



## On (very) Low Wh-Positions

The Case of Trevigiano

---

Caterina Bonan  
Université de Genève  
18th October 2017



SWISS NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

1. Introduction
2. "Insituness" in Trevigiano
  - Matrix questions
  - Embedded questions
3. Low(er) landing Sites for Wh-Movement
  - IP-internal 'little whP'
  - Low left peripheral WhP
4. Conclusions
5. References

## Introduction

---

## SCII and the "ex situ-in situ alternation"

SCII is compulsory in genuine direct questions:

- (1) a. Ga-tu      catà cualchedun al      marcà?  
Have-you<sub>CL</sub> met someone      at.the market  
"Did you met someone at the market?"
- b. \*Te      gà      catà      cualchedun al      marcà?  
You<sub>CL</sub> have found someone      at.the market

Wh-phrases can appear fronted or sentence-internally:

- (2) a. **Chi** ga-tu      catà      al      marcà?  
who have-you<sub>CL</sub> found at.the market  
"Who did you meet at the market?"
- b. \*Chi te      gà      catà      al      marcà?  
Who you<sub>CL</sub> have found at.the market

- (3) a. Ga-tu      catà **chi** al      marcà?  
have-you<sub>CL</sub> met who at.the market  
“Who did you meet at the market?”
- b. \*Te      gà      catà      chi al      marcà?  
You<sub>CL</sub> have found who at.the market

Also D-linked wh-phrases can appear both fronted or sentence-internally (4):

- (4) a. **Ch**e **profesor** a-ea      visto al      marcà?  
what professor has-she<sub>CL</sub> seen at.the market  
“Which professor did she see at the market?”
- b. A-ea      visto **ch**e **profesor** al      marcà?  
has-she<sub>CL</sub> seen what professor at.the market

The same patterns are found in long-distance questions (5-6):

- (5) a. **Chi** pens-ea che te gà visto al marcà?  
who thinks-she<sub>CL</sub> that you<sub>CL</sub> have seen at.the market  
“Who does she think you saw at the market?”
- b. Pens-ea che te gà visto **chi** al marcà?  
thinks-she<sub>CL</sub> that you<sub>CL</sub> have seen who at.the market
- (6) a. **Chè maestra** pens-ea che te ga visto al marcà?  
what teacher thinks-she<sub>CL</sub> that you<sub>CL</sub> have seen at.the market  
“Which teacher does she think you saw at the market?”
- b. Pens-ea che te ga visto **chè maestra** al marcà?  
thinks-she<sub>CL</sub> that you<sub>CL</sub> have seen what teacher at.the market

Predictably, *SCII* is a root phenomenon (7):

- (7) a. Chi pens-ea che te ga visto al marcà?  
who thinks-she<sub>CL</sub> that you<sub>CL</sub> have seen at.the market

- b. \* Pens-ea che ga-tu visto chi al marcà?  
thinks-she<sub>CL</sub> that have-you<sub>CL</sub> seen who at.the market

### Similar, yet different from Bellunese and French

**Bellunese** (Munaro (1995), Poletto and Pollock (2015) and previous related works, Munaro et al. (2001)): obligatory *SCII*. However, non-D-linked wh-phrases can ONLY appear sentence-internally (8), and D-linked wh-words are only compatible with wh-fronting (9):

- (8) a. Ha-tu magnà **che**?  
have-you eaten what  
“What did you eat” (Bellunese)
- b. \* **Che** ha-tu magnà?  
What have-you eaten



- (9) a. **Ch** **libro** ha-tu ledest?  
what book have-you read  
“Which book did you read?” (Bellunese)
- b. \* Ha-tu ledest **ch** **libro**?  
have-you read what book

**French** (Mathieu (1999), Bošković (2000), Cheng and Rooryck (2002)): both D-linked and non-D-linked wh-phrases are licensed sentence-internally. However, in French “insituness” and SCII are NEVER compatible (10):

- (10) a. \* As-tu mangé **quand**?  
have-you eaten when  
“When did you eat?” (French)
- b. T’as mangé **quand**?  
You’ve eaten when

## **"Insituness" in Trevigiano**

---

Word order in declaratives: V arguments > ADJ<sub>time</sub> > ADJ<sub>place</sub> (11):

