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GENERAL CONSENSUS (NORTHERN ITALIAN)

- Clause-internal wh-elements are moved;
- They move to the LP of the clause;
- The movement is masked by further computations (including movement of the remnant-IP);

Manzini & Savoia (2005;2011)
- Scope construals

The theory presented here challenges both.
**GENERAL CONSENSUS (INTERROGATIVE WH-MOVEMENT)**

*Common consensus:* the interrogative fronting of wh-elements results from a property borne by the wh-element.

Huang (1982):
- **English:** Spell-Out: ‘WHO did you see?’
- **Chinese:** Spell-Out: ‘Ni kanjian-le SHEI’ (you saw WHO)
- **LF:** ‘SHEI ni kanjian-le’ (WHO you saw)

Trevisan clause-internal movement of wh-elements argues that a covert/overt movement parameter is not enough.

---

**‘WH-TO-FOC’ (BONAN 2019;2021)**

‘Wh-to-Foc’ implements the periphery of vP in the derivation of ‘wh-in situ’ in answer-seeking interrogatives.

**Theoretical framework:**

- Aboh & Pfau (2011): wh-movement should be dissociated from interrogative force (wh-elements are not inherently interrogative – only required for the identification of the content of the question);
- Cable (2010): a model is required where wh-fronting is never triggered by properties of the wh-element, but rather targets the features of the Q-particle.

> The theory presented here blends and amends these two approaches.
THREE TYPES OF ‘WH-IN SITU’

TYPE 1: ‘PURE’

(1) Chinese (Huang 1982:253(159))
   a. Ni kanjian-le SHEI ?
      you see-asp who
      ‘WHO did you see?’
   b. * SHEI ni kanjian-le __ ?
      who you see-asp

TYPE 2: ‘OPTIONAL’

(2) French

a. Tu as vu qui ?
   you2PS have seen who
   ‘Who did you see?’

b. Qui tu as vu ?
   who you2PS have seen


TYPE 3: ‘FAKE’

(3) Trevisan (Bonan 2021)

dato te'ʧa___?
A Kl a to who the saucepan
DAT have=you2PS given

‘Who did you give the saucepan to?’

Very few mentions in the literature on Romance wh-in situ:
Kato (2003;2013)
Belletti (2006)
Manzini (2014)
Badan & Crocco (2021)
LOW MOVEMENT OF WH-ELEMENTS

Bonan (2019)
Bonan (2021)

«A TYPOLOGICALLY INTERESTING AND SIGNIFICANT TYPE» (Cheng & Bayer 2017)

- Type 1 (Old Japanese Nara period, Watanabe 2003 et Aldridge 2009; Ancient Chinese, Aldridge 2010, et alia);
WHAT TYPE OF MOVEMENT?


---

TREVISAN (BONAN 2019;2021)

(6) ge 'gatu 'dato A KI a teʧa ___ ?
   DAT have=you given to who the saucepan
   ‘Who did you give the saucepan to?’

(7) te ghe gà dato a teʧa A KI ?!
   you= DAT have given the saucepan to who
   ‘You gave the saucepan TO WHOM?!’

(8) A KI ghe gatu dato a teʧa ___ ?
   to who DAT have=you given the saucepan
   ‘TO WHOM did you give the saucepan?’

---

Exceptions:
- che (‘what’)
- parké (‘why’)

Bonan & Shlonsky (2021)
ACTIVE PAST PARTICIPLE > IO > DO

➢ Is IO > DO the base order in Trevisan?
➢ If not, is this ordering derived by moving the IO or the DO?

(9)

➢ How come the past participle surface higher than the DO?

(10) a. ghe go dato i pomi_DO a çsani_IO
    DAT have_1PS given the apples to John
    'I gave the apples to John'

    b. * ghe go dato a çsani_IO i pomi_DO
    DAT have_1PS given to John the apples

(11) a. go mañà çnoki_DO iËri serartiME a sagra_PLACE
    have_1PS eaten gnocchi yesterday night at festival
    'I ate gnocchi yesterday evening at the festival'

    b. ? go mañà çnoki_DO a sagra_PLACE iËri serartiME
    have_1PS eaten gnocchi a festival yesterday night

    c. * go mañà { iËri serartiME } { a sagra_PLACE } çnoki_DO
    have_1PS eaten yesterday night at festival gnocchi
(12) a. ghe gatu dato A KIIO i pomidO ?
   DAT have=you given to whom the apples
   'TO WHOM did you give the apples?'
   b. * ghe gatu dato i pomidO A KIIO ?
   DAT have=you given the apples to whom

(13) a. gatu mañà KWANDOwh-ADV ɲɔkiDO a sagraADV ?
   have=you eaten when gnocchi at festival
   'WHEN did you eat gnocchi at the festival?'
   b. * gatu mañà ɲɔkiDO a sagraADV KWANDOwh-ADV ?
   have=you eaten gnocchi at festival when

(14) ghe [i] gatu dati A KI, i pomidO ?
    DAT they=have=you givenM.PL to who # the apples
    'The apples, TO WHOM did you give (them) ?'
(15) a. *ghe gatu regaeà KWANDO aa marìa lanɛl ?

