

- b. A-ea visto **che** **profesor** al marcà?
 Has=she seen what professor at.the market

The exact same patterns are predictably found in long-distance questions, where *SCII* is only performed in the matrix part of the sentence.

1.2 Similar, yet different from Bellunese and French

Bellunese (Munaro 1995, Poletto&Pollock 2015 and previous related works, Munaro et al. 2001): obligatory *SCII*. However, non-D-linked wh-phrases can ONLY appear sentence-internally (5), and D-linked wh-words are only compatible with wh-fronting (6):

- (5) a. Ha-tu magnà **che**? Bellunese
 Have=you eaten what
 "What did you eat?"
 b. * Che ha-tu magnà?
 What have=you eaten
- (6) 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, Boskovic 2000, Cheng&Rooryck 2002): both D-linked and non-D-linked wh-phrases are licensed sentence-internally. However, in French insituness and *SCII* are NEVER compatible (7):

- (7) a. * As-tu mangé quand? French
 Have=you eaten when
 "When did you eat?"
 b. T'as mangé **quand**?
 You've eaten when

1.2 Insituness in Trevigiano

Word order in declaratives: V arguments > ADJ_{time} > ADJ_{place} (8):

- (8) a. Giani el gà magnà pomi_{DO} jeri sera_T al ristorante_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_{DO} al ristorante_P jeri sera_T
 John he has eaten apples at.the restaurant yesterday evening
 c. * Giani el gà magnà jeri sera_T pomi_{DO} al ristorante_P
 John he has eaten yesterday evening apples at.the restaurant
 d. * Giani el gà magnà al ristorante_P pomi_{DO} jeri sera_T
 John he has eaten at.the restaurant apples yesterday evening

"In situ" wh-elements appear moved from the unmarked declarative position (9a-c) - they follow the lexical V:

- (9) a. Ga-tu magnà **quando** el dolse ____ ?
 Have=you eaten when the cake
 "When did you eat the cake?"
- b. Ga-tu visto **dove** a Maria ____ ?
 Have=you seen where the Maria
 "Where did you see Maria?"
- c. Ghe ga-tu dato **a chi** a tecia ____ ?
 DAT have=you given to who the saucepan
 "Who did you give the saucepan to?"

The unmarked order is ungrammatical in *genuine* questions (9a'-c'):

- (9) a'.* Ga-tu magnà el dolse **quando**?
 Have=you eaten the cake when
 "When did you eat the cake?"
- b'.* Ga-tu visto a Maria **dove**?
 Have=you seen the Maria where
 "Where did you see Maria?"
- c'.* Ghe ga-tu dato a tecia **a chi**?
 DAT have=you given the saucepan to who
 "Who did you give the saucepan to?"

Wh-phrase in its unmarked declarative position: echo reading. The interrogative syntax is lost altogether!!!! (no *SCII*) (10a-c):

- (10) a. Te gà magnà el dolse **quando**?! ECHO
 You have eaten the cake when
 "You ate the cake WHEN?!"
- b. Te gà visto a Maria **dove**?!
 You have seen the Maria where
 "You saw Maria WHERE?!"
- c. Te ghe gà dato a tecia **a chi**?!
 You DAT have given the saucepan to who
 "You gave the saucepan TO WHO?!"

...in case you were wondering! Examples (9) are not *right dislocations* (RD, 11 and 12):

- (11) a. **O** ga-tu magnà **quando**, el dolse?
 It have=you eaten when #² the cake
 "The cake, when did you eat?"
- b. **A** ga-tu vista **dove**, a Maria?
 She have=you seen_F where # the Maria
 "Mary, where did you see?"
- c. Ghe **a** ga-tu **data** a chi, a tecia?
 DAT it have=you given_F to who # the saucepan
 "The saucepan, who did you give it to?"

² Throughout this work, I (very naively) use the # symbol to signal the presence of a prosodic break.

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

Please notice that the possibility of having *emargination* in Trevigiano (TV) is excluded by the impossibility of having structures like (8c-d)!

