

3.3. Interim summary

Krachi and Bono pattern together with respect to their general tolerance for *wh*- in-situ in root clauses, but diverge as far as the status of subjects is concerned. Unlike Bono, Krachi interrogative subjects may appear in-situ. Preliminary research suggests that Krachi's distributional profile in this regard is atypical of Tano languages in general. Among the Central Tano languages, for example, Asante Twi and Wasa have been shown to pattern like Bono in constraining subject interrogative expressions from appearing in-situ (Torrence and Kandybowicz 2012).

The languages pattern together in a second notable way – both afford ‘why’ a special status. We have characterized this behavior as a ‘why’ – non-‘why’ asymmetry. In both Krachi and Bono, non-‘why’ interrogatives show a flexibility in their ability to appear either clause-internally or peripherally. ‘Why’, on the other hand, obligatorily surfaces in a left peripheral focus position. This asymmetry has been documented in other languages both distantly related and unrelated: Kiitharaka (Muriungi 2005); Italian (Rizzi 2001); Bakweri (Marlo and Odden 2007); Romanian (Shlonsky and Soare 2011); Zulu (Buell 2011); New Testament Greek (Kirk 2010); Lubukusu (Wasike 2007); Korean and Japanese (Ko 2005); Persian (Karimi 2005); Chinese (Lin 1992) and English (Hornstein 1995, Thornton 2008, Stepanov and Tsai 2008). Closer to home, Saah (1988) has pointed out that all *wh*- expressions apart from ‘why’ can appear in-situ in Akan (8).

- (8) a. *Kwadwo bɔɔ Ama den ade nti? Akan (Saah 1988:20)
 Kwadwo hit.PST Ama what thing why/because
- b. Den ade nti na Kwadwo bɔɔ Ama? Akan (Saah 1988:20)
 what thing why/because FOC Kwadwo hit.PST Ama
 ‘Why did Kwadwo hit Ama?’
- c. *Wobaa ha aden nti? Akan (Saah 1988:20)
 2ND.SG-come.PST here reason why
- d. Aden nti na wobaa ha? Akan (Saah 1988:20)
 reason why FOC 2ND.SG-come.PST here
 ‘Why did you come here?’

The lack of in-situ ‘why’ in Krachi and Bono provides support for the idea, going back to Reinhart (1998), that ‘why’ is different from other *wh*-expressions in the sense that it does not originate in a low adjunct position in the clause. The facts presented here also support cartographic approaches to ‘why’ like those in Rizzi (2001) and Shlonsky and Soare (2011), both of which posit a left peripheral base position for the expression.

4. Embedded clause *wh*- in-situ patterns

In addition to root clauses, Krachi and Bono allow *wh*- in-situ (of appropriate items) in embedded domains. In this respect, then, both languages have consistent policies for handling in-situ interrogatives across syntactic contexts.

4.1. Embedded clause *wh*- in-situ in Krachi

Apart from the item ‘why’, all Krachi *wh*- expressions may appear in-situ in embedded clauses, as attested by the data below.

- (9) a. Kofi ε-ɕɪra [fé nse ε-mò bwatéo]? Embedded subject *wh*- in-situ
 Kofi AGR-say.PST COMP who AGR-kill.PST chicken
 ‘Who did Kofi say slaughtered the chicken?’

- b. Kofi ε-ɔ́ɪra [fé ɔ́ɪw ε-mò ne]? Embedded object *wh-* in-situ
 Kofi AGR-say.PST COMP woman AGR-kill.PST what
 ‘What did Kofi say that the woman slaughtered?’
- c. Kofi ε-ɔ́ɪra [fé ɔ́ɪw ε-mò bwatéo nfré/kemeké/nene]? Embedded
 Kofi AGR-say.PST COMP woman AGR-kill.PST chicken where/when/how *wh-* adjuncts
 ‘Where/when/how did Kofi say that the woman slaughtered the chicken?’ in-situ
- d. *Kofi ε-ɔ́ɪra [fé ɔ́ɪw ε-mò bwatéo nání]? *Embedded ‘why’ in-situ
 Kofi AGR-say.PST COMP woman AGR-kill.PST chicken why

The distribution of in-situ interrogatives in Krachi embedded domains is actually broader than the facts above suggest. Instances of *wh-* in-situ across more varied embedded domains in the language appear in section 6.1 below, when islands are taken into consideration.

