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**Structure of the talk**

1- Northern Italian Insituness. Classic derivations:

2- Northern Italian Insituness. Novel data:
   a. Trevigiano
   b. *IP-internal 'insituness'*

3- More than one variety, more than one type of 'insituness'

---

**Introduction**

Two types of **genuine** (as opposed to echoic) 'insituness':


(1) **Chinese** (adapted from Huang 1982, ex. 159-160, p. 253)

   a. Ni kanjian-le shei?
      you see-ASP who
       'Who did you see?'

   b. * Shei ni kanjian-le?
      who you see-ASP

   c. [[ shei ]], [ ni kanjian-le ti ]] wh-movement @ LF
      who you see-ASP

---

\(^1\) This work was fully supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation, project n° 156160, 'Optional Wh-in situ in French Interrogatives: Syntax and Prosody'.

(2) *Trevigiano*\(^2\) (Bonan 2018, ex. 5-6)

a. **Cossa** a-tu leto ____ ? wh-fronting $\rightarrow$ *pre-Spell Out movement*

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{what} \\
\text{have=you}_2\text{PS read}
\end{array}\]

‘What did you read?’

b. A-tu leto **cossa**? wh-in situ: moved? unmoved?

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{have=you}_2\text{PS read} \\
\text{what}
\end{array}\]


$\rightarrow$ The syntax of *optional insituness* varies greatly. Working hypothesis: maybe one unique derivation is not enough to account for all of the phenomena described in the literature.

1. *Northern Italian Insituness. Classic derivations*

Two major, conflicting treatments of ‘insituness’ in NIDs have been proposed over the years: *left peripheral* (fake) insituness (Munaro et al. 2001, Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015) (1.1) and (real) *argumental* insituness (Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011) (1.2).

1.1. Left peripheral ‘insituness’

Starting from Poletto & Pollock 2000 and Munaro et al. 2001, NI insituness has been claimed to be the result of (masked) movements to the LP (= *fake* ‘insituness’) (3-3 ‘):

(3) *Bellunese* (Poletto & Pollock 2000)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Ha-tu parecià che?} \\
\text{have=you}_2\text{PS prepared what}
\end{array}\]

‘What did you prepare?’

---

\(^2\) The variety of Trevigiano described throughout this paper, and more generally in my work, is a mixed *Destra Piave-Sinistra Piave* variety, more precisely the one spoken in the San Biagio di Callalta - Salgareda area.
(3') Input: [IP tu ha parecià che ]
   First step: [XP che, X° [IP tu ha parecià t_i ]]  
   Second step (oversimplified): [VP [IP tu ha parecià t_i ], Y° [XP che, X° t_j ]]  

Phenomena that push a treatment of 'in situ' wh-words of Bellunese-like languages as moved:

(i) Morphological similarity between French que (only fronted) and Bellunese che (only sentence-internal) + SClI (4-6).

(4) French que vs other non-D-linked wh-words
   a. Tu vas où?
      you2PS go where
      ‘Where are you going?’
   b. * Jean a acheté que?
      Jean has bought what
      ‘What did Jean buy?’

(5) Bellunese che (‘what’): only ‘in situ’
   a. Ha-tu magnà che?
      have=you2PS eaten what
      ‘What did you eat?’
   b. * Che ha-tu magnà?
      what have=you2PS eaten

(6) French que (‘what’): only fronted + SClI
   a. Qu’a-t-il acheté?
      what’has=t=he bought
      ‘What did he buy?’
   b. * Que il a acheté?
      what he has bought

Also: Bellunese-like languages license only non-D-linked wh-words sentence-internally (Munaro 1999) (7-7), French both non-D-linked and D-linked (8-8):
(7)  **Bellunese**: distribution of D-linked wh-words (Munaro 1999, ex. 1.2, p. 14)

a.  *Che vestito* à-tu sièlt?
    what dress have=you₂ps chosen
    'Which dress did you choose?'

b.  *À-tu sièlt che vestito?*
    Have=you₂ps chosen what dress

(7)  **Bellunese**: distribution of non-D-linked wh-words (adapted from Munaro 1999, ex. 1.56, p. 50)

a.  *Che à-tu parecià?*
    what have=you₂ps prepared
    'What did you prepare?'

b.  À-tu parecià che?
    have=you₂ps prepared what

(8)  **French**: distribution of D-linked wh-words

a.  Tu as lu **combien de livres**?
    you₂ps have read how many books
    'How many books did you read?'  (like Trevigiano!)