Working hypothesis (i): in TV, what we call “in situ” wh-phrases actually undergo *partial wh-movement* to a very low wh-position (13). Maybe *FocusP*, in Belletti's (2004) words?³

(13) ... [_{VP} [_{FocP} **wh-phrase**_j [Foc° [_{TopicP} [Top° [_{VP} [V° t_j]]]]]]]

1.2.1 The complementizers of Trevigiano

The Left Periphery (*LP*) of Trevigiano is very Italian-like (14):

- (14) a. Penso *de* ndar da Toni stasera **Fin°**
 Think_{1PS} to go at Toni tonight
 “I think I'll go to Toni's tonight”
- b. Me domando *sel* ndarà da Toni doman **Int°**
 Myself ask_{1PS} if=he go_{FUT} at Toni tomorrow
 “I wonder whether he'll go to Toni's tomorrow”
- c. Penso *chel* vae da Toni doman **Force°**
 Think_{1PS} that=he go_{SUBJ} at Toni tomorrow
 “I think he'll go to Toni's tomorrow”
- d. Quando pensi-tu *chel* vae da Toni?
 When think_{2PS}=you that=he go_{SUBJ} at Toni
 “When do you think he'll go to Toni's?”

1.2.2 Insituness in indirect questions: the “if”-complementizer⁴

In Trevigiano *se* appears also in non-echo “in situ” indirect wh-questions (*se_{wh}*) (15a-c):

- (15) 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 *sel* vegnarà **quando**
 She herself asks *se_{wh}*=he come_{FUT} when
 “She wonders when he's going to come”

³ A similar suggestion has already been made in Manzini (2014). However, her data did not provide actual proof in favour of *IP*-internal wh-movement, which she only postulated. My work shows that her intuition was right, provides examples thereof and develops the analysis for *IP*-internally moved wh-phrases.

⁴ I am forever grateful to my director Ur Shlonsky for pointing out I was systematically using an *if*-complementizer in situ indirect wh-questions, which had actually never occurred to me. Strange as it may sound, that's exactly how I discovered the existence of *se_{wh}* in Trevigiano, my native language.

- c. Voria saver *se* ve caté **dove**
 Would_{IPS} 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 position of wh-adjuncts with respect to arguments patterns that observed in matrix clauses (16a-b):

- (16) a. Me domando *se* te ga magnà **quando** i pomi ____
 Myself ask *se* you have eaten when the apples
 “I wonder when you ate the apples”
- b. A *se* domanda *sel* pianterà **dove** i perseggeri ____
 She herself asks *se*=he plant_{FUT} where the peach.trees
 “She wonders where he’ll plant the peach trees”

In the absence of *IP*-internal wh-movement, the questions are very marginal. Wondering again?? (16a-b) are clearly NOT instances of *RD* (16a’):

- (16) a’. Me domando *se* te_i ga magnà_i **quando**, i pomi RD
 Myself ask *se* you=them have eaten_{mascPL} when # the apples
 “The apples, I wonder when you ate”

If the wh-element of indirect questions moves “ex situ”, the insertion of *se* becomes ungrammatical (17a). *Che* (“that”) must be used instead (17b):

- (17) a. * Me domando **cozza** *se* te ga magnà
 Myself ask what *se* you have eaten
 “I wonder what you ate”
- b. Me domando **cozza** *che* te ga magnà
 Myself ask what that you have eaten
- a’. Me domando *se* te ga magnà no wh-phrase: √ (y/n)
 Myself ask *se* you have eaten
 “I wonder whether you ate”
- b’. * Me domando *che* te ga magnà no wh-phrase: *
 Myself ask that you have eaten

Working hypothesis (ii): The *che* and *se* just discussed might be only *homophonous* to the COMPs that introduce embedded clauses and yes/no questions.

2. Low(er) landing Sites for Wh-Movement

Manzini&Savoia (2005), Manzini (2011): "in situ" wh-phrases in NIDs are in their argumental position. Manzini (2014): insituness might actually target an *IP*-internal *focal region*. My data support her intuition, which I develop here.