4.2. *Embedded clause wh- in-situ in Bono*

As with Krachi, interrogatives of the appropriate type may appear clause-internally in Bono embedded domains. The data below illustrate the occurrence of non-subjects and non-‘why’ interrogative expressions in embedded in-situ positions.

- (10) a. Wo dwene [sɛ bema kɛ kum abe]? Embedded object *wh-* in-situ
 2ND.SG think COMP man the kill.PST what
 ‘What do you think that the man slaughtered?’
- b. Wo dwene [sɛ bema kɛ kum akoko kɛ ahífa/dabe/sɛ]? Embedded *wh-*
 2ND.SG think COMP man the kill.PST chicken the where/when/how adjuncts in-situ
 ‘Where/when/how do you think that the man slaughtered the chicken?’
- c. *Wo dwene [sɛ hwaɛ kum akoko kɛ]? *Embedded subject *wh-* in-situ
 2ND.SG think COMP who kill.PST chicken the
- d. *Wo dwene [sɛ bema kɛ kum akoko kɛ senti]? *Embedded ‘why’ in-situ
 2ND.SG think COMP man the kill.PST chicken the why

The only difference between Krachi and Bono in-situ interrogative distribution, then, is a minor one and concerns the status of subjects. *Wh-* in-situ is available in main and embedded clauses in both languages, but only Bono subjects are constrained from appearing clause-internally.

4.3. *Interim summary*

We have brought to light another dimension uniting the grammars of Krachi and Bono. Mirroring the availability of *wh-* in-situ in root clauses, both languages freely allow interrogatives of appropriate categories (e.g. non-‘why’ expressions in both languages and non-subjects in Bono) to surface in non-root contexts. In addition to the considerations discussed thus far, this property may also be utilized to grammatically taxonomize the Tano languages, as Asante Twi and Wasa, for example, tolerate *wh-* in-situ in matrix clauses, but not in embedded contexts (Torrence and Kandybowicz 2012). In other words, whereas Asante Twi and Wasa manifest a root/embedded clause asymmetry with respect to *wh-* in-situ, Krachi and Bono pattern together in their liberal tolerance of *wh-* in-situ across syntactic domains. This may prove to be a fruitful dimension for future comparative work on the Tano languages.

5. **Partial *wh-* movement patterns**

We have shown that, like many other Kwa languages (Aboh 2007), Krachi and Bono allow *wh-* movement to the left periphery. This section demonstrates that Krachi and Bono also tolerate partial

wh- movement. Based on Fanselow’s (2006) typology, we show that these two Tano languages exhibit “naked partial movement”, in which the moved interrogative is unaccompanied by an overt question particle in the clause where it takes scope. To our knowledge, this is the first report of partial *wh*- movement in any Kwa language.

5.1. Partial *wh*- movement in Krachi

Regardless of their thematic status, all *wh*- expressions in Krachi may undergo partial movement. The data in (11a,c,e,g) below show full *wh*- movement from the embedded clause to the main clause left periphery. (11b,d,f,h) exemplify the options for partial movement. In each case, a *wh*- expression from the embedded clause (in parentheses) takes matrix scope, despite surfacing lower in an embedded position. For example, (11b) demonstrates that a *wh*- expression can partially move to either the most embedded focus position or to the focus position in the intermediate clause.

