We argue that English and Portuguese, which have been assumed to have distinct syntax for wh-in-situ, in fact share significant properties regarding this phenomenon. We present various contexts beyond echo-questions in which a wh-phrase can stay in-situ in questions with a single wh-phrase (single wh-questions) both in (Brazilian) Portuguese and English. We argue that single wh-questions can have the wh-phrase in-situ, provided that semantic and pragmatic requirements we define in terms of Common Ground (Stalnaker 1978, 2002) are satisfied. This restricts the possibility of free optionality for wh-in-situ questions in both languages. We propose a minimalist analysis in which a null complementizer with [+wh, +Q] features is inserted in these single wh-in-situ questions and requires neither overt nor covert movement, as shown by the fact that these wh-in-situ cases can evade island violations and different intervention effects, contrary to what has been observed for instance for French wh-in-situ questions.

This is part of a larger project on the investigation of wh-in-situ questions. Here we provide evidence for the existence of wh-in-situ in various questions with a single wh-phrase in English, beyond echo-questions. Second, we show similar properties for in-situ questions in (Brazilian) Portuguese. Third, we propose a minimalist analysis that explains the existence of wh-in-situ in these languages, taking into account properties of syntax-semantics (and pragmatics) interface and the architecture of the grammar.

---
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English has been standardly argued to have a null [+wh, +Q] Complementizer that requires overt movement of at least one wh-phrase to Spec, CP. We argue that this is only one of two distinct instances of a [+wh, +Q] C both in Portuguese and in English. We argue that another instance of such a null Complementizer exists in questions with a single wh-in-situ, but they have to satisfy a Common Ground (CG) requirement we make explicit below (thus, we refer to it as a CG complementizer). We provide evidence that this CG complementizer does not have any features that drive wh-movement, allowing the wh-phrase to stay in-situ, overtly and covertly. The CG null complementizer can be encoded as having a ‘weak’ [+Wh] feature (or as lacking an EPP-requirement that would force a wh-phrase to raise overtly) (Chomsky 2001). That is, there is neither overt nor covert movement involved, allowing the wh-phrase to stay in situ.

1 The standard view

Wh-fronting of at least one wh-phrase in a wh-question has been argued to be obligatory in English and assumed to be optional in simple (1) and successive-cyclic wh-questions (2), in so-called ‘optional wh-in-situ languages’, such as Portuguese.

(1) a. What did Bill buy what?
   b. O que o Bill comprou o que? (Portuguese, wh-fronting)
   c. O Bill comprou o quê? (Portuguese, wh-in-situ)

(2) a. What does Bill think Sue bought what?
   b. O que o Bill acha que a Sue comprou o quê?
   c. O Bill acha que a Sue comprou o quê?

The only standardly accepted exception to this generalization is echo questions (echo-Qs), which are canonically (but not obligatorily) in-situ in these languages (3) (capitals such as A and B identify different speakers in a discourse, in the examples that follow).

(3) A: Mary ate a skunk. B: Mary ate WHAT ↑ ? Echo
   A: A Maria comeu um gambá. B: A Maria comeu O QUE ↑ ? Echo

2 New data

However, we argue that under specific discourse-pragmatic conditions a range of new cases demonstrate that the overt wh-movement requirement in English can be violated, as it is in Portuguese, by the existence of wh-in-situ counterparts placed under specific discourse-pragmatic conditions. We propose a

---

2 The examples that follow are from Brazilian Portuguese, unless otherwise indicated.
minimalist account of these wh-in-situ cases that encodes features relevant for the CI-interface can also restrict free optionality in wh-in-situ languages such as Portuguese. Finally, an I-language explanation requires that we encode in the syntax of wh-in-situ questions features that can also contribute to the satisfaction of specific interface (discourse-pragmatic) conditions imposed upon both languages, also given their effects for PF (e.g. wh-in-situ as opposed to overt wh-movement).