b.  **Combien de livres** est-ce que tu as lu?
    how many books est-ce que you₂ps have read

(8')  **Trevigiano**: distribution of non-D-linked wh-words

a.  Tu as lu **quoi**?
    you₂ps have read what
    'What did you read?'  (like Trevigiano!)

b.  Qu'est-ce que tu as lu?
    what est-ce que you₂ps have read

(ii)  Strong and weak *islands effects* (9):

(9)  **Bellunese** (Munaro 1999, ex. 1.105-1.107)

a.  *Te piase-lo [i libri che parla de che]?*  Complex-NP
    you like=it the books that speak of what
    'You like books about what?'
(iii) 'order of internal arguments' → clause-finality requirement (10):

(10)  
Bellunese (adapted from Poletto & Pollock 2015, ex. 2, p. 139)

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

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

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

(iv) 'insituness' is a root phenomenon (11):

(11)  
Bellunese (adapted from Munaro 1999, ex. 1.96&1.93)

a. À-tu dit [ che l'à sièlt *{che vestito}/(che) ]?
have=you2ps said that he'has chosen *what dress what
‘Which dress did you say he chose?’

b. No so [ (che) l'ha comprà *{che vestito}/*{che} ]
NEG know1ps (that) he'has bought *what dress *what
‘I don't know what he bought’

⇒ “[…] strings like Bellunese  A-tu magnà che? [have=you eaten what, ‘What did you eat?’] and French Tu as mangé quoi? [you have eaten what] are very misleading: both result from a conspiracy involving wh-movement and remnant IP movement. Neither language allow for ‘real’ in situ questions in which the wh-word would be standing in its argumental position.” (Poletto&Pollock 2015, p. 151)

This model does not predict (at least):

a. non sentence-final 'insituness';

b. embedded 'insituness';

c. island-contained 'insituness'.

→ However (a-c) are attested in Romance (see 2).
1.2. Argumental insituness

Starting from Manzini & Savoia 2005 (up to 2011), the remnant-IP movement hypothesis has been criticized for theory internal and data-related reasons.

Data-related arguments against a derivation involving movement of the remnant-IP:

(i) contrary to Bellunese, Lombard dialects show no sensitivity to islands in case of non-doubling insituness (12):

(12) *Grunellese* (Manzini & Savoia 2005, ex. 157, p. 587)

a. *De ch’i* di-g-ei che gé egnit i amis *de chì?* Subject island
say=them that is come the friends of whom
‘Whose friends do they say that came?’

b. *De* kòha ta pjah i liber ch’i pàrla de cohè? Relative island
you like the books that’they speak of what
‘What kind of books do you like?’

c. *Chì* l’è ndàʧ’ ivja hènha haludà *chi?* Adjunct island
he’is gone away without greeting who
‘Whom did he leave without greeting?’

!!!!! Interestingly, if the sentence internal wh-phrase is doubled by its left peripheral counterpart, island effects appear (12’):

(12’) *Grunellese* (Manzini & Savoia 2005, ex. 157, p. 587)

a. *De* ch’i di-g-ei che gé egnit i amis *de chì?* Subject island
of whom say=them that is come the friends of whom

b. *De* kòha ta pjah i liber ch’i pàrla de cohè? Relative island
of what you like the books that’they speak of what

c. *Chì* l’è ndàʧ’ ivja hènha haludà *chi?* Adjunct island
who he’is gone away without greeting who

(ii) insituness is NOT exclusively a root phenomenon – it is in fact widely attested in long distance (13) and in indirect questions (14):

---

3 The original examples are given in IPA. All transliteration errors are mine.
13. **Grumellese** (Manzini & Savoia 2005, ex. 155, p. 591)

   a. Krèdet che al hàbe indàʧ **indoè**?
      think<sub>2PS</sub> that he has<sub>SUBJ</sub> gone where
      ‘Where do you think he went?’

   b. (Kòha) pènhet che l’abe ṭʧ kòhè?
      (what) think<sub>1PS</sub> that he has<sub>SUBJ</sub> done what
      ‘What do you think he did?’


   a. Öle hai **indo** l’è ndàʧ **indoè**
      want<sub>1PS</sub> know where he’s gone (where)
      ‘I want to know where he went’

   b. Domànde-ga kòha l’a ṭʧ kòhè
      ask=him what he has done (what)
      ‘Ask him what he did’

(iii) no distributional asymmetry between D-linked and non-D-linked wh-words in Lombard;
(iv) no direct correlation between SCLI and ‘insituness’, both regular and of the wh-doubling types.

