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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_{CL} met someone at the market
     “Did you met someone at the market?”
    
   b. * Te gà catà cualchedun al marcà?
      You_{CL} 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_{CL} found at the market
    “Who did you meet at the market?”

   b. * Chi te gà catà al marcà?
      Who you_{CL} have found at the market
(3)  

a. Ga-tu catà chi al marcà?
   have-you_{CL} met who at.the market
   “Who did you meet at the market?”

b. * Te gà catà chi al marcà?
   You_{CL} have found who at.the market

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

(4)  

a. Che profesor a-ea visto al marcà?
   what professor has-she_{CL} seen at.the market
   “Which professor did she see at the market?”

b. A-ea visto che profesor al marcà?
   has-she_{CL} seen what professor at.the market

The same patterns are found in long-distance questions (5-6):
The Interrogative Syntax of Trevigiano

(5) a. **Chi pens-** e-a 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-** e-a 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. **Che maestra** pens-** e-a che te gà 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-** e-a che te gà visto che 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-** e-a che te gà 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$_{CL}$ that have-you$_{CL}$ 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 $SCll$. 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. Che libro ha-tu ledest?
   what book have-you read
   “Which book did you read?”

   b. * Ha-tu ledest che 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?”

   b. T’as mangé quand?
      You’have eaten  when
"Insituness" in Trevigiano
Word order in declaratives: V arguments > ADJ\textsubscript{time} > ADJ\textsubscript{place} (11):

(11) a. Giani el gà magnà pomi\textsubscript{DO} jeri sera\textsubscript{T} al ristorante\textsubscript{P} John he has eaten apples yesterday evening at the restaurant “Yesterday evening, John ate apples at the restaurant”

b. ? Giani el gà magnà pomi\textsubscript{DO} al ristorante\textsubscript{P} jeri sera\textsubscript{T} John he has eaten apples at the restaurant yesterday evening

c. * Giani el gà magnà jeri sera\textsubscript{T} pomi\textsubscript{DO} al ristorante\textsubscript{P} John he has eaten yesterday evening apples at the restaurant

d. * Giani el gà magnà al ristorante\textsubscript{P} pomi\textsubscript{DO} jeri sera\textsubscript{T} 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 \textit{cuando} a el dolse t\textsubscript{a}?
Have-you\textsubscript{CL} eaten when the cake t
“When did you eat the cake?”

b. Ga-tu visto \textit{dove} a Maria t\textsubscript{a}?
Have-you\textsubscript{CL} seen where the Maria t
“Where did you see Maria?”

c. Ghe ga-tu dato a \textit{chi} a tecia t\textsubscript{a}?
DAT have-you\textsubscript{CL} given to who the saucepan t
“Who did you give the saucepan to?”

d. Ga-ea visto \textit{cossa} a Maria t\textsubscript{a}?
Has-she\textsubscript{CL} seen what the Maria t
“What did Maria see?”
The unmarked order is ungrammatical in *genuine* questions (13):

\[(13)\]

a. *Ga-tu magnà el dolse *cuando*?
   Have-you\textsubscript{CL} eaten the cake when
   “When did you eat the cake?”

b. *Ga-tu visto a Maria *dove*?
   Have-you\textsubscript{CL} seen the Maria where
   “Where did you see Maria?”

c. *Ghe ga-tu dato a tecia a chi*?
   DAT have-you\textsubscript{CL} given the saucepan to who
   “Who did you give the saucepan to?”

d. *Ga-ea visto a Maria *cossa*?
   Has-she\textsubscript{CL} seen the Maria what
   “What did Maria see?”
Wh-phrase in its base position: echo reading. The interrogative syntax is lost altogether (no \textit{SCI}) (14):

\begin{enumerate}[a.]
\item Te gà magnà el dolse \textbf{cuando}?!  
You have eaten the cake when  
“You ate the cake WHEN?!” (ECHO)

\item Te gà visto a Maria \textbf{dove}?!  
You have seen the Maria where  
“You saw Maria WHERE?!” (ECHO)