2.1 IP-internal "little whP"

My proposal: *Partial wh-movement* targets an *IP*-internal wh-projection, **little whP** (18):

- (18) a. Si-tu [IP ndà [whP **quando** ... [VP al marcà ____]]]?
 Are=you gone when to.the market
 "When did you go to the market?"
 b. Ga-tu [IP posà [whP **dove** ... [VP i ociai ____]]]?
 Have=you put where the glasses
 "Where did you put the glasses?"

Where's *whP*? Lower than the position targeted by the lexical *V* (19):

- (19) a. Pensi-tu che Toni el magnarà **quando** da nojaltri?
 Think=you that Toni he eat_{FUT} when at ours
 "When do you think Toni will come over for dinner?"
 b. El vol saver se me mare a ga magnà **quando** da ti
 He wants know se my mother she has eaten when at yours
 "He wants to know when my mother had lunch at your place"

Little whP must lie in the low periphery, *vP* (20):

- (20) a. ... che [SubjP Toni [Subj° el [TP magnarà [whP **quando** [VP ts tv da nojaltri ____]]]]
 b. ... se [SubjP me mare [Subj° a [TP gà magnà [whP **quando** [VP ts tv da ti ____]]]]

This position is very likely *FocP* in Belletti (2004) ⇒ desirable *vP* / *CP* correspondence - wh-phrases target focal positions (21):

- (21) ... [vP [whP/FocP **wh-phrase** [wh° [TopicP [Top° [VP [V° ____]]]]]]

Similar conclusions had already been proposed for *Japanese* by Miyagawa (2001) and *Brazilian Portuguese* by Kato (2013). Here, following Baunaz's (2011) claim (contra Tual 2017), I extend this analysis to oral French as well (22):

- (22) a. T'as mis **quand** le pain dans le placard ____? info seeking
 You've put when the bread in the cupboard
 "When did you put the bread in the cupboard?"
 b. T'as mis le pain dans le placard **quand**? presupp/echo
 You've put the bread in the cupboard when
 "You put the bread in the cupboard when/WHEN?!"

In oral French, *sentence medial* "in situ" wh-phrases are clearly less *presuppositional* than *sentence final* ones. I suggest we analyse the former as instances of wh-movement to *whP* (23a),

- (23) a. ... [vP [whP/FocP **quand** [wh° [TopicP [Top° [VP [V° le pain dans le placard ____]]]]]]

contrary to the latter that are cases of *genuine insituness* (similarly to TV echo questions). (23b). It is tempting to analyse these examples as instances of elliptical questions "truncated at least from the embedded *Force*^o upwards", as suggested in Kato (2013) for Brazilian Portuguese echo questions:

(23) b. [CP ... [TP ~~tu chis~~ [ForceP(emb) ~~que~~ [TP tu as mis le pain dans le placard **quand**]]]]?!

⇒ such analysis explains why and how *SCII* is excluded in TV in these contexts!
 ⇒ if my intuition is correct, then wh-movement to *whP* of "in situ" wh-phrases will be excluded only when the sentence in question is not genuinely interrogative.
 ⇒ differently from TV, where the non-interrogative nature of the sentence is signalled by the exclusion of *SCII*, in FR this is not straightforwardly visible.

2.2 Low left peripheral WhP

Let us observe 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") (24, summarized in 25):

- (24) a. [Sto libro], me domando *se* te o gà za leto
 This book myself ask_{1PS} *se* you it have already read
 "This book, I wonder if you've already read"
- b. Me domando *se* te o gà za leto, [sto libro]
 Myself ask_{1PS} *se* you it have already read this book
- c. Me domando, [sto libro], *se* te o gà za leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} this book *se* you it have already read
- d. Me domando *se*, [sto libro], te o gà za leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} *se* this book you it have already read

(25) topic_{LeftD} [CP topic ... *se_{y/n}* ... topic / topic_{RightD}

2- *Se_{wh}*, wh-element "in situ" and a topic like *sto libro* (26, summarized in 27):

