Clause internal or fronted? The syntax and pragmatics of wh-words in Valdôtain Patois Luisa Seguin, University of Maryland

It is widely assumed that wh-words and Contrastive Foci (CF) target the same position, both in the high and low peripheries (Rizzi & Bocci, 2017, Bonan, 2019; Kahnemuyipour, 2001). Such an approach is motivated by the complementary distribution of wh-words and CF in the High Left Periphery (HLP) across Romance languages (Rizzi & Bocci, 2017). In this paper, I use evidence from Franco-Provençal Valdôtain (FPV), or Valdôtain Patois (Glottolog: vall1249), to argue for a more nuanced approach. *On the empirical plane*, I show that (i) FPV wh-words move to an operator position at the edge of the vP phase, then overtly to the highest A'-position and that (ii) wh-words are compatible with CF clause-internally, but not in the high periphery. *On the theoretical plane*, I argue that (i) wh-words and CF do not target the same position and that (ii) the inner structure of the peripheries differs.

Data. FPV is an Arpitan language spoken in the northern Italian region Aosta Valley (the data in this paper come from the variety spoken in the village Morgex), with an unmarked argument order DO>IO (1). All wh-words (except *perqué* 'why') can occur in two positions: fronted (FWh), (2a), and clause-internal (IWh), (2b). Both options differ from echo questions (2c) in terms of prosody and linear order. Topics can freely co-occur with both types of wh-words, (3). Contrastive Focus (CF) can co-occur with IWhs (4a), but not with FWhs (4b,c).

(1)	Dz'ì	baillà lo livro à Marco.			
	1SG'have.1SG	given the book to Marco			
	'I have given the book to Marco.'				

- (2) a. À qui t'à baillà lo livro?
 b. T'à baillà à qui lo livro?
 'To whom did you give the book?'
- (3) a. *À Marco* quan te 'lli predze? To Marco when 2SG CL.DAT speak 'When will you speak to Marco?'
- (4) a. Te predze quan À MARCO, pò à Luca?b. *À MARCO quan te predze, pò à Luca?
- c. T'à baillà lo livro À QUI?'You gave the book to WHOM?'
- b. Te 'lli predze quan à Marco?
- c. *Quan À MARCO te predze, pò à Luca? 'When do you speak to Marco, no to Luca?'

IWhs and the structure of the Low Left Periphery (LLP). The following arguments show that the IWh in (2b) has moved from its base position: (i) the order of arguments; (ii) crossover effects, (iii) parasitic gaps, (6), and (iv) lack of intervention effects (not shown here for space reasons). (i) Since the unmarked order of arguments is DO>IO (1), the IO>DO order in (2b) indicates that the IWh has moved. (ii) In 0, \hat{a} qui 'to whom' induces a crossover effect if coindexed with the possessive *son*.

- (5) *T'à baillà $[\hat{a} qui_j]_i$ son_j livro t_i ?
- 'To whom you gave his book?'

(6)	T'à	pensò que	dze	couegnissao	qui	[sensa	demandé <i>pg</i>]]?
	2SG'have	thought what	1SG	know	whom	[without	asking]?
	'Who did you think I knew without asking?'						

The IWh's landing position is relatively low; in particular, it must follow low manner adverbs like *bien* 'well':

(7) a.	Те	soun-e	bien	dequé	à	l'organeun?
	You	play-2SG	well	what	to	the-accordion
	What do you play well with the accordion?'					
b.	*Te se	oune dequé bier	<i>i</i> à l'organe	eun?		

This result suggests that the left periphery of the vP (LLP) in FPV has an elaborate structural layering, which is consistent with several proposals concerning LLP structure and its parallels to

the structure of the CP (Belletti, 2004; Bonan, 2019; Kahnemuyipour, 2001; Poletto 2014, a.o.). In the LLP, the highest A'-position is an operator position, purely targeted by wh-words. This whP is followed by freely adjoining topics (8). The position of the whP is crucial: it is the demarcation of the lower-phase edge, parallel to ForceP in the HLP (Rizzi & Bocci, 2017).