⇒ In NIDs, sentence internal wh-words are literally *in situ* (= in their argumental position).

This model correctly predicts:

- a. island-contained ‘insituness’;
- b. embedded ‘insituness’;

This model does not predict:

- c. moved ‘in situ’ wh-words;

⇒ However (c) is attested in Romance (see 2).

2. **Northern Italian Insituness. Novel data**

The phenomena that the classic derivations of ‘insituness’ discussed in section 1 fail to predict (non sentence-final ‘insituness’, embedded ‘insituness’, island-contained ‘insituness’) are actually attested in NIDs. Let us consider the case of *Trevigiano* (Bonan 2018;2019), discussed in (2.2).
2.1. Trevigiano

Bonan (2018; 2019): in Trevigiano, a Venetan dialect closely-related to Bellunese, sentence-internal wh-words need not appear at the right edge of the clause\(^4\) → they actually undergo *systematic* wh-movement from their unmarked declarative position to a position lower than the finite V (15):

\[\text{(15) Trevigiano (Bonan 2018)} \quad \text{(not attested in Lombard dialects by M&S)}\]

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. Ga-tu magnà \textbf{cuando} el dolse } \underline{\text{??}} \text{?} \\
\text{have=you eaten when the cake} \\
\text{‘When did you eat the cake?’} \\
\text{b. * Ga-tu magnà el dolse \underline{\text{cuando}}?} \\
\text{have=you eaten the cake when} \\
\end{array}\]

Also, in Trevigiano ‘insituness’ is indeed possible in long-distance (16a) and in indirect wh-questions (16b), the latter under a semantically vacuous *if-COMP*\(^5\), *se*:

\[\text{(16) Trevigiano (Bonan 2018)}\]

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. Pens-\textit{ea} chel ne ciamarà \textbf{cuando}?} \\
\text{thinks=she that=he us call_{FUT} when} \\
\text{‘When does she think he will call us?’} \\
\text{b. A vol \textit{volver} se\textit{l} ne ciamarà \textbf{cuando}} \\
\text{she wants know se_{WH}=he us call_{FUT} when} \\
\text{‘She wonders when he will call us’} \\
\end{array}\]

\\[\\text{!!!! IP-internal wh-movement (see 15) is compulsory also in embedded environments (17):}\\\\]

\[\text{(17) Trevigiano (Bonan 2018)}\]

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. Pensi-tu che a voje metar \textbf{dove} i piteri } \underline{\text{??}} \text{?} \\
\text{think=you that she want_{SUBJ} put where the vases} \\
\text{‘Where do you think she wants to put the vases?’} \\
\end{array}\]

\(\text{[4] The DO \textit{el dolse} in (15a) is NOT left dislocated. In Bonan (2018), I show that in Trevigiano dislocations are only possible in costruction with clitic resumption, and that marginalization (in the sense of Cardinaletti 2001 and 2002, Samek-Lodovici 2015) are excluded categorically.}\\
\(\text{[5] See Bonan (2019) on the possibility of treating } se \text{ as an instance of embedded wh-doubling of the invariable operator-wh word type à la Poletto & Pollock (2015).}\\\)
b. A se domanda se l'piantarà dove i persegheri ___

she herself asks se he plant in situ where the peach. trees

‘She wonders where he’ll plant the peach trees’

Bonan (2019): contrary to Bellunese (Munaro 1999), in Trevigiano, ‘in situ’ wh-words are fine both inside of weak (18) and strong (19) islands:

(18) **Trevigiano: Weak islands** (Bonan 2019)

a. *Wh-island*

No te te ricordi [ se vemo comprà cossa ]?  
NEG you yourself remember if have 1PP bought what

‘What is it that you don’t remember whether we bought?’

b. *Negative island*

No te vol ‘ndar dove?  
NEG you want go where

‘Where is it that you don't want to go?’

(19) **Trevigiano: Strong islands** (Bonan 2019)

a. *Subject island*

I te gà dito che [ i clienti de chi ] no i a pagà?  
they to.you have said that the clients of whom NEG they have paid

‘Whose clients are said to have left without paying?’

b. *Complex-NP island*

Te gà comprà [ un porsel che peza quanto ]?  
you have bought a pig that weights how much

‘How big a pig did you buy?’