- (11) a. Giani el g\`a magn\`a pomi<sub>DO</sub> jeri sera<sub>T</sub> al ristorante<sub>P</sub>  
John he has eaten apples yesterday evening at.the restaurant  
"Yesterday evening, John ate apples at the restaurant"
- b. ? Giani el g\`a magn\`a pomi<sub>DO</sub> al ristorante<sub>P</sub> jeri sera<sub>T</sub>  
John he has eaten apples at.the restaurant yesterday evening
- c. \* Giani el g\`a magn\`a jeri sera<sub>T</sub> pomi<sub>DO</sub> al ristorante<sub>P</sub>  
John he has eaten yesterday evening apples at.the restaurant
- d. \* Giani el g\`a magn\`a al ristorante<sub>P</sub> pomi<sub>DO</sub> jeri sera<sub>T</sub>  
John he has eaten at.the restaurant apples yesterday evening

“In situ” wh-elements appear moved from the unmarked position (12) - they follow the lexical V:

- (12) a. Ga-tu        magnà **quando**<sub>a</sub> el    dolse t<sub>a</sub>?  
Have-you<sub>CL</sub> eaten    when    the cake t  
“When did you eat the cake?”
- b. Ga-tu        visto **dove**<sub>a</sub> a    Maria t<sub>a</sub>?  
Have-you<sub>CL</sub> seen    where the Maria t  
“Where did you see Maria?”
- c. Ghe ga-tu        dato **a chi**<sub>a</sub> a    tecia        t<sub>a</sub>?  
DAT have-you<sub>CL</sub> given to who the saucepan t  
“Who did you give the saucepan to?”
- d. Ga-ea        visto **cossa**<sub>a</sub> a    Maria t<sub>a</sub>?  
Has-she<sub>CL</sub> seen what    the Maria t  
“What did Maria see?”

The unmarked order is ungrammatical in *genuine* questions (13):

- (13) a. \* Ga-tu        magnà el    dolce **quando**?  
Have-you<sub>CL</sub> eaten    the cake    when  
“When did you eat the cake?”
- b. \* Ga-tu        visto a    Maria **dove**?  
Have-you<sub>CL</sub> seen the Maria where  
“Where did you see Maria?”
- c. \* Ghe ga-tu        dato a    tecia        a **chi**?  
DAT have-you<sub>CL</sub> given the saucepan to who  
“Who did you give the saucepan to?”
- d. \* Ga-ea        visto a    Maria **cosa**?  
Has-she<sub>CL</sub> seen the Maria what  
“What did Maria see?”

Wh-phrase in its base position: echo reading. The interrogative syntax is lost altogether (no *SCII*) (14):

- (14) a. Te g`a magn`a el dolse **quando**?!  
You have eaten the cake when  
"You ate the cake WHEN?!" (ECHO)
- b. Te g`a visto a Maria **dove**?!  
You have seen the Maria where  
"You saw Maria WHERE?!" (ECHO)
- c. Te ghe g`a dato a tecia **a chi**?!  
You DAT have given the saucepan to who  
"You gave the saucepan TO WHO?!" (ECHO)
- d. A Maria a g`a visto **cossa**?!  
The Maria she has seen what  
"Maria saw WHAT?!" (ECHO)

...in case you were wondering! The examples in (12) are not right-dislocations (15 and 16):

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

- (16) a. Ghe o ga-tu regaeà cuando, {aa Maria}, l'anel?  
 DAT it have-you<sub>CL</sub> given when # to.the Maria # the'ring  
 "The ring, when did you give to Maria?" (RD)
- b. Ghe ga-tu regaeà cuando \*{aa Maria} l'anel {aa Maria}?  
 DAT have-you<sub>CL</sub> given when to.the Maria the'ring.to.the Maria  
 "When did you give Maria the ring?"

Working hypothesis: in Trevigiano, "in situ" wh-phrases undergo partial wh-movement to a very low wh-position (17):

- (17) ... [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> **wh-phrase**<sub>j</sub> [<sub>foc<sup>0</sup></sub> [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>Top<sup>0</sup></sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>V<sup>0</sup></sub> t<sub>j</sub> ]]]]]]]



The LP of Trevigiano is very Italian-like (18):

- (18) a. Penso *de* ndar da Toni stasera  
Think<sub>1PS</sub> to go at Toni tonight  
“I think I’ll go to Toni’s tonight” **Fin<sup>0</sup>**
- b. Me domando *se* l ndarà da Toni doman  
Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> if he<sub>CL</sub> go<sub>FUT</sub> at Toni tomorrow  
“I wonder whether he’ll go to Toni’s tomorrow” **Int<sup>0</sup>**
- c. Penso *che* l vae da Toni doman  
Think<sub>1PS</sub> that he<sub>CL</sub> go<sub>SUBJ</sub> at Toni tomorrow  
“I think he’ll go to Toni’s tomorrow” **Force<sup>0</sup>**
- d. Quando pensi-tu *che* l vae da Toni?  
When think<sub>2PS</sub>-you that he<sub>CL</sub> go<sub>SUBJ</sub> at Toni  
“When do you think he’ll go to Toni’s?”