B’s utterances in (5b)-(9b), in answer to (a), show that wh-in-situ is grammatical in English. They match in-situ counterparts in Portuguese ((5c)-(9c) examples, from Brazilian Portuguese, henceforth BP). The wh-in-situ cases in (5)-(9) (speaker B’s utterances) are NOT echo-Qs. Echo-Qs have been taken to have certain properties that are not systematically found here:

(4) (i) Echo-Qs have been to be non-interrogative (e.g. Ambar 2000, Ambar and Veloso 2001), an assumption we do not make.
(ii) They require an immediately prior antecedent that matches certain features of the echo question. E.g. given the use of who and what, at least features such as [+human, -animate] have to be matched by the antecedent.
(iii) have a wh-phrase that receives rising intonation and focal stress (capitalized in (3)).

(5)-(9) all lack focal stress and partially differ from echo-Qs regarding intonation and discourse-pragmatic conditions.

Among the single wh-in-situ questions we present, [+specific]Qs (5) request more specific information about something mentioned immediately prior. Regarding feature-match, [+specific Qs] are similar to echo-questions, but they are different regarding intonation and focal stress.

   b. B: You made [what \uparrow kind of desserts↓ ]  ? [+Specific] Q
   c. B: Você fez [que \uparrow tipo de sobremesa↓ ] ?
   d. B: [Que tipo de sobremesa], você fez e? (overt wh-movement)

Expect-Qs (6) occur when further questioning for new information is expected, as in legal questioning.
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(6)  
   a. B. Attorney: Tell me what happened on January 1st, 2005 at 4 pm
   B.  
   Você pode dizer o que aconteceu no dia 1º de janeiro de 2005, às 4 da tarde.
   A. Defendant: I was driving along Andrews Avenue.
   Eu estava dirigindo na Avenida dos Andradas.
   b. B. Attorney: And you were driving which ↑ direction↓? Expect-Q
   c. B:  
   E você estava dirigindo em que↑ direção↓?
   A. Defendant: I was headed south, towards the library.
   Eu estava indo para o sul, na direção da biblioteca.
   d. B. Attorney: And the police officer said you were traveling about how fast?
   e. B:  
   E o policial disse que você estava dirigindo a quê velocidade?

Another example of Expect-Q below exemplifies this where Speaker A is a bakery employee giving the manager (Speaker B) the daily report of the business’s activities:

(7)  
   a. A [employee]: I made many different kinds of desserts.
   b. B [manager]: So, you made [how many cookies↓]?  Expect-Q
   c. B:  
   (E) você fez [quanto biscoitos↓]?  
   d. (E) [Quantos biscoitos↓] você fez e↓?  (overt mvmt)

Ref-Qs (Reference-questions) (8), originally presented by Wachowicz (1974, 1975), ask for a paraphrase or repetition of an immediately prior antecedent. Ginzberg & Sag (2001) present Ref-Qs as a type of echo-Qs (3), whereas we will argue that both types of questions are subsumed under a more general category of in-situ questions.

(8)  
   a. A: I did not sell those strange pictures.
   A: Eu não vendi aquelas pinturas estranhas.
   b. B: You didn’t sell what ↑ ↓ strange pictures↓?  Ref-Q
   c. B:  
   Você não vendeu que ↑↓ pinturas estranhas↓?
   d. [Que pinturas estranhas↓], você não vendeu↓ e↓?
   e. B: You didn’t sell what ↑ ↓ strange pictures↓?  Ref-Q

Finally, a wh-in-situ question can be asked provided certain properties of the extra-linguistic context make the question felicitous, as in (9):

(9)  
   a. B sees his friend reading something: (extra-linguistic common ground)
   b. B: You’re reading what?
   c. B:  
   Você (es)tá lendo o quê?
   d. [O que↓], você está lendo e↓?
Except for echo-Q and Ref-Qs, these data were not investigated in detail before, especially in connection with the existence of overt wh-movement in these languages. For all these constructions, wh-fronting is also possible, sometimes with a special intonation, but as the result of the general acceptability of overt wh-movement, both in English (not shown above) and Portuguese: (5d) and (7d)-(9d)).