- (11) a. Nse jí Kofí ε-ɕíra [fé ___ Áma ní [fé ___ ɔ-mò bwatéó]]?
 who FOC Kofi AGR-say COMP Ama know COMP 3RD.SG-kill.PST chicken
 ‘Who did Kofi say that Ama knows slaughtered the chicken?’
- b. Kofí ε-ɕíra [fé (nse jí) Áma ní [fé (nse jí) ___ ɔ-mò bwatéó]]?
 Kofi AGR-say COMP who FOC Ama know COMP who FOC 3RD.SG-kill.PST chicken
 ‘Who did Kofi say that Ama knows slaughtered the chicken?’
- c. Ne jí Kofí ε-ɕíra [fé ___ Áma ní [fé ___ Kwáme ε-mò ___]]?
 what FOC Kofi AGR-say COMP Ama know COMP Kwame AGR-kill.PST
 ‘What did Kofi say that Ama knows that Kwame slaughtered?’
- d. Kofí ε-ɕíra [fé (ne jí) Áma ní [fé (ne jí) Kwáme ε-mò ___]]?
 Kofi AGR-say COMP what FOC Ama know COMP what FOC Kwame AGR-kill.PST
 ‘What did Kofi say that Ama knows that Kwame slaughtered?’
- e. Nfré/kemeké/nene jí fe nu [fé ___ ɔʃíw ε-mò bwatéó ___]?
 where/when/how FOC 2ND.SG hear COMP woman AGR-kill.PST chicken
 ‘Where/when/how did you hear that the woman slaughtered the chicken?’
- f. Fe nu [fé nfré/kemeké/nene jí ɔʃíw ε-mò bwatéó ___]?
 2ND.SG hear COMP where/when/how FOC woman AGR-kill.PST chicken
 ‘Where/when/how did you hear that the woman slaughtered the chicken?’
- g. Nání jí fe nu [fé ___ ɔʃíw ε-mò bwatéó]?
 why FOC 2ND.SG hear COMP woman AGR-kill.PST chicken
 ‘Why did the woman slaughter the chicken, according to what you heard?’
- h. Fe nu [fé nání jí ɔʃíw ε-mò bwatéó]?
 2ND.SG hear COMP why FOC woman AGR-kill.PST chicken
 ‘Why did the woman slaughter the chicken, according to what you heard?’

5.2. Partial *wh*- movement in Bono

Any *wh*- expression may undergo partial movement in Bono, including ‘why’. (12a,c,e,g) show full movement of the *wh*- expression from the embedded clause to the left periphery of the main clause. (12b,d,f,h) demonstrate that *wh*- items with matrix scope may surface on the left edge of embedded clauses as well.

- (12)a. Mmema benie wo dwene [se ___ be-kum akoko kē]?
 men which 2ND.SG think COMP 3RD.PL-kill.PST chicken the
 ‘Which men do you think slaughtered the chicken?’
- b. Wo dwene [se mmema benie ne (be-)kum akoko kē]?
 2ND.SG think COMP men which FOC 3RD.PL-kill.PST chicken the
 ‘Which men do you think slaughtered the chicken?’
- c. Abe ne wo dwene [se ___ bema kē kumye ___]?
 what FOC 2ND.SG think COMP man the kill.PST
 ‘What do you think that the man slaughtered?’
- d. Wo dwene [se abe ne bema kē kuye ___]?
 2ND.SG think COMP what FOC man the kill.PST
 ‘What do you think that the man slaughtered?’
- e. Ahīfa/dabe/sen ne wo dwene [se ___ bema kē kum akoko kē ___]?
 where/when/how FOC 2ND.SG think COMP man the kill.PST chicken the
 ‘Where/when/how do you think that the man slaughtered the chicken?’
- f. Wo dwene [se ahīfa/dabe/sen ne bema kē kum akoko kē ___]?
 2ND.SG think COMP where/when/how FOC man the kill.PST chicken the
 ‘Where/when/how do you think that the man slaughtered the chicken?’
- g. Senti ne wo dwene [se ___ mmema kē kum akoko kē]?
 why FOC 2ND.SG think COMP men the kill.PST chicken the
 ‘Why do you think that the men slaughtered the chicken?’
- h. Wo dwene [se senti ne mmema kē kum akoko kē]?
 2ND.SG think COMP why FOC men the kill.PST chicken the
 ‘Why do you think that the men slaughtered the chicken?’

Broadening the comparative perspective, the Bono facts are particularly interesting because in the closely related Akan language Asante Twi, partial movement is not possible, regardless of the thematic status of the interrogative. Example (13a) below shows that long movement of the object of an embedded clause into the root clause focus position is attested. However, it is not possible for that object to undergo a shorter movement to the embedded clause focus position, marked by *na* (13b). Note too that the presence or absence of the complementizer *se* has no effect on the grammaticality of partial movement in Asante Twi.

- (13)a. Hena na wo dwene [se ___ Kofi bɔɔye ___]? Asante Twi
 who FOC 2ND.SG think COMP Kofi hit.PST
 ‘Who is it that you think that Kofi hit?’
- b. *Wo dwene [(se) hena na Kofi bɔɔye ___]? Asante Twi
 2ND.SG think COMP who FOC Kofi hit.PST
 Intended: ‘Who do you think that it is that Kofi hit?’