### The "if"-complementizer of indirect questions

In Trevigiano *se* appears also in non-echo indirect wh-questions when the wh-element is "in situ" ( $se_{WH}$ ) (19a-19c):

- (19) a. Me domando *se* te ga magnà **cosa**  
Myself ask  $se_{wh}$  you have eaten what  
"I wonder what you ate"
- b. A *se* domanda *se* l vegnarà **quando**  
She herself asks  $se_{wh}$  he come<sub>FUT</sub> when  
"She wonders when he's going to come"
- c. Voria saver *se* ve caté **dove**  
Would<sub>1PS</sub> know  $se_{wh}$  yourselves meet where  
"I wonder where you'll be meeting"

Doesn't give rise to a yes/no interpretation!

Even under  $se_{wh}$ , the distribution of wh-adjuncts with respect to arguments patterns that observed in matrix clauses (20a-20b):

- (20) a. Me domando *se* te ga magnà **quando** i pomi  $t_{quando}$   
 Myself ask se you have eaten when the apples t  
 "I wonder when you ate the apples"
- b. A se domanda *se* l piantarà **dove** i persegheri  $t_{dove}$   
 She herself asks se he plant<sub>FUT</sub> where the peach.trees t  
 "She wonders where he'll plant the peach trees"

In the absence of partial wh-movement, the questions are very marginal. Wondering again?? (20a-20b) are clearly NOT instances of RD (21):

- (21) Me domando *se* te i ga magnai **quando**, i pomi  
 Myself ask se you them have eaten<sub>mascPL</sub> when # the apples  
 "The apples, I wonder when you ate" (RD+cl-resumption)

## Insituness in indirect questions iii

If the *wh*-element of indirect questions moves “*ex situ*”, the insertion of *se* becomes ungrammatical (22a). *Che* (‘that’) must be used instead (22d):

- (22) a. \* Me domando **cosa** *se* te ga magnà  
Myself ask what *se* you have eaten  
“I wonder what you ate”
- b. Me domando **cosa** *che* te ga magnà  
Myself ask what that you have eaten
- c. Me domando *se* te ga magnà  
Myself ask *se* you have eaten  
“I wonder whether you ate” no *wh*-phrase: ✓(y/n)
- d. \* Me domando *che* te ga magnà  
Myself ask that you have eaten  
“I wonder whether you ate” no *wh*-phrase: ✗

Working hypothesis: these *che* and *se* might be only homophonous to the C that introduce embedded clauses and indirect yes/no questions.

## Long-distance questions

In Trevigiano, embedded “insituness” is licensed also in long-distance wh-questions:

- (23) a. Pensi-tu che vegnarà catarne **chi**?  
Think-you<sub>CL</sub> that come<sub>FUTURE</sub> see.us who  
“Who do you think will visit us?” “in situ”
- b. Pensi-tu che i voje magnar **cossa**?  
Think-you<sub>CL</sub> that they want<sub>SUBJ</sub> eat what  
“What do you think they want to eat?”
- (24) a. **Chi** pensi-tu che vegnarà catarne?  
Who think-you<sub>CL</sub> that come<sub>FUTURE</sub> see.us  
“Who do you think will visit us?” “ex situ”
- b. **Cossa** pensi-tu che i voje magnar?  
What think-you<sub>CL</sub> that they want<sub>SUBJ</sub> eat  
“What do you think they want to eat?”

## Insituness in long-distance questions ii

Partial wh-movement of “in situ” wh-phrases is clearly at play here too (25):

- (25) Pensi-tu che magnaremo **quando** i fighi  $t_{cuando}$ ?  
Think-you<sub>CL</sub> that eat<sub>1PP.FUTURE</sub> when the figues t  
“When do you think we will eat the figues?”

