trevigiano, a dialect of the Venetan area in which the distribution of clause-internal wh-words appears strikingly different from that found in more widely-studied Bellunese (Munaro 1995, Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto & Pollock 2015, and related works). Among the reasons behind my proposal that the clause-internal wh-phrases of Trevigiano are moved TP-internally is the different linear positions occupied by IOs and adverbials in declaratives compared to the wh-Ios and wh-adverbs of the corresponding wh-questions. Indeed, in genuine wh-questions, clause-internal wh-words clearly always directly follow the past participle in the linear string. As a consequence, wh-adverbials and wh-Ios precede DOs linearly, as in (25):

(25) **FOCUS MOVEMENT BELOW THE PAST PARTICIPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a.   | Ga-tu magnà cuando, el dolse ___i?  
      | have=you2PS eaten when the cake  
      | ‘When did you eat the cake?’ |
| b.   | Ghe ga-tu dato a chi, a tecia ___i?  
      | DAT have=you2PS given to whom the saucepan  
      | ‘Who did you give the saucepan to?’ |

I have claimed that DOs such as el dolse ‘the cake’ in example (25a) are not right dislocated. In fact, dislocation in Trevigiano is only possible when costrued with clitic resumption (when available) and in the presence of so-called comma intonation. In addition, the strict order between V-selected arguments and adverbs in declaratives strongly suggests that Italian-like marginalisation is categorically excluded in this variety. These data are extremely difficult to account for in a remnant-IP movement derivation. If Trevigiano had wh-movement of sentence internal wh-words to the CP, followed by movement of the remnant-IP, to derive peculiar orders such as those in (25) one would have to posit:

(i) either the existence of a left-peripheral functional projection lower than Op1P to which the DO is attracted prior to wh-movement, as in (26):

(26) Input: [IP te gà magnà el dolse cuando ]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a.   | Step 1: Merge FP and IP; attract the DP to SpecFP:  
      | [FP el dolse, F0 [IP te gà magnà ___i cuando ]] |
Step 2: merge Op1P and FP, and attract the wh-phrase to SpecOp1P:

\[ \text{Op1P } \text{cuando}, \text{ Op1}^0 \text{ [FP el dolse, } F^0 \text{ [IP te gà magnà ___i cuanto ]]} \]

(ii) or some sort of topicalisation of the DO to a TP-internal projection higher than IP, taking prior to all other movements. Crucially, this would spare the DO, which would be able to stay TP-internally when the remnant-IP raises to the LP, as in (27):

(27) Input: \[ [IP \text{ te gà magnà el dolse cuanto ]} \]

a. Step 1: Topicalisation of the DO to a FP higher than IP:

\[ \text{TP el dolse, } T^0 \text{ [IP te gà magnà ___i cuanto ]} \]

b. Step 2: Various movements that displace the wh-phrase, the past participle, and the subject clitic to the CP:

\[ \text{CP [IP tu magnà ___i cuanto ], TP el dolse, } T^0 \text{ [IP ___i 'ga ... ]]} \]

c. Step 3: When the remnant-IP is attracted to the CP, the TP-internal DO is spared:

\[ \text{CP [IP ... 'ga ... ]IP tu magnà ___i cuanto [TP el dolse, } T^0 \text{ ___i IP ]} \]

However, while stipulating the presence of Bellunese-like bi-partite wh-words in closely-related Trevigiano might be justified, movements of the DO such as those shown in (i) and (ii) would be extremely ill-justified, and hence ruled out. Clearly, a derivation including remnant-IP movement should be rejected at least for varieties of this type.

Similarly, if the sentence internal wh-words of Trevigiano-like languages stayed in the position in which they are externally-merged, as posited by Manzini & Savoia (2011), the only way to derive the orders in (25) would be systematic rightward extraposition of the DO (as in 28), which is both an unjustified move and a theoretically undesirable one:

(28) Ga-tu magnà ___i cuanto [ el dolse ], ?

I have claimed that Trevisian insituness closely resembles that found in the Lombard and similar varieties described by Manzini & Savoia (Chapter 1). In fact, it is felicitously licensed not only in long-distance and indirect wh-questions, but also inside syntactic islands. In a derivation based on remnant-IP movement, these distributional properties are difficult to account for. For example, checking the Force of inherently interrogative sentences like indirect wh-questions via movement to the LP is unnecessary, and should hence be ruled out by Economy (as in Bellunese and similar varieties). However, insituness is felicitous in this type of question.

Also, proposing that the wh-phrases of Trevigiano need to systematically check an interrogative feature in the low CP (in Op1P, in Poletto & Pollock’s terms), as they do in Bellunese, would incorrectly predict the facts in (a)-(c):
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(a) systematic partial wh-fronting to the embedded LP in long-distance questions, yielding the infelicitous COMP > wh-phrase order, as in (29):

\[
\text{(29) LONG-DISTANCE EXTRACTION TO CHECK Op1P} \quad \text{Trevigiano}
\]

* Pensi-tu \{ForceP che \ldots [Op1P cuando, i [IP a pasarà catarne \ldots ]]? \hfill <------>
think=you2PS that when she comeFUT visit.us

‘When do you think she will visit?’

Following many cartographic studies (Rizzi 1997 and further related works) and my discussion in Chapter 5, I assume that the that-COMP che in (29) realises Force\(^0\). Nevertheless, the reverse wh-phrase > ke order is also out. In fact, only long extraction targeting the matrix LP is possible.

(b) systematic wh-fronting in indirect wh-questions, when construed with either the COMP ke (‘that’) or se\_WH (‘if’), as shown in (30):

\[
\text{(30) WH-EXTRACTION IN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS TO CHECK Op1P} \quad \text{Trevigiano}
\]

a. A vol saver \{ForceP \ldots quando, che [IP te pasarà catarne \ldots ]\}

she wants know when that you comeFUT visit.us

‘She wants to know when you will be visiting’

b. * A vol saver \{ForceP \ldots quando, se [IP te pasarà catarne \ldots ]\}

she wants know when se\_WH you come visit.us

In (30), I take the low operator projection to be located higher than the projection(s) headed by the COMP of indirect wh-questions, which I take to realise Qembp. This approach accounts for the correct wh-phrase > che order in (30a), but incorrectly predicts it as the only viable option, as well as predicting that the ungrammatical order *wh-phrase > se is possible (30b). The opposite order, where Op1P is lower than the projection headed by che/se, also predicts utterly ungrammatical orders: *che > wh-phrase and *se\_WH > wh-phrase.

(c) systematic extraction of island-contained wh-phrases, targeting Op1P (31):

\[
\text{(31) OUT-OF-ISLAND EXTRACTION TO CHECK Op1P} \quad \text{Trevigiano}
\]

a. Wh-island

Chi no te te ricordi \{ [cuando, che vemo visto \ldots ]\}

who NEG you yourself remember when that have1PS seen

‘Who is \(x\), such that you don’t remember when we saw \(x\)?’

b. Complex-NP island

* Cossa, a se gà inamorà de \{ un profesor che insegna \ldots ]\}

what she her has fallen for a professor who teaches

‘What is \(x\), such as she has fallen in love with a professor who teaches \(x\)?’
Crucially, the need for the wh-phrase to check $Op1P$ in overt syntax falsely predicts that weak-island extraction is the only available option (when in fact Trevigiano can have wh-in situ inside weak islands), as in (31a), and predicts ungrammatical cases of fronting out of strong islands, as in (31b), which are actually excluded by the properties of islands themselves. In fact, the situation with islands would be even more complicated than presented here, because Force would need to be checked, producing extremely ill-formed strings.

Predictions (a)-(c) are clearly false. Finally, the felicity of D-linked wh-phrases clause-internally also rules out a derivation of insituness à la Poletto & Pollock for both type I and type II varieties. For these reasons, an explanation of Trevigiano fake wh-in situ as being derived TP-internally seems more reasonable, though not in an argumental position à la Manzini & Savoia (2005): otherwise the short movement of wh-phrases would remain unaccounted for. I therefore believe that the $Wh$-$to$-$Foc$ analysis that I have developed here provides a better account of Northern Italian insituness type I. One might wonder whether the Lombard data could actually fit into a derivation such as that proposed for Trevigiano. This does indeed seem to be possible, as was confirmed by Rita Manzini (pc.): in hers and Savoia’s (2005) corpus, there is neither positive nor negative evidence regarding short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases. Consequently, an extension of the analysis of insituness in terms of TP-internal focus movement to Lombard-like varieties might be plausible, although evidence from unmoved wh-in situ in other Romance and non-Romance varieties suggests that an over-generalisation of $Wh$-$to$-$Foc$ should be avoided, as I shall claim in §6.2.

### 6.2 Beyond Northern Italian dialects

Because the Northern Italian varieties discussed so far display very regular patterns in the distribution of clause-internal wh-words, Romance wh-in situ is expected to follow similar patterns, at least partially. Indeed, data similar to those discussed for Trevigiano and type II Lombard dialects are attested in other Romance varieties spoken outside Northern Italy.

#### 6.2.1 Sentence final(ity requirement). Or not?

It has been argued that some languages, such as Bellunese, only license insitution at the edge of the clause, i.e. in a sentence-final position (Munaro 1999, Poletto & Pollock 2015 and related works). This means that, independently of its grammatical function, a sentence internal wh-phrase always occupies the rightmost sentential position: if it be followed by extra material, this would have to be dislocated and a clear-cut separation between the two would have to be signalled prosodically. Take for example the classic Bellunese examples below (all adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015:139(2)): although in the declarative order IOs directly follow the DO, as in (32a), it is not possible to reproduce
the same order in ‘in situ’ wh-questions, as in (32b). The only felicitous option is placing the wh-word at the edge of the clause, and separated by means of a prosodic pause, as in (32c):

(32) **SENTENCE-FINALITY REQUIREMENT FOR clause-internal WH-WORDS**

*Bellunese*

(adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015:139(2))

a. Al ghe a dat al libro a so fradel
   he DAT has given the book to his brother
   ‘He gave the book to his brother’

b. * Ghe ha-lo dat che a so fradel?
   DAT has=he given what to his brother
   ‘What has he given to his brother?’

c. Ghe ha-lo dat che, a so fradel?
   DAT has=he given what # to his brother

As previously discussed, for authors such as Poletto & Pollock (2015) examples like (32c) prove that Bellunese clause-internal wh-words are moved. Similar claims were made for French and Spanish by authors including Obenauer (1994), Ambar & Veloso (2001), Munaro et al. (2001), Etxebarria (2005), Poletto & Pollock (2015) (and previous related works), among others. Accordingly, in French (or Spanish) questions like (33) the wh-word that is situated at the rightmost edge of the clause at Spell Out is not in its external-merge position:

(33) **French**

(adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015:142(15))

a. Marie a embrassé qui?
   Mary has kissed who
   ‘Who did Mary kiss?’

b. Marie a engagé quel linguiste?
   Mary has hired what linguist
   ‘Which linguist did Mary hire?’

However, this claim meets with disagreement in works where French sentence internal wh-phrases are actually considered instances of real Chinese-like insituness (Cheng 1991, Cheng & Rooryck 2000, Mathieu 1999/2002, a.o.). Non sentence-final insituness is also attested in varieties spoken outside of the Northern Italian domain. One of these is Contemporary Spoken French (*Non Standard Colloquial French* in Baunaz 2011, Baunaz & Patin 2011, a.o.), as illustrated in (34):

(34) **ABSENCE OF SENTENCE-FINALITY REQUIREMENT**

*Contemporary Spoken French*

(Baunaz 2011:48;49(88;89))

**Context.** Everybody is queueing at the cafeteria. Several main courses are proposed: beefsteak, chicken and stew. The waiter asks Léa, who is hesitating for too long:

a. Bon, vous prenez *quoi* finalement?
   ok you take what finally
   ‘Ok, what do you want, finally?’
b. Vous choisissez quel plat finalement?
you choose which dish finally
‘Finally, which dish do you want?’

Examples like (34) clearly show that no sentence-finality requirement applies in Contemporary Spoken French, both with non-D-linked and D-linked wh-phrases. The prosody of sentences like this shows that the wh-element does not lie at the sentential edge: there is no prosodic pause between the wh-word itself and the following elements (such as the finalement, ‘finally’), yet the questions are perfectly felicitous (Baunaz 2011). In this variety of French, the lack of a sentence-finality requirement can also be observed in constructions that resemble Trevisian Wh-to-Foc, as in (35b):

(35) CLAUSE-INTERNALLY MOVED WH-WORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary Spoken French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Tu as mangé les pommes quand?
you2PS have eaten the apples when
‘When did you eat the apples?’ |
| b. ? Tu as mangé quand les pommes___?
you2PS have eaten the apples |

Regardless of the formal explication provided for this optional movement in (35b), it clearly constitutes further evidence that clause-internal wh-words need not occupy the clausal edge in Contemporary Spoken French. The lack of a sentence-finality requirement for sentence internal wh-words has also been attested in European and Brazilian Portuguese (Cheng & Rooryck 2002 and Kato 2013, respectively):

(36) ABSENCE OF SENTENCE-FINALITY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O João pensa [ que viu quem, a Maria? ]? | the John thinks that saw who the Mary
‘Who does João think saw Maria?’ |

(37) ABSENCE OF SENTENCE-FINALITY REQUIREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brazilian Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maria ama [ o livro [ que quem escreveu ]]? | Mary loves the book that who wrote
‘Mary loves the book that was written by whom?’ |

Although the examples above are not instances of root wh-in situ, they clearly demonstrate that in both varieties of Portuguese clause-internal wh-words are not required to occupy the rightmost sentential edge. A non-strict sentence-finality requirement for sentence internal wh-phrases is in fact also attested in Spanish (Biezma 2018, contra Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2005;2012), which I discuss in §6.2.2.
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6.2.2 (Optional) TP-internal wh-movement

Because of the requirement for Trevisian clause-internal wh-phrases to move, I have argued that this movement should be treated as proper syntactic movement, i.e. movement triggered by the need to check a [foc]-feature in Foc:\textsubscript{LOW}.

A close look at the behaviour of clause-internal wh-adverbs in Contemporary Spoken French and Spanish suggests that wh-in situ can also be moved TP-internally in these languages. In French, short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases has been claimed to be felicitous in strongly presuppositional contexts (Baunaz 2011), while in Spanish the possibility seems to be linked to the notion of givenness (Biezma 2018)\textsuperscript{7}. Observe (38) and (39):

(38) CLAUSE-INTERNAL MOVEMENT OF WH-PHRASES  
Contemporary Spoken French

T’as mangé quand\textsubscript{ADV} les frites\textsubscript{DO} ___\textsubscript{ADV} ?
you’ve eaten when the french.fries
‘When did you eat the French fries?’

(39) CLAUSE-INTERNAL MOVEMENT OF WH-PHRASES (adapted from Biezma 2018:6(8))  
Spanish

Context: Two people are discussing. Speaker A wants to know where speaker B bought all of their music instruments. Speaker B gives information about their trumpet; then speaker A replies asking when they bought the guitar.

A: ¿ Cuándo\textsubscript{ADV} compraste todos estos instrumentos musicales ___\textsubscript{ADV} ?
‘When did you buy all this musical instruments?’

B: Compré la trompeta\textsubscript{DO} el lunes\textsubscript{ADV}.
‘I bought the trumpet on Monday.’