3 Semantics: common ground

(5)-(9) clearly show that interrogative questions permit a sole wh-phrase to remain in-situ, beyond contexts of echo-questions. We argue that, in both Brazilian Portuguese and English wh-in-situ questions (including echo-Qs) do request information, thus a non-interrogative analysis (even for echo-questions) is inaccurate. This is also supported by optional overt movement even in echo-Qs, a possibility found in regular questions.4

(10) a. A: Mary ate a skunk.
   A: *Maria comeu um gambá.
   b. B: Mary ate WHAT ↑ ?  Echo-Q
   c. B: *Maria comeu O QUÊ↑ ?  Echo-Q

Crucially, we argue wh-in-situ in single wh-questions requires specific discourse-pragmatic conditions in English and in Brazilian Portuguese. We propose that the different types of wh-in-situ questions in (5)-(9) ([+specific]Qs, Expect-Qs, Ref-Qs) and Echo-Qs in (3) are special in that the set of possible answers to them is part of the Common Ground (CG) (Stalnaker 1978, 2002, see also Schwarzchild 1999 and Gunlagson 2003 for yes/no Qs).

As we discuss below, Common Ground can be defined as information that was previously given in the discourse or in the extralinguistic context (9), and which is shared (or assumed by the speaker to be shared) by speaker and hearer.

Stalnaker (1978) defines two core terms– proposition and speaker presupposition. A proposition is anything with a truth value: “propositions are functions from possible worlds to truth values”, or “a proposition is a rule for determining a truth value as a function of the facts – of the way the world is.” These propositions shape what is commonly believed by all members of the

3 The literature that focuses on wh-in-situ in English (e.g. Aoun & Li 1993, Pesetsky 1987, 2000 Reinhart 1998) considers wh-in-situ only in multiple questions (in which the in-situ wh-phrases can, but do not have to satisfy same semantic-pragmatic conditions we investigate here). Tom Wasow (p.c. 2007) kindly pointed out to us that Postal (1972) had discussed cases similar to ours, and indeed they turn out to be examples of Expect-Qs like (6), which Postal refers to as Legalistic Question Clauses, in the context of an investigation about pronominal binding. Reglero 2005 makes brief reference to the possibility of in-situ single wh-questions in English, although her focus is on prosodic constraints on wh-in-situ questions in Spanish.
4 Sobin 1990 also argues in detail that echo-questions are interrogatives, and also deals with echo-questions that involve overt-movement.
discourse. (p. 149). Regarding presuppositions, he states that “Roughly speaking, the presuppositions of a speaker are the propositions whose truth he takes for granted as part of the background of the conversation.”

(11) “Presuppositions are what is taken by the speaker to be the common ground of the participants of the conversation, what is treated as their common knowledge or mutual knowledge.” (Stalnaker 1978:704)

Given the proposal developed here, we argue that wh-in situ in English and Brazilian Portuguese (in the more restrictive dialect we are considering) is possible when the information being requested is expected (by the speaker) to be part of the CG. One prediction of this analysis is that wh-in-situ, in the contexts in which it is syntactically possible, is not freely optional in Portuguese, contrary to what has been standardly assumed.

According to our analysis, wh-in-situ has to satisfy the CG conditions above, in both English and BP: The in-situ questions in (15a,b) are infelicitous in the context:

(15) Você aborda um colega de trabalho e pergunta, de sopetão:
You approach a colleague at work and ask, out of the blue:
  a. B: #Você conhece quem em São Paulo?
  b. B: # You know who in Sao Paolo?

3.1 Partial difference between English and Portuguese

We already pointed out that there is apparently more variation in Brazilian Portuguese regarding the restrictions on wh-in-situ. The data suggest that even though the wh-in-situ clauses have to be licensed in the context, Portuguese is less restrictive than English in the licensing of wh-in-situ in at least one respect.

Given the BP example in (16a), we can conclude that certain which-type questions are possible as “out-of-the-blue” wh-in-situ questions, under the assumption that their use alone is enough to establish the CG. However, English is more restricted in this respect, as shown by the infelicity of (16b).

(16) a. B: (out-of-the-blue): Anna, você está assistindo qual programa na TV essa semana?
  b. B: (out-of-the-blue) #Anna, you’re watching which program on TV this week?

We assume that the Common Ground cannot be established in English only by the use of a which-type wh-phrase in an out-of-the-blue context, as shown in (16b), but depends upon previous discourse. In a similar guise, it is in fact not always the case that in-situ which-type questions alone can be felicitous in BP, if they ask for information that is incompatible with the common ground, as shown
by the fact that wh-in-situ with a which is infelicitous in both languages, in (17b-c), contrary to the overt movement counterparts (17c-d):

(17)  

a. Você está conversando com um estudante que disse tem interesse em viajar (mas que não disse se já viajou para qualquer lugar). Você pergunta:
   You’re talking to a student who says she is interested in traveling (but she has not told you whether she has already traveled anywhere). You ask:

   b. B: # Você (já) visitou que/quais países europeus?
   c. B: # You have (already) visited what/which European countries?
   d. B: Que/quais países europeus você (já) visitou?

