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This work deals with the distribution and syntax of insituness in Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect. My main claim, supported by cross-linguistic data from Romance, is that insituness is actually an instance of IP-internal wh-movement. Here, I develop and provide proof in favour of Manzini’s 2014 intuition that “in situ” wh-words target a focal position at the edge of vP.

1. The Interrogative Syntax of Trevigiano

1.1 Subject-Clitic Inversion and the in situ-ex situ alternation

Subject-Clitic Inversion (SCI) is compulsory in genuine direct questions (1a-b):

(1) a. Ga-tu ca-tà cualchedun al marcà?
    "Did you meet someone at the market?"

b. * Te gà ca-tà cualchedun al marcà?
    "You have found someone at the market"

Wh-phrases can appear fronted or sentence-internally (2-3):

(2) a. Chi ga-tu ca-tà al marcà?
    "Who did you meet at the market?"

b. * Chi te gà ca-tà al marcà?
    "Who you have met at the market"

(3) a. Ga-tu ca-tà chi al marcà?
    "Who did you meet at the market?"

b. * Te ga ca-tà chi al marcà?
    "You 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?
    "Which professor has=she seen at the market"
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b. A-\text{ea} visto che profesor al marcà?  
Has=\text{she} seen what professor at.\text{the market}

The exact same patterns are predictably found in long-distance questions, where \text{SCI} is only performed in the matrix part of the sentence.

1.2 Similar, yet different from Bellunese and French

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

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(5)] a. \textbf{Ha-tu magnà che?}  
Have=\text{you} eaten what  
"What did you eat?"

b. * \textbf{Che ha-tu magnà?}  
What have=\text{you} eaten

\item[(6)] a. \textbf{Che libro ha-tu ledest?}  
What book have=\text{you} read  
"Which book did you read?"

b. * \textbf{Ha-tu ledest che libro?}  
Have=\text{you} read what book
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{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 \text{SCI} are \textit{NEVER} compatible (7):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(7)] a. * \textbf{As-tu mangé quand?}  
Have=\text{you} eaten when  
"When did you eat?"

b. \textbf{T'as mangé quand?}  
You'have eaten when
\end{enumerate}

1.2 Insituness in Trevigiano

\textbf{Word order in declaratives:} \textit{V} arguments $>$ \textit{ADJ}_{\text{time}} $>$ \textit{ADJ}_{\text{place}} (8):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(8)] a. Giani el gà magnà pomìDO jeri seraT al ristoranteP  
John he has eaten apples yesterday evening at.\text{the restaurant}  
"Yesterday evening, John ate apples at the restaurant"

b. ? Giani el gà magnà pomìDO al ristoranteP jeri seraT  
John he has eaten apples at.\text{the restaurant} yesterday evening

c. * Giani el gà magnà jeri seraT pomìDO al ristoranteP  
John he has eaten yesterday evening apples at.\text{the restaurant}

d. * Giani el gà magnà al ristoranteP pomìDO jeri seraT  
John he has eaten at.\text{the restaurant} apples yesterday evening

"In situ" wh-elements appear \textit{moved from the unmarked declarative position} (9a-c) - they follow the lexical \textit{V}:
(9) a. Ga-tu magnà **cuando** el dolce ___? 
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 dolce **cuando**? 
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 **chi** a tecia?  
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 dolce **cuando**?!  
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=you 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 cuando, 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 where # the Maria  
"Mary, where did you see?"

c. Ghe a ga-tu data a chi, a tecia?  
DAT it have=you given# 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.
a. Ghe o ga-tu regaeà quando, aa Maria, l'anel?

“The ring, when did you give to Maria?”

b. Ghe ga-tu regaeà quando *{aa Maria} l'anel {aa 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?

(13) ... [vP [FocP wh-phrase] [ Foc° [TopicP [ Top° [vP [ V° t° ]]]]]]

### 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

“Think I'll go to Toni's tonight”

b. Me domando sel ndarà da Toni doman

“Myself ask if=he goFUT at Toni tomorrow

“i wonder whether he'll go to Toni's tomorrow”

c. Penso che l'vae da Toni doman

“Think he'll go to Toni's tomorrow”

d. Quando pensi-tu che l'vae da Toni?