A: ¿ Y compraste cuándo\textsubscript{ADV} la guitarra\textsubscript{DO} ___\textsubscript{ADV} ?
and bought\textsubscript{2PS} when the guitar

However, unlike what is observed in Trevigiano, the clause-internal wh-words of Contemporary Spoken French and Spanish are also fine in their declarative order, i.e. short movement of the wh-phrase appears to be optional. Observe (40) and (41):

(40) UNMOVED CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-PHRASES  
Contemporary Spoken French

T’as mangé les frites\textsubscript{DO} quand\textsubscript{ADV}?
you’ve eaten the french.fries when

\textsuperscript{7}Context of use is not the subject of this dissertation, hence I shall not go into detail regarding the concepts of ‘presuppositional’ and ‘given’. As long as a question is associated with a true question reading (as opposed to echoic reading), it belongs in this discussion. For further details on the pragmatics and semantics of wh-questions, refer to works such as Kayne (1972,1983), Obenauer (1994), Chang (1997), Sportiche (1998), Boeckx (1999), Mathieu (1999,2004), Cheng & Rooryck (2000), Starke (2001), Baunaz (2011), Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria (2005,2012), Biezma (2018), among many others.
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(41) UNMOVED CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-PHRASES (adapted from Biezma 2018:6(8))

Spanish

A: ¿ Y compraste la guitarra DO cuándo ADV?
and bought2PS the guitar when

The possibility of clause-internal wh-words appearing in their first-merge position clearly makes Spanish and Contemporary Spoken French different from Trevigiano. In a recent experimental study, Tual (2017) showed that in the case of ditransitive verbs, native speakers of French prefer non-TP-internally moved clause-internal wh-words to TP-internally moved ones. In fact, although questions containing clause-internally moved wh-phrases such as (42a) are not ungrammatical, they are less natural than their unmoved counterparts, as in (42b):

(42) POSITION OCCUPIED BY CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-PHRASES

Contemporary Spoken French

a. T’as donné le bracelet DO à qui IO?
you’ve given the bracelet to whom
‘Who did you give the bracelet to?’
b. ? T’as donné à qui IO le bracelet DO ___ IO ?
you’ve given to whom the bracelet

I suggest that sentences like (42b) should be analysed as optional permutations of word order, plausibly pragmatically-driven short distance scrambling. Starting from Ross’s (1967) PhD dissertation, scrambling is a term that has commonly been used to refer to a type of movement that is related to pragmatic word order considerations (see also Ross 1986, Saito 1989, Webelhuth 1989, Mahajan 1990, Nishigauchi 2002, Miyagawa 2005, a.o.). In formal linguistics, this phenomenon, along with the issue of free vs. constrained word orders more generally, has been widely explored in traditional works including Grewendorf & Sternefeld (1990), van Riemsdijk & Corver (1994), Kayne (1994), and Karimi (2003). Since in the presence of scrambling the order of the clausal constituents is determined by pragmatic considerations such as emphasis, it seems reasonable to posit that in this variety of French and in Spanish clause-internally moved wh-words are scrambled, plausibly for reasons of prominence. The optional status of these instances of movement makes an analysis of them as driven by feature-checking somewhat undesirable.

6.2.3 Embedded insituness

In this section I survey the distribution of embedded wh-in situ in Romance languages spoken outside Northern Italy. The main properties that will be taken into consideration are: (i) the (in)ability to license wh-in situ in long-distance and/or indirect wh-questions, and (ii) the presence of an embedding COMP construed with wh-fronting and with insituness.
Long-distance questions

Insituness in long-distance questions is fine in Contemporary Spoken French (Obenauer 1994, Baunaz 2011, Tual 2019; contra Mathieu 1999, Bošković 2000, Cheng & Rooryck 2000, a.o.), both with non-D-linked and D-linked wh-phrases, as in (43). Note that the availability of long construals in French has been debated for decades; this is because there are multiple varieties of oral French, whose grammars vary in the extent to which they permit wh-in situ (Baunaz 2011, a.o.).

(43) **LONG CONSTRUAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary Spoken French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Il pense [ qu'elle a appelé qui ?]?
| he thinks that’s she has called who
| ‘Who does he think she called?’ |
| b. Il t’a dit [ qu’elle est passée à quelle heure ]?
| he you’has said that she is passed at what hour
| ‘What time did he tell you she passed by?’ |

Spanish has also been argued to license long-distance insituness, again with both types of wh-phrases (Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2005), as in (44):

(44) **LONG CONSTRUAL** (Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2005:19(37))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Juan dice [ que María compró eso ¿ donde ]?
| John says that Mary bought this where
| ‘Where does John say Mary bought this?’ |
| b. Juan dice [ que María compró eso ¿ en qué tienda ]?
| John says that Mary bought this in which shop
| ‘In which shop does John say Mary bought this?’ |

Insituness in long-distance questions has also been observed in Brazilian (Kato 2013), as in (45), and European Portuguese (Pires & Taylor 2009, Cheng & Rooryck 2000), as in (46):

(45) **LONG CONSTRUAL** (Kato 2013:6(12))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brazilian Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maria pensa [ que o João comprou o quê ]?
| Mary thinks that the John bought what
| ‘What does Mary think John bought?’ |

(46) **LONG CONSTRUAL** (Cheng & Rooryck 2002:3(6))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European Portuguese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O João pensa [ que a Maria viu quem ]?
| the João thinks that the Maria saw who
| ‘Who does John think that Mary saw?’ |

Indirect questions

It has been argued that Spanish licenses indirect insituness (Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2005, Suñer 1991, a.o.), both in regular wh-questions, as in (47), and in polar questions, as in (48). Note that
the COMP in (48) is a regular if'-COMP, unlike the semantically void se\textsubscript{WH} found in Trevigiano: the only available interpretation for the question in (48) is ‘for which \(x\), \(x\) is such that you don’t know whether \(x\) came?’, not ‘for which \(x\), \(x\) came and you don’t know it?’ In contrast, the semantics of questions like (47) is undoubtedly that of a single wh-question\(^8\).

(47) EMBEDDED WH-IN SITU (Suñer 1991:285(4))

\[\text{Spanish}\]

Juan dijo [ que a quién habían invitado ]
John said that to whom had\textsubscript{3PP} invited

‘Who did John say they invited?’

(48) EMBEDDED WH-IN SITU (Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarría 2005:19(38))

\[\text{Spanish}\]

Y tú no sabes [ si ha venido quién ]?
and you neg know if has come who

‘Who is \(x\) such that you don’t know whether \(x\) came?’

Nevertheless, a cross-linguistic counterpart of se\textsubscript{WH} has indeed been attested in European (Cheng & Rooryck 2000;2002), as in (49), and Brazilian Portuguese (Kato 2013), as in (50), but also in Belgian French (Boeckx et al. 2000), as illustrated in (51):

(49) EMBEDDED WH-IN SITU (Cheng & Rooryck 2002:2(1))

\[\text{European Portuguese}\]

O João quer saber [ se tu compraste o quê ]
the João wants know se you bought what

‘João wants to know what you bought’

(50) EMBEDDED WH-IN SITU (Kato 2013:6(12))

\[\text{Brazilian Portuguese}\]

Eu me perguntei [ se o João comprou o que ]?
I myself asked se the John bought what

‘I wondered what John bought’

(51) EMBEDDED WH-IN SITU (Boeckx et al. 2000:60(10))

\[\text{Belgian French}\]

Pierre a demandé [ si tu as vu qui? ]
Pierre has asked se you have seen who

‘Pierre asked who you saw’

\(^8\)Very interestingly, the displayed linear order suggests that in Spanish there might be Trevigiano-like short movement of clause-internal wh-phrases (1):

(1) Spanish (adapted from Suñer 1991:285(4))

Juan dijo [ que a quién habían invitado ___]
John said that to whom had\textsubscript{3PP} invited

If this was the case, the fact that in Spanish, contrary to Trevigiano, clause-internal wh-phrases target a position higher than the finite V, could be linked to different movement properties of finite Vs and past participles in the two languages (Cinque 1999).
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6.2.4 Sensitivity to islands

The morphosyntax of French insituinsness has often been compared to that of Northern Italian insituinsness (Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto & Pollock 2015, and related works). In the preceding sections, I showed that wh-in situ in Contemporary Spoken French does not obey a sentence-finality requirement. I also showed that in this same variety, insituinsness is productive in long-distance questions, but not in indirect questions. In fact, if the cryptic case of the unavailability of SCII construed with wh-in situ and the absence of wh-doubling are excluded, Contemporary Spoken French seems to qualify as a type II variety in the way it treats wh-in situ. Consequently, if my approach is valid, this variety of French would be expected to show no island effects. Indeed, this prediction is correct, contra much of the existing literature on weak island effects (Obenauer 1994, Mathieu 1999, Shlonsky 2012, a.o.). Similar predictions for Spanish and Portuguese can be drawn from the discussion in the previous sections, which are confirmed by the data on island-trapped wh-in situ that I discuss here.

Contemporary Spoken French

Mathieu (1999) argued that in French the argument-adjunct asymmetry observed in extraction out of weak islands does not extend to instances of insituinsness, which he claims to be unselectively restricted by locality constraints such as Rizzi’s (1990) Relativized Minimality. For Mathieu, unlike overtly-moved wh-arguments, clause-internal wh-arguments and wh-adjuncts are indeed sensitive to intervention by c-commanding quantificational elements. As pointed out in Shlonsky (2012), although the status of some weak island effects appears subtle and controversial, researchers (almost) universally agree that wh-in situ is ungrammatical inside negative and wh-islands. However, these claims do not apply to Contemporary Spoken French, where wh-in situ is indeed acceptable inside weak islands, as in the examples in (52 and 53)\textsuperscript{9}. Note that in these cases overt out-of-island extraction is always possible:

(52) NEGATIVE ISLAND

\begin{itemize}
\item a. \textit{À qui il [ n’a pas voulu parler ___ ]?} to whom he NEG’has NEG wanted talk ‘To whom didn’t he want to talk?’
\item b. \textit{Il [ n’a pas voulu parler à qui ]?} he NEG’has NEG wanted talk to whom
\end{itemize}

(53) WH-ISLAND

\begin{itemize}
\item a. \textit{Quelle voiture tu te demandes [ qui devrait réparer ___ ]?} which car you yourself ask who should fix ‘Which car do you wonder when we should fix?’
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{9}All judgements on island extraction in Contemporary Spoken French discussed in this section were provided by my colleague Lucas Tual, to whom I am thankful.
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b. Tu te demandes [qui devrait réparer quelle voiture]?
you yourself ask who should fix which car

On the contrary, most of the literature is in agreement that strong islands are able to embed insituuness (Obenauer 1994, Starke 2001, Shlonsky 2012, Tual 2019, a.o.). Out-of-island extraction is categorically excluded in these cases, and wh-fronting results in ungrammaticality. Therefore, inside strong syntactic islands wh-in situ is not only optional but compulsory. This is illustrated by the contrasts in (54) to (56):

(54) ADJUNCT ISLAND (adapted from Tual 2019) Contemporary Spoken French

a. *Qui, tu crois qu’elle a dit ça [[ pour inciter Pierre à séduire ]]
who you think that she has said this to push Pierre to seduce

b. Tu crois qu’elle a dit ça [[ pour inciter Pierre à séduire qui ]]
you think that she has said this to push Pierre to seduce who
‘Who is x, such that you think that she said this to encourage Pierre to seduce x?’

(55) COMPLEX-NP ISLAND Contemporary Spoken French

a. *Quoi, tu crois qu’elles vont inviter [[ ceux qui ont fait ]]
what you think that they will invite those who have done

b. Tu crois qu’elles vont inviter [[ ceux qui ont fait quoi ]]
you think that they will invite those who have done what
‘What is x, such that you think they are going to invite the people who did x?’

(56) SUBJECT ISLAND Contemporary Spoken French

a. *De quel acteur, [[ un bon ami ]] a peint Van Gogh?
of which actor a good friend has painted Van Gogh

b. [[ Un bon ami de quel acteur ]] a peint Van Gogh?
a good friend of which actor has painted Van Gogh
‘Who is x, such that x is an actor whose good friend painted Van Gogh?’

The data from the examples discussed in this section confirm the prediction that this variety of French displays a Lombard-like behaviour in its distribution of clause-internal wh-phrases10.

10Note that I have only analysed the syntactic islands discussed for Bellunese in Munaro (1999). However, the data on other island effects such as the Coordinate structure constraint, as in (1), or the Left-branch constraint, as in (2), also confirm what has been said so far, although the status of the two seems slightly degraded with respect to the strong islands in (54-56). A more detailed analysis of island effects in French can be found in Tual (2019).

(1) COORDINATE STRUCTURE ISLAND (adapted from Tual 2019) Contemporary Spoken French

a. *(À) qui, tu as parlé [[ à Paul et ]]
(to) who you have talked to Paul and

b. Tu as parlé [[ à Paul et (à qui) ]]
you have talked to Paul and (to) who
‘Who is x, such that you talked to Paul and to x?’
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Spanish and Portuguese

The data discussed in the previous sections, coupled with my discussion of NIDs, predict that Spanish insituness cannot be derived as in Bellunese and similar languages (type III). Its morphosyntactic properties instead more closely resemble those of Lombard and similar varieties (type II), so Spanish insituness is hence expected to be acceptable inside syntactic islands. The prediction is confirmed by the data on wh-in situ inside islands attested in the literature on Spanish (Suñer 1991, Arnaiz 1993, Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2005, Reglero 2007, Reglero & Ticio 2008), all of which seem to confirm my intuition. Observe the weak and strong islands in (57) and (58):

(57) WH-ISLAND (adapted from Reglero 2007:273(18))

a. [Y] tú no sabes [cómo llegó quién]?
   and you neg know how arrived who
   ‘Who is x, such that you don’t know how x arrived?’

b. Quién tú no sabes [cómo llegó ____]?
   who you neg know how arrived

(58) COMPLEX-NP ISLAND (adapted from Reglero 2007:272(16))

a. Te has enamorado [[del hombre que vive con quién]]?
   you have fallen.in.love of.the man who lives with whom
   ‘Who is x, such that you fell in love with the man who lives with x?’

b. * Con quién te has enamorado [[del hombre que vive ___]]?
   with whom you have fallen.in.love of.the man who lives
   ‘Who is x, such that you fell in love with the man who lives with x?’

Predictably, overt extraction of the wh-element is possible in the case of weak island, as in (57), and ruled out with strong islands, as in (58). Data also exist that show the impossibility of out-of-island extraction of wh-elements for other types of islands, such as the adjunct island in (59):

(59) ADJUNCT ISLAND (adapted from Alcalà 2014:168(2a))

* A quién te fuiste [[antes de saludar ___]]?
  whom you left before of greeting
  ‘Who is x, such that you left without greeting x?’

In light of the data discussed so far, the structure in (59) is expected to be grammatical in the absence of wh-fronting. Let us now turn to Portuguese\textsuperscript{11}. I have claimed that Portuguese displays

\begin{Verbatim}
(2) LEFT-BRANCH ISLAND

a. * Quoi, elle a cassé [[quoi de Paul]]?
   \begin{tabular}{l}
   what she has broken of Paul
   \end{tabular}

b. ? Elle a cassé [[quoi de Paul]]?
   she has broken what of Paul
   ‘What is x, such that you broke Paul’s x?’
\end{Verbatim}

\textsuperscript{11}Note that I do not draw a clear-cut distinction between European and American varieties here: to the best of my knowledge, the differences observed among varieties of the two families are not significant for the present discussion.
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optional wh-in situ, both in root and in non-root contexts (Pires & Taylor 2009, Cheng & Rooryck 2000; 2002 Kato 2013). As mentioned above, the status of its indirect wh-questions is uncertain. In fact, it has been argued that both European and Brazilian Portuguese have insituness in indirect questions under a COMP which closely resembles Trevisian seWH. However, I have not been able to reproduce the data with my informants, who lack the relevant if-COMP and systematically carry out wh-fronting in indirect interrogatives, as in (60):

(60) INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS
(Brazilian Portuguese)

(adapted from Figueiredo Silva & Grolla 2016:263(8))

a. Ele perguntou o que, ((é) que) a Maria viu ___
   he asked what ((is) that) the Mary saw
   ‘He asked what Mary saw’

b. * Ele perguntou ((é) que) a Maria viu o que
   he asked (is) that the Mary saw what

In my theory, the absence of indirect wh-in situ in a variety that has an embedding that-COMP construed with fronting but no specialised COMP for insituness (or wh-doubling) is predicted. Nonetheless, the possibility of embedding a wh-phrase within an indirect yes/no question, such as that in (48) for Spanish, has also been attested in Portuguese (61):

(61) WH-IN SITU IN INDIRECT POLAR QUESTION
(Brazilian Portuguese)

(Figueiredo Silva & Grolla 2016:262(4))

A Maria perguntou se o João comeu o quê?
the Mary asked if the John ate what
‘What is x such that Mary asked if John has eaten x?’

What is more, although my data are not sufficient to establish whether Portuguese has proper syntactic movement of clause-internal wh-phrases, it is clear that no movement of the remnant-IP can be involved in its derivation. There exists a possibility, although limited, of moving non-subject wh-phrases in real questions, as in (64), which looks like the phenomenon observed in Contemporary Spoken French and Spanish that I analysed as short-distance scrambling:

(62) DO > WH-ADV vs WH-ADV > DO
(Brazilian Portuguese)

(adapted from Figueiredo Silva & Grolla 2016:277(36c))

a. O Pedro viu a Maria DO como ADV?
   the Peter saw the Mary how
   ‘How did Peter see Mary?’

b. O Pedro viu como ADV a Maria DO ___ADV?
   the Peter saw how ___ the Mary

Note that the order in (65) is also possible in the presence of a prosodic break (O Pedro viu como, a Maria?), although only the latter should be considered an instance of scrambling. In line with
6.3 Features responsible for Northern Italian wh-in situ(s)

Trevigiano and Lombard varieties, Portuguese can also license D-linked wh-phrases clause-internally, as in (63):

(63) D-LINKED WH-PHRASE IN SITU

(Brazilian Portuguese
(adapted from Figueiredo Silva & Grolla 2016:285(17B))

Você fez quantos biscoitos?
you made how many cookies
‘How many cookies did you make?’