   B: (?)What/which European countries have you (already) visited?

The discourse-requirement imposed upon which-type wh-phrases is along the lines of what Pesetsky (1987:107-8) proposed, by adopting the notion of discourse-linking (D-linking).

However, differently from what we show here, Pesetsky assumes that D-linked wh-phrases in English need to move if there is no other wh-phrase in the derivation to satisfy a [+WH] Complementizer. He states “in English wh-in-situ are found exclusively in multiple interrogations” (1987:98). Pesetsky (2000) also focuses, for English, only on wh-in-situ in multiple questions, and he makes the general proposal that English is a language with a multiple Spec C that requires overt movement of at least one wh-phrase. Different from Pesetsky, as we indicated in various CG in-situ cases above, a single wh-phrase can stay in-situ provided it satisfies the Common Ground requirements, even when there is no other wh-phrase that can be overtly moved.

3.2 A note on French

A similar proposal regarding the semantic-pragmatic properties of wh-in-situ was also made for a dialect of French by Chang 1997, who argued that wh-in-situ in French involves a strongly presupposed context (see also Boeckx et al. 2000). These questions seek “details on an already established (or presupposed) situation”. It is claimed that (18a) is only felicitous if the speaker assumes the event of Marie’s buying something. Given this, it is not felicitous to answer the question with nothing as in (18c).

(18)  

a. Q Marie a acheté quoi? (French)

b. A Maria comprou o quê? (BP)
   Mary has bought what?

c. #Rien. (French)

d. Ela não comprou nada / NADA! ? Nada (BP)
She did not buy anything / NOTHING / Nothing.

However, the common ground requirement associated with wh-in-situ questions in English and French is slightly different in this respect from the presuppositional requirement argued to hold for French. Both in English and in BP it is felicitous to answer the corresponding in-situ questions in (18b) by saying that Mary didn’t buy anything. In addition, the semantic properties of wh-in-situ raise other complications. Chang (1997) refer to the need for satisfaction of a presupposition in the wh-in-situ cases. The problem is that wh-questions in general have a presupposition of their own, independent of showing wh-in-situ. In a question like ‘What did John read?’, even out of the blue, there is a presupposition that John read something’ (see also Mathieu 2004). However, in both cases an answer such as (18d) is possible, in BP and English.

Zubizarreta (2003) also considers data including (18) in French and argues that the French wh-in-situ construction is a case of contrastive focus, while the fronted wh-construction is a case of information focus. Among different pieces of evidence she provides is the fact that contrastive focus, but not informational focus, is associated with the property of exhaustivity. However, similar to the contrast in (18), the English and BP CG in-situ counterparts behave distinctly from French. For instance, whereas it is odd to modify to wh-in-situ phrase with for example, this is perfectly acceptable with the BP and English counterparts, indicating that the exhaustivity requirement associated with contrastive focus does not extend to wh-in-situ in these two languages.

(19) a. *Pierre a invite qui par exemple? (French)
    b. Peter invited who, for example?
    c. O Pedro convidou quem, por exemplo? (BP)

As we will show and analyze in section 4, English and Portuguese are significantly different from French regarding other properties of the syntax of wh-in-situ.

---

1 The answer nothing to the corresponding BP in-situ question (18d) is slightly marginal if nothing is uttered alone, possibly for independent reasons associated with polarity requirements.

2 However, a broader set of empirical data suggests a more complex, and maybe more interesting picture, especially regarding BP. There seem to be two distinct sets of in-situ cases in BP: one that lacks focal stress and contrasts with the French cases, and which we discuss above, and another set that carries focal stress and may be more similar to the cases considered by Zubizarreta. We put aside here further discussion of this and other contrasts.