- (26) a. [Sto libro], me domando *se* te ghe o gà regaeà **a chi**
 This book myself ask_{1PS} *se_{wh}* you DAT it have given to who
 "I wonder who you gave this book to"
- b. Me domando *se* te ghe o gà regaeà **a chi**, [sto libro]
 Myself ask_{1PS} *se_{wh}* you DAT it have given to who this book
- c. Me domando, [sto libro], *se* te ghe o gà regaeà **a chi**
 Myself ask_{1PS} this book *se_{wh}* you DAT it have given to who
- d. ?? Me domando *se*, [sto libro], te ghe o gà regaeà **a chi**
 Myself ask_{1PS} *se_{wh}* this book you DAT it have given to who

(27) topic_{LeftD} [CP topic ... *se_{wh}* ... ??topic [TP *wh-phrase* topic_{RightD}

3- Che_{wh}, wh-element "ex situ" and a topic like *sto libro* (28, summarized in 29):

- (28) a. [Sto libro], me domando **dove** *che* te o gà leto
 This book myself ask_{1PS} where *che_{wh}* you it have read
 "I wonder where you read this book"
 b. Me domando **dove** *che* te o gà leto, [sto libro]
 Myself ask_{1PS} where *che_{wh}* you it have read this book
 c. Me domando, [sto libro], **dove** *che* te o gà leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} this book where *che_{wh}* you it have read
 d. ?? Me domando **dove**, [sto libro], *che* te o gà leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} where this book *che_{wh}* you it have read
 e. ? Me domando **dove** *che*, [sto libro], te o gà leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} where *che_{wh}* this book you it have read

(29) topic_{LeftD} [CP topic ... *wh-phrase* ??topic **che_{wh}** ... ?topic / topic_{RightD}

4- Surrounded by topics? (30, summarized in 31):

- (30) a. Me domando, [sto libro], *se*, [jeri], te o gà leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} this book *se_{y/n}* yesterday you it have read
 "I wonder if you read this book yesterday"
 b. * Me domando, [sto libro], *se*, [jeri], o gà leto **chi**
 Myself ask_{1PS} this book *se_{wh}* yesterday it has read who
 "I wonder who read this book yesterday"
 c. * Me domando, [sto libro], **chi** *che*, [jeri], o gà leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} this book who *che_{wh}* yesterday it has read

(31) [CP topic ... *se_{y/n}* / **se_{wh}* / ***che_{wh}** ... topic]

5- Co-occurrence with focus (32-34, summarized in 35):

- (32) a. Me domando *se* STO LIBRO te ga leto (no staltro)
 Myself ask_{1PS} *se_{y/n}* THIS BOOK you 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 have read (not other)
- (33) a. Me domando STO LIBRO *se* o ga leto **chi**
 Myself ask_{1PS} THIS BOOK *se_{wh}* it 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 has read who
- (34) a. Me domando STO LIBRO **chi** *che* o gà leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} THIS BOOK who *che_{wh}* it has read
 "THIS BOOK I wonder who read"
 b. * Me domando **chi** STO LIBRO *che* o gà leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} who THIS BOOK *che_{wh}* it has read
 c. ?? Me domando **chi** *che* STO LIBRO o gà leto
 Myself ask_{1PS} who *che_{wh}* THIS BOOK it has read

Conclusions (i)

In this presentation I showed that:

- as suggested by Kato (2013) for Brazilian Portuguese and Manzini (2014) for NIDs, "insituness" in Trevigiano and contemporary oral French is actually an instance of *IP*-internal wh-movement;
- the position targeted by "in situ" wh-phrases is the *Spec* of the focal projection of the *low* periphery (Belletti 2004), which I call **whP**;
- the absence of *IP*-internal wh-movement set *real* questions apart from non-real (echo, presupposed etc.) questions;
- *embedded insituness* is indeed possible, both in long distance and in indirect wh-questions - not only in TV, but also in many other Romance varieties;
- 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 - its head has two phonetic realizations, *se* and *che*;
- I proposed to explain the *se-che alternation* as *se* surfacing as *che* when crossed by wh-movement, thus being endowed with a [+WH] feature.