Consequently, the prediction is that wh-in situ should be not only possible (in all types of islands), but also necessary (inside strong islands). Observe the contrasts in (64) and (65):

(64) COMPLEX-NP ISLAND

(Brazilian Portuguese
(adapted from Figueiredo Silva & Grolla 2016:263(10))

a. * Que livro, (que) a Maria admira [[ o autor que escreveu ___ ]] ?
which book (that) the Mary admires the author who wrote

b. ? A Maria admira [[ o autor que escreveu que livro ]] ?
the Mary admires the author who wrote which book
‘What is x, such as x is a book written by the author who Mary admires?’

(65) ADJUNCT ISLAND

(Brazilian Portuguese
(adapted from Figueiredo Silva & Grolla 2016:263(11))

a. * O que, você vai no quarto [[ fazer ___ ]] ?
what you go in bedroom to do

b. Você vai no quarto [[ fazer o que ]] ?
you go in bedroom to do what
‘What is x, such that you’re heading to your bedroom to do x?’

Again, the legitimacy of the tripartition of wh-in situ developed so far is confirmed, and Portuguese appears to fit perfectly into the Lombard type.

6.3 Features responsible for Northern Italian wh-in situ(s)

The degree of morphosyntactic variation observed in Northern Italian wh-in situ is substantial, and realised along several variables. Even greater micro- and macro-variation is observed if Romance varieties spoken outside of Northern Italy are taken into account. Consequently, the pursuit of a unified derivation that might account for all of the attested phenomena seems rather idealistic. It is clear, however, that languages display fixed behavioural patterns in the way that they license insituness: based on a number of variables related to the distribution of wh-in situ, I have singled out three linguistic types. Let us move briefly outside of the Romance domain and explore whether the analysis presented so far can also be applied to non-Romance languages.
Pure wh-in situ

As briefly stated in the Introduction to this work, the optionality observed in the in situ-ex situ alternation in Romance does not apply in languages which, like Chinese or Japanese, have insituness as their only question formation strategy. Here, I take Mandarin Chinese as an example. The topic of this dissertation is not pure wh-in situ; detailed accounts of the issue can be found in works such as Huang (1982), Xu (1990), Lasnik & Saito (1992), Lin (1992), Watanabe (1992), Aoun & Li (1993), Cole & Hermon (1994;1998), Tsai (1994;1999), Beck & Kim (1997), Kishimoto (2005), Ko (2005), Soh (2005), Bruening & Thuan (2006), Downing (2011), Jin (2014), and Pan (2014), among others. In languages like Mandarin Chinese, wh-words must stay clause-internally. Observe the contrast in (66):

(66) NO IN SITU/EX SITU ALTERNATIONS (adapted from Huang 1982:253(159))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. | Ni kanjian-le shei? (Chinese)
|    | you see-ASP who
|    | ‘Who did you see?’ |
| b. | *Shei, ni kanjian-le ____,?
|    | who you see-ASP |

Although Chinese and similar languages are different from Romance languages where insituness is an option, i.e. it co-exists with total wh-fronting, let us try to understand whether it is possible to fit Chinese into one of the distributional patterns discussed so far. To the best of my knowledge, no compulsory short movement of Modern Chinese clause-internal wh-phrases has been discussed in the literature, nor is there any sentence-finality requirement: Chinese is head-final, hence non-subject wh-words normally surface to the left of the V, i.e. in a non-sentence-final position. The wh-word in (66) is non-D-linked. However, Chinese wh-in situ is also fine in the case of D-linking, as in (67):

(67) D-LINKED WH-PHRASE IN SITU (Pan 2014:6(12))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mei-gē nánshéng dōu xīhuàn nà-bèn shū ?
| every-Cl boy all like which-Cl book
| ‘Which book does every boy like?’ |

In Chinese, wh-in situ is fine in long-distance and indirect wh-questions, as in (68) and (69):

(68) LONG CONSTRUAL (adapted from Cheng & Bayer 2015:4(6))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Huángróng xiāngxīn [ Guójìng mǎi-le shénme ]?
| Huangrong believe Guojing buy-PERF what
| ‘What does Huangrong believe that Guojing bought?’ |

(69) EMBEDDED WH-IN SITU (adapted for Cheng 2003:103(3b))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Botong xiăng-zhídào [ Hufei mǎi-le shénme ]
| Botong want-know Hufei buy-PERF what
| ‘Botong wants to know what Hufei bought’ |
6.3 Features responsible for Northern Italian wh-in situ(s)

On the basis of the behavioural patterns identified so far and given that Chinese wh-in situ displays the same properties as Lombard insituness, it is expected to be acceptable inside syntactic islands, as confirmed by the data. Observe the instances of wh-in situ inside weak and strong islands in (70) and (71):

(70) **WH-ISLAND** (Cheng & Bayer 2015:5(14a))

\[\text{Nǐ xiǎng-zhīdào [ wǒ wéishénme mǎi shénme ]?} \]
\[\text{you wonder I why buy what} \]
\[\text{‘What is the x such that you wonder why I bought x?’} \]

(71) **ADJUNCT ISLAND** (Cheng & Bayer 2015:5(14b))

\[\text{Zhāngsān [ yǐnwéi sléi méiyǒu lái ] hěn shēngqí?} \]
\[\text{Zhangsan because who not have come very angry} \]
\[\text{‘Who is x such that Zhangsan got angry because x didn’t come?’} \]

Different analyses have been proposed for Chinese wh-in situ (Xu 1990, Lin 1992, Aoun & Li 1993, Tsai 1994;1999, Cole & Hermon 1998, a.o.). Starting from Huang (1982), many authors have claimed that in situ wh-phrases undergo movement to their scope position at LF, i.e. after Spell Out. Other authors have argued that it is crucial to distinguish between two groups of wh-phrases, *nominal* (which systematically take scope across an island) vs. *adverbial* (which might not). These authors claim that only adverbial wh-phrases raise to their scope position in covert syntax, while nominal wh-phrases do not. Other authors, such as Soh (2005), have argued in favour of generalised covert raising à la Huang (1982), and explained the asymmetry between wh-nominals and wh-adverbials in terms of covert *feature* movement vs. covert *phrasal* movement. Nonetheless, what is clear is that none of the studies cited above assumes that Chinese clause-internal wh-phrases move before Spell Out: the language displays *real* insituness, i.e. clause-internal wh-phrases appear in their first-merge position. Interestingly, leaving wh-doubling aside, Chinese wh-in situ displays all the characteristics of the Lombard *type*, which supports Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) covert movement analysis.

From the discussion in this Chapter, it has emerged that the varieties studied for the remnant-IP movement analysis perfectly fit into *type III*, while those used in Manzini & Savoia (2011) as evidence for *unmoved* insituness fall into *type II*. In this theoretical framework, Trevigiano and similar varieties, i.e. *type I*, which I argued have TP-internal Wh-to-Foc, are different from *type II* and *I* varieties in the way they derive wh-in situ.

6.3.1 Three types of wh-in situ

Contra Poletto & Pollock (2000-2015), Munaro et al. (2001), Manzini & Savoia (2005;2011) and Manzini (2014), I wish to argue against the possibility of proposing a unified derivation for Northern Italian wh-in situ (and more generally, wh-in situ in Romance). Indeed, I believe that the wide range
of empirical variation is better explained in terms of micro-variations triggered by the need (or lack thereof) for clause-internal wh-phrases to check TP-internal features, the status of the EPP in T, and the presence or absence of certain prosodic requirements in construals with wh-in situ.

In what follows, I shall first survey previous treatments of the optionality observed in the in situ/ex situ alternation, none of which considers the role of Q in the derivation of wh-questions. Consequently, maintaining Cable’s (2010) claim that the Q-particle enters the computation even in languages where it does not have phonological content, I shall re-address the issue of Northern Italian optional wh-in situ, on the assumption that wh-phrases do not move freely between TP and CP, but surface clause-internally or sentence-initially depending on whether they adjoin the Q-particle or are QP-selected. I shall also argue that the D-linked/non-D-linked asymmetry in Bellunese signals the presence of an unusual evolutionary stage, where D-linked wh-words are not yet able to adjoin the silent Q-particle, while non-D-linked wh-words have already moved towards generalised Q-adjunction.

Mixed pictures of wh-movement and wh-scoping

Manzini & Savoia (2011) concluded that no remnant-IP movement operation can be at work in NIDs, and therefore argued in favour of real wh-in situ, where clause-internal wh-phrases stay in their external-merge position. According to them, the parameter between wh-in situ and wh-movement in NIDs should not be explained in terms of different derivations, but rather a very ordinary alternation between scope construal (in the case of wh-in situ) and overt scope (in the case of wh-fronting). As for the exceptionality of Bellunese wh-in situ with respect to embedded wh-in situ and sensitivity to islands (Munaro 1999), the authors claim that, in the context of micro-variation among closely-related grammars, it is possible that some grammars impel wh-movement in embedded sentences (Bellunese-like varieties) while others do not (Lombard), while different sensitivities to islands are easily explained if they are taken to be related to conditions on LF interpretive construals, not to conditions on movement operations. Even outside of the Romance domain, a mixed picture of wh-movement and wh-scoping is in fact quite common. Recall for example, among other works discussed in §3.1, Mirdamadi’s (2018) discussion of Persian, where partial wh-movement and total wh-fronting co-exist with the movement of clause-internal wh-phrases to FOC\textsubscript{LOW}. Partial wh-movement is a variant of wh-movement where the wh-word moves to a position lower than its scope position, which is in turn filled by a distinct wh-word (usually a what-word). Observe the German examples in (72), where the contentful wh-phrase is given in italics, while the scope-marking wh-word is bolded:

(72) GERMAN PARTIAL WH-FRONTING

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a.] Was \textit{denken die Besucher,} \textit{weni} sie \textit{\_i} gesehen haben?
  \textit{\text{what think the visitors \text{who}\text{ACC} they \text{seen} have}
  \text{‘Who do the visitors think that they saw?’}
\end{itemize}
b. *Was denken die Besucher, mit wem, sie i gesprochen haben?
   was think the visitors with who DAT they spoken have
   ‘Who do the visitors think that they talked with?’

The instances of partial wh-movement in (72) clearly differ from their full wh-movement counterparts, where the wh-word functions as a scope marker on its own, as illustrated in (73):

(73) GERMAN TOTAL WH-FRONTING

   a. *Wen, denken die Besucher, dass sie i gesehen haben?
      who ACC think the visitors that they seen have
      ‘Who do the visitors think that they saw?’
   b. Mit wem, denken die Besucher, dass sie i gesprochen haben?
      with who think the visitors that they spoken have
      ‘Who do the visitors think that they talked with?’

Wahba (1991) shows that Iraqi Arabic also displays overt movement, wh-in situ (covert movement) and partial movement side by side. On the basis of robust cross-linguistic evidence, Cole & Hermon (1994) claim that the scoping strategies are often not homogeneous, both across closely-related languages and language-internally. For instance, while Imbabura Quechua systematically displays overt wh-movement, as in (74), Ancash Quechua also has covert wh-movement, as in (75):

(74) IMBABURA QUECHUA WH-MOVEMENT (adapted from Cole & Hermon 1994:240(4))

   a. Ima-ta-taj, ya-ngui [Juan i randishka-ta]?
      what-ACC-Q think-2PP Juan ACC bought-ACC
      ‘What do you think Juan has bought?’
   b. *Ya-ngui [Juan ima-ta-taj, randishka-ta]?
      think-2PP Juan what-ACC-Q bought-ACC

(75) ANCASH QUECHUA WH-MOVEMENT (adapted from Cole & Hermon 1994:240(5))

   a. May-man-taq, [José munan [María ___ aywanan-ta] ]?
      where-to-Q José wants María will-go-ACC
      ‘Where does José want María to go?’
   b. [José munan [María may-man, aywanan-ta] ]?
      José wants María where-to will-go-ACC

The Q-morpheme taq in (75a) seems to be responsible for the attraction of the wh-phrase into CP. Indeed, if the wh-phrase stays clause-internally, as in (75b), no such morpheme appears. Interestingly, both island-sensitivity and ECP (Empty Category Principle) effects are observed in the case of overt wh-movement, but not in the case of wh-in situ. Observe the contrasts in (76) and (77):

(76) ISLAND-EFFECTS (adapted from Cole & Hermon 1994:245(12;14))

Ancash Quechua

   a. *Ima-ta-taq, (qam) kuya-nki [___ suwaq nuna-ta]?
      what-ACC-Q you love-2PP steal man-ACC
      ‘What is x such that you love the man who stole x?’
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b. (Qam) kuya-nki [ ima-ta suwaq nuna-ta ]?
   you love-2PP what-ACC steal man-ACC

(77) ECP-EFFECTS (adapted from Cole & Hermon 1994:247(17;18)) Ancash Quechua

a. * Pi-taq, Fuan musyan [ ___ tanta-ta runanqan-ta ]?
   who-Q Juan knows bread-ACC made-ACC
   ‘Who is x such that Juan knows that x made bread?’

b. Fuan musyan [ pi tanta-ta runanqan-ta ]?
   Juan knows who bread-ACC made-ACC

The ECP is a principle of transformational grammar that requires traces to be visible. An empty category is sub-categorised for by a verb, and must be identifiable as an empty positions at LF, i.e. must be properly governed. Proper government can be ensured either by a lexical category, in which case it is referred to as theta-government, or via co-indexation with a governing maximal projection, which is known as antecedent-government (which is what we have in the examples in (77)). In (77) it is possible to observe that while Ancash Quechua exhibits strong restrictions on the extraction of complement subjects, as in (77a), no ECP-violation arises in case of wh-in situ, as in (77b).

Following Aoun & Li (1993), Cole & Hermon argue that a null wh-operator must be in SpecCP, which binds the in situ word. This operation is carried out in the sense of variable binding, as in (78):

(78) VARIABLE BINDING VIA A WH-OPERATOR IN CP
    [CP Qu i C0 [IP ...wh-word i ...]]

Malay is also a language in which wh-fronting and wh-in situ co-exist, along with partial wh-movement, as illustrated in (79):

(79) MALAY WH-MOVEMENT (Cole & Hermon 1998:224-225(1-3))

a. Siapa i (yang) [ Bill harap [ yang ___ akan membeli baju untuknya ]
   who (that) Bill hope [ that will buy clothes for.him
   ‘Who does Bill hope will buy clothes for him?’

b. Ali memberitahu kamu tadi [ Fatimah baca apa ]
   Ali informed.you just now Fatimah read what
   ‘What did Ali tell you Fatimah was reading?’

c. Ali memberitahu kamu tadi [CP apa i (yang) [IP Fatimah baca ___ i]
   Ali told.you just now what (that) Fatimah read
   ‘Ali told you just now, what was Fatimah reading?’

For Cole & Hermon (1998), wh-in-situ is licensed by an operator, which can be either phonetically-realised or silent and serves as an unselective binder. Unselective binding is the idea, first investigated in Baker (1970), that certain quantificational elements bind any and all unbound variables in their scope. As for the reason why Malay (or any other language) should have all three wh-options at its disposal, Cole & Hermon suggest that the variation can be reduced to certain lexical options that do not exist in
pure wh-in situ and pure wh-movement languages. In their discussion pure wh-movement languages, such as English, have wh-words composed of lexical combinations of operator and variable features (so called [OP+Var]-type), while wh-words in pure wh-in situ languages, such as Chinese, lack the operator feature ([Var] type). Therefore, [OP+Var]-languages impel wh-fronting so that the wh-word occupies the proper operator position, while [Var]-interrogative pronouns have to rely on an external operator and cannot undergo movement. Malay is said to involve both options: the [OP]-feature either stems from the lexicon as part of the interrogative pronoun, or it is externally-merged independently in CP. With regard to partial wh-movement, where island effects appear not only between the trace and the position occupied by the operator at Spell-Out, but also between the operator and its scope position, Cole & Hermon argue that there must be an expletive that needs to be replaced by moving the [OP]-feature of the head of the overt chain upwards, covertly.

None of the approaches to optionality mentioned in this section and, to the best of my knowledge, none of the works on Romance wh-in situ published so far have tried to integrate Cable’s (2010) theory of Q into the computation. Nonetheless, it should be clear from this discussion that Q is crucial in the derivation of Trevisian wh-in situ, and of Northern Italian wh-in situ more generally. Therefore, in the upcoming discussion I shall assume that Q is present (though with substantial cross-linguistic variation) in all NIDs.

**Variables and types of Northern Italian in situ/ex situ alternation**

In a theory like the one proposed here, where wh-phrases interact in various ways with a silent Q-particle, the wide range of morphosyntactic variation attested in the literature on NIDs and discussed throughout this dissertation is better explained if the in situ/ex situ alternation is taken to be the result of: (a) the (un)availability of QP-selection and/or Q-adjunction in the sense of Cable (2010); (b) the presence or absence of a feature other than the left-peripheral [q] to be checked in TP; (c) the presence or absence of an attracting EPP-feature in T and/or C.