3 In addition, notice that BP also displays significant dialectal variation, and certain speakers allow wh-in-situ more freely. We focus in this paper on what appears to be the most restrictive dialect regarding wh-in-situ.
4 The syntax of wh-in-situ in English and Brazilian Portuguese

In this section we argue that English and BP wh-in-situ display a specific kind of [+Wh, +Q] complementizer that does not trigger wh-movement, as supported by different pieces of evidence that further contrast both languages with French. In matrix clauses this complementizer is obligatorily null (20a), as one finds in English standard matrix questions, whereas an overt complementizer que ‘that’, which can occur in wh-questions in BP, obligatory triggers overt wh-movement in matrix questions (20b), (but not in embedded clauses, as in (21b), contrary to what is stated by Hornstein et alii 2005, who also argue for different complementizers in BP wh-questions):

(20) a. B: * que você está lendo o quê? 
that you are reading the what?

b. B: O que você está lendo? 
The what that you are reading?

In embedded clauses the picture is more complex, in that wh-in-situ has to co-occur with an overt complementizer in BP, but not in English, although this state of affairs only applies to embedded questions with a single in-situ wh-phrase:

(21) a. Peter said (that) he read what?

b. O Pedro disse *(que) ele leu o quê?

We put aside a more detailed analysis of the feature properties that determine the overt realization of different complementizers. What is crucial is that questions with single wh-in-situ phrases behave alike regarding the semantic and syntactic properties we analyze in this paper, independently of whether their complementizer is morphologically overt or not.

4.1 Null complementizer in French?

Differently from the picture presented above for English and BP, Boskovic (1999, 2000, 2002) and Cheng & Rooryck (2000) propose that null complementizer licenses single wh-in-situ in French. However, this holds only with respect to matrix clauses, identically to English and BP. This is compatible with English and BP only with respect to matrix clauses, as we showed above.

---

9 In addition, an overt complementizer is obligatory with embedded wh-in-situ in both languages if the matrix clause subcategorizes for a [+Q] complementizer: 
(i) a. Peter asked *(if) Sylvia read what?

b. O Pedro perguntou *(se) a Silvia leu o quê?
In addition, Boskovic argues that French long-distance questions in which a finite-clause boundary intervenes between a [+wh][Spec, CP] and a wh-in-situ are fully acceptable only on the echo question reading. However, as (23) shows, embedded (non-echo) wh-in-situ in single wh-questions is perfectly grammatical in BP and English (provided the CG requirement is satisfied).

(22) a. * Jean et Pierre croient que Marie a vu qui? (French)
 b. Qui Jean et Pierre croient que Marie a vu? (Boskovic 2000:64)

(23) a. O João e o Pedro acham que a Maria viu quem? (BP)
 b. John and Peter think that Mary saw who?

The BP and English properties are also in contrast with what is argued by Boeckx et al. (2001) for a dialect of Belgian French, for which the ungrammaticality in (22) holds with intensional matrix verbs (think, believe), although in that dialect embedded wh-in-situ is possible with non-intensional matrix verbs (e.g. factive say, regret, find out).10

Given cases such as (22) Boskovic (2000:64-5) argues that in French the null [+wh] complementizer has to be inserted at LF. For him this is due to the need to force insertion of null C at the root of the tree, which he proposes in order to account for (22a) in French, in which wh-in-situ cannot occur in embedded clauses. Given LF-insertion Boskovic proposes that these derivations are blocked because they involve movement to an X0-position (matrix CP) that violates locality restrictions on head movement.

However, given that English and BP do not show the restrictions found in French, one does not need to postulate that the insertion of the CG null complementizer takes place at LF in English and BP. In fact, if insertion at LF can indeed only take place at the root (see also Chomsky 1995), the LF-insertion analysis is actually predicted to rule out embedded wh-in-situ in English/BP, contrary to what we showed in (23) (see also (6e)). In addition, given that the C required in single wh-in-situ sometimes can or needs to be overt, in embedded clause, an LF-insertion analysis cannot explain how the complementizer can be realized at PF, in English and BP.

Given these facts, we argue that the [+wh,+Q] C in wh-in-situ questions is inserted in overt syntax. This can also account for intonational properties that are found with wh-in-situ, but not with overt wh-movement.