        DAT have=you gifted when to.the Mary the.ring

b. ghe gatu regaeà KWANDO lanɛl aa marìa ?

        DAT have=you gifted when the.ring to.the Mary

    ‘WHEN did you give Mary the ring?’

(16) a. ghe oj gatu regaeà KWANDO, aa marìa, lanɛlj ?

        DAT it= have=you_{2ps} gifted when # to.the Mary # the.ring

b. ghe oj gatu regaeà KWANDO, lanɛlj, aa marìa ?

        DAT it= have=you_{2ps} gifted when # the.ring # to.the Mary

    ‘The ring, KWANDO did you give (it) to Mary?’

‘Low’ focalisations in Italian are in situ.

The post-focal material can be:

- Marginalised (destressed in its base position) = c-command;
- Dislocated without clitic (destressed and realised in an internal-merge position) = no c-command.
(17) a. ghe go dato A ʤANI i pomį  IO > DO  
DAT have1ps given to John the apples  
‘It’s TO JOHN that I gave the apples’  
(Lit: ‘I gave TO JOHN the apples’)  

b. go maŋà JERI SERA ɲɔki ADV > DO  
have1ps eaten yesterday night gnocchi  
‘It’s YESTERDAY NIGHT I ate gnocchi’  
(Lit: ‘I ate YESTERDAY NIGHT gnocchi’)  

(18) a. ʤanil, ghe gà regaeà AL BʤA el so_i/? putinOt  
John=he DAT has gifted to.the boy the his doll  
‘John gave his doll TO THE BOY’  
(Lit: ‘John gave TO THE BOY his doll’)  

b. ghe gaeo, domandà A Klí el so_i/? putinot ?  
DAT has=he asked to who. the his doll  
‘TO WHOM did he ask his doll?’  
(Lit: ‘Did he ask TO WHOM his doll?’)
Marked Orders: Marginalisation? (IV)

Cinque (1999):
- ADVs are not adjuncts;
- they are located in the Specs of functional projections (FPs) within IP;
- in Italian, “(active) past participles must move to the head to the left of tutto ['all']”, along the lines of (20):

\[
\text{(20)}
\]

\begin{align*}
\text{FP2} & \quad \text{F2'} \\
\text{F2''} & \quad \text{mangiato} \\
\text{FP1} & \quad \text{tutto} \quad \text{tout} \quad \text{mangé}
\end{align*}
(21) a. a lo ga mañà tuto
    she= it has eaten all
  b. * a lo ga tuto mañà
    she= it has all eaten
  ‘She ate it all’

(22) a. a ga mañà ben el pometo
    she= has eaten well the applesauce
  b. * a ga ben mañà el pometo
    she= has well eaten the applesauce
  ‘She ate the applesauce well’

(23) F2'
    F2°
    FP1
    tuto
    mañà
(24) no gheo go [LAS mia dato tuto [vP ___ ]]!
    NEG DAT=it have NEG eaten all
    'I didn’t give it all to him!' 

(25) gheo gatu ... [FP2 dato ... [FP A KI F ... [vP ___ ]]][?]
    DAT=it have=you given to who
    'WHO did you give it to?'

(26) gheo gatu dato tuto A KI?
    DAT=it have=you given all to who
    'WHO did you give it all to?'

=> ‘Low’ wh-elements are in the periphery of vP (low Left Periphery, LLP).
THE 'FOCUS/WH-' PARALLEL

(28) A: so ke te ghe ga prestà el libro a Pjëro
   know1ps that you= DAT have lent the your book to Piero
   'I know that you lent your book to Piero'
B: ghe go prestà a TONI el libro ___ no a Pjëro
   DAT have1ps lent to Toni the book NEG to Piero
   'No, I lent the book TO TONI, not to Piero'
B': ? ghe go prestà el libro a TONI no a Pjëro
   DAT have1ps lent the book TO TONI NEG to Piero
**Contrastive Focus in Trevisan**

(29) $FP2 = AspP$

$$\begin{align*}
\text{F2}^0 & \quad \text{FP1} \\
\text{tuto} & \quad \text{LLP} \\
\text{vP} & \quad \text{el libro prestà A TONI}
\end{align*}$$

(31) a. Question: $\text{Ki} \ ze \ ke \ ze \ \text{rivà}?$

who is that arrived

‘WHO's arrived?’