2.2 IP-internal wh-movement

My proposal(s) (Bonan 2018):

- whatever the reasons, Trevigiano clearly derives 'insituanness' differently from Bellunese;
- in Trevigiano, “in situ” wh-words undergo IP-internal wh-movement → Building on Kato (2013) treatment of Brazilian Portuguese sentence-internal wh-words and on Manzini’s (2014) intuition about NIDs → they target a focal position in vP, the one that was called FocP in Belletti (2004). I call it whP (“little whP”) (20-20):
(20) IP-internal wh-movement (Bonan 2018, ex. 25)

a. Si-tu [IP ndà [whP **cùndo** ... [VP al marcà ____ ]]]?

↑________________________

‘When did you go to the market?’

b. Ga-tu [IP posà [whP **dove** ... [VP i ociai ____ ]]]?

↑________________________

‘Where did you put the glasses?’

(20’) Position of whP inside vP (Bonan 2018, ex. 27)

… [vP [whP/FixedP **wh-phrase** [wh° [TopicP [Top° [vP [v° ____ ]]]]]]]

↑__________________________________________|

My proposal(s) (Bonan 2019):

➢ the (un)availability of long distance ‘insituness’ depends on the wh-projection that is exploited in the derivation thereof (left peripheral vs. IP-internal);
➢ the (un)availability of indirect ‘insituness’ depends on the presence of an *if*-COMP like seWh, which in turn seems linked to the necessity for indirect questions to be introduced by an overt COMP (or wh-doubling, see Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011) ⇒ sets languages like Trevigiano and French apart (21-22):

(21) **Trevigiano** – Indirect questions

a. El vol saver **cùndo** che te parti

he wants know when that you leave

‘He wants to know when you’re leaving’

b. El vol saver se te parti **cùndo**

he wants know se you leave when

(22) **French** – Indirect questions

a. Il veut savoir quand (**que**) tu pars

he wants know when *that* you leave

b. * Il veut savoir tu pars quand

he wants know you leave when

c. * Il veut savoir si/que tu pars quand (but see Boeckx et al 2000)

he wants know si/que you leave when
Conclusions: More than one variety, more than one type of 'insituness'

- the degree of morpho-syntactic variation observed in Northern Italian insituness is great (doubling / non-doubling insituness; presence / absence of SClI; compatibility with islands, embedded environments; presence / absence of IP-internal wh-movement, etc.);
- the degree of variation is even larger if one looks at Romance varieties spoken outside of Italy: how to explain French? (also: why is 'insituness' possible, yet rare in Spanish and Portuguese?)
- it is rather utopic to pursue a one-fits-all derivation.

To summarize:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellunese-like languages</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;S’s Lombard dialects</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevigiano-like languages</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ (se\textsubscript{wh})</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is it plausible to posit that different wh-words target different wh-projections? **YES.**

- NIDs: wh-doubling constructions: the relative order between doubling wh-elements is rigidly fixed (see Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015, Manzini & Savoia 2005;2011, a.o.)!!
- Lombard varieties described by Manzini & Savoia and Trevigiano allow for D-linked wh-words sentence-externally, Bellunese-like varieties do no: could this be due to the wh-projection(s) targeted by 'in situ' wh-words?
- The Comunnauvese data (Donzelli 2017;2018) clearly show that different wh-words have different distributional properties, not only cross-linguistically but also language-internally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-languages (CN)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ (é-type)</td>
<td>√ (basic-type)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My proposal:

Contra (Poletto & Pollock 2000-2015) and Manzini & Savoia (2005;2011), I argue against the possibility of positing a one-fits-all derivation for 'insituness' in NIDs (and more generally, Romance).

→ the wide range of morpho-syntactic variation is better explained if one considers 'insituness' to be the result of:

(i) the wh-projections available as landing sites for 'insituness' in each language;
(ii) the type(s) of wh-words that each language has at its disposal\(^6\).

→ the reasons behind the remaining, unexplained differences will have to be looked for at the *Interfaces* (see French and the puzzling lack of SClI, for example).

---

\(^6\) That language-specific inherent properties of wh-words might play a role in their distribution (= the position they target) has already been convincingly proven in Lee (1991) and Finer (2014) – they discuss Korean-English codeswitching data suggesting that wh-words in code-switched sentences maintain the same distributional properties as in the original language.
I will leave the discussion of the WHYs and HOWs of everything seen throughout this work for my PhD dissertation.
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