Boskovic (1999, 2000) also argues for French that LF insertion of C is followed by (LF)-feature-movement (of a wh-feature, at least). For him, this is different from insertion of an overt wh-complementizer, which requires obligatory

---

10 Boeckx et al. (2000:60) also point out that an overt complementizer is necessary with embedded wh-in-situ with an embedded [+Q] C si, corresponding to ‘if’, in the dialect they consider, similar to what we show for BP/English in fn. 9. These facts provide evidence that the C required for wh-in-situ sometimes can or has to be overt, in that dialect, as we also argued for BP/English.
wh-fronting in French. However, the latter is distinct from BP and English, in which the overt insertion of a wh-complementizer does not trigger overt wh-movement, provided the complementizer in question is a complementizer that does not have features requiring overt wh-movement, as is the case in (21), (i) in fn. 7 and (23).

Boskovic argues that LF-movement necessarily involves head-movement (following Chomsky 1995, in which LF formal features move to the heads bearing matching features). This allows him to account for why wh-in-situ cannot take place in negative questions (24), by appealing to a head-intervention effect. But crucially, this restriction also does not hold for English (25), nor for BP (26b):¹¹

(24) *Jean ne mange pas quoi?  (French)
Jean eats not what
(25) John doesn’t eat what?
What doesn’t John eat?

(26) a. A: Tem várias coisas que a Ana e o Paulo não comem quando a gente sai para jantar. (BP)
There are several things that Anna and Paul do not eat when we go out to dinner.

b. B: Eu sei que a Ana não come peixe. E o Paulo, não come o quê?
B: I know that Anna doesn’t eat fish. And Paul, he doesn’t eat what?

This shows respectively that feature-movement in English/BP wh-in-situ does not yield the same locality violations as in French, and it is not restricted to head-movement, further supporting the view that an entirely unified account of wh-in-situ cannot be adopted for English/BP and for French (considering Boskovic’s observations for this language), regarding their syntax.

Cheng & Rooryck (2000, henceforth C&R) argue that there are at least two types of wh-in-situ. Similarly to Boskovic, they argue that one type of wh-in-situ is present in French, and involves wh-feature movement at LF (French). Wh-in-situ in French is licensed by an intonation morpheme, which also licenses yes/no questions. In their analysis, movement of a Q-feature of an in-situ wh-word is required to disambiguate the intonation morpheme, which for them is underspecified. The underspecification nature of this intonation morpheme leads to the limited distribution of French wh-in-situ, in C&R’s analysis.

¹¹ The negation intervention, which does not apply in English and BP, is actually part of a larger set of intervention effects discussed by various authors (e.g. Chang 1997, Cheng & Rooryck 2000:11, Zubizarreta 2003) and which also do not apply as restrictively to English and BP single wh-in-situ questions.
As we will argue in the next section, English and BP actually do not involve either overt or convert movement in single wh-in-situ, as shown by the lack of violations that were originally taken to result from subadjacency and the ECP.

4.2 Insensitivity to Islands

In this section we provide evidence showing that English and BP wh-in-situ evade island violations, either as arguments or as adjuncts, to support the argument that single wh-in-situ does not trigger movement, either overtly or at LF.

This is compatible with the properties of wh-phrases in general, in wh-in-situ languages such as Chinese and Japanese. Aoun & Li (1993) for instance, consider Chinese, and argue that “wh-elements stay in situ even in the LF component. They do not raise at LF to the Spec of Comp position”. C&R’s second type wh-in-situ corresponds to in Chinese and Japanese, and for them it also does not involve overt or LF movement.

In addition, Chinese and Japanese have wh-particles, and C&R assume that “insertion of the wh-particle (i.e., an overt or null Q-morpheme) checks the Q-feature in C, allowing wh-words to stay in situ [in wh-questions in general]”. The “wh-word or wh-particle checks the Q-feature in C and thereby voids the need of the wh-words to undergo movement.” (C&R, p. 2).

We argue that the [+Wh, +Q] C overtly inserted in single wh-in-situ in English and BP also does not involve movement, either overtly or at LF. The lack of movement is supported by an asymmetry between in-situ questions and questions involving movement: in situ wh-arguments can appear in islands, as shown in (27) from Chinese (C&R (3), citing Tsai 1994 (but see e.g. Watanabe 1992, according to who wh-in-situ in Japanese can sometimes induce Subjacency violations; see also Lasnik & Saito 1992). Similar insensitivity to islands holds for the wh-in-situ cases we are considering here, as shown in (28):

(27) hufei xihuan nei-ben shei xie de shu (Mandarin Chinese)
Hufei like who write DE book
Who is the person x such that Hufei likes the book that x wrote?