Torrence and Kandybowicz (2012) document the existence of partial *wh*- movement in Wasa (14a), a related Central Tano language, and note that the species of movement also seems to be allowed in Akyem (14b), an Akan language closely related to Asante Twi. These facts suggest that although absent in Asante Twi, partial *wh*- movement may in fact be a fairly widespread feature in the Tano languages.

- (14) a. Wo dwene [se berema ben na ___ o-kum akoko no]? Wasa
 2ND.SG think COMP man which FOC 3RD.SG-kill.PST chicken the
 ‘Which man do you think slaughtered the chicken?’
- b. Kwasi bias-è [se háe ná ___ ɔ bá-è]? Akyem (Boadi 2005:39)
 Kwasi ask.PST COMP who FOC 3RD.SG come.PST
 ‘Who was it that Kwasi inquired about whether or not he came?’

5.3. Interim summary

We have shown that despite constraints on ‘why’ in both languages and subject interrogatives in Bono, any *wh*- item of any thematic persuasion may undergo partial movement in both Krachi and Bono. Furthermore, partial *wh*- movement in Tano appears to take the form of the “naked” variety in Fanselow’s (2006) typology, as suggested by the fact that displaced interrogatives in not only Krachi and Bono, but also Wasa and Akyem, appear without an overt question particle in the clauses where they take scope. Of additional significance is our finding that partial movement appears to be a prevalent, but not universal feature across Tano. Although a grammatical possibility in Krachi, Bono, Wasa and Akyem, partial *wh*- movement is systematically unavailable in Asante Twi. We are aware of no other account of the existence of partial *wh*- movement among the Kwa languages. As such, the Tano data discussed in this section constitute the first documentation of Kwa partial movement.

6. Constraints on *wh*- movement: islands and intervention effects

There are a number of languages in which in-situ *wh*- expressions are immune to (strong) island effects. For example, certain *wh*- items in French (Obenauer 1994, Starke 2001), Mandarin Chinese and Japanese (Lasnik and Saito 1984), among others, though unable to be extracted out of islands, may appear in-situ island-internally. Although both Krachi and Bono permit *wh*- in-situ in embedded domains, only Krachi tolerates island-internal in-situ interrogatives. That is, all Bono interrogatives (in- and ex-situ) are constrained by islandhood, while only Krachi’s displaced interrogatives are island-sensitive.

In spite of this difference, we show that Krachi and Bono pattern alike regarding so-called “intervention effects”: both languages disallow *wh*- in-situ under the scope of interveners such as negation. This finding complements Kobele and Torrence’s (2006) discovery of similar intervention effects in Asante Twi, suggesting the possibility that negative intervention might be another prevalent feature of Tano grammar.

6.1. Island-internal *wh*- in-situ and intervention effects in Krachi

Sentential subjects (15a) are islands for movement in Krachi, as (15b) shows. However, they can host in-situ *wh*- items and be interpreted as genuine *wh*- questions (15c).

- (15) a. [Ke Kofi ε-mò bwatéó] ε-wa ηwanwa.
 COMP Kofi AGR-kill.PST chicken AGR-be strange/surprising
 ‘That Kofi slaughtered the chicken is surprising.’
- b. *Ne jí [ke Kofi ε-mò ___] ε-wa ηwanwa?
 what FOC COMP Kofi AGR-kill.PST AGR-be strange/surprising
- c. [Ke Kofi ε-mò ne] ε-wa ηwanwa?
 COMP Kofi AGR-kill.PST what AGR-be strange/surprising
 ‘That Kofi slaughtered WHAT is surprising?’

Krachi relative clauses are comparable to sentential subjects. The data below show that although subject relatives (16a) are barriers to movement (16b), they do not limit the availability of *wh-* in-situ (16c):⁴

- (16) a. [ɔʔfíw ke ɔ-mò bwatéó] bò ñfi.
 woman COMP 3RD.SG-kill.PST chicken LOC here
 ‘The woman who slaughtered the chicken is here.’
- b. *Ne jí [ɔʔfíw ke ɔ-mò ____] bò ñfi?
 what FOC woman COMP 3RD.SG-kill.PST LOC here
- c. [ɔʔfíw ke ɔ-mò ne] bò ñfi?
 woman COMP 3RD.sg-kill.PST what LOC here
 ‘The woman who slaughtered WHAT is here?’