3. Insituness is not (always) Masked Wh-Movement to the LP

Poletto&Pollock (2000, and subsequent related works), Munaro et al (2001): insituness in French and North Italian dialects (NIDs): (masked) *overt* wh-movement to a low *left peripheral FP* + further computations including movement of the remnant-*IP* to dedicated projections in the *LP*.

These derivations do not predict a number of phenomena:

- (i) non sentence-final "in situ" wh-elements;
- (ii) insituness in long-distance environments; and
- (iii) insituness in indirect questions.

(i-iii), categorically excluded from the varieties on which the remnant-*IP* movement analysis is based, are actually attested in TV and other Romance varieties.

3.1 (Further) Evidence from Romance⁵

Non sentence-final insituness: oral French (Baunaz 2011) (39a), Spanish (Biezma, in press) (39b), and Lombard dialects (Comunuovese, CN, Donzelli, p.c.) (39c):

- (39) a. T'as mangé **quand** les frites? Oral French
You've eaten when the french.fries
"When did you eat the French fries?"
- b. ¿Y compraste {**cuándo**} la guitarra {**cuándo**}? Spanish
And bought_{2PS} when the guitar when
"And when did you buy the guitar?"

⁵ The alternation seen in French, TV and Lombard (Manzini&Savoia 2005;2011, Manzini 2014, Poletto&Pollock 2009;2015, Donzelli 2017) is not at play to the same extent in Spanish and Portuguese, yet the data from these languages are worth mentioning - the ability of grammar to license *insituness* is unrelated to the frequency thereof.

- c. Te vest {ndoe/ndoè} ol Gioan *{ndoe/ndoè}? CN
 You saw where the John *where
 "Where did you see John?"

Insituness in long distance questions: oral French (a.o. Obenauer 1994, Baunaz 2011, Tual 2017) (40a), Spanish (Etxepare&Uribe-Etxebarria 2005) (40b), Brazilian (Kato 2013) and European Portuguese (Pires&Taylor 2009) (40c), and Lombard (Manzini&Savoia 2005) (40d):

- (40) a. Il pense qu'elle a appelé **qui**? Oral French
 He thinks that'she has called who
 "Who does he think she called?"
 b. Juan dice que Maria compro eso ¿**dónde**? Spanish
 John says that Mary bought this where
 "When does John say Mary bought this?"
 c. O Bill acha que a Sue comprou **o qué**? EuPort
 The Bill thinks that the Sue bought what
 "What does Bill think that Sue bought?"
 d. Ta penset ke abje fatf **kohé**? Cologno
 You think that has done what
 "What do you think he did?"

Lombard dialects: insituness in indirect questions, both in the absence of an overt COMP (41a) and in embedded wh-doubling constructions (41b) (Manzini&Savoia 2005-2011):

- (41) a. Ore hai l'é ndatf **indoè** Cologno
 Want_{1PS} know he'has gone where
 "I want to know where he's gone"
 b. Di-m **m** i durmi **kumè** Civate
 Tell-me how you_{PL} sleep how
 "Tell me how you (guys) slept"

Also Spanish licenses indirect insituness (Etxepare&Uribe-Etxebarria 2005) (42):

- (42) Y Juan se pregunta si ha venido ¿**quien**? Spanish
 And John himself asks if has come who
 "Who is such that you don't know whether he came?"