A theoretical model for Northern Italian wh-in situ that is based on the differences between varieties in terms of properties (a) to (c) is sufficient to explain the broad but systematic range of variation in the in situ/ex situ alternation attested in NIDs. I therefore claim that for NIDs it is not necessary to posit either a unified derivation à la Poletto & Pollock (2000) and Manzini & Savoia (2005), or diametrically-different derivations: an identical underlying structure, combined with different ways of integrating the silent Q-particle to wh-phrases and (if relevant) features other than [q] to be checked is sufficient. Crucially, assuming that all varieties must have QP-fronting, variable (a) will be responsible for the availability of covert movement of clause-internal wh-phrases (when QP-selection is involved) or overt movement of the silent Q-particle alone (in the varieties which display Q-adjunction). Meanwhile, variable (b) will account for all cases of apparent wh-in situ, i.e. Trevisian...
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(and plausibly Lombard) *moved* clause-internal wh-phrases. Finally, variable (c) will explain the presence or absence of Attraction into the Spec of a relevant functional projection after a proper Agree relation is established between the probing uninterpretable feature in their head and the interpretable feature of a matching goal. The Bellunese case is slightly more complex than the cases of Lombard, Trevigiano, and similar languages, though I believe that remnant-IP movement can be dispensed with, and my theory of Wh-to-Foc also extended to *type III* varieties if we analyse the D-linked/non-D-linked asymmetry and the sentence-finality requirement through a new lens.

In a theoretical framework where we assume that clauses have both a Left Periphery (Rizzi 1997 and further developments) and a low periphery within the clausal domain (Belletti 2004), and where the existence of FPs available as landing sites for movement of clause-internal wh-phrases has been posited both in the lower portion of the LP (Poletto & Pollock 2000 and developments, Munaro et al. 2001) and inside the VP-periphery (Manzini & Savoia 2005, Belletti 2006, Kato 2013, Manzini 2014, this work), we predict that (at least) three different types of wh-in situ are possible:

(i) TP-internal unmoved, Chinese-like insituness;
(ii) TP-internally moved (fake) insituness;
(iii) (fake) insituness derived via wh-movement to CP.

Following the discussion in this Chapter, (i) appears to be the case for Manzini & Savoia’s Lombard dialects (*type II*), (ii) for Trevigiano-like varieties (*type I*), and (iii) for Bellunese-like languages (*type III*). Therefore, the projections available for clause-internal wh-phrases in NIDs are likely those in (80):

(80) POSITIONS AVAILABLE FOR CLAUSE-INTERNAL WH-WORDS IN NIDs

\[
\text{[CP \ldots [Op1P \text{wh-phrase Op1}] \ldots [TP \ldots [FocLow \text{wh-phrase Foc}] \ldots [VP \ldots [XP \text{wh-phrase }]]]}
\]

*type III*: A’-position  
*type I*: A’-position  
*type II*: External-merge

Recall that in generative grammar, an A-position is a position where a \(\theta\)-role can be assigned. A \(\theta\)-role (or theta-role) is a formal device used to refer to the arguments required syntactically by a given verb: thus, A-positions (or argumental positions) are those occupied by the subject and, if relevant, by the object(s). Under this assumption, all positions which are not an A-position are called A’-positions. In (80), I did not use the term A-position for unmoved wh-phrases because not all wh-phrases are assigned a \(\theta\)-role.

Op1P is the label used in some versions of the remnant-IP movement analysis to refer to the operator position in the lower portion of the LP to which clause-internal wh-phrases are attracted in Bellunese and similar varieties. In the next section, although the availability of Rizzi & Bocci’s (2017) QembP was originally only posited in *indirect* wh-questions, I shall claim that the only way to derive the Bellunese facts in a remnant-IP movement derivation is to posit a parametrisation responsible...
for the activation of this landing site for wh-movement in direct wh-questions in type III varieties as well. I would like to note that $\text{Foc}_{\text{LOW}}$ is likely to also be involved in type II varieties. This possibility would entirely rule out real wh-in situ in NIDs. However, in the absence of evidence of any kind, the possibility that there is unmoved insituness in Lombard dialects cannot be excluded. In fact, although Romance languages spoken outside of the Northern Italian domain are not the topic of this dissertation, I provided evidence in §6.2 that while the status of Wh-to-Foc in Romance varieties other than Trevigiano is yet to be tested, real wh-in situ should at least be assumed to be available, for example in Spanish and Contemporary Spoken French. In Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) set of Lombard and Venetan dialects there might be both languages with real wh-in situ and languages that display Wh-to-Foc.

6.3.2 Wh-to-Foc and the theory of Northern Italian wh-in situ

I have claimed that, cross-linguistically, clause-internal wh-phrases display fixed behaviours in matrix and non-matrix contexts, and within weak and strong islands. These are shown in Table 6.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NIDs</th>
<th>Romance</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Bl_{type}$</td>
<td>$Tv_{type}$</td>
<td>$Lb_{type}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-D-linked wh-phrases</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-linked wh-phrases</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence-finality requirement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short wh-movement</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance Qs</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Qs</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic islands</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distributional regularities in Table 6.1 follow from the movement requirements of clause-internal wh-phrases (or lack thereof), as I shall argue in what follows. Before moving on to the discussion of each type, observe the projections that have been argued to be relevant to the movement of wh-phrases in the interrogative sentences of types I to III, in (83) to (81), respectively:

(81) $A'$-POSITIONS TARGETED BY INTERROGATIVE MOVEMENT: TYPE I

\[
[\text{ForceP} \ldots [\text{Focus}_{\text{HIGH}} 'ex situ' \text{Focus}^0 \ldots [\text{TP} \ldots [\text{Foc}_{\text{LOW}} 'in situ' \text{Foc}^0 \ldots [\text{VP} \ldots ]]]]]
\]

(82) $A'$- & AND EXTERNAL-MERGE POSITIONS FOR WH-PHRASES: TYPE II

\[
[\text{ForceP} \ldots [\text{Focus}_{\text{HIGH}} 'ex situ' \text{Focus}^0 \ldots [\text{TP} \ldots [\text{VP} \ldots [\text{XP} 'in situ' ]]]]]
\]

$A'$-position

External-merge position
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(83) A'-POSITIONS TARGETED BY INTERROGATIVE MOVEMENT: TYPE III
\[ [\text{Opt}_2 'ex situ' \text{Opt}^2] [\text{Force}_2 \ldots [\text{Opt}_1 'in situ' \text{Opt}^1] [\text{TP} \ldots]] \]

Trevigiano and similar varieties (type I): QP and Q-adjunction, plus focus movement

I have proposed that Trevigiano has two strategies to integrate the silent Q-particle into the computation: both QP-selection, leading to QP-fronting into SpecFocus_{HIGH}, and Q-adjunction, responsible for wh-in situ. Recall also that I have taken all observed instances of movement to be related to the presence of an EPP-feature in C and/or T. In Trevisian wh-questions, wh-phrases are never bare, modulo (i) the case of strong islands to extraction, where the island-trapped wh-phrase does not have a direct relation with the Q-particle (instead, it appears to select the whole island), and (ii) the case of wh-phrases in indirect wh-questions. Following Cable (2010), I take QP-fronting to be triggered by a [q]-feature in C (or more precisely, in the head of Rizzi’s Focus_{HIGH}). Under these assumptions, [wh] is not a relevant feature in interrogatives: on the assumption that what is relevant for the fronting of wh-phrases in interrogatives is Q, and in the spirit of Chomsky’s (2005) claim that the CP of interrogatives is a residual V2 environment, it seems plausible that the interrogative Force is somehow inherently set as [+int/wh]. This, as a consequence, sets Focus^0_{HIGH} as [+q]. The [wh]-feature becomes relevant in the case of indirect wh-questions which, because of their special semantics, have a declarative-like LP with an active QembP: Focus^0_{HIGH} contains a [foc]-feature and (when relevant) QembP is set as [+wh]. (84) illustrates the situation:

(84) FEATURES IN THE LP OF TREVISIAN INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES

a. Indirect: [\text{Force}_P \text{Force}^0_{[+int]} \text{Focus}_P \text{Focus}^0_{[+foc]} \text{Qemb}_P \text{Qemb}^0_{[+int]} \text{Fin}_P \text{Fin}^0_{[TP \ldots]]}]

b. Direct: [\text{Force}_P \text{Force}^0_{[+int]} \text{Int}_P \text{Int}^0_{[+int]} \text{Focus}_P \text{Focus}^0_{[+q]} \text{Fin}_P \text{Fin}^0_{[TP \ldots]]}]

Consequently, when an indirect wh-phrase contains a focaised constituent, this Agrees with the [foc]-feature in Focus^0_{HIGH} and is subsequently attracted into its Spec, while the wh-phrase undergoes Wh-Agreement and is attracted into SpecQembP. This approach explains, why only the order Foc > Wh is felicitous (as discussed in Rizzi 1997), while also accounting for the limited availability of focus-containing wh-questions in Italian: plausibly, while NID's are able to use bare wh-words as a last-resort operation, Standard Italian cannot (with the sole exception of the case of focalled IO followed by a wh-DO, as discussed in Rizzi 1997 and related developments). Note that while IntP is available only for elements that are externally-merged there, Focus_{HIGH} establishes an Agree-relation with TP-internal elements.

In indirect wh-interrogatives, Trevisian bare wh-words must value at least their [wh]-feature. I have in fact claimed that, in indirect questions, a fronted wh-word lands in the Spec of QembP following Wh-Agreement between Qemb^0 and the interpretable [wh]-feature on the wh-word. For
this reason, and in the exceptional lack of the Q-particle, for indirect wh-in situ se\textsubscript{WH} is needed in order for the question to be correctly set as [+int]. Similarly, wh-doubling is a way of checking \( Q^0_{\text{emb}} \) in the absence of overt movement of the wh-phrase. However, [foc] also is clearly active in the case of embedded wh-in situ in Trevigiano, as it is needed to check the uninterpretable [foc]-feature in \( Foc^0_{\text{LOW}} \) before the wh-word moves further to satisfy the Wh-Criterion. That the Q-particle is excluded from the computation in indirect interrogatives is semantically not surprising: because these are not real interrogatives, the CP does not contain [q], thus the insertion of Q fails to have an output effect, and hence is plausibly ruled out or inactivated by Economy or another mechanism of this sort. In contrast, in the case of focus movement, wh-words must be specified merely as [+foc]. The two features are, by default, interpretable but unvalued: the relevant feature is valued based on the context, while the remaining feature is deleted/not valued. Subsequently, the adjoined-Q takes over the satisfaction of the Q-criterion via overt movement into \( Focus^0_{\text{HIGH}} \).

If the felicity of wh-in situ in embedded questions is exclusively linked to the availability of se\textsubscript{WH}, long construals are indeed expected in a grammar that derives wh-in situ TP-internally. The same is true for weak islands, and is also expected in varieties other than Trevigiano. On the contrary, the availability of wh-in situ within strong islands for extraction might only depend on the ability of QPs in a given language to select whole islands, and then in turn on the exceptional availability of covert QP-movement or overt massive pied-piping.

I have already argued that a crucial change introduced in Chomsky (2000) was related to the hierarchical loci where the EPP applies. Indeed, Chomsky suggests an extension of the EPP from its original locus in T to all functional categories, namely vP, T and C. The presence of the EPP in a given projection depends on the presence of the full set of the appropriate agreement features on the projection itself. In a way, the EPP has subsumed the strong features of Chomsky (1995), i.e. phonologically indigestible features to be checked overtly, and functions as a selectional feature that requires overt Merge. In Trevigiano, the EPP is clearly present in all projections related to wh-movement: \( Foc_{\text{LOW}} \), WhP, and \( Focus_{\text{HIGH}} \), as in (85). The reasons why it fails to be satisfied in the case of wh-phrases trapped inside strong islands remain opaque for the time being.

(85) RELEVANT FEATURES IN TREVISIAN DIRECT INTERROGATIVES

\[
[\text{Force}_\text{INT} \ \text{Force} \ [\text{IntP}\ [\text{Int}\ [\text{Focus}\ [\text{Foc}\ [\text{TP}\ [\text{Foc}_{\text{LOW}} \ \text{Foc}_{\text{HIGH}} \ \text{Foc}_{\text{EPP}} \ [\text{q}]])]])]]
\]

Note that the lack of an EPP-feature in IntP is linked to the fact that, to the best of my knowledge, IntP is only compatible with interrogative elements that are externally-merged there directly (but see Shlonsky & Soare 2011 for a claim that why is generated lower in the LP, then moved to IntP: if they are right, the presence of an EPP-feature should also be posited in the head on IntP).
Lombard-like varieties (type II): mixed languages with different availability of EPP in $\text{Focus}_{\text{LOW}}$

Manzini & Savoia (2005 and later in their 2011 paper), argued that Northern Italian wh-in situ displays real insituteness: clause-internal wh-phrases are located in the position in which they are first-merged. I have claimed that this unifying approach to NID s needs to be abandoned, and that the observed micro-variation should be treated as the by-product of the presence/absence of certain clause-internal features and (if relevant) prosodic requirements. On these assumptions, Manzini & Savoia’s Lombard and Venetan dialects should fit into one of two categories: type II with unmoved wh-in situ, as proposed in their work, and type I, with TP-internally moved wh-in situ, as in Trevigiano. Indeed, neither positive nor negative evidence for clause-internally moved wh-phrases can be found in their (2005) corpus. The possibility that Northern Italian wh-in situ is derived via Wh-to-Foc was already mentioned in Manzini (2014), but I believe that the data in Manzini & Savoia’s (?) corpus show some regular patterns that do not allow unmoved wh-in situ to be ruled out in some Lombard dialects. Consequently, both types of wh-in situ must be proposed to exist.

The major difference between the Lombard and Venetan dialects described in the studies cited above on the one hand, and Trevigiano on the other is wh-doubling which, I have tentatively claimed, is a special type of Q- adjoining structure where Wh/Q-Agreement à la Cable 2010 is bi-directional: the Q-particle is exceptionally endowed with the [wh]-features of the wh-word to which it adjoins, which are spelled out as a monosyllabic or bisyllabic Q. Despite the misleading term ‘particle’, bisyllabic Q-particles are attested cross-linguistically: *puas* in the Chinese language Hmong Njua (Harriehausen 1990:205), *nakai* in the Oceanic language Niuean (Seiter 1980:25), *mbéni* in Bantu language Hunde (Kahombo 1992:171), among others. Though the Q-particles that I have just mentioned are polar operators, they illustrate that particles need not be monosyllabic. Note that, for the extraordinary Q-particles in wh-doubling to encode [wh]-features entails that the grammars that allow them can (yet need not) exceptionally have a [wh]-feature to check in Focus$^0_{\text{HIGH}}$. Again, this phenomenon can be traced back to an intermediate linguistic stage where C can optionally encode [wh] along with [q], requiring wh-doubling if Focus$^0_{\text{HIGH}}$ is exceptionally set as [q;wh].

My interpretation is that the dialects discussed by Manzini & Savoia can be categorised into the following two types: dialects of the Trevigiano type, where QP-selection and Q-adjunction co-exist, and the EPP in Focus$^0_{\text{HIGH}}$ impels overt movement of Q, while an EPP-feature in Focus$^0_{\text{LOW}}$ triggers clause-internal focus movement; and languages where clause-internal wh-phrases are not subject to focus movement. In this second type of varieties, assuming that Cable’s (2010) claim that matrix wh-fronting is always proof of the availability of QP-selection is correct, the relationship between the silent Q-particle and the clause-internal wh-phrase must be one of Q-adjunction. In fact, since the EPP is present in Focus$^0_{\text{HIGH}}$, as signalled by the possibility of overt QP-fronting, overt movement of Q to C must also be at play when wh-phrases stay clause-internal, which is only possible if the language
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has Q-adjunction. For the Lombard languages that have no matrix SCIL, a lack of phi-features in the interrogative CP can be posited, which despite the presence of an EPP-feature in Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} excludes T-to-C movement. Note that the fact that clause-internal wh-phrases fail to undergo focus movement does not necessarily mean that in the varieties under consideration there is no Focus-Agreement: the asymmetry between focus movement vs. real wh-in situ can be explained as the result of the absence of an EPP-feature in Focus\textsubscript{LOW}. This is illustrated in (86):

(86) RELEVANT FEATURES IN LOMBARD INTERROGATIVES

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ForceINT} & \text{ Force [Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} Focus\textsubscript{[EPP]}\textsubscript{[q]}\textsubscript{[\pm\phi]}\textsubscript{Fin} \text{ Fin [TP \ldots [Focus\textsubscript{LOW} Focus\textsubscript{[EPP]}\textsubscript{[?\phi]}\textsubscript{FinP} \ldots \ldots ]}\ldots ]]\ldots ]]
\end{align*}
\]

To conclude, similarly to Trevigiano, the fact that wh-in situ is derived TP-internally in the varieties under consideration here entails that this phenomenon can also appear in long construals. I have also claimed that indirect wh-questions are possible only in the presence of the [wh]-carrying Q-particle of wh-doubling. The status of wh-in situ within islands to extraction remains unclear, although I have argued that the examples discussed in Manzini & Savoia (2005) suggest that QP-selection of entire strong islands might be at play in Lombard.