\item Te ghe gà dato a tecia a \textbf{chi}?!  
You DAT have given the saucepan to who  
“You gave the saucepan TO WHO?!” (ECHO)

\item A Maria a gà visto \textbf{cossa}?!  
The Maria she has seen what  
“Maria saw WHAT?!” (ECHO)
\end{enumerate}
...in case you were wondering! The examples in (12) are not right-dislocations (15 and 16):

(15)  

a. **O** ga-tu magnà quando, el dolse?
   *It*$_{CL}$ have-*you*$_{CL}$ eaten when *#* the cake
   “The cake, when did you eat?”  
   (RD)

b. **A** ga-tu vista dove, a Maria?
   *She*$_{CL}$ have-*you*$_{CL}$ seen$_{F}$ where *#* the Maria
   “Mary, where did you see?”  
   (RD)

c. Ghe **a** ga-tu data a chi, a tecia?
   *DAT* it$_{CL}$ have-*you*$_{CL}$ given$_{F}$ to who *#* the saucepan
   “The saucepan, who did you give it to?”  
   (RD)
(16) a. Ghe o ga-tu regaeà quando, {aa Maria}, l’anel? 
DAT it have-you$_{CL}$ given when # to.the Maria # the’ring  
“The ring, when did you give to Maria?” (RD)  
b. Ghe ga-tu regaeà quando*{aa Maria} l’anel {aa Maria}? 
DAT have-you$_{CL}$ 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) $\ldots [vP [FocP wh\text{-phrase}_j [foc^0 [TopicP [Top^0 [VP [v^0 t_j ]]]]]]]$
The LP of Trevigiano is very Italian-like (18):

(18)  

a. Penso de ndar da Toni stasera  
Think$_{1PS}$ to go at Toni tonight  
“I think I’ll go to Toni’s tonight”

b. Me domando se l ndarà da Toni doman  
Myself ask$_{1PS}$ if he$_{CL}$ go$_{FUT}$ at Toni tomorrow  
“I wonder whether he’ll go to Toni’s tomorrow”

c. Penso che l vae da Toni doman  
Think$_{1PS}$ that he$_{CL}$ go$_{SUBJ}$ at Toni tomorrow  
“I think he’ll go to Toni’s tomorrow”

d. Cuando pensi-tu che l vae da Toni?  
When think$_{2PS}$-you that he$_{CL}$ go$_{SUBJ}$ 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 cossa
     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$_{FUT}$ when
     “She wonders when he’s going to come”

     c. Voria saver se ve caté dove
     Would$_{1PS}$ 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 cuan\text{d}o i pom\text{i} t_{cuan\text{d}o}  
Myself ask se you have eaten when the apples t  
“I wonder when you ate the apples”

b. A se domanda se l piantarà do\text{v}e i persegher\text{i} t_{dove}  
She herself asks se he plant_{FUT} where the peach\text{.}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 cuan\text{d}o, i pom\text{i}  
Myself ask se you them have eaten_{mascPL} when # the apples  
“The apples, I wonder when you ate” (RD+cl-resumption)
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 cossa se te ga magnà  
Myself ask what se you have eaten  
“I wonder what you ate”

(b) Me domando cossa 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$_CL$ that come$_FUTURE$ see.us who
    “Who do you think will visit us?”
    “in situ”

   b. Pensi-tu che i voje magnar cossa?
    Think-you$_CL$ that they want$_SUBJ$ eat what
    “What do you think they want to eat?”