In (43) *si* is a *regular* "if"-COMP, ≠ from the semantically void *se_{wh}* of TV. A(n although contested)⁶ counterpart of *se_{wh}* has been attested in European (Cheng&Rooryck 2000) and Brazilian Portuguese (Kato 2013) (22a) and in Belgian French (*BelgFR*, Boeckx et al. 2000) (43b):

- (43) a. O Joao perguntou *se* tu compraste **o qué**? BrazPort
 The John asked *se_{wh}* you bought what
 "John asked what you bought"
 b. Pierre a demandé *si* tu as vu **qui**? BelgFR
 Pierre has asked *se_{wh}* you have seen who

⁶ We have not been able to reproduce the data in (43) with our informants, yet the acceptability of these *very marginal* structures witnesses that: (i) a derivation via remnant-*IP* movement is indeed undesirable, and (ii) there might exist a low *FP* in indirect questions, whose head has a somewhat fragile phonological form.

3.2 French, as we actually speak it

3.2.1 *There is no remnant-IP movement in (oral) French*

No movement to the *LP* can be involved in the derivation of *oral* French insituness either (44):

- (44) a. Elle a dit {**quand**} qu'il l'a larguée {**quand**}? Oral FR
She has said when that'he her'has left when
"When did she say he left her?"
b. T'as décidé {**quand**} d'inviter Anne {**quand**}?
You've decided when of'invite Ann when
"When did you decide to invite Ann?"
c. C'est dur d'être accepté en these **avec quels sujets**?
It's hard of'be accepted in thesis with which subjects
"Which subjects are harder to get funds for?"

In 44, both the high and low interpretation are accessible. (45), where only the high interpretation is available, prove that the *wh*-phrase can be construed with the matrix *V* when it follows the clausal complement:

- (45) Il a avoué qu'il ne voulait pas l'épouser **quand**?
He has admitted that'he NEG wanted pas her'marry when
"When did he admit he actually didn't want to marry her?"

Further proof against a remnant-*IP* movement derivation in *oral* French comes from (46):

- (46) Chaque étudiant_i a déclaré **quand** qu'il_i avait été cambriolé?
Each student has declared when that'he had been burgled
"When did each student declare that he had been burgled?"

⇒ there must be c-command – impossible if remnant-*IP* movement was involved.

3.2.2 *Same Language, two Grammars*

French, distribution of insituness: substantial disagreement on the basic data. Embedded insituness: impossible or only felicitous in echo questions for some authors (a.o. Boeckx 1999, Cheng&Rooryck 2000, Mathieu 1999); perfectly fine in real questions for others (a.o. Obenauer 1994, Starke 2001, Etxepare&Uribe-Etxebarria 2005, Adli 2006, Baunaz 2011, Oiry 2011).

⇒ major problem: no reliable theoretical model can be built on uncertain empirical assumptions.

Baunaz (2011): two varieties of European French, *Standard Colloquial* (SC) and *Non Standard Colloquial French* (NSCF) - in NSCF, insituness is felicitous where the former excludes it categorically (Adli 2006, Starke 2001): long distance finite/non finite questions (47a-b), in the scope of negation (48) or modals (49), construed with quantifiers (50) and adverbs (51):

- (47) a. Tu crois que Jean a acheté **quel livre**? NSCF
You believe that John has bought which book
"Which book do you think John bought?"

- b. Tu penses que Jean va épouser **qui** finalement?
 You think that John go marry who eventually
 “Who do you think John will marry, eventually?”
- (48) Il n’a pas rencontré **qui**?
 He ne’has NEG met who
 “Who didn’t he meet?”
- (49) Il peut / doit aller **où**?
 He can / must go where
 “Where is he able to / must he go?”
- (50) Plusieurs personnes ont reconnu **qui**?
 Several people have recognized who
 “Who did several people recognize?”
- (51) Tu fais toujours **quoi** le weekend?
 You do always what the weekend
 “What do you always do at weekends?”

⇒ Insituness = oral phenomenon: it is capital to put aside standard French and focus on the *contemporary oral variety* ⇒ French clearly has (at least) two grammars!!
 ⇒ Manzini&Savoia (2005, talking of NIDs): closely-related languages (such as Venetan, or French) might have different grammars - when no major typological divide is at play, **microvariation** should be simply analysed as different settings of the same parameter.
 ⇒ French: the parameter distinguishing between insituness in embedded context in the oral contemporary variety and wh-fronting in standard (written) French is a very classical one between *scope construal* in the former and *overt scope* in the latter.