b. Answer: $\text{ze \ rivà} \ \text{ʤANI} \ / \ \text{UN TOZATO}$

is arrived John / a young.man

Lit: ‘Arrived JOHN / A YOUNG MAN’

* $\text{ʤANI} \ / \ \text{UN TOZATO} \ ze \ \text{rivà}$

John / a young.man is arrived
(32) \[ FP2 = AspP \]
\[ F2^o \]
\[ FP1 \]
\[ (tuto) \]
\[ LLP \]
\[ vP \]
\[ \text{rivà} \]
\[ \text{dANI} \]

**INFORMATIONAL FOCUS IN TREVISAN (II)**

(33) a. Question: \[ \text{A KI ghe gatu dato i pomi?} \]
\[ \text{to who DAT have=you}_{2\text{PS}} \text{ given the apples} \]
\[ \text{‘TO WHOM did you give the apples’} \]

b. Answer: \[ \text{ghe go dato A dANI i pomi} \]
\[ \text{DAT have}_{1\text{PS}} \text{ given to John the apples} \]
\[ \text{Lit: ‘I gave TO JOHN the apples’} \]

**Informational focus is not ‘in situ’ in Trevisan;**

**Both the movement of foci and that of wh-elements targets SpecFoc (Belletti 2004), in the LLP.**
Horvath (1986): ‘whenever languages have a special position for contrastively-focused constituents, this should also be available for wh-elements’
FEATURES

Cable (2010), Aboh & Pfiau (2011): Question-particles are needed in wh-interrogatives + wh-needed for meaning (what C targets is Q).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wh-elements</th>
<th>Context of activation</th>
<th>[Output Effect]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[wh]</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[focus]</td>
<td>Interrogatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-particles carry [q] and do the clause-typing in wh-interrogatives.

CABLE (2010)

(35) PROJECTION of Q

= Q moves with the wh-element

(36) ADJOINED Q

= Q moves alone
TWO TYPES OF WH-IN SITU (CABLE’S)

1- Wh-in situ with projection of Q
   = like English, but ‘covert’ interrogative movement

(37)

2- Wh-in situ with adjunction of Q
   = wh-element in situ, Q moves alone

(38)
THE ‘THIRD TYPE’

First step: WH-TO-FOC (focus movement)

(40)

Second step: Q-to-Focus (interrogative movement)

‘INTERROGATIVE FEATURE SCATTERING’
(Bonan 2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[FOC]</th>
<th>[Q]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LLP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTENDING WH-TO-FOC

OLD JAPANESE

(42) a. [...] NANI-WO-ka-mo mikari-no hito-no ori-te kazasa-mu
    what-ACC-Q-GEN hike-GEN person-NOM pick-CONJ wear.on.the.hair-will
    ‘WHAT should hikers pick and wear on the hair?’

b. [...] IZUKU-YU-ka imo-ga iriki-te yume-ni mie-tsuru
    where-throught-Q wife-NOM enter-CONJ dream-LOC appear-PERF
    ‘FROM WHERE did my wife come and appear in my dream?’

(Watanabe 2003:182(5))

Evolution: wh-to-foc > wh-in situ.

ARCHAIC CHINESE

(44) a. qi zi YAN½ [vP wang ___]?  
3.Gen son where go  
"WHERE would their sons go?"

b. Wu SHE½ [vP qi ___]?  
I who deceive  
"WHO do I deceive?"

(Aldridge 2010:2(2))

Aldridge (2010): Archaic Chinese (Warren State Period, 5th-3rd BC): "position for interrogative and other focus constituents in the edge of vP".
Evolution: wh-to-foc > wh-in situ.

What about contrastive foci?

PRESENT-DAY CHINESE

(46) a. Lisi bu xihuan ZHEI BEN SHU
Lisi not like this CLAS book
b. * ZHEI BEN SHU Lisi bu xihuan
this CLAS book Lisi not like
‘Lisi does not like THIS BOOK’ (intended, for instance, not THAT BOOK)
(Badan 2015:28(10))
Aldridge (2010): Archaic chinese: focus moved to the 'periphery of \(vP\) = LLP.

The evolution of focus movement goes from \(\text{AGREE+MOVE}\) to \(\text{AGREE alone}\).
Wh-to-Foc has important consequences for the theory of ‘wh-in situ’ in NIDs (and more generally, Romance);

Wh-to-Foc also has consequences for the general theory of wh-in-situ (synchrony + diachrony), and makes NIDs more similar to Asian languages than we used to think (wh-to-foc vs simple focus agreement);

The status of wh-to-foc should be checked systematically when studying ‘wh-in situ’: observation of OIs, adverbs, of the surface position of foci;

A reconsideration of the role of the LLP in the derivation of wh-in situ is in order.
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