In the absence of partial wh-movement:

- (26) a. \* Pensi-tu che magnaremo i fighi **quando**?  
Think-you<sub>CL</sub> that eat<sub>1PP.FUTURE</sub> the figues when  
“When do you think we will eat the figues?”
- b. Pensi-tu che i magnaremo **quando**, i fighi?  
Think-you<sub>CL</sub> that them eat<sub>1PP.FUTURE</sub> when # the figues  
“The figues, when do you think we’re going to eat?” (RD)
- c. Te pensiche magnaremo i fighi **quando**?!  
Think-you<sub>CL</sub> that eat<sub>1PP.FUTURE</sub> the figues when  
“You think we’re going to eat the figues WHEN?!” (ECHO)

## **Low(er) landing Sites for Wh-Movement**

---

## IP-internal "little whP"

"Partial wh-movement" targets an IP-internal wh-projection, *little whP* (27):

- (27) a. Si-tu [IP ndà [whP **quando** ...[VP al marcà t<sub>quando</sub> ]]]?  
 are-you<sub>CL</sub> gone when to.the market  
 "When did you go to the market?"
- b. Ga-tu [IP posà [whP **dove** ...[VP i ociai t<sub>dove</sub> ]]]?  
 have-you<sub>CL</sub> put where the glasses  
 "Where did you put the glasses?"

Where's **whP**? Lower than the position targeted by the finite V (28):

- (28) a. Pensi-tu che Toni el vegnarà **quando** da nojaltri?  
 think-you<sub>CL</sub> that Toni he<sub>CL</sub> come<sub>FUT</sub> when at ours  
 "When do you think Toni will come over?"



- b. El vol saver se me mare a vegnarà **cuando** da ti  
 He<sub>CL</sub> wants know se<sub>WH</sub> my mother she<sub>CL</sub> come<sub>FUT</sub> when at yours  
 "He wants to know when my mother will come at your place"

"Little whP" must lie in the low periphery, *vP* (29):

- (29) a. Pensi-tu che [<sub>SubjP</sub> Toni [<sub>Subj</sub><sup>0</sup> el [<sub>TP</sub> vegnarà [<sub>whP</sub> cuando<sub>j</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>S</sub> t<sub>V</sub> da nojaltri t<sub>j</sub> ]]]]?  
 b. El vol saver se [<sub>SubjP</sub> me mare [<sub>Subj</sub><sup>0</sup> a [<sub>TP</sub> vegnarà [<sub>whP</sub> cuando<sub>j</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>S</sub> t<sub>V</sub> da ti t<sub>j</sub> ]]]]

This position is very likely FocP in Belletti (2004) (*vP*/*CP* correspondence - *wh*-phrases target focal positions):

- (30) ... [<sub>vP</sub> [<sub>whP/FocP</sub> **wh-phrase**<sub>j</sub> [<sub>wh</sub><sup>0</sup> [<sub>TopicP</sub> [<sub>Top</sub><sup>0</sup> [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>V</sub><sup>0</sup> t<sub>j</sub> ]]]]]]]]

## Low left peripheral WhP

The distribution of  $se_{WH}/che_{WH}$  and  $se_{Y/N}/che_{Y/N}$ :

1-  $se_{Y/N}$  and a topic like *sto libro* ("this book"):

- (31) a. [Sto libro], me domando  $se$  te o già za leto  
this book myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{Y/N}$  you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have already read
- b. Me domando  $se$  te o già za leto, [sto libro]  
myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{Y/N}$  you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have already read this book
- c. Me domando, [sto libro],  $se$  te o già za leto  
myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book  $se_{Y/N}$  you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have already read
- d. Me domando  $se$ , [sto libro], te o già za leto  
myself ask<sub>1PS</sub>  $se_{Y/N}$  this book you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have already read

(32) topic<sub>LeftD</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> topic ...  $se_{Y/N}$  ... topic ] topic<sub>RightD</sub>

2- se<sub>WH</sub>, wh-element “in situ” and a topic like *sto libro*:

- (33) a. [Sto libro], me domando *se* te ghe o gà regaeà a **chi**  
 this book myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> se<sub>WH</sub> you DAT it have given to who  
 “I wonder who you gave this book to”
- b. Me domando *se* te ghe o gà regaeà a **chi**, [sto libro]  
 myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> se<sub>WH</sub> you DAT it have given to who this book
- c. Me domando, [sto libro], *se* te ghe o gà regaeà a **chi**  
 myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book se<sub>WH</sub> you DAT it have given to who
- d. ?? Me domando *se*, [sto libro], te ghe o gà regaeà a  
 myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> se<sub>WH</sub> this book you DAT it have given to  
**chi**  
 who