Conclusions (ii)

- a remnant-IP movement analysis (Poletto&Pollock 2000 and much related works) for insituness might not be desirable for all Romance varieties;
- for the varieties that allow for non-sentence final insituness and embedded insituness, the presence of a more economical, derivationally less complex IP-internal movement can be postulated⁷;
- it is capital to distinguish between standard (written) FR and the oral contemporary variety – whereas the former is compatible with a remnant-IP movement analysis, the latter is not.

⁷ In this, I am readapting Kato’s 2013 analysis of insituness in Brazilian Portuguese, and developing Manzini’s 2014 intuition concerning the possible derivation of insituness in NIDs.

References

- Abels, K. (2012) *Phases. An Essay on Cyclicity in Syntax*. Linguistische Arbeiten 543. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Adli, A. (2006). "French wh-in-situ questions and syntactic optionality: Evidence from three data types." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 25.
- Baunaz, L. (2011). *The Grammar of french Quantification*. Springer. Dordrecht.
- Belletti, A. (2004) "Aspects of the low IP area." In L. Rizzi (ed) *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Berthelot, F. (2017). *Movement of and out of subjects in French*. PhD Dissertation. Université de Genève.
- Biezma, M. (in press). "Givenness and the difference between wh-fronted and wh-in-situ questions in Spanish." *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*. John Benjamins.
- Bocci, G. (2007) "Criterial Positions and Left Periphery in Italian: Evidence for the Syntactic Encoding of Contrastive Focus." *Nanzan Linguistics: Special Issue*. Vol 1.
- Bocci, G. (2013) *The Syntax–Prosody Interface: A cartographic perspective with evidence from Italian*. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Boeck, C., Stateva, P. & Stepanov, A. (2000). "Optionality, Presupposition, and Wh-in Situ in French." *Romance Syntax, Semantics, and L2 Acquisition*.
- Boeckx, C. (1999). "Decomposing French questions." *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania.
- Bonan, C. (2018) [to appear] "On In-situness and (very) low Wh-Positions. The Case of Trevigiano." In C. Bonan, H. Jivanyan and M. Pallottino (eds) *GG@G. Generative Grammar in Geneva*. Université de Genève.
- Bošković, Ž. (2000) "Sometimes in [Spec CP], Sometimes in-situ". In R. Martin, D. Michaels & J. Uriagereka (eds) *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalism in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA. MIT Press, 53-88.
- Cheng, L. L.-S. & J. Rooryck (2000) "Licensing WH-in-situ". *Syntax* 3, 1-18.
- Cheng, L. L.-S. & J. Rooryck (2002) "Types of Wh-in-situ". Leiden University.
- Cinque, G. (1990) *Types of A'Dependencies*. MIT Press. Cambridge, Mass.
- Culicover, P. (1992) "Topicalization, inversion and complementizers in English." *OTS Working Papers*. In D. Delfitto (ed) *Going Romance and Beyond*. University of Utrecht. Utrecht.
- Donzelli, G. (2017). *Standard and Special Questions in Comunuovese*. RI 17.
- Etxepare, R. & Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (2005). "In-situ wh-phrases in Spanish: locality and quantification." *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes*.
- Kato, M. (2013). "Deriving "wh-in-situ" through movement in Brazilian Portuguese." *Information Structure and Agreement*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Krapova, I. & Cinque, G. (2013) *The Case for Genitive Case in Bulgarian, The Nominal Structure in Slavic and Beyond*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Manzini, M. R. & Savoia, E. M. (2005). *I Dialetti Italiani e Romanci*. Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Manzini, M. R. & Savoia, E. M. (2011). "Wh- in situ and wh-doubling in Northern Italian varieties: Against remnant movement." *Linguistic Analysis*.
- Manzini, M. R. (2014). "Grammatical categories: Strong and weak pronouns in Romance." *Lingua* 150. Elsevier.
- Mathieu, E. (1999) "French wh in situ and the intervention effect". *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11:441-472.
- Miyagawa, S. (2001). "The EPP, Scrambling, and wh-in-situ." In M. Kenstowicz (ed) *A Life in Language* Ken Hale. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Munaro, N. (1995) "On nominal wh-phrases in some North-Eastern Italian dialects". *RGG. Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 20:69-110.