“When do you think he will go to Toni’s?”

**1.2.2 Insituness in indirect questions: the "if"-complementizer**

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 cossa

“Myself ask sewh you have eaten what

“I wonder what you ate”

b. A se domanda sel vegnarà quando

“She herself asks sewh=he comeFUT 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 therof and develops the analysis for IP-internaly 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.
Would$_{\text{IP}}$ know se$_{\text{wh}}$ yourselves meet where
“I wonder where you’ll be meeting”

⇒ Doesn’t give rise to a yes/no interpretation!

Even under se$_{\text{wh}}$, 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 **cuando** i pomi
   Myself ask se you have eaten when the apples
   “I wonder when you ate the apples”

b. A se domanda sel piantarà **dove** i persegheri
   She herself asks se=he plant$_{\text{FUT}}$ 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 tej ga magnà **cuando**, i pomi **RD**
   Myself ask se=them have eaten$_{\text{mascPL}}$ 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 **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

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

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 cuando ... [VP al marçà ___ ]]]?
   Are=you gone when to.the market
   "When did you go to the market?"

b. Ga-tu [IP posà [whP dove ... [VP i ocai ___ ]]]?
   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 eatFUT 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 ___?
   You’ve put when the bread in the cupboard
   "When did you put the bread in the cupboard?"

b. T’as mis le pain dans le placard quand?
   You’ve put the bread in the cupboard when
   "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 insituiness (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° upwards", as suggested in Kato (2013) for Brazilian Portuguese echo questions:

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

⇒ such analysis explains why and how SClI 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 SClI, 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\_yn / che\_yn.

1- Se\_yn and a topic like sto libro ("this book") (24, summarized in 25):

(24) a. [Sto libro], me domando \_se te o gà za let o 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 let o, [sto libro] Myself ask\_1PS \_se you it have already read this book
c. Me domando, [sto libro], \_se te o gà za let o Myself ask\_1PS this book \_se you it have already read
d. Me domando \_se, [sto libro], \_se te o gà za let o Myself ask\_1PS \_se this book you it have already read

(25) topic\_LeftD [CP topic ... se\_yn ... 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 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 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 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], \_se te 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\textsubscript{wh}, wh-element "ex situ" and a topic like \textit{sto libro} (28, summarized in 29):

(28) a. [Sto libro], me domando \textbf{dove} \textit{che} te o \textit{gà} leto
This book myself \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} where \textit{che}\textsubscript{wh} you it have read
"I wonder where you read this book"

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

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

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

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

(29) \textit{topic}\textsubscript{LeftD} [\textit{CP topic ... wh-phrase }\textit{?topic che}\textsubscript{wh} ... \textit{?topic / topic}\textsubscript{RightD}

4- \textbf{Surrounded by topics?} (30, summarized in 31):

(30) a. Me domando, [sto libro], \textit{se}, [jeri], te o \textit{gà} leto
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} this book \textit{se}\textsubscript{wh} yesterday you it have read
"I wonder if you read this book yesterday"

b. * Me domando, [sto libro], \textit{se}, [jeri], o \textit{gà} leto \textit{chi}
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} this book \textit{se}\textsubscript{wh} yesterday it has read who
"I wonder who read this book yesterday"

c. * Me domando, [sto libro], \textit{chi \it{che}}, [jeri], o \textit{gà} leto
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} this book who \textit{che}\textsubscript{wh} yesterday it has read

(31) [\textit{CP topic ... se}\textsubscript{wh} / *se\textsubscript{wh} / *che\textsubscript{wh} ... topic ]

5- \textbf{Co-occurrence with focus} (32-34, summarized in 35):

(32) a. Me domando \textit{se} \text{STO LIBRO} te ga leto (no staltro)
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} \text{THIS BOOK} \textit{se}\textsubscript{wh} you have read (not other)
"THIS BOOK I wonder if you read (not the other one)"

b. * Me domando \text{STO LIBRO} \textit{se} te ga leto (no staltro)
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} \text{THIS BOOK} \textit{se}\textsubscript{wh} you have read (not other)