**Bellunese (type III): a mixed language with a [wh]-feature in QembP...or something else?**

The remnant-IP movement analysis developed in works such as Poletto & Pollock (2000) and Munaro et al. (2001) is not entirely incompatible with the approach adopted in this dissertation. If we take Bellunese wh-fronting to be a regular instance of QP-fronting à la Cable (2010), and if we assume that the FP where [q] is located higher than in Trevigiano and other languages discussed here, then the analysis developed in the works cited above can be reconciled with mine. That some functional projections might be realised higher or lower in the functional spine across languages is a well-known phenomenon. Similarly, clause-internal wh-phrases can be analysed as Q-adjoining structures and, under the assumption that Bellunese displays fake wh-in situ, the movement into the lower portion of CP can be justified by the need to check [wh] in QembP. Although Rizzi (1997) and further studies along the same lines argue that QembP is active only in indirect questions, it does not seem theoretically undesirable to suggest that the presence of QembP in indirect and/or direct questions might be parametrised. In this framework, the need to move the whole IP to the LP of the clause could be considered a sub-product of similar parametric variations, probably an evolutionary stage where wh-words are not yet able to stay clause-internally without checking [wh] in the low LP, and given the need to verify the residual V2 environment in CP, movement of phrasal chunks into various left-peripheral FPs is carried out as some sort of last-resort operation to save the structure.

Recall, however, that since the early days of the theory, there has been controversy regarding an analysis of Northern Italian wh-in situ in terms of remnant-IP movement. Theoretically, this type
of analysis is anchored on the derivational approach to syntax (Chomsky 1998 and much related work) where *strict cyclicity* replaces proper binding, and where locality is systematically checked after each movement operation has taken place. Although movement of remnant chunks has been successfully proven to be possible in the literature, hence there is no reason *per se* to argue against a derivation of wh-in situ that includes movement of the remnant-IP, the feasibility of this analysis might be questioned, for reasons of both linguistic economy and learnability. Indeed, it is not clear how the linguistic input might be sufficient for the learner to infer that wh-questions are derived via such complex computations including various displacements of trace-containing chunks. For this reason, I would like to tentatively propose a more economical theoretical explanation that fits within the approach that I have developed in this dissertation. A derivation of *type III* wh-in situ that includes movement of the remnant-IP requires the postulation of major typological variation among closely-related varieties which, in light of Chomsky’s (2001) Uniformity Principle, appears undesirable:

**Uniformity Principle** (Chomsky 2001:2)

‘in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, assume languages to be uniform, with variety restricted to easily detectable properties of utterances’.

One way of dispensing with the postulation of such a massive divide between *type III* and other Northern Italian varieties is to posit that Bellunese has both QP-selection, leading to QP-fronting, and Q-adjunction, which strands the wh-word clause-internally. Because of the presence of matrix *SCII*, there must be a residual V2 environment in CP, with a Focus-head bearing uninterpretable [\(\phi;q\)] features, and an EPP-feature that triggers overt movement of QP-selected wh-words into SpecFocus\(_{\text{HIGH}}\). Similarly, the wh-words that stay clause-internally must be Q-adjoining. Under these assumptions, the sentence finality requirement, i.e. the requirement that wh-words occupy the rightmost edge of the clause, might be constrained by PF. Indeed, in a question like (87), nothing prevents the wh-word from being in Foc\(_{\text{LOW}}\), with deletion or dislocation of all following constituents for prosodic reasons, namely a requirement for wh-words to occupy the rightmost position in the prosodic string:

(87) **SENTENCE-FINALITY REQUIREMENT FOR clause-internal WH-WORDS**

*Ghe ha-lo dat *che* a so fradel?*  
DAT has=he given what to his brother  
‘What has he given to his brother?’

Bellunese

a. *Ghe ha-lo dat *che* a so fradel?*  
DAT has=he given what to his brother  
‘What has he given to his brother?’

b. Ghe ha-lo dat *che*, a so fradel?*  
DAT has=he given what # to his brother
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If dislocated material appears after the questioned wh-word, such as *a to fradel* in example (87), it is plausible that the whole vP is pied-piped into a topic position such as Belletti’s (2004) lowest TopP, along the lines of (88):

\[(88)\] **WH-TO-FOC & PROSODIC BREAK**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{prosodic break} \\
&\ldots [\text{FocusH Q [ghe ha]},_v\text{-lo} \ldots [TP \text{ dat } [\text{FocLOW} [\neg Q \text{ che }]]]]_v \\
&[\text{Top} \text{ Top}^0 [\text{vP vP}^0_v a \text{ so fradel }]]]?
\end{align*}
\]

The movement analysis in (88) entails that Foc\text{LOW} must be endowed with both an uninterpretable [foc]-feature and an attracting EPP-feature, as posited for Trevigiano. Under Belletti’s (2004) assumption that dislocated elements are in the VP-periphery, orders such as (87) are possible if the wh-word itself undergoes movement to the focal projection of the low periphery. The hypothesis that Bellunese clause-internal wh-words might undergo Wh-to-Foc is supported by data from Bellunese long construals such as (89), whose acceptability demonstrates that remnant-IP movement must not be at play after all:

\[(89)\] **LONG CONSTRUALS WITH NON-D-LINKED WH-WORDS**

\text{Bellunese}

(Munaro 1999:72(1.100-102))

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. A-tu \text{ dit} che \text{ l’a compra che?} \\
  \text{ have=you2PS said that he=has bought what} \\
  \text{ ‘What did you say he bought?’}
  \item b. A-tu \text{ dit} che \text{ l’e ‘ndat andé?} \\
  \text{ have=you2PS said that he=is gone where} \\
  \text{ ‘Where did you say he went?’}
\end{itemize}

With regard to the D-linked/non-D-linked asymmetry, and especially the unavailability of D-linked wh-words clause-internally (which are also better fronted in varieties like Trevigiano), an explanation in terms of the non-availability of Q-adjunction is theoretically desirable. Observe (90):

\[(90)\] **D-LINKED/NON-D-LINKED ASYMMETRY** (adapted from Munaro 1999)

\text{Bellunese}

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. A-tu \text{ parecià che?} \\
  \text{ have=you2PS prepared what} \\
  \text{ ‘What did you prepare?’}
  \item b. * Che \text{ à-tu parecià?} \\
  \text{ what have=you2PS prepared}
  \item c. Che \text{ vestito à-tu sièlt?} \\
  \text{ what dress have=you2PS chosen} \\
  \text{ ‘Which dress did you choose?’}
  \item d. * A-tu \text{ sièlt che vestito?} \\
  \text{ have=you2PS chosen what dress}
\end{itemize}
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Although QPs are available in Bellunese, covert movement is not, as signalled by the compulsory status of $\textit{SClI}$. Therefore, if D-linked wh-phrases are unable to adjoin Q, it follows that they would be infelicitous clause-internally. It is possible that, within a process of linguistic evolution that aims to achieve maximally-simple derivations (getting rid of optionality and of lexical strategies specialised for the same phenomenon, performing as little movement as possible, etc.), Bellunese has an evolutionary delay with respect to Trevigiano, which is closest to becoming a pure Q-adjoining language, at least when it comes to D-linked wh-phrases. On the contrary, non-D-linked wh-phrases, which are only felicitous clause-internally, have clearly developed Q-adjunction, to the point that they can no longer be selected by Q. It is well-established cross-linguistically that semantically-related linguistic phenomena can co-exist during ‘transitional’ periods (Roberts 2007b, Ledgeway 2012, a.o.), which strongly supports the analysis that I develop throughout this dissertation.

With regard to indirect wh-in situ, I claim that its unavailability is due to the lack of both a se$_\textit{WH}$ operator and of wh-doubling, contra Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) claim that the Bellunese infelicity is the result of grammar-related reasons that compel wh-movement in embedded contexts. However, I do agree with Manzini & Savoia (2011) when it comes to the unavailability of wh-in situ within islands and out-of-island extraction, which they believe is linked to conditions on LF construals. If both strong and weak islands indeed block extraction in Bellunese, and for some reason this variety has Q/Wh-Agreement, the impossibility of selecting whole islands is predicted, and in the absence of Q the computation fails. I illustrate this in (92) using the ill-formed instance of a complex-NP island in (91):

(91) INFELICITOUS WH-IN SITU WITHIN STRONG ISLAND

(adapted from Munaro 1999:74(1.105 & 1.107))

$^*$ Te piase-lo [i libri che parla de che ]?
you$_{2\text{PS}}$ like=it the books that speak of what

‘What is $x$, such that $x$ is a topic and you enjoy books about $x$’

(92) ILLEGAL PIED-PIPING PAST ISLAND IN BELLUNese

Bellunese

\begin{center}
\includegraphics{bellunese_diagram.png}
\end{center}
For Cable, in languages with limited pied piping, the Q-particle bears an interpretable but unvalued Q-feature (iQ[ ]); the presence of a syntactic island between the Q-particle and the wh-phrase therefore blocks the transmission of a value for the Q-feature of the Q-particle at LF. If Bellunese is indeed this type of language, then it is entirely expected that structures like (91) should crash at the LF interface.

This approach to the syntax of Bellunese wh-in situ seems more economical than the remnant-IP movement hypothesis and, even more importantly, does not require the postulation of major typological divides between Bellunese and type I-II varieties. I believe that this means that Munaro (1999) was right when he posited the presence of interrogative movement in Bellunese in the case of wh-in situ as well, which he explained in terms of an abstract operator that moves to the CP to determine the scope of the clause-internal wh-word. In a way, his abstract operator was an adjoined Q-particle ante litteram.

Concluding remarks

In this Chapter, I have surveyed the existing analyses of Northern Italian wh-in situ. On the basis of robust cross-linguistic regularities, I have claimed that it is necessary to abandon the aim of finding a cross-linguistically valid derivation for wh-in situ: it is theoretically more desirable to posit the existence of more than one derivation, dependent on the type(s) of relationships between wh-words and Q and on the need (or lack thereof) to check features other than [q] clause-internally.

Following my discussion, I provide some comments here on Cable’s (2010) grammar of Q. Cable posited the existence of a number of variations in his Q-based grammar, which have some major consequences. I list only four of the five here, since the parameter that relates to multiple wh-questions, which is irrelevant in Trevigiano, has not played any role in this dissertation.

CABLE’S GRAMMAR OF Q: PARAMETERS

- **Projection parameter**: Q-projection vs. Q-adjunction
  In Q-adjunction languages, Q adjoins to its sister and their mother is of the same category as the sister (in most cases, a Wh-projection). In Q-projection languages, Q takes its sister as complement, and so the node minimally dominating the Q and its sister is a QP.

- **Q-movement parameter**: Overt movement vs. Covert movement
  In overt Q-movement languages, the highest syntactic copy of a Q-particle is pronounced. In covert Q-movement languages, the lowest syntactic copy of a Q-particle is pronounced. In light of my discussion, we can tentatively attribute the setting of this parameter to the presence or absence of EPP in C.
Q-pronunciation parameter: Phonetically-realised vs. Silent
In some languages, like Tlingit, the Q-particle has phonological content. In other languages, like Trevigiano, the Q-particle is phonologically null.

Agreement parameter: Q/Wh-Agreement vs. Non-Agreement
In Q/Wh-Agreement languages, a Q-particle must Agree with the wh-word that it enters a relationship with. In non-Agreement languages, Q-particles need not Agree with wh-words.

In light of my discussion of the Trevigiano facts, I believe that the projection parameter and the agreement parameter ought to be modified as follows:

CABLE’S GRAMMAR OF Q: PARAMETERS (modified)

Projection parameter (amended)
In Q-adjunction languages, Q adjoins to its sister and their mother is of the same category as the sister (in most cases, a Wh-projection). In Q-projection languages, Q takes its sister as complement, and so the node minimally dominating the Q and its sister is a QP. Some languages can have both Q-adjunction and QP-projection.

Agreement parameter (amended)
In Q/Wh-Agreement languages, a Q-particle must Agree with the wh-word it entertains a relationship with. In non-Agreement languages, Q-particles need not undergo Agreement with wh-words. Q/Wh-agreement languages can have bidirectional agreement, hence display [wh]-features on the Q-particle.

The major consequences of the parameters above are first that the cases in which Q is attached not directly to the wh-word, but higher up, are those that are commonly referred to as pied-piping constructions. Only one kind of total fronting exists, namely that of Q-projection languages that move QP overtly. As a consequence, not only is wh-movement actually parasitic on Q-movement and not relevant in interrogatives, but according to Cable the existence of QPs should also be posited in languages with silent Q-particles: I have posited the existence of QPs in Trevigiano and I believe the presence of silent QPs accounts rather well for all of the observed phenomena, from simple QP-fronting to massive pied-piping of strong islands.

Another prediction of Cable’s approach is that there can be basically three types of wh-in situ language: (a) Q-projection languages that move QP covertly, (b) Q-adjunction languages that move Q covertly, and (c) Q-adjunction languages that move Q overtly. I have argued that the apparent optionality in the in situ/ex situ alternation in NIDs can be better explained if it is assumed to derive from the exceptional existence of two ways of joining the Q-particle to wh-words, rather than one: both QP-projection (responsible for total fronting) and Q-adjunction (responsible for wh-in situ).
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Because of the presence of \textit{SCII} in many NIDs, both with QP-fronting and with wh-in situ, I have claimed that these are of the (c) type: Q-adjunction languages that move Q overtly. The lack of \textit{SCII} in certain NIDs has been explained in terms of a missing residual V2 environment at the level of C, with \textit{phi}-features systematically transferred correctly to T. Admittedly, one could assume that these languages are actually type (b), i.e. Q-adjunction languages that move Q covertly. However, although a mixed picture of EPP/lack of EPP in C (resulting respectively in overt or covert Q-movement) does not seem impossible at certain stages in linguistic evolution, the total lack of an interrogative paradigm of NOM clitics strongly suggests that these languages have moved past the residual V2 CP and their \textit{phi}-features in C never fail to be correctly passed to T. Under these assumptions, I argue that nothing prevents Q-adjoining clause-internal wh-phrases from undergoing non-Q-movement before Q moves to the LP of the clause. I have distinguished between two types of movements of clause-internal wh-words: focus movement triggered by \textit{[foc]} in \textit{Foc}$_{\text{LOW}}$, as in Trevigiano, and (plausibly) wh-movement triggered under wh-Agreement between the Q-adjoining wh-word and the \textit{[wh]} feature in QembP, as in Bellunese. Both types of movement are related to features commonly associated to wh-phrases, \textit{[wh]} and \textit{[q]}, and it is possible that in closely-related languages (and sometimes even within the same variety) wh-phrases might only be specified for one of the two features, rather than both, depending on which one is relevant in the computation.

A third prediction of Cable’s theory of Q is that in languages where Q agrees with the wh-word that it enters a relationship with, no obstacles can be in the way that prevent agreement between Q and the wh-word. Obstacles are mostly islands and phase boundaries: to prevent intervention as much as possible, Q must attach at the right height, which might not always be the same in different languages. In Trevigiano, I have only discussed the case of islands, and have argued that one characteristic of this language is that its QPs can select entire islands. This is possible largely because Trevigiano, like Tlingit, does not have Wh/Q-Agreement, hence the presence of an island border between a wh-word and the selecting Q-particle is unproblematic. This property makes the Trevisian Q-particles different from both the Q-particles in Bellunese and those of wh-doubling. I have in fact claimed that in Bellunese the infelicity of wh-in situ within islands can be traced back to the need for Q and the wh-phrase to agree, as also observed in languages like English. Similarly, if I am right and wh-doubling is indeed an instance of \textit{bi-directional} Wh/Q-Agreement where wh-features are exceptionally passed to (and pronounced on) the Q-particle, then the infelicity of wh-doubling when construed with islands is a logical consequence.