- Munaro, N. (1999) "Sintagmi interrogativi nei dialetti settentrionali italiani." Padova: Unipress.
- Munaro, N., C. Poletto & J.-Y. Pollock (2001) "Eppur si muove! On comparing French and Bellunese wh-movement". In P. Pica & J. Roorick (eds) *Linguistic Variation Years*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 293-338.
- Obenauer, H.-G. (1994). *Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre. Effets d'intervention et mouvements des quantifieurs*. Université de Paris VIII. Unpublished PhD dissertation.
- Oiry, M. (2011). "A case of true optionality: Wh in situ patterns like long movement in French." *Linguistic Analysis* 37.
- Pesetsky, D. (1982) *Paths and Categories*. PhD Dissertation. MIT.
- Pires, A. & Taylor, H. L. (2009). "The syntax of wh-in-situ and common ground." In M. Elliot et al. (Eds.) CLS 43. The Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Poletto C., & Pollock J.-Y. (2009). "Another look at wh-questions in Romance." In L. Wentzel (ed.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*. John Benjamins.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. (2004) "On wh-clitics and wh-doubling in French and some North Eastern Italian Dialects". *Probus*, 16:241-277.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2000) "On the Left Periphery of Some Romance Wh-Questions". *The Structure of CP and IP*, Oxford. 251-296.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2005) "On wh-clitics, wh-doubling and apparent wh-in-situ in French and some North Eastern Italian dialects". *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes. L'architecture propositionnelle, la syntaxe de la périphérie gauche*.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2009) "Another look at wh-questions in Romance: the case of Medrisiotto and its consequences for the analysis of French wh-in-situ and embedded interrogatives". In L. Wentzel (ed) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance'*, volume 1. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 199-258.
- Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (2015) "Arguing for remnant movement in Romance". In G. Grewendorf (ed) *Remnant Movement*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Poletto, C. & L. Vannelli (1993) "Gli introduttori delle frasi interrogative nei dialetti italiani." In E. Banfi, G. Bonfadini & P. Cordin (eds) *Atti del Convegno Italia Settentrionale: Crocevia di Idiomi Romanzi*. Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen. 145-158.
- Poletto, C. (1993) "Subject Clitic-Verb Inversion in North Eastern Italian Dialects". *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. Rosenberg e Sellier, Torino.
- Poletto, C. (2000). *The Higher Functional Field. Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*, volume 1. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Rizzi, L. & G. Bocci (2016) "The Left Periphery of the Clause - Primarily illustrated for Italian". In *Blackwell Companion to Syntax, II Edition*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Rizzi, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery." In L. Haegeman (ed) *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer. Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, L. (2001). "On the Position Int(errogative) in the Left Periphery of the Clause." In Cinque G. & Salvi G.P. (eds) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax*. Amsterdam.
- Rizzi, L. (2004). "On the Cartography of Syntactic Structures." In L. Rizzi (ed) *The Structure of CP and IP, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Oxford.
- Rizzi, L. (forthcoming). "Uniqueness of left peripheral focus, "further explanation", and Int." In L. Bailey and M. Sheehan (eds) *Syntactic Order and Structure in Syntax*. Open Generative Syntax. Language Science press.
- Rizzi, L., & Shlonsky, U. (2007). "Strategies of subject extraction." In Gärtner, H.-M. & Sauerland, U. (Eds.) *Interfaces + Recursion = Language?* Mouton de Gruyter.
- Starke, M. (2001). *Move dissolves into merge: a theory of locality*. PhD dissertation.
- Tual, L. (2017) Long-distance wh-in-situ in French: an experimental study. RI 17.