(33) a. Me domando \text{STO LIBRO} \textit{se} o ga leto \textit{chi}
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} \text{THIS BOOK} \textit{se}\textsubscript{wh} it has read who
"THIS BOOK I wonder who read"

b. * Me domando \text{se} \text{STO LIBRO} o ga leto \textit{chi}
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} \text{THIS BOOK} \textit{se}\textsubscript{wh} it has read who

(34) a. Me domando \text{STO LIBRO} \textit{chi \it{che}} o gà leto
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} \text{THIS BOOK} who \textit{che}\textsubscript{wh} it has read
"THIS BOOK I wonder who read"

b. * Me domando \textit{chi} \text{STO LIBRO} \textit{che} o gà leto
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} who \text{THIS BOOK} \textit{che}\textsubscript{wh} it has read

c. ?? Me domando \textit{chi \it{che}} \text{STO LIBRO} o gà leto
Mysellf \textit{ask}\textsubscript{1PS} who \textit{che}\textsubscript{wh} \text{THIS BOOK} it has read
2.3 Making sense of the data

The distribution of the three COMPs with respect to topics and focus is summarized in (36):

(36) a. Topic > seyn > Focus > Topic
    b. Focus > Topic > sewh
    c. Focus > Topic > chewh

⇒ seyn is likely to realize Int°, as its Italian counterpart (Rizzi 2001).
⇒ sewh appears to occupy the head of a very low left peripheral projection: lower than the lowest TopP - and it is in complementary distribution with chewh.
⇒ the Spec of chewh seems to be a landing site for wh-movement, whereas that of sewh is clearly not.

Working question (iii): Could sewh and chewh head two different projections?

NO!! ⇒ theoretically undesirable:
➤ imagine se is there for locality reasons, and is inserted as a last resort operation to "save" the structure: why not simply move the wh-phrase, instead of projecting a FP?
➤ why isn’t che able to "save" the structure on its own?
➤ if che is selected by the V, and se "saves" the in situ structure, why can’t they appear together?

My proposal (i): sewh and chewh are two phonetic realizations of the same F°. The COMP of indirect questions surfaces either as sewh or as chewh (37):

(37) matrix V ... [ForceP(emb) Force° ... [FP sewh / chewh [FinP Fin° [IP I° ]]]][[...]]]

My proposal (ii): the alternation between sewh and chewh can (tentatively) be attributed to the presence/absence of a relevant wh-feature: as in the French que/qui alternation (Rizzi 1990, Rizzi & Shlonsky 2007, Berthelot 2017), sewh surfaces as che when it is crossed by wh-movement, when it is endowed with a [+WH] feature.

⇒ let us call the relevant wh-projection WhP, borrowing Rizzi’s terms (QembP in Rizzi & Bocci 2016) (38a-b):

(38) a. I wonder ... [ForceP ... [TopP Top° ... [WhP se [FinP Fin° [TP ... [whP wh-phrase[+WH] ... [VP < wh-phrase[+WH] > ]]]]]]]
    b. I wonder ... [ForceP ... [TopP Top° ... [WhP wh-phrase[+WH] che[+WH] [FinP Fin° [TP ... [whP < wh-phrase[+WH] > ... [VP < wh-phrase[+WH] > ]]]]]]]
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-çhe alternation as se surfacing as çhe 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 Romance\(^5\)

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?
   You've eaten when the french.fries
   "When did you eat the French fries?"

b. ¿Y compraste {cuándo} la guitarra {cuándo}?
   And bought\(_{PS}\) 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?"


(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 faʧ 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 ndaf’ indoè Cologno
Want1PS know he’has gone where
“I want to know where he’s gone”
b. Di-m m i durmi kumè Civate
Tell-me how youPL 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 has left when
   "When did she say he left her?"

   b. T'as décidé {quand} d'inviter Anne {quand}?
   You've decided when to invite Ann when
   "When did you decide to invite Ann?"

   c. C'est dur d'être accepté en these avec quels sujets?
   It is 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 didn’t want to 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, a déclaré quand qu'il, avait été cambriolé?
   Each student has declared when 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


   ⇒ 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 goes 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.
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