Contrary to Cable (2010), I have claimed that there must be languages where both QP-selection and Q-adjunction exist, which explains the apparent optional in situ/ex situ alternation of Northern Italian Dialects quite well. Under these assumptions, the fact that not all wh-phrases can surface either clause-internally or sentence-initially can be assumed to be related to: (i) either special properties
of the wh-words under consideration (for example, wh-words externally-merged directly in the LP, as *purché*) or (ii) the fact that, in intermediate stages in the linguistic evolution, for QP-selection and Q-adjunction to not apply perfectly to all types of wh-words is unsurprising. Ideally, my claim could be further supported by the existence of mixed varieties with phonetically-realised Q-particle(s) where both QP-fronting and Q-adjunction, though I have not encountered any such variety yet. Nonetheless, it would not be unsurprising for a variety to have an overt Q-particle construed within QPs and a silent one which adjoins to wh-phrases, or the other way round. Supporting evidence in favour of this prediction is provided by Ancash Quechua (Cole & Hermon 1994). Observe the peculiar instance of in situ/ex situ alternation illustrated in (93):

(93) WH-MOVEMENT (adapted from Cole & Hermon 1994:240(5))

Ancash Quechua

a. May-man-\textit{taq}$_i$ [José munan [María \textit{ti} aywanan-ta ]]?
   where-to-Q José wants María will-go-ACC
   ‘Where does José want María to go?’

b. [José munan [María may-man, aywanan-ta ]]?
   José wants María where-to will-go-ACC

(93a) illustrates an Ancash Quechua fact that has been widely discussed in Cole & Hermon (1994): that wh-fronting must be construed with the Q-particle \textit{taq}. Differently, wh-in situ is inconsistent with \textit{taq}, as in (93b). Following the discussion provided so far, and under the assumption that wh-words are never bare in matrix questions, it seems possible to assume that wh-fronting is in fact overt QP-fronting of a QP-selected wh-phrase in Ancash Quechua, while clause-internal wh-phrases adjoin a silent Q-particle, as in (94):

(94) ANCASH QUECHUA AS A MIXED LANGUAGE

Ancash Quechua

a. QP-projection (phonetically-realised Q-particle)
   \[\text{QP} [\text{WhP may-man } \text{taq}]\]

b. Q-adjunction (silent Q-particle)
   \[\text{WhP} [\text{WhP may-man } \emptyset]\]

It cannot be that Ancash Quechua has an optionality in the timing of movement to CP, otherwise the presence of a QP-projecting wh-phrase would also be expected clauseinternally, contrary to fact. Welcomingly, my analysis of Ancash Quechua as a mixed language with overt movement to C is confirmed by both ECP effects and data on island-extraction. Observe (95) and (96):

(95) ECP-EFFECTS (adapted from Cole & Hermon 1994:247(17;18))

Ancash Quechua

a. * Pi-\textit{taq}$_i$ Fuan musyan [\textit{ti} tanta-ta ruranqan-ta ]?
   who-Q Juan knows bread-ACC made-ACC
   ‘Who is x such that Juan knows that x made bread?’
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b. Fuan musyan [ pi tanta-ta runaqan-ta ]?
Juan knows who bread-ACC made-ACC

(96) ISLAND-EFFECTS (adapted from Cole & Hermon 1994:245(12;14)) Ancash Quechua

a. * Ima-ta-taqi (qam) kuya-nki [ t suwaq nuna-ta ]?
what-ACC-Q you love-2PP steal man-ACC
‘What is x such that you love the man who stole x?’

b. (Qam) kuya-nki [ ima-ta suwaq nuna-ta ]?
you love-2PP what-ACC steal man-ACC

If my analysis is on the right track and Ancash Quechua is indeed a mixed language, the contrast in (95) follows: QP-fronting is blocked by the ECP, while the wh-phrase which stays clause-internally is a Q-adjointing one, predictably. Even more unsurprisingly, QP-fronting out of a strong island is banned, as in (96a), while wh-in situ is felicitous in this same environment. On the assumption that Ancash Quechua derives wh-in situ through Q-adjunction, the question in (96b) must indeed involve adjunction to the whole island. Please note that the possibility that a wh-word within an island adjoins the Q-particle at a more embedded structural level, i.e. within the island, is untenable on the assumption that both QP-fronting and Q-to-C movement are done overtly in Ancash Quechua. I shall not discuss Ancash Quechua further. However, I believe that this unusual presence of a Q-particle construed with wh-fronting is relevant and deserves attention in future work.

Recent works on pure wh-in situ have also illustrated that there exist languages which underwent interesting typological changes. Watanabe (2003) claimed that Japanese went from overt wh-fronting into CP during the Nara period (8th century) to modern-day wh-in situ12. Examples of wh-fronting in Old Japanese are provided in (97):

(97) QP-FRONTING IN OLD JAPANESE (adapted from Watanabe 2003:182(5))

a. Kasugano-no fuji-ha chiri-ni-te nani-wo ka-mo mikari-no hito-no Kasugano-GEN wisteria-TOP fall-PERF.CONJ what-ACC-KA-MO hike-GEN person-NOM ori-te kazasa-mu pick-CONJ wear.on.the.hair-will
‘Since the westeria flowers in Kasugano are gone, what should hikers pick and wear on the hair?’

‘From where did my wife come and appear in my dream, despite the fact that I closed the gate and shut the door?’

In light of Cable’s (2010) assumption that wh-fronting is systematically QP-fronting, (97) could be assumed to be proof that the linguistic evolution goes from QP-fronting to unmoved Q-adjunction,

12I am thankful to Hiromune Oda for pointing this out.
passing through the a phase characterised by optionality, such as the one observed today in NIDs. Indeed it has been claimed that wh-fronting co-existed with wh-in situ in Japanese in the Heian period (9th to 12th century). A different evolutionary path is actually suggested by Aldridge’ (2009) analysis of the Old Japanese examples in (97). According to her, Watanabe’s claim that Old Japanese had wh-fronting is partly based on his assumption that genitive subjects are located in SpecTP, and hence he analyses a preceding wh-phrase as having been raised out of TP. In contrast, for Aldridge genitive subjects do not exhibit the behavior expected of nominative subjects located in SpecTP, and hence their distribution is better understood if they are assumed to stay in their first-merge position in SpecvP. As a consequence of Aldridge’s analysis whereby the genitive subject occupies a very low position, a TP-internal movement analysis is available for instances of clause-internal wh-phrases such as those in (97). If Aldridge analysis is on the right track, it is possible that Japanese never had Q-projection: under these assumptions, Old Japanese should rather be analysed as a Q-adjunction language, as the Contemporary variety. Plausibly, the presence of an EPP-feature in T, which is no longer present today, triggered overt movement in Old Japanese. Similarly, in Aldridge (2010) work on Archaic Chinese (Warring States period, 5th to 3rd century BCE) it is suggested that Chinese went from clause-internal movement of wh-phrases, as shown in (98), to present day unmoved wh-in situ:

(98) WH-TO-FOC IN ARCHAIC CHINESE (adapted from Aldridge 2010:2(2))

a. Tianxia zhi fu gui zhi qi zi yan i [VP wang ___i]?
   world GEN father settle here 3.GEN son where go
   ‘If the fathers of the world settled here, where would their sons go?’

b. Wu shei, [VP qi ___i]? Qi tian hu?
   I who deceive go
   ‘Who do I deceive? Do I deceive Heaven?’

Aldridge’s works therefore seem to suggest that both Japanese and Chinese moved from what looks like Wh-to-Foc to modern-day unmoved in situ. Another possible evolutionary path is illustrated, I believe, by the syntax of wh-in situ in Contemporary Spoken French, i.e. the variety discussed in works such as Starke (2001) or Baunaz (2005). Remember that the most peculiar property of French wh-in situ is its incompatibility with SCl II, as shown in (99):

(99) WH-PLACEMENT IN CASE OF SCl II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contemporary Spoken French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Qui as-tu rencontré?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who have=you meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Who did you meet?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. * As-tu rencontré qui?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have=you meet who</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under Cable’s (2010) assumption that wh-fronting is always parasitic to QP-fronting, and Roberts’ (2007a) analysis of French SCl II as an instance of V-to-C movement triggered by a residual V2 environment in C in which phi-features are not transmitted to T but rather realised as an inflectional
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class of left-peripheral interrogative enclitics, the only possible explanation of the phenomenon in (99) is in terms of an optionality between overt QP-movement (leading to wh-fronting) and covert QP-movement (leading to wh-in situ). This analysis accounts for all peculiarities observed in the variety of French under investigation, from the absence of SCI and est-ce que (under the assumption that they both serve as indicators of an active LP before Spell-Out, their incompatibility with wh-in situ follows) to the felicity of wh-in situ within islands to extraction. I leave the investigation of this prediction for further work; further details on the morphosyntax of French wh-in situ can be found in Tual (2019).

On the basis of the evolutionary patterns that I have surveyed here, it seems tempting to suggest that the evolution of wh-interrogatives goes from overt QP-fronting to either covert QP-fronting or unmoved Q-adjunction, along the lines of (100):

1. **STAGE I**: overt QP-fronting (wh-fronting); Tlingit, English, (?) Old Japanese
   - possible evolution (i)

2. **STAGE II**: (mixed stage) overt QP-fronting alternates with covert QP-fronting;
   - caused by loss of EPP in C. Spoken French
   - possible evolution (ii)

3. **STAGE III**: generalisation of covert QP-fronting (wh-in situ). Sinhala

4. **STAGE II**: (mixed stage) QP-fronting coexists with Q-adjunction;
   - **STAGE IIa**: Focus-Agreement + Wh-to-Foc; NIDs like Trevigiano, Archaic Chinese, (?) Old Japanese
   - **STAGE IIb**: Focus-Agreement without Wh-to-Foc; NIDs like Lombard, Ancash Quechua
     - caused by loss of EPP in T.
   - **STAGE III**: Generalisation of unmoved Q-adjunction. Japanese, Korean

I discussed these cases here with two aims: to further support the analysis developed in this dissertation, and to open my analysis of NIDs to the investigation of other optional in situ languages. Indeed, the patterns of linguistic evolution outlined in (100) constitute, I believe, a solid starting point for future research.
Conclusions

In this dissertation, I have explored the morphosyntax of a phenomenon related to wh-in situ which, to the best of my knowledge, had never previously been discussed with reference to NIDs: the case of clause-internally moved wh-phrases. This clause-internal movement of wh-phrases, which I analysed in terms of *Wh-to-Foc*, i.e. focus movement into the Spec of Belletti’s (2004) VP-peripheral Foc, is a quite robust phenomenon cross-linguistically, as I argued in Chapters 2 and 3. I based my analysis on novel data from Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect, and published data from Venetan and Lombard varieties (Munaro 1999, Polletto & Pollock 2000 and related works, Manzini & Savoia 2005 and further developments, a.o.), which I discussed in Chapter 1, along with many studies of focus movement of wh-phrases in non-Romance languages, which were surveyed in Chapter 3 (Jayaseelan 1996 for Malayalam, Manetta 2010 for Hindi-Urdu, Aboh 2007 for Aghem, Sinopoulou 2008 for Greek multiple wh-questions, Kahnemuyipour 2001 for Persian, a.o.).

Many works have explored the in situ/ex situ alternation, but unfortunately none of them is able to account for the substantial morphosyntactic variation observed. In light of this, and given the widely-attested existence of Q-particles in wh-interrogatives, I decided to provide a completely new account of the phenomenon, in which I crucially posited the existence of (silent) Q-particles in NIDs as well. Indeed, in the cartographic enterprise, the existence of one functional head in one and only one language is enough to posit the existence of that head in all natural languages: therefore, given the robust cross-linguistic evidence from languages in which Q-particles are phonetically-realised (Japanese as described in Hagstrom 1998, Korean as in Ko 2005, Sinhala as in É. Kiss 1995, Tlingit as in Cable 2010, Edo as in Baker 1999, Ancash Quechua as in Cole & Hermon 1998, a.o.), to not posit their existence in the computation in the absence of phonological content would constitute a major conceptual error.

I have therefore based my analysis on Cable’s (2010) claim that there are two ways of joining the (phonetically-realised or silent) Q-particle to wh-words in interrogatives, as discussed in Chapter 2: in Q-projection languages, Q takes its sister as complement, and so the node minimally dominating the Q and its sister is a QP, as illustrated in (1); in Q-adjunction languages, Q adjoins to its sister and their mother is of the same category as the sister, as in (2):
In the case of Q-projection, the Q-particle is not able to move alone, which results in compulsory QP-fronting, and ‘parasitic’ movement of the selected wh-word. The movement under consideration can either be overt, which leads to what is commonly referred to as pied-piping, or covert, which results in wh-in situ. Another type of wh-in situ is that found in languages in which the Q-particle adjoins to the wh-projection headed by the wh-word. In these cases, the Q-particle is more free and moves to the LP alone. Under these assumptions, in this dissertation I have claimed that the in situ/ex situ alternation observed in NIDs (and more generally in Romance) should be analysed as a by-product of the exceptional existence, in these languages, of both QP-selection and Q-adjunction, and of systematic overt Q-movement to CP triggered by the EPP-feature within it (plus, when relevant, clause-internal movement triggered by an [EPP;foc] featural bundle in the head of Foc{\text{\textsc{low}}}).

The felicitous co-existence of two semantically-identical lexical or syntactic strategies, such as Q-selection and Q-adjunction, seems well-justified on the assumption that this functions as an indicator of an intermediate evolutionary stage, which will eventually lead to the generalisation of one or the other strategy. In fact, linguistic stages characterised by optionality are widely attested and have been discussed in detail in many works on historical linguistics, such as Roberts (2007b) and Ledgeway 2012, among others. Intermediate linguistic stages in the in situ/ex situ alternation are also attested in the literature, for languages that have overt Q-particles (as well as for some that do not), such as for example Ancash Quechua (as described in Cole & Hermon 1998), whose syntax I believe is better understood if one assumes that the particle taq, which is construed with wh-fronting is responsible for Q-projection, and that clause-internal wh-phrases adjoin a silent Q-particle. Similarly, I have claimed, the puzzling facts observed for Contemporary Spoken French are perfectly captured if this variety is assumed to only have Q-projection, and to derive wh-in situ via exceptional covert QP-fronting. Indeed, on Roberts’ (2007a) assumption that French interrogative enclitics are not proper pronouns but rather an inflectional series of phi-features that the residual V2 CP of questions fails to pass to T, the fact that wh-in situ is construed with declarative NOM pronouns follows if we take CP to be inactivated before LF. Then, further supporting evidence in favour of my claim that Northern Italian interrogative wh-movement is closely linked to the presence of silent Q-particles comes from the phenomenon known as wh-doubling, which I take to be a special case of Q-adjunction where [wh]-features are exceptionally passed to the adjoined Q-particle. Wh-doubling, I claim, is the by-product of the optional
setting of Focus\(^0\)\(\text{HIGH}\) as \([q;\text{wh}]\) in some Northern Italian varieties, whose optionality should also be considered an intermediate evolutionary stage. One welcome consequence of the \([\text{wh}]\)-features on the overt Q-particle of wh-doubling is the felicity of wh-in situ in indirect wh-questions, which follows from the exceptional ability of this special Q-particle to check \([\text{wh}]\) in the low LP. This unusual ability is only observed elsewhere in Trevisian se\(\text{WH}\), as described in Chapter 5. Similar yet not identical phenomena have been attested in older stages of pure in situ languages, as claimed in Chapter 6: the variety of Old Japanese spoken in the Nara period (8\(^{th}\) century) has been in turn described as a wh-fronting language (Watanabe 2003) or a language that displays clause-internal movement of wh-phrases similar to the Northern Italian movement I characterised as Wh-to-Foc (Aldridge 2009). Moreover, according to Aldridge (2009) an intermediate stage where the movement of wh-phrases co-existed with present-day unmoved wh-in situ existed in the Heian Period (9\(^{th}\) to 12\(^{th}\) century). Archaic Chinese (in the Warring States period, 5\(^{th}\) to 3\(^{rd}\) century BCE) also displayed clause-internal movement of wh-phrases, lost in the evolution to present-day Chinese, according to Aldridge (2010). I believe that all of these diachronic and synchronic phenomena constitute the foundations that should be taken into account in future works on interrogative wh-movement in languages at intermediate evolutionary stages.

**Trevigiano and the theory of Wh-to-Foc**

Starting from Chapter 2, I claimed that the two configurations relevant for NIDs are those illustrated in (3), where a QP-projection is attracted into the Spec of Focus\(\text{HIGH}\) following Q-agreement, and in (4), where a Q-adjoining wh-phrase stays clause-internally, leaving the checking of the \([q]\)-feature in the head of Focus\(\text{HIGH}\) to the silent Q-particle:

(3) QP-FRONTING
To posit that the in situ/ex situ alternation in NIDs is due to an optionality in the timing of movement, namely the co-existence of overt and covert QP-fronting, as I suggested for Contemporary Spoken French in Chapter 6, would constitute a major conceptual error: indeed, in NIDs the realisation of SCII signals that the LP is active throughout the derivation and, in NIDs that have lost SCII, its absence is orthogonal to the position occupied by the wh-phrase, unlike the extraordinary case of French. As in (3) and (4) and Chapter 3, I take the Force of interrogative clauses to be inherently set as [+int], and the head of Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} to be consequently endowed with an uninterpretable [q]-feature. The only exception to this rule, among the varieties discussed in this dissertation, is that of languages with wh-doubling, which can (but do not have to) have an additional [wh]-feature in Focus\textsubscript{0\textsubscript{HIGH}}, correctly checked by the [wh]-feature on the overt adjoining Q-particle. Therefore, as in Cable’s model, my approach predicts that only [q] is responsible for wh-fronting (or better, QP-fronting) and the attraction of the adjoining Q-particle into the Spec of Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}. Both movements are done under Q-Agreement with Focus\textsubscript{0\textsubscript{HIGH}} and are triggered by a left-peripheral EPP-feature contained within it.