An interesting twist on the distribution of island-internal *wh-* in-situ in Krachi (one that we are unaware obtains in any other language) is that despite occurring in islands, *wh-* in-situ is barred from occurring in doubly embedded islands (that is, islands inside other inlands). Example (17a) below presents just such an environment – a subject relative clause is embedded within a sentential subject. In such a context, *wh-* in-situ now becomes unavailable (17b), despite the independent availability of *wh-* in-situ in either domain when unembedded (15c, 16c). Examples (17c-d) furnish an additional example of the phenomenon. In this case, a coordinate structure is embedded within a subject relative clause (17c), blocking *wh-* in-situ (17d).

- (17) a. [Ke [ɔʔfíw ke ɔ-mò bwatéó] bò ñfi] ε-wa ɣwanɣwa.
 COMP woman COMP 3RD.SG-kill.PST chicken LOC here AGR-be surprising
 ‘That the woman who killed the chicken is here is surprising.’
- b. *[Ke [ɔʔfíw ke ɔ-mò ne] bò ñfi] ε-wa ɣwanɣwa?
 COMP woman COMP 3RD.SG-kill.PST what LOC here AGR-be surprising
- c. [ɔʔfíw ke ɔ-mò [bwatéó jè dʒoró]] bò ñfi.
 woman COMP 3RD.SG-kill.PST chicken and dog LOC here
 ‘The woman who slaughtered the fowl and the dog is here.’
- d. *[ɔʔfíw ke ɔ-mò [bwatéó jè ne]] bò ñfi.
 woman COMP 3RD.SG-kill.PST chicken and what LOC here

It is tempting to respond to these data by hypothesizing that the problem lies not with islandhood, but rather with degree of embeddedness more generally. We have reason to believe that this is not the case. The datum in (18) below illustrates that *wh-* items may occur in deeply embedded domains in the language, provided that none of them are syntactic islands.

- (18) Kofi ε-ɕɪra [fé Áma jí [fé Kwáme ε-mò ne]]?
 Kofi AGR-say COMP Ama know COMP Kwame AGR-kill.PST what
 ‘Kofi said that Ama knows that Kwame slaughtered WHAT?’

The distribution of *wh-* items in Krachi is also constrained by intervention effects (Beck 1996). The data below illustrate that *wh-* expressions must take surface scope over negation, limiting the possibility of *wh-* in-situ under clause-mate negation.⁵ Examples (19a,c) show that a *wh-* expression

⁴ Other islands in Krachi that restrict extraction, but not *wh-* in-situ include temporal adverbial (‘before’/‘after’) clauses and coordinate structures. Space limitations preclude a demonstration of these other island types.

⁵ Kandybowicz and Torrence (2012) demonstrate that in addition to negation, modals are also interveners in Krachi. Space limitations prevent us from demonstrating this fact here.

cannot surface in the *c*-command domain of negation, marked by *n-*. However, if the *wh-* item is moved higher, into a left peripheral focus position where it is no longer *c*-commanded by negation, the resulting question becomes grammatical, as illustrated by (19b,d). Since subjects always *c*-command negation, they need not be fronted into the left periphery in the presence of verbal negation, as demonstrated by (19e). And assuming that clause-internal temporal interrogatives adjoin to TP and thus scope over negation, we can account for the fact that in-situ items like ‘when’ fail to be constrained by intervention effects (19f).

- (19) a. *ɔʃíw ɛ-n-dìkè ne?
 woman AGR-NEG-cook.PST what ♣ NEG *c*-commands ‘what’
- b. Ne jí ɔʃíw ɛ-n-dìkè?
 what FOC woman AGR-NEG-cook.PST ♣ ‘What’ *c*-commands NEG
 ‘What didn’t the woman cook?’
- c. *ɔʃíw ɛ-n-dìkè kudʒó nene?
 woman AGR-NEG-cook.PST yam how ♣ NEG *c*-commands ‘how’
- d. Nene jí ɔʃíw ɛ-n-dìkè kudʒó?
 how FOC woman AGR-NEG-cook.PST yam ♣ ‘How’ *c*-commands NEG
 ‘How didn’t the woman cook yam?’
- e. Nse wɔ-n-dìkè kudʒó?
 who AGR-NEG-cook.PST yam ♣ ‘Who’ *c*-commands NEG
 ‘Who didn’t cook yam?’
- f. ɔʃíw ɛ-n-dìkè kudʒó kemeké?
 woman AGR-NEG-cook.PST yam when ♣ ‘When’ *c*-commands NEG
 ‘When didn’t the woman cook yam?’