(24) a. Chi pensi-tu che vegnarà catarne?
    Who think-you$_CL$ that come$_FUTURE$ see.us
    “Who do you think will visit us?”
    “ex situ”

   b. Cossa pensi-tu che i voje magnar?
    What think-you$_CL$ that they want$_SUBJ$ eat
    “What do you think they want to eat?”
Partial wh-movement of “in situ” wh-phrases is clearly at play here too (25):

(25) Pensi-tu che magnaremo **cuando** i fighi t_{cuando}?
Think-you_{CL} that eat_{1PP.FUTURE} 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 **cuando**?
Think-you_{CL} that eat_{1PP.FUTURE} the figues when
“When do you think we will eat the figues?”

b. Pensi-tu che i magnaremo **cuando**, i fighi?
Think-you_{CL} that them eat_{1PP.FUTURE} when # the figues
“The figues, when do you think we’re going to eat?” (RD)

c. Te pensi che magnaremo i fighi **cuando**?!
Think-you_{CL} that eat_{1PP.FUTURE} 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’

IP-internal ”little whP”

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

(27) a. Si-tu \_[IP ndà \_[whP \textit{cuando} \ldots [\textit{VP al marcà t}_{\textit{cuando}}]]\]? are-you\textit{CL} gone when to.the market
   “When did you go to the market?”

b. Ga-tu \_[IP posà \_[whP \textit{dove} \ldots [\textit{VP i ociai t}_{\textit{dove}}]]\]? have-you\textit{CL} 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 \textit{cuando} da nojaltri?
   think-you\textit{CL} that Toni he\textit{CL} come\textit{FUT} when at ours
   “When do you think Toni will come over?”
“Little whP” must lie in the low periphery, vP (29):

(29)  a. Pensi-tu che [SubjP Toni [Subj0 el [TP vegnarà [whP quandoj [vP tS tV da nojaltri t_i ]]]]? 

b. El vol saver se [SubjP me mare [Subj0 a [TP vegnarà [whP cuandoj [vP tS tV da ti t_j ]]]] 

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

(30)  ... [vP [whP/FocP wh-phrase] [wh0 [TopicP [Top0 [vP [V0 t_j ]]]]]]
Low left peripheral WhP

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

1- $se_{YN}$ and a topic like *sto libro* (“this book”):

(31) a. [Sto libro], me domando *se te o gà za leto* this book myself ask$_{1PS}$ se$_{YN}$ you$_{CL}$ it$_{CL}$ have already read

b. Me domando *se te o gà za leto, [sto libro]* myself ask$_{1PS}$ se$_{YN}$ you$_{CL}$ it$_{CL}$ have already read this book

c. Me domando, [sto libro], *se te o gà za leto* myself ask$_{1PS}$ this book se$_{YN}$ you$_{CL}$ it$_{CL}$ have already read

d. Me domando *se, [sto libro], te o gà za leto* myself ask$_{1PS}$ se$_{YN}$ this book you$_{CL}$ it$_{CL}$ have already read

(32) $topic_{LeftD}$ [$CP$ topic $\ldots$ se$_{YN}$ $\ldots$ topic ] $topic_{RightD}$
2- $se_{WH}$, wh-element “in situ” and a topic like *sto libro*:

(33) a. [Sto libro], me domando $se$ te ghe o gà regaeè a chi
this book myself ask$_{1PS}$ $se_{WH}$ you DAT it have given to who
“I wonder who you gave this book to”

b. Me domando $se$ te ghe o gà regaeè a chi, [sto libro]
myself ask$_{1PS}$ $se_{WH}$ you DAT it have given to who this book

c. Me domando, [sto libro], $se$ te ghe o gà regaeè a chi
myself ask$_{1PS}$ this book $se_{WH}$ you DAT it have given to who

 d. ?? Me domando $se$, [sto libro], te ghe o gà regaeè a chi
myself ask$_{1PS}$ $se_{WH}$ this book you DAT it have given to chi
who

(34) topic$_{LeftD}$ [$CP$ topic ... $se_{WH}$ ... ??topic wh-phrase] topic$_{RightD}$
3- che\textsubscript{WH}, wh-element “ex situ” and a topic like \textit{sto libro}:

(35) a. [Sto libro], me domando dove che te o gà leto
   This book myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} where che you\textsubscript{CL} it\textsubscript{CL} have read
   “I wonder where you read this book”

b. Me domando dove che te o gà leto, [sto libro]
   Myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} where che you\textsubscript{CL} it\textsubscript{CL} have read this book

c. Me domando, [sto libro], dove che te o gà leto
   Myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} this book where che you\textsubscript{CL} it\textsubscript{CL} have read

d. ?? Me domando dove, [sto libro], che te o gà leto
   Myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} where this book che you\textsubscript{CL} it\textsubscript{CL} have read

e. ? Me domando dove che, [sto libro], te o gà leto
   Myself ask\textsubscript{1PS} where che this book you\textsubscript{CL} it\textsubscript{CL} have read