In this theoretical framework, and on the basis of my discussion of Trevisian focus movement, I claimed that virtually all facts observed in the data from NIDs are predicted by a model that assumes that (i) wh-fronting is a sub-product of the existence of QP-projections, (ii) wh-in situ follows from the mechanism of Q-adjunction, which strands the wh-word clause-internally and lets the Q-particle move to the LP alone, and (iii) features other than the left-peripheral [q] are checked clause-internally and, in a very limited number of cases, there is an exceptional prosodic requirement for the clause-internal
wh-phrase to occupy the edge of the clause (which I referred to as the sentence-finality requirement, à la Etxepare & Uribe-Etxebarria 2005).

Characterisation of Wh-to-Foc

On the basis of an intuition sketched in Manzini (2014) and of the robust movement patterns observed in many Indo-Aryan languages (as discussed in Kahnemuyipour 2001, Aboh 2007, Manetta 2010, a.o.), in Chapter 3 I claimed that what triggers Trevisian Wh-to-Foc is the presence of both an EPP-feature and an uninterpretable [foc]-feature in the head of Belletti’s (2004) VP-peripheral focal projection, Foc\textsubscript{LOW}. Therefore, in my model, the Q-adjoining wh-phrase first undergoes Focus-Agreement and moves into the Spec of Foc\textsubscript{LOW}, then regularly undergoes Q-Agreement with the [q]-feature in Focus\textsuperscript{0}\textsubscript{HIGH}, which results in movement of the silent Q-particle to the LP of the clause, triggered by the EPP in C. This two-stage derivation is illustrated in (5):

\begin{equation}
(5) \text{WH-TO-FOC: CLAUSE-INTERNAL FOCUS MOVEMENT}
\end{equation}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Step I: the uninterpretable [foc]-feature in Foc\textsubscript{LOW}\textsuperscript{0} Agrees with its interpretable counterpart on the Q-adjoining wh-word, which is subsequently attracted into the Spec of Foc\textsubscript{LOW} by the EPP-feature in Foc\textsubscript{LOW}:
    \[ \ldots \text{Foc}\textsubscript{LOW} \{ \text{whP} \text{Q} \{ \text{whP} \text{wh-phrase}[foc] \}, \text{Foc}\textsubscript{0}\textsuperscript{0}[\text{foc}]\textsubscript{[EPP]} \{ \text{vP} \ldots \text{___} \} \} \] 
  \item Step II: the uninterpretable [q]-feature in the left-peripheral Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}\textsuperscript{0} Agrees with the interpretable counterpart on the silent Q-particle, which is then attracted into the Spec of Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} by the EPP-feature in C:
    \[ \ldots \text{Focus}\textsubscript{HIGH} \{ \text{Q} \{ \text{q} \}, \text{Focus}\textsubscript{0}\textsuperscript{0}[\text{q}]\textsubscript{[EPP]} \} \ldots \{ \text{Foc}\textsubscript{LOW} \{ \text{whP} \ldots \text{Q} \{ \text{whP} \text{wh-phrase}[foc] \}, \text{Foc}\textsubscript{0}\textsuperscript{0} \} \ldots \} \] 
\end{enumerate}

In Step I, I claimed, a Focus Criterion is satisfied, while Rizzi’s (1996) Wh/Q-Criterion is met in Step II. The analysis in (16) is based on the observation that clause-internal wh-words in Trevigiano do not surface in their external-merge position, but rather appear to move to a linear position higher than that targeted by the past participle, which I have argued is external to vP, in the spirit of Cinque’s (1999) movement analysis of Italian active past participle. Observe (6) and (7):

\begin{equation}
(6) \text{DISTRIBUTION OF IOs IN DECLARATIVES AND INTERROGATIVES}
\end{equation}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Declarative. S > V > DO > IO
    \[
    \text{Te ghe \ g\ v\ e\ d\ at\ o\ e\ l\ re\ o\ j\ o\ a\ t\ o\ p\ a\ r\ e\ y\ D\ A\ t\ \ h\ a\ v\ e\ \ g\ i\ v\ e\ n\ t\ h\ e\ w\ a\ t\ c\ h\ t\ o\ y\ o\ u\ f\ a\ t\ h\ e\ r\ f\ a\ t\ h\ e\ r\ 'B\ y\ o\ u\ g\ a\ v\ e\ t\ e\ w\ a\ t\ c\ h\ t\ o\ y\ y\ o\ u\ f\ a\ t\ h\ e\ r\ f\ a\ t\ h\ e\ r\ '
    \]
  \item Interrogative. S > V > wh-IO > DO
    \[
    \text{Ghe g\ a\ -\ t\ u\ d\ a\ t\ o\ e\ l\ re\ o\ j\ o\ a\ t\ o\ p\ a\ r\ e\ y\ D\ A\ t\ h\ a\ v\ e\ \ g\ i\ v\ e\ n\ t\ h\ e\ w\ a\ t\ c\ h\ t\ o\ y\ o\ u\ f\ a\ t\ h\ e\ r\ f\ a\ t\ h\ e\ r\ 'T\ o\ w\ h\ o\ m\ d\ i\ d\ y\ o\ u\ g\ i\ v\ e\ n\ t\ h\ e\ w\ a\ t\ c\ h\ t\ o\ y\ o\ u\ f\ a\ t\ h\ e\ r\ f\ a\ t\ h\ e\ r\ '
    \]
\end{enumerate}
On the theory of Romance \( \text{wh-in situ} \)

(7) DISTRIBUTION OF ADVs IN DECLARATIVES AND INTERROGATIVES

Trevigiano

a. Declarative: \( S > V > DO > \text{Adv}_{\text{Time}} \)

\text{Te g\`{a} mang\`{a} tute e banane dopo sena}
\text{you have eaten all the bananas after dinner}

‘You ate all of the bananas after dinner’

b. Interrogative: \( S > V > \text{wh-Adv}_{\text{Time}} > \text{DO} \)

\text{Ga-tu magn\`{a} \text{cuando} tute e banane ___ ?}
\text{have=you eaten when all the bananas}

‘When did you eat up the bananas?’

Because of the rigid declarative word order, which is strictly SVO and requires the DO to precede the IO and verb-selected arguments to precede adverbials, Italian-like \textit{emarginazione} \`a la Cardinaletti (2001) or Samek-Lodovici (2015) is ruled out in Trevigiano. Consequently, I have claimed that an analysis whereby the wh-words in (6) and (7) occupy the sentential edge, with all following constituents somehow external to the core of the clause, cannot be correct. The triggers for overt movement in steps I and II, i.e. focus movement and Q-movement, are EPP-features in both the VP-periphery and in the LP of the clause. The analysis in terms of \textit{Wh-to-Foc} outlined in (5) finds further support in the availability, in languages like Trevigiano, of Belletti’s (2004) \textit{Foc}_{\text{LOW}} not only for focus of new information, as in (8), but also for contrastively-focused constituents, such as the one in (9). Focus fronting is somewhat marginal in Trevigiano, as illustrated in (10):

(8) FOCUS OF NEW INFORMATION

Trevigiano

a. Question: Chi zeo che te g\`{a} ciam\`{a}?
\text{who is=EXPL that you has called}
‘Who called you?’

b. Answer I: Me g\`{a} ciam\`{a} [\textit{Foc}_{\text{LOW}} Giani ]
\text{me have called John}
‘John called me’

c. Answer II: * [\textit{SubjP} Giani el [\textit{TP} me g\`{a} ciam\`{a} ]]
\text{John cl me has called}

(9) CLAUSE-INTERNAL CONTRASTIVE FOCUS

Trevigiano

a. A: Insoma Giani el g\`{a} ciam\`{a} a Maria, jeri...
so John cl has called the Mary yesterday
‘So John called Mary yesterday…’

b. B: El g\`{a} ciam\`{a} [\textit{Foc}_{\text{LOW}} \textit{INCU\`O} [\textit{VP} a Maria ]], no jeri!
\text{he has called TODAY the Mary not yesterday}
‘He called Mary TODAY, not yesterday!’

(10) FRONTEO CONTRASTIVE FOCUS

Trevigiano

?? \textit{INCU\`O} el g\`{a} ciam\`{a} a Maria!
\text{TODAY he has called the Mary}
‘He called Mary TODAY’
The case of focus-containing wh-questions, which I have not investigated in this work, is very interesting and confirms the special status of focus-fronting in Trevigiano. Observe the indirect question in (11), where a fronted focalised DO needs to be construed with a coindexed clitic within the clausal domain:

(11) **FOCUS-CONTAINING INDIRECT QUESTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trevigiano</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me domando</td>
<td>A MARIA quando che i *(la) gà vist(*o)(*a), no a Marina!</td>
<td>me ask$<em>{1PS}$ THE MARY when that cl$</em>{3PP,M}$ her have seen$_{1(M)(F)}$ NEG the Marina</td>
<td>'MARY I wonder when they saw, not Marina'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming that the fronted element in (11) is indeed a focus, because it is compatible with a negative tag (‘no a Marina!’), nothing prevents an analysis of that element as subject to left-peripheral topic movement. In fact, an interesting matrix/embedded asymmetry exists, and a matrix fronted focus in a declarative clause is incompatible with a corresponding clause-internal clitic, as in (12):

(12) **FOCUS-FRONTING IN MATRIX DECLARATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trevigiano</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A MARIA i <em>(la) gà vist</em>(o)(*a), no a Marina!</td>
<td>THE MARY cl$<em>{3PP,M}$ her have seen$</em>{1(M)(F)}$ not the Marina</td>
<td>'MARY they saw, not Marina'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These facts clearly need further investigation, which I leave aside for future work. In fact, the unavailability of proper focus fronting in Trevigiano, and the infelicity of clause-internally moved foci in Standard Italian suggest not only that the LPs of the two languages are actually more divergent than they may seem, but also that the unavailability of wh-in situ in Standard Italian is attributable to more than just the sole existence of QP-fronting: the absence of a [foc]-feature that is able to Agree with wh-phrases and contrastively-focused constituents in Foc$_0^{LOW}$ might indeed play a crucial role. Note that, given Bianchi’s (2013) claim that focus is a very unusual phenomenon that does not support a deterministic one head-one feature mapping, it does not seem theoretically problematic to suggest that the head of Foc$_0^{LOW}$ can indeed encode both new information focus and contrastive focus in some languages. However, other possible solutions to this problem could be (i) positing the existence of two different focus projections in the periphery of vP, one dedicated to new information focus and the other to contrastively-focused constituents and clause-internally moved Q-adjoining wh-phrases, or (ii) proving (if possible) that contra Belletti (2004) new information focus is realised within vP.

Before moving to the next section, let me summarise why an analysis of Trevisian wh-in situ in terms of clause internal focus movement of Q-adjoining wh-phrases is indeed theoretically desirable. First, Wh-to-Foc is supported by robust cross-linguistic data on non-wh-movement within the clausal domain, as discussed in detail in Chapter 3. Second, my approach dispenses with the spurious notion of syntactic optionality, which is for the first time shown to be related to the exceptional existence of two strategies for joining interrogative wh-words and the (silent) Q-particle (in Cable’s 2010 terms),
plausibly as a consequence of an intermediate evolutionary stage that will result either in each strategy becoming semantically specialised, or in one of the two strategies falling out of us. Then, and related to the second point, the fact that wh-phrases that move clause-internally do not need to raise further to the LP in case of fronting is theoretically welcome under Rizzi’s (2004) Criterial Freezing. In fact, to be able to use both Q-projection and Q-adjunction means that only Q-projections are relevant for total wh-fronting and move successive-cyclically to the LP of the clause. In contrast, wh-phrases that are frozen in place clause-internally are of the Q-adjoining type and need not move further: checking of [q] in Focus\textsubscript{HIGH} is carried out via sub-extraction of the silent Q-particle, which does not violate Criterial Freezing. Finally, I believe that the theory of Wh-to-Foc developed in this dissertation, in combination with Cable’s assumption that silent Q-particles should also be integrated into the computation, provides a simple and elegant framework for the study of Northern Italian wh-in situ, where languages can be classified on the basis of micro-variations along a continuum of typological variation that goes from clause-internal focus movement to unmoved wh-in situ.

**Consequences for the theory of Northern Italian wh-in situ**

Ever since their (2000) paper, Poletto & Pollock have proposed an analysis of Northern Italian wh-in situ as an instance of overt wh-movement targeting the lower portion of the CP, masked by further computations including movement of the remnant-IP to higher functional projections. I have referred to this approach, which is based on Bellunese and similar varieties, as the remnant-IP movement analysis throughout. Observe the derivation of the Bellunese question in (13):

(13) **REMNANT-IP MOVEMENT ANALYSIS** (simplified)

a. Input: \[[IP\ tu\ ha\ parecià\ che\ ]

\[you\ have\ prepared\ what\ ‘What\ did\ you\ prepare?’\]

b. Step I: wh-movement to an FP higher than IP:

\[[FP\ che;\ F^0 [IP\ tu\ ha\ parecià\ ___ ]\]

c. Step II: Movement of the remnant to higher FP:

\[[FP\ [IP\ tu\ ha\ parecià\ ___ ]\ [FP\ che;\ F^0\ ___ ]\]

On these assumptions, Poletto & Pollock have argued that SCI\textsubscript{II} should be analysed as phrasal movement of IP-internal chunks into the LP of the clause, namely attraction of the IP-internal interrogative clitic into the Spec of the left-peripheral projection that they call GroundP, followed by movement of the remnant-IP into SpecForce. Subsequently, a Bellunese question like that in (14) is argued to be derived as in (15). The stages strictly relevant to SCI\textsubscript{II} are (c) and (d); please that I use copies for derivational ease:
6.3 Features responsible for Northern Italian wh-in situ(s)

(14) Bellunese (Munaro 1999:50(1.56))
Ha-tu parecià che?
have=you prepared what
‘What did you prepare?’

(15) Input: [IP tu ha parecià [CIP [che;∅]]]

a. Merge Wh2P and IP and attract che to SpecWh2P:
   \([\text{Wh2P} \text{che Wh2}^0 \text{[IP tu ha parecià [che;∅]]]}\]

b. Merge Top and Wh2P and attract the Participle Phrase to SpecTopP:
   \([\text{TopP} \text{[PartP parecià [CIP [che;∅]]]} \text{Top}^0 \text{[Wh2P che Wh2}^0 \text{[IP tu ha <PartP>]]}]\]

c. Merge GroundP and attract tu to SpecGroundP:
   \([\text{GroundP tu Ground}^0 \text{[TopP [PartP parecià [CIP [che;∅]]] Top}^0 \text{[Wh2P che Wh2}^0 \text{[IP <tu> ha <PartP>]]}]\]

d. Merge Force and GroundP and attract the remnant-IP to SpecForce:
   \([\text{ForceP} \text{IP <tu> ha <PartP> } \text{Force}^0 \text{[GroundP tu Ground}^0 \text{[TopP [PartP parecià [CIP [che;∅]]] Top}^0 \text{[Wh2P che Wh2}^0 \text{<IP>]]}]\]

e. Merge Wh1^0 and ForceP and attract ∅ to Wh1^0.
   \([\text{Wh1P ∅ Wh1}^0 \text{[ForceP IP <tu> ha <PartP> } \text{Force}^0 \text{[GroundP tu Ground}^0 \text{[TopP [PartP parecià [CIP [che;∅]]] Top}^0 \text{[Wh2P che Wh2}^0 \text{<IP>]]}]\]

The remnant-IP movement analysis aimed to explain the composite phenomenon of Northern Italian wh-in situ as a whole. Similarly, Manzini & Savoia (2005) and related works argued in favour of generalised real wh-in situ in NIDs (the covert movement hypothesis), along with a further development in Manzini (2014) where it was suggested that there might actually be movement to Belletti’s (2004) Foc. My claim is that, while both the remnant-IP hypothesis and the covert movement hypothesis fail to account for all insituteness-related phenomena observed in NIDs, Manzini’s analysis in terms of TP-internally moved wh-phrases was on the right track, but had two major weakness: (i) it too aimed to account for all Northern Italian phenomena related to wh-in situ at once, and (ii) it was not empirically-supported. Consequently, contra much work on Northern Italian wh-in situ, I suggested that three different derivations should be posited for the three linguistic types that I identified in the Northern Italian domain and beyond: varieties in which wh-in situ displays the same distributional patterns as Munaro (1999) observed for Bellunese (type III), varieties similar to Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) Lombard and Venetan dialects (type II), and varieties similar to Trevigiano (type I). Although I believe that Poletto & Pollock’s analysis of Northern Italian wh-in situ in terms of remnant-IP movement accounts perfectly for the data from Bellunese and related varieties, I claimed that an application of their theory to my theoretical model would require (minimally) a parametrisation of
the availability of Rizzi & Bocci’s (2017) low left-peripheral QembP, crucially entailing the existence of a major typological divide among closely-related varieties. Therefore, in the spirit of Chomsky’s (2001) Uniformity Principle repeated below, in Chapter 6 I decided to dispense with wh-movement of clause-internal wh-phrases and subsequent movement of the remnant-IP in type III varieties, and instead to posit the existence of micro-variations.