(34) topic<sub>LeftD</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> topic ... se<sub>WH</sub> ... ??topic *wh-phrase*] topic<sub>RightD</sub>

### 3- che<sub>WH</sub>, wh-element “ex situ” and a topic like *sto libro*:

- (35) a. [Sto libro], me domando dove che te o già letto  
 This book myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> where che you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have read  
 “I wonder where you read this book”
- b. Me domando dove che te o già letto, [sto libro]  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> where che you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have read this book
- c. Me domando, [sto libro], dove che te o già letto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> this book where che you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have read
- d. ?? Me domando dove, [sto libro], che te o già letto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> where this book che you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have read
- e. ? Me domando dove che, [sto libro], te o già letto  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> where che this book you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have read
- (36) topic<sub>LeftD</sub> [CP topic ... *wh-phrase* ??topic **che<sub>WH</sub>** ... ?topic ] topic<sub>RightD</sub>

## 4- Surrounded by topics?:

- (37) a. Me domando, [sto libro], se, [jeri], te o gà leto  
 I wonder this book *se<sub>Y/N</sub>* yesterday you<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> have read  
 "I wonder if you read this book yesterday"
- b. \* Me domando, [sto libro], se, [jeri], o gà leto chi  
 I wonder this book *se<sub>WH</sub>* yesterday it<sub>CL</sub> has read who  
 "I wonder who read this book yesterday"
- c. \* Me domando, [sto libro], chi che, [jeri], o gà leto  
 I wonder this book who che yesterday it<sub>CL</sub> has read

(38) [<sub>CP</sub> topic ... *se<sub>Y/N</sub>* / \**se<sub>WH</sub>* / \**che<sub>WH</sub>* ... topic ]

## 5- Co-occurrence with focus:

- (39) a. Me domando se STO LIBRO te ga leto (no staltro)  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> se<sub>Y/N</sub> THIS BOOK you<sub>CL</sub> have read (not other)  
 "THIS BOOK I wonder if you read (not the other one)"
- b. \*Me domando STO LIBRO se te ga leto (no staltro)  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> THIS BOOK se<sub>Y/N</sub> you<sub>CL</sub> have read (not other)
- (40) a. Me domando STO LIBRO se o ga leto chi  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> THIS BOOK se<sub>WH</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> has read who  
 "THIS BOOK I wonder who read"
- b. \*Me domando se STO LIBRO o ga leto chi  
 Myself ask<sub>1PS</sub> se<sub>WH</sub> THIS BOOK it<sub>CL</sub> has read who
- (41) a. Me domando STO LIBRO chi che o g`a leto  
 I wonder THIS BOOK who che it<sub>CL</sub> has read  
 "THIS BOOK I wonder who read"

- b. \* Me domando chi STO LIBRO che o già letto  
I wonder who THIS BOOK che  $it_{CL}$  has read
- c. ?? Me domando chi che STO LIBRO o già letto  
I wonder who che THIS BOOK  $it_{CL}$  has read

- (42) a. \*focus >  $se_{Y/N}$  > focus (IT, Rizzi (2001))  
b. focus >  $se_{WH}$  > \*focus  
c. focus > wh-phrase \*focus  $che_{WH}$  > \*focus

### Making sense of the data

The distribution of the three complementizers with respect to *topics* and *focus* is summarized in (43):

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

$Se_{Y/N}$  is likely to realize **Int**<sup>0</sup>, as its Italian counterpart (Rizzi (2001)).

$Se_{WH}$  appears to occupy the head of a very low left-peripheral projection - lower than the last TopP - and it is in complementary distribution with  $che_{WH}$ . The Spec of the latter seems to be a landing site for wh-movement, whereas that of the former is not.

Working question: could  $se_{WH}$  and  $che_{WH}$  head two different projections? **NO**.



## Two phonetic realizations for Wh<sup>0</sup>

The V-selected C of indirect questions surfaces either as *se*<sub>WH</sub> or as *che*<sub>WH</sub> (44):

$$(44) \text{ matrix } V \dots [_{ForceP(emb)} \text{ Force}^0 \dots [_{FP} \text{ se}_{WH}/\text{che}_{WH} [_{FinP} \text{ Fin}^0 [_{IP} I^0 ]]]]]]]]]$$

The alternation between *se*<sub>WH</sub> and *che*<sub>WH</sub> can be attributed to the presence/absence of a relevant wh-feature: as in French *que/qui alternation* (Rizzi (1990), Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007)), *se*<sub>WH</sub> surfaces as *che* when it is crossed by wh-movement, thus being endowed with a [+WH] feature.