(36) topic\textsubscript{LeftD} [\textit{CP topic ... wh-phrase ??topic che\textsubscript{WH} ... ?topic }] topic\textsubscript{RightD}
4- Surrounded by topics:

(37) a. Me domando, [sto libro], se, [jeri], te o gà leto
I wonder this book se_{Y/N} yesterday you_{CL} it_{CL} 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_{WH} yesterday it_{CL} 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_{CL} has read

(38) [cP topic \ldots se_{Y/N} / *se_{WH} / *che_{WH} \ldots topic ]
5- Co-occurrence with focus:

(39) a. Me domando se STO LIBRO te ga leto (no staltro) 
Myself ask$_{1PS}$ se$_{Y/N}$ THIS BOOK you$_{CL}$ 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$_{1PS}$ THIS BOOK se$_{Y/N}$ you$_{CL}$ have read (not other)

(40) a. Me domando STO LIBRO se o ga leto chi 
Myself ask$_{1PS}$ THIS BOOK se$_{WH}$ it$_{CL}$ has read who 
“THIS BOOK I wonder who read”

b. *Me domando se STO LIBRO o ga leto chi 
Myself ask$_{1PS}$ se$_{WH}$ THIS BOOK it$_{CL}$ has read who

(41) a. Me domando STO LIBRO chi che o gà leto 
I wonder THIS BOOK who che it$_{CL}$ has read 
“THIS BOOK I wonder who read”
b. * Me domando chi STO LIBRO che o gà leto
   I wonder who THIS BOOK che it\textsubscript{CL} has read

(42) a. *focus > se\textsubscript{Y/N} > focus \quad \text{(IT, Rizzi (2001))}
b. focus > se\textsubscript{WH} > *focus
c. focus > wh-phrase *focus che\textsubscript{WH} > *focus
Making sense of the data

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

\begin{equation}
\begin{align*}
(43) & \quad \text{a. Topic} > \text{se}_{Y/N} > \text{Focus} > \text{Topic} \\
& \quad \text{b. Focus} > \text{Topic} > \text{se}_{WH} \\
& \quad \text{c. Focus} > \text{Topic} > \text{che}_{WH}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

\text{se}_{Y/N} \text{ is likely to realize } \textbf{Int}^0, \text{ as its Italian counterpart (Rizzi (2001)).}

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

\textbf{Working question}: could \text{se}_{WH} \text{ and } \text{che}_{WH} \text{ head two different projections? } \textbf{NO}. 
Two phonetic realizations for $Wh^0$

The V-selected C of indirect questions surfaces either as $se_{WH}$ or as $che_{WH}$ (44):

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

The alternation between $se_{WH}$ and $che_{WH}$ can be attributed to the presence/absence of a relevant wh-feature: as in French *que/qui alternation* (Rizzi (1990), RRizzi and Shlonsky (2007)), $se_{WH}$ 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):

\[
(45) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. I wonder } \ldots [_{ForceP} \ldots [_{TopP} \text{Top}^0 \ldots [_{WhP} \text{se} [_{FinP} \text{Fin}^0 [_{TP} \ldots [_{whP} \text{wh-phrase}[+WH] \ldots [_{VP} <\text{wh-phrase}[+WH]> ]]])]]] \\
\text{b. I wonder } \ldots [_{ForceP} \ldots [_{TopP} \text{Top}^0 \ldots [_{WhP} \text{wh-phrase}[+WH] \text{che} [_{FinP} \text{Fin}^0 [_{TP} \ldots [_{whP} <\text{wh-phrase}> \ldots [_{VP} <\text{wh-phrase}> ]]])]]]
\end{align*}
\]
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 and 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 therof), 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!
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