(8) a. Te lo baille [Op quan] [Top lo livro] à Marco?
When do you give the book to Marco?
b. *Te lo baille [Top lo livro] [Op quan] à Marco?

Contrastive focus can co-occur with an IWh. The order is again fixed: IWh-(Top)-CF-(Top):

(9) a. Te lo baille quan lo livro À MARCO deman?b. *Te lo baille À MARCO quan lo livro deman?When do you give the book to Marco tomorrow?'

Crossover effects show that the CF constituent also undergoes A'-movement:

(10) a. Te baille quan son_i livro À MARCO_i?
When do you give to Macro his book?'
b. *Te baille quan À MARCO_i son_i livro?

For several reasons, IWh and CF cannot be analyzed as multiple specifiers of FocP (*pace* the Attract-All-F account, Bošković, 2022): (i) as it will be shown in the talk, FPV disallows multiple wh-words; (ii) the order is strictly wh > CF; (iii) topic phrases can intersperse, cf. 0. Thus, IWh and CF target separate positions, with CF targeting a lower A'-position inside the LLP.

FWh and the structure of the High Left Periphery (HLP). I then show that, despite their acceptability inside islands, IWhs overtly move further up to a wh-position in the HLP. Evidence for this movement comes from (i) the lack of intervention effects (IEs); (ii) inverse scope; (iii) binding (all presented in the talk), and (iv) parasitic gaps (6). PGs can only be licensed by overt A'-movement to a high position, where they can take wide scope (Nunes, 2004). As I will outline in the talk, the Lebeaux, or reconstruction, effect (Lebeaux 1988; Fox, 1999) in (11) supports a successive-cyclic movement analysis of the wh-word, transiting through the LLP (12), Finally, I will show that such position is not a mere phase escape hatch, but a dedicated wh-position.

- (11) [Quinta fotografie que l_j 'à fà à Ivana_k]_i tsaque garcon_j l'à stampò t_i [_{vP} per llie_k t_i]? Which picture that 3SG'has made to Ivana every boy 3SG'has printed for her 'Which photo that he has made Ivana every boy has printed for her?'
- (12) ([TopP]) [whP **XPi** ([TopP]) [TP ... [whP **XPi** ([TopP]) [FocP] ([TopP]) [vP...]]]

The different word orders, as in (2a-b), are obtained by deletion of different copies at PF (Bošković, 2011), hence the amelioration of island effects discussed in the talk. The mutual exclusivity of FWhs and CF in the HLP (4b-c) suggests that, as opposed to the LLP, in the HLP wh-words and CF target the same position, lower than the phase edge (12), as Topics can precede it (3a). While a definitive explanation of this asymmetry between the HLP and LLP in FPV is outstanding, in the talk I will discuss possible analyses, including one ascribing the mutual exclusivity to post-syntactic constraints.

In summary, this paper presents evidence that: (i) FPV IWhs move to a dedicated wh-position at the edge of the LLP, whereas CF target a lower position in the LLP; (ii) Whs successive-cyclically move further up, to an wh-position in the HLP, then different copies can be deleted at PF (lower copy deletion: FWh; higher copy deletion: IWh); (iii) peripheries differ structurally: in the LLP the wh-positions is at the periphery's edge, while in the HLP it can be preceded by other A' elements, e.g. Topics.

Selected references: Belletti, A. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area, in Rizzi (ed) The Structure of IP and CP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures OUP; **Bonan, C.** 2019. On clause-internally moved wh-phrases. Wh-to-Foc, nominative clitics, and the theory of Northern Italian wh-in situ, PhD Diss; **Boškovič, Z**. 2011. Rescue by PF Deletion, Traces as (Non)interveners, and the That-Trace Effect, LI 42(1): 1-44; **Fox**, D. 1999. Reconstruction, Binding Theory and the Interpretation of Chains. Linguistic Inquiry 30(2). 157–196; **Lebeaux, D.** 1988. Language acquisition and the form of grammar. Ph.D. Diss; **Rizzi, L. & G. Bocci**. 2017. Left Periphery of the Clause; Primarily Illustrated for Italian, In Everaert M. & H. C. van Riemsdijk (Eds.) The Wiley.