6.2. Island-internal *wh-* in-situ and intervention effects in Bono

Unlike Krachi, Bono disallows *wh-* in-situ island-internally. As (20b,c,e,f) show, it is impossible for a *wh-* item to occur inside a sentential subject or subject relative clause, two strong islands. This is clearly an island effect, as we have already shown in (10) that Bono allows *wh-* in-situ (of appropriate items) in embedded clauses.

- (20) a. [Sɛ Kofi kum akoko kɛ̃] yɛɛ Ama nwonwa.
 COMP Kofi kill.PST chicken the make.PST Ama surprise
 ‘That Kofi slaughtered the chicken surprised Ama.’
- b. *[Sɛ Kofi kum abe] yɛɛ Ama nwonwa?
 COMP Kofi kill.PST what make.PST Ama surprise
 Intended: ‘That Kofi slaughtered WHAT surprised Ama?’
- c. *[Sɛ Kofi kum akoko kɛ̃ ahífa/dabe/sɛ] yɛɛ Ama nwonwa?
 COMP Kofi kill.PST chicken the where/when/how make.PST Ama surprise
 Intended: ‘That Kofi slaughtered the chicken WHERE/WHEN/HOW surprised Ama?’
- d. Kofi hu [bema kɛ̃ (o-)kum akoko kɛ̃].
 Kofi see.PST man the 3RD.SG-kill.PST chicken the
 ‘Kofi saw the man who slaughtered the chicken.’

Table 1. Properties of *wh*- questions in Krachi and Bono

	KRACHI	BONO
SUBJECT <i>wh</i> - IN-SITU (MAIN CLAUSES)	✓	✗
NON-SUBJECT <i>wh</i> - IN-SITU (MAIN CLAUSES)	✓	✓
‘why’ IN-SITU	✗	✗
<i>wh</i> - IN-SITU (EMBEDDED CLAUSES)	✓	✓
<i>wh</i> - IN-SITU (ISLANDS)	✓	✗
PARTIAL <i>wh</i> - MOVEMENT	✓	✓
<i>wh</i> - DISTRIBUTION CONSTRAINED BY INTERVENTION EFFECTS	✓	✓

The detailed investigation of just a subset of Tano languages reveals a wealth of systematic micro-parametric variation. We have shown that Krachi and Bono allow for both *wh*- movement and *wh*- in-situ in matrix and embedded clauses. However, the in-situ construction in both languages is subject to several constraints. As Table 1 shows, Bono does not permit in-situ *wh*- subjects, unlike Krachi. Within the *wh*- paradigm, ‘why’ patterns differently and in neither language can occur clause-internally. These facts provide further empirical support for analyses that treat ‘why’ as fundamentally different from all other *wh*- expressions, owing to its origination in the left periphery. Using negation, it was shown that *wh*- in-situ in both languages is susceptible to intervention effects. Thus, Krachi and Bono pattern together with a number of related (Asante Twi) and unrelated (German) languages in which intervention effects have been documented to constrain interrogative distribution. The *wh*- movement construction was also shown to be island-sensitive in both languages, an expected result. However, *wh*- in-situ was shown to distribute differently in island configurations. Krachi tolerates appropriate (i.e. non-‘why’) in-situ *wh*- expressions inside islands, while Bono does not. This constituted only the second systematic difference in the interrogative systems of Krachi and Bono. Finally, we have documented the existence of partial *wh*- movement in two Kwa languages, specifically, partial movement of the “naked” variety. The existence of partial movement in both the Central Tano (as manifested by Bono) and Guang (as exemplified by Krachi) language groups suggests that it may be present in other branches of Tano or Kwa as well. This is significant because documentation of partial *wh*- movement in Kwa has thus far been noticeably absent from the literature. The phenomenon of partial movement also highlights variation within the Akan cluster, as it exists in Bono (as well as Akyem and Wasa), but not in Asante Twi.

Stepping back to consider *wh*- question formation in these languages, we discovered that in most respects Bono and Krachi pattern together. However, in others (e.g. the distribution of in-situ subject interrogatives and availability of island-internal *wh*- in-situ) Bono behaves more like Asante Twi. Given the genetic relationship between the Akan and North Guang branches of Tano, this raises the possibility that Bono has preserved interrogative constructions that have been lost in other Akan varieties, supporting a deeper genetic affiliation between the two branches than is commonly assumed.