(28) Eu escolhi o escritor que escreveu Hamlet. E você, escolheu o escritor que escreveu o quê? (BP)
I chose the writer that wrote Hamlet. And you, you chose the writer who wrote what?

Not all speakers accept the why-adjuncts in islands as easily as other cases. There has been substantial debate in the literature regarding the treatment of these cases, and we put aside further discussion of them here.
This supports our view that the in-situ cases we are considering do not involve overt wh-movement. As pointed out by Kato (2004:2-3), this raises problems for the analysis proposed by Ambar 2000 for European Portuguese (EP), given that Ambar proposes an overt movement analysis of wh-in-situ, despite the fact that overt wh-movement cannot evade island violations.\textsuperscript{13} Ambar argue for overt wh-movement of the in-situ phrase, followed by overt remnant movement of the IP, following a proposal by Kayne 1994 for Japanese.

We have already provided evidence that there is no head-movement involved in single wh-in-situ in English and BP (e.g. (8), (25) and (26)), contrary to what Boskovic argued for French. In addition, the CG in-situ cases should not involve LF wh-movement either (unless it can be shown that such movement can evade Subjacency violations). This is also in contrast to what Lasnik & Saito (1992: 172) observe, following Huang 1982: “a wh-adjunct is impossible within an island even in a language that freely allows wh-in-situ.” L&S show that this violation holds in Japanese for an example like:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{29}  * Mary-wa [John-ni naze hon-o ageta hito-ni] atta no (Jap)
  \item Mary –top John-to why book-acc gave person-to met
  \item ‘Mary met [the person that gave the book to John why]’
  \item (L&S 1992:172 (134))
\end{itemize}

By contrast, our in-situ data show that such violations can be evaded, in BP and also in English. Consider the following example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{30}  a. A man won the lottery this year. Another one did it last year.
  \item b. B: E aí, você vai entrevistar o homem que ganhou na loteria quando?
  \item b. B: So, you will interview the man that won in the lottery when?
\end{itemize}

Even sentences with \textit{why}-type adjuncts within an island are acceptable if the adjunct stays in-situ:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{31}  a. A student applied to the Ph.D. program because she wants to do science. Another one did it because she wants to do humanities.
  \item b. B: Vocês vão admitir a aluna que se candidatou por qual motivo/por quê?
  \item c. B: You are going to admit the student that applied for which reason/?why?\textsuperscript{14}
\end{itemize}

The different cases in which island violations can be evaded are all in contrast to French wh-in-situ, which is not allowed even with argument wh-phrases in islands, as in (32), and which led to the proposal made by Boskovic and C&R that in French wh-in-situ does involve movement (see also Chang 1997; Boskovic 2000; Mathieu 2004), contrary to what we argue here for English and BP:
(32) *Jean aime le livre que qui a écrit? (C&R (4a))
Jean like the book that who has written
Who is the person x such that Jean likes the book that x wrote?

7 Conclusion
We have provided evidence that questions with single in-situ wh-phrases are possible in English. We have then provided evidence that single wh-in-situ questions in both English and Brazilian Portuguese are not entirely optional, but need to satisfy semantic-pragmatic restrictions we defined in terms of Common Ground. It remains to be further explored why the Common Ground requirements seem to be subject to more variation in BP than in English, regarding wh-in-situ. We then argued that a [+Wh, +Q] complementizer distinct from the one found in overt wh-movement questions is overtly inserted in single wh-in-situ questions in both languages (with variation regarding its PF realization). We have provided different pieces of evidence that this complementizer does not trigger wh-movement, either overtly or covertly, as shown by the fact that wh-in-situ can evade intervention effects and island violations, contrary to what has been argued for French.

This proposal expands the scope of wh-in-situ in English, a language standardly taken to display obligatory wh-movement, in ways similar to what one finds in Brazilian Portuguese (BP). It unveils and makes precise the source of the apparent optionality in wh-in-situ, in BP and English. Finally, it motivates a wide range of wh-in-situ cases, providing an account that restricts or eliminates appeal to optionality in the grammar, in both languages.
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