**Uniformity Principle** (Chomsky 2001:2)

‘in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, assume languages to be uniform, with variety restricted to easily detectable properties of utterances’.

Observe the sketched derivation of Wh-to-Foc in (16), which I posited for type I Northern Italian varieties, namely Trevigiano and some of the Venetan and Lombard dialects described in Manzini & Savoia (2005) (as well as, plausibly, European and Brazilian Portuguese):

(16) **WH-TO-FOC**

In the spirit of Chomsky’s Uniformity Principle, and in light of the basic assumption that clauses are minimally endowed with a universally-invariant Left Periphery à la Rizzi (1997 and further developments) and, in some cases, also of a low periphery à la Belletti (2004), I have argued in favour of generalised Focus-Agreement, and of a parametrisation of the presence of the EPP-feature in Foc\(^0\)\_LOW that is responsible for focus movement of clause-internal wh-phrases into the Spec of Foc\_LOW. Under these assumptions, the instances of unmoved Chinese-like wh-in situ observed in NIDs by Manzini & Savoia (2005) and, plausibly, in languages such as Spanish, can be explained as the consequence of the absence of EPP in Foc\(^0\)\_LOW. Finally, I suggested that type III wh-in situ should be analysed as a sub-class of type I, namely an instance of Wh-to-Foc with a sentence-finality requirement somehow constrained by PF, and a D-linked/non-D-linked asymmetry explained by an evolutionary stage where D-linked wh-phrases are not yet able to adjoin the Q-particle and stay clause-internally, while non-D-linked wh-words have already moved towards a generalisation of Q-adjunction which,
as claimed in Chapter 6, constitutes the penultimate step in the process of evolution towards unmoved insituteness in languages which retained their EPP-feature in C.

The possible movement patterns predicted by Cable’s (2010) grammar of Q and by my discussion of clause-internal agreements and movements of wh-phrases are illustrated on the following page. (a) varieties are those that have total fronting, in the spirit of Cable (2010). Cable predicted that the only possibilities for QP-projecting languages were either overt QP-fronting (surfacing as a pied-piping structure), as in (a), or covert QP-fronting (resulting in wh-in situ), as in (d). My model, however, in which certain languages need to check lower features and display variation in the structural loci where EPP is present, also predicts (b) and (c). In languages like (b), QPs move clause-internally to check [foc], attracted by the EPP in Foc$_0^{\text{LOW}}$, and then undergo Q-Agreement but, in the absence of EPP in Focus$_0^{\text{HIGH}}$ their movement is delayed to LF, resulting in TP-internally moved wh-in situ. Clearly, this cannot be the case of or Trevigiano or similar languages, where $SCI$ shows that there is indeed an EPP-feature in C, and that QP- and Q-movement are done overtly. Instead, nothing rules out the possibility that the phenomenon in (c) might be at play in Trevigiano: I have claimed that this language has EPP both in T and in C, hence it is not implausible that fronted QPs might first undergo Focus-Agreement, resulting in overt Wh-to-Foc, and then Q-Agreement and movement to the LP. Concerning Q-adjoining languages, I claimed that the Lombard and Venetan varieties in Manzini & Savoia (2005) can be either (e) or (g), namely either varieties with unmoved wh-in situ, or varieties with Wh-to-Foc. Technically, in the first case, nothing rules out the presence of invisible Focus-Agreement, which would reduce the difference between types (e) and (g) to the presence/absence of EPP in T. Under these assumptions, if Bellunese and similar varieties do derive wh-in situ TP-internally, the differences between these and (g”) varieties reside exclusively in the presence/absence of a sentence-finality requirement. To conclude, the existence of (f) varieties, which have Wh-to-Foc of Q-adjoining wh-phrases but no overt Q-to-C movement, is predicted by my model yet impossible to test in languages where the Q-particle is silent: though the absence of overt Q-to-C movement sets these varieties apart from Trevigiano and similar varieties, the structure could be easily mistaken for type (b) QP-fronting. Overt Q-particles are necessary to distinguish between the two types.

To conclude, note that the availability of Foc$_{\text{LOW}}$ as a landing site for contrastively-focused constituents should be taken into account when trying to establish whether an in situ language has Wh-to-Foc, along with the status of Focus$_{\text{HIGH}}$ with respect to focus fronting. Indeed, the prediction is that a variety that displays Wh-to-Foc should resist focus fronting and should instead have clause-internally moved foci as the unmarked option.
Illustration: Movement patterns predicted by the grammar of Q and the [EPP] in C and/or T
Nominative clitics as inflectional elements and V-to-C

The clause-internal movement of wh-phrases discussed above clearly rules out the possibility that Trevigiano derives wh-in situ in terms of wh-movement to the CP followed by further movements of all IP-internal constituents. On these assumptions, contra Poletto & Pollock (2000) and many related works, I have argued that SClI cannot be movement of phrasal chunks. The Trevisian data are also unsuited to Manzini & Savoia’s (2005) claim that Northern Italian wh-in situ is unmoved, though their model is compatible with the analysis of SClI in terms of head movement of the complex verbal head to C that I have developed in this dissertation.

Contra Kayne (1991), I have in claimed that non-NOM clitics do adjoin to the finite verb, unlike NOM clitics: while the latter are externally-merged within vP then moved to IP along with the V, declarative NOM clitics are realised directly in the head of Cardinaletti’s (2004) SubjP and are independent from the verb. Observe (17), in which I suggest that the verb is not structurally conjoined to NOM clitics and moves as a complex head along with non-NOM clitics:

(17) COMPLEX VERBAL HEAD
   a. Declarative: cl_{NOM} > cl_{DAT} > cl_{ACC} > V
      Te [v, ghe [ o [ gà ][]] za dato you  DAT  ACC  have  already  given  
      ‘You’ve already given it to him/her’
   b. Interrogative: cl_{DAT} > cl_{ACC} > V > cl_{NOM}
      [v, Ghe [ o [ gà ][]] tu za dato?
      DAT  ACC  have  =you  already  given
      ‘Have you given it to him/her already?’

The main peculiarities of NOM clitics are that, at least superficially, they are proclitic in declaratives and enclitic in interrogatives (as in 17), and that in enclisis they display morphological variations and are greater in number. I have argued that these facts cannot be trivial and clearly suggest that we are dealing with two different series. The two series of Trevisian NOM clitics are repeated in (18):

(18) TREVISIAN NOMINATIVE CLITICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1PS</th>
<th>2PS</th>
<th>3PS</th>
<th>1PP</th>
<th>2PP</th>
<th>3PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative:</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>eM/af/ØEXPL</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>iM/ef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative:</td>
<td>(io)</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>oM/af/(oEXPL)</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>iM/ef</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That Northern Italian dialects can have two incomplete NOM paradigms has been known for decades (Renzi & Vanelli 1983, Poletto 2000, a.o.) and, while incomplete pronominal series are uncommon, deficient inflectional classes are unsurprising. Following Rizzi (2016), I assumed that Trevisian declarative NOM clitics realise the head of Cardinaletti’s (2004) SubjP, and argued in favour
of a treatment of Trevisian as systematically pro-drop. Crucially, I claimed that NOM clitics are a phi-subset in Subj\(^0\), which is realised phonetically at Spell-Out in the presence of a relevant spec-head configuration in SubjP, along the lines of (19):

(19) SPEC-HEAD CONFIGURATIONS WHICH ACTIVATE DECLARATIVE NOM CLITICS

a. Configuration I: lexical category in SpecSubjP:
\[
[\text{SubjP} \text{ XP } \text{Subj}^0 [+\phi] \implies \text{cl}\text{NOM }]
\]

b. Configuration II: pro in SpecSubjP:
\[
[\text{SubjP pro } \text{Subj}^0 [+\phi] \implies \text{cl}\text{NOM }]
\]

A similar analysis (modulo my spec-head activation analysis in (19)) has already been proposed for French enclitics in Roberts (2007a), which he takes to be phi-features that the residual V2 CP of interrogatives does not pass to T (à la Chomsky 2005). Consequently, I have argued that the interrogative NOM clitics of Trevigiano are a \([\phi\phi]\) featural bundle in Focus\(^0\)\_HIGH, activated following interrogative movement of overt or covert operators into SpecFocus\_HIGH.

My treatment of Trevisian NOM clitics as inflectional classes activated under proper Spec-head agreements, along with the claim that the inflected verb adjoins to non-NOM clitics to move as a complex head to C, has at least two major advantages. First, the presence of a residual V2 environment in the LP of matrix questions, but not in that of embedded questions, successfully accounts for the matrix/embedded asymmetry observed with SCII. Then, assuming that NOM clitics are inflectional classes correctly predicts that it is possible to have incomplete paradigms of these, while also accounting for the morphological alternations observed, which in Chapter 4 I attributed to the exclusive presence of [q]-features in the interrogative series. Under the assumption that phi-features are not realised twice over, the complementary distribution of the two classes is expected.

I have also claimed that the assumption that there is a clitic field in the high IP, in the spirit of Sportiche (1999), and that the finite verb moves there once all clitics have cliticised in their relevant clitic projections is untenable, both under Strict Cycle and under Kayne’s (1994) assumption that cliticisation is always left adjunction. Consequently, I outlined an alternative proposal and argued that an analysis whereby non-NOM clitics are externally-merged within vP makes it possible to posit that what moves first is the finite verb, followed by the ACC clitic, and then the DAT clitic. Indeed, if the finite V moves first, then what left-adoins must be the pronouns. That it is the pronouns that move to ensure cliticisation is unsurprising: in fact, while the verb can survive alone in the structure, clitics cannot. Although declarative NOM clitics are commonly analysed as proclitic in nature, I then claimed that these elements are clitic only phonologically, not syntactically. When the V moves to C, it moves along with non-NOM clitics (if present) and the cliticisation process involved both in the formation of the complex verbal head and in V-to-C movement is always proclisis, as in (20) and (21):
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That non-NOM clitics are different from NOM clitics has already been observed in Roberts (2010), although he takes NOM clitics to be moved from a vP-internal position. Though I do not think that Roberts’ conclusion is false, since it accounts brilliantly for the data from languages such as French, it would be interesting to verify whether other (Northern Italian) pro-drop languages with NOM clitics can fit into my clitic activation analysis. The difference between Roberts’ declarative NOM clitics and those of Trevigiano, I claim, is that only the former are pronominal in nature.

**Featural specifications in the declarative and interrogative LP, and concluding remarks**

Following my discussion in this dissertation, the functional projections involved in the derivation of Northern Italian matrix wh-questions, along with their respective featural specifications, are those in (22). As previously stated, [wh] is not a feature involved in matrix wh-questions, where Force is by default set as [+interrogative], with the consequence that a residual V2 environment is activated and the phi-features in C are not transmitted to T. Under the assumption that the LP starts out as a single coalesced Force+Fin projection and then expands, the hypothesis that the featural specification of the activated left-peripheral projections is different in interrogatives and in declaratives does not seem untenable. In interrogatives, for instance, the lower portion of the LP is incompatible with the activation of Rizzi & Bocci’s (2017) QembP, and Focus\text{HIGH} is set as [+q]. IntP, which I have described
as inherently [+wh], is only compatible with elements externally-merged within it, not with moved ones (or at best with moved elements from the lower LP, as in Shlonsky & Soare 2011). Since it is inherently interrogative, this projection is predictably unavailable in declarative clauses. Because interrogative movement to the LP always takes place overtly in NIDs, both in the case of QP-fronting and in the case of Q-movement, I argued that there must always be an EPP-feature in the head of FocusHIGH. As for the clausal domain, I argued that in NIDs the head of FocLOW is always associated to an unvalued [foc]-feature, responsible for Focus-Agreement with the Q-adjoining wh-phrases, and in some varieties also with an EPP-feature.

(22) NORTHERN ITALIAN MATRIX WH-QUESTIONS

Under the assumption that embedded interrogatives have a declarative-like LP, modulo the activation of QembP, in these structures FocusHIGH is endowed with a [foc]-feature. This, I claimed, explains the order Foc > Wh observed in focus-containing indirect wh-interrogatives in Rizzi (1997),
which I take to have a *declarative* LP. Similarly, the different availability of focus-containing indirect wh-questions in Standard Italian with respect to languages like Trevigianese follows from the fact that the latter, but not the former, has clause-internally moved contrastive foci which, I claimed, can only marginally be fronted in the LP. This fronting movement, I believe, is better analysed as a topicalisation of focus, targeting a left-peripheral TopP instead of Focus\textsubscript{HIGH}.

The left-peripheral projections that distinguish indirect interrogatives, which have a declarative-like LP (modulo a realised Q\textsubscript{emb}P, as seen in (22)), from direct interrogatives are provided in (23). Note that, in the absence of a residual V2 environment in the LP, the phi-features in C are correctly transmitted to T, which can be realised in SubjP as declarative NOM clitics:

(23) **NORTHERN ITALIAN INDIRECT WH-QUESTIONS**

I would like to argue that the in situ/ex situ alternation is a point where grammar appears quite plastic, which supports my analysis of optionality as a bi-product of the exceptional existence of both strategies for joining wh-phrases and the Q-particle. This is demonstrated for instance by the fact that wh-in situ can be felicitously licensed in the varieties of Italian of areas in which an in-situ-licensing dialect is also spoken, such as in the Veneto region, as claimed in Chapter 1 and shown in (24):

(24) **WH-IN SITU**

a. Context: You see your friend’s new cardigan and find it amazing. You ask:

   [E] l’hai comprata dove, questa meraviglia ____?
   [And] it\textsubscript{2PS} bought where, this wonder
   ‘[And] when did you buy this gem?’
b. Context: Your meet your friend Eva in the streets, she tells you that she is happy because Marco has called her, at least. You ask:

\[E\] ti ha chiamata quando, Marco ____?

[And] you has\textsubscript{3PS} called when Marco

[And] when did Marco call you?’

That language-specific inherent properties of wh-words play a role in their distribution has already been convincingly proven in Lee (1991) and Finer (2014), who discuss Korean-English code-switching data and argue that wh-words in code-switched sentences maintain the same distributional properties as in the original language. The examples in (24) provide further evidence that the possibility of licensing wh-in situ is bound to depend not only on wh-phrases themselves but also on the focal projections that a variety can activate successfully. Venetan Italian, differently from the standard variety, can make use of Q-adjunction and, given the availability of the VP-peripheral focal position for contrastively-focused elements, attracts Q-adjointing wh-phrases into the Spec of Foc \textsubscript{LOW}. Indeed, Venetan Italian can also exploit the VP-peripheral focal projection for contrastive foci, as in (25):

(25) \textbf{CLAUSE-INTERNALLY MOVED CONTRASTIVE FOCUS} \hfill Venetan Italian

\begin{verbatim}
Ho dato ieri i soldi a Gianni, non lunedì!
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
I gave John the money \textit{YESTERDAY}, not on Monday!
\end{verbatim}

To conclude, I would like to briefly clarify an important issue. I have in fact been asked several times whether the focal projection involved in Wh-to-Foc might actually be the edge of vP, namely the one through which wh-phrases are argued to cyclically-move on their way to the LP. I think I have made it clear that it is not: indeed, I argued that the movement of clause-internal wh-phrases is not the same as that involved in interrogative fronting, namely focus movement vs QP-movement, and that the type of Q-structures involved in the two cases are different: Q-adjunction vs QP-selection. Under these assumptions, I think the question of whether there exists a low periphery à la Belletti (2004), which I have adopted in this dissertation, is irrelevant. In fact, if vP is to be considered a phase, as widely acknowledged in the literature, it is totally unsurprising that it should have a periphery of some kind. It is in this precise periphery that the focal projection relevant for moved wh-in situ is located, regardless of the name or structure that we decide to attribute to it.

Future research is undoubtedly needed to refine my analysis, to articulate its technical implementation and to test its empirical validity in other languages, not only synchronically but also in diachrony. Nonetheless, I believe that the approach developed in this dissertation offers a novel, cross-linguistically well-motivated and theoretically uncomplicated model for the analysis of variation in optional in situ languages which, I hope, will inspire future investigations and debates on this composite and fascinating phenomenon.
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