References

- Aboh, Enoch Oladé. 2007. Leftward Focus Versus Rightward Focus: the Kwa-Bantu Conspiracy. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 15: 81-104.
- Beck, Sigrid. 1996. Quantified Structures as Barriers for LF Movement. *Natural Language Semantics* 4: 1-56.
- Boadi, L.A. 2005. *Three Major Syntactic Structures in Akan: Interrogatives, Complementation and Relativisation*. Accra: Black Mask Limited.
- Buell, Leston. 2011. Zulu *Ngani* ‘why’: Postverbal and yet in CP. *Lingua* 121: 805-821.

- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2006. Partial Movement. In Martin Everaert, Henk van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans and Bart Hollebrandse (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax (Volume 3)*, 437-492. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1963. *The Languages of Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1995. *Logical Form*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kandybowicz, Jason and Harold Torrence. 2011. How *Why* is Different: *Wh*-in-situ in Krachi. *Snippets* 23: 5-6.
- Kandybowicz, Jason and Harold Torrence. 2012. Are Syntax and Prosody Entangled? Insights from Krachi in-situ Interrogatives. Ms. University of Kansas.
- Karimi, Simin. 2005. *A Minimalist Approach to Scrambling: Evidence from Persian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kirk, Allison. 2010. Word Order Variation in New Testament Greek *wh*- Questions. To appear in *Proceedings of ConSOLE XVII*.
- Ko, Heejeong. 2005. Syntax of *Why-in-situ*: Merge into [spec, CP] in the Overt Syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 867-916.
- Kobe, Gregory and Harold Torrence. 2006. Intervention Effects in Asante Twi. In *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 46: 161-184.
- Korboe, Agyei Joseph. 2002. *The Study of the Nominal Phrase in Kaakyi*. Master's thesis, University of Ghana.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito. 1984. On the Nature of Proper Government. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 235-289.
- Lin, Jo-Wang. 1992. The Syntax of *Zenmeyang* 'How' and *Weishenme* 'Why' in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1: 293-331.
- Marlo, Michael and David Odden. 2007. The Exponence of TAM in Bakweri. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 15: 19-31.
- Muriungi, Peter Kinyua. 2005. *Wh*- Questions in Kiiharaka. *Studies in African Linguistics* 34: 43-104.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 1994. *Aspects de la Syntaxe A-barre*. Ph.D. thesis, Université de Paris VIII.
- Osam, Emmanuel Kweku Ahen. 1994. *Aspects of Akan Grammar: a Functional Perspective*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1998. *Wh*-in-situ in the Framework of the Minimalist Program. *Natural Language Semantics* 6: 29-56.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the Position Int(errogative) in the Left Periphery of the Clause. In Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 287-296. Amsterdam: Elsevier North-Holland.
- Saah, Kofi. 1988. *Wh*- Questions in Akan. *Journal of West African Languages* 18: 17-28.
- Shlonsky, Ur and Gabriela Soare. 2011. Where's 'why'?. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42: 651-669.
- Snider, Keith. 1990. Tonal Upstep in Krachi: Evidence for Register Tier. *Language* 66: 453-474.
- Starke, Michal. 2001. *Move Dissolves into Merge: a Theory of Locality*. Ph.D dissertation. Geneva: Université de Genève.
- Stepanov, Arthur and Wei-Tien Dylan Tsai. 2008. Cartography and Licensing of *wh*- Adjuncts: A Cross-linguistic Perspective. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 589-638.
- Thornton, Rosalind. 2008. Why Continuity. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 107-146.
- Torrence, Harold and Jason Kandybowicz. 2012. Comparative Tano Interrogative Syntax: Typological and Genetic Implications. Paper presented at ACAL 43, New Orleans, LA.
- Wasike, Aggrey. 2007. The Left Periphery, *Wh*-in-situ, and A-bar Movement in Lubukusu and other Bantu Languages. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Westermann, Diedrich and M.A. Bryan. 1952. *The Languages of West Africa*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, Kay and Roger Blench. 2000. Niger-Congo. In Bernd Heine and Derek Nurse (eds.), *African Languages: An Introduction*, 11-42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.