Let us call the relevant wh-projection **WhP**, borrowing Rizzi's terms (*QembP* in Rizzi and Bocci (2016)) (45a-45b):

- $$(45) \text{ a. I wonder } \dots [_{ForceP} \dots [_{TopP} \text{ Top}^0 \dots [_{WhP} \text{ se } [_{FinP} \text{ Fin}^0 [_{TP} \dots [_{whP} \text{ wh-phrase}_{[+WH]} \dots [_{VP} \langle \text{wh-phrase}_{[+WH]} \rangle ]]]]]]]]]]]$$
- $$\text{ b. I wonder } \dots [_{ForceP} \dots [_{TopP} \text{ Top}^0 \dots [_{WhP} \text{ wh-phrase}_{[+WH]} \text{ che } [_{FinP} \text{ Fin}^0 [_{TP} \dots [_{whP} \langle \text{wh-phrase} \rangle \dots [_{VP} \langle \text{wh-phrase} \rangle ]]]]]]]]]]]$$

## Conclusions

---

In this presentation I showed that:

- what looks like “insituness” in Trevigiano is actually an instance of IP-internal wh-movement;
- the targeted position is the Spec of the focal projection of the *low* periphery (Belletti (2004)), which I call *whP*;
- embedded insituness is indeed possible, both in long distance and in indirect wh-questions;
- in indirect wh-questions, the V selects an embedded LP whose landing site for wh-movement stands very low - I called it WhP (as in Rizzi (2004));
- WhP seems one of the “root/non-root asymmetries” involving the LP of the clause, and its head has two phonetic realizations, *se* and *che*;
- I proposed the *se-che alternation* be treated as *se* surfacing as *che* when crossed by wh-movement, thus being endowed with a [+WH] feature.

### And now...?

It is tempting to try to explain “insituness” in Romance as a combination of morpho-syntactic and prosodic phenomena: (no) SCII, special wh-prosody (and lack thereof), internal structure of wh-words (Poletto and Pollock (2000) and refinements), (un)availability of certain Wh-positions.

A number of questions and predictions are raised by my claims. Hopefully, further systematic cross-linguistic comparison among Romance varieties will shed light on the complex natures of **insituness** and **linguistic optionality** (if any) - and on the ways morphology, syntax and prosody interact to licence sentence-internal wh-phrases.

**THANK YOU!**

## References

---

## References

---

- Belletti, A. (2004). Aspects of the low IP area. In Rizzi, L., editor, *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartograph of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Bošković, Ž. (2000). Sometimes in [Spec CP], Sometimes in-situ. In Martin, R., Michaels, D., and Uriagereka, J., editors, *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalism in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, pages 53–88, Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.
- Cheng, L. L.-S. and Rooryck, J. (2002). *Types of Wh-in-situ*. Leiden University.
- Mathieu, E. (1999). French wh in situ and the intervention effect. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11:441–472.
- Munaro, N. (1995). On nominal wh-phrases in some North-Eastern Italian dialects. *RGG. Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 20:69–110.
- Munaro, N., Poletto, C., and Pollock, Y.-Y. (2001). Eppur si muove! On comparing French and Bellunese wh-movement. In Pica, P. and Roorick, J., editors, *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 1*, pages 147–180. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Poletto, C. and Pollock, Y.-Y. (2000). On the Left Periphery of Some Romance Wh-Questions. In Press, O. U., editor, *The Structure of CP and IP*, pages 251–296. Rizzi, Luigi, Oxford.
- Poletto, C. and Pollock, Y.-Y. (2015). Arguing for remnant movement in Romance. In Grewendorf, G., editor, *Remnant Movement*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Rizzi, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rizzi, L. (2001). On the Position Int(errogative) in the Left Periphery of the Clause. *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, page 287–296.

- Rizzi, L. (2004). On the Cartography of Syntactic Structures. In Rizzi, L., editor, *The Structure of CP and IP, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume II*, page 223 – 251. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax, Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, L. and Bocci, G. (2016). The Left Periphery of the Clause - Primarily illustrated for Italian. In *Blackwell Companion to Syntax, II Edition*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Rizzi, L. and Shlonsky, U. (2007). Strategies of subject extraction. *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics*, pages 115 – 160.