In the last handout, we saw how the Contiguity requirement can account for the behavior of wh-phrases and (some kinds of) head-movement in various languages.

In this one, three main topics:
- how Contiguity interacts with Affix Support, and
- how Contiguity interacts with the syntactic derivation, and
- some cross-linguistic variation in pied-piping.

1. Contiguity and Affix Support

Now we have two things that drive movement:

**Affix Support:** affixal heads need to have metrical structure in the direction of affixation

  - certain suffixes need specifiers (specifically, suffixes that don’t affect the position of stress)

**Contiguity:** Probes need to be sufficiently close to their Goals to create Contiguity between them, and sometimes this triggers movement.

  - specifically, when the prosodically active edge of the Goal is between it and the Probe

So a head could be both an affix and a Probe, or just an affix, or just a Probe…

1.1 Suppose it’s just a Probe, and not an affix?

If X doesn’t need Affix Support, and if there’s a preference for moves to be maximally short, then maybe we expect (1)?

(1) will always be enough to create Contiguity between X and αP, no matter what kind of language we’re looking at: they’re adjacent, which means Contiguity-adjunction at least will be possible.

We could avoid this result, in several ways—we could insist on some version of the Extension Condition, for example.

On the other hand, there are cases out there that look like wh-movement to a position below interrogative C. Tagalog, for example, has an interrogative complementizer *kung*:

(2) Hindi ko alam [kung darating ang estudyante]  
    not NG I know C[+wh] NOM will.come ANG student  
    ‘I don’t know whether the student will come’

And Tagalog wh-movement is to a position after *kung*:

(3) Hindi ko alam [kung kailan darating ang estudyante]  
    not NG I know C[+wh] when NOM will.come ANG student  
    ‘I don’t know when the student will come’

Similarly:

(4) Pe [dxiin zhe] r-laa de?  
    Q work WH HAB-do 2SG  
    ‘What work are you doing?’

now, these are both verb-initial languages… problem deserves further study.

1.2 Okay, now suppose a head is both a Probe and an affix?

a useful idea (for similar conditions, see Pesetsky and Torrego 2001, Kotek 2014, van Urk and Richards 2015):

(5) **Multitasking**

At every step in a derivation, if two operations A and B are possible, and the conditions satisfied by A are a superset of those satisfied by B, the grammar prefers A.

three things for which this will be relevant:
- accounting for the (near-)absence of V2, wh-in-situ languages
- dealing with the fact that English EPP is generally satisfied by the subject, and Japanese EPP isn’t
- guaranteeing that C-final languages will have wh-in-situ.
1.2.1 The (near-)absence of V2, wh-in-situ languages

There are almost no V2 languages with (even optional) wh-in-situ.

Multitasking gives you a handle on that: if a C has both the “V2 property” and a [+wh] feature, then Multitasking teaches us that it’s a good idea for C to satisfy both of its needs with a single operation, so you should get wh-movement, both for whatever drives V2 and for Contiguity (regardless of how the prosody of the language works).

There is one counterexample that I know of, which is Dinka. We’ll talk about Dinka soon.

First, let’s consider some examples. First, we have the Germanic language family. Not so exciting: they’re related, so they share many features. But there are several language families with single languages that are outliers both in having V2 and in having obligatory wh-movement (their relatives are generally SOV and have wh-in-situ).

(6)  

   noon 3-decl-sing-NONFUT Gokyp (Tupian)  
   'Gokyp sang at noon'

b. Gokyp Ø-naka-hyr̩-Ø omenda  
   Gokyp 3-decl-sing-NONFUT noon

c. *Gokyp omenda Ø-naka-hyr̩-Ø  
   Gokyp noon 3-decl-sing-NONFUT

d. ?Ø-naka-hyr̩-Ø Gokyp omenda  
   3-decl-sing-NONFUT Gokyp noon

(7)  

   wh 3-eat-IRR potato  
   "Who will eat potatoes?"

b. Mora -mon [taso ti-’y̩-t]?  
   wh COP man OBLFOC PTCPL-eat-NONFUT
   "What did the man eat?"

c. Tikat a-a-ri j leite-ty?  
   when 2SG-buy-IRR milk-obl  
   "When will you buy milk?"

(8)  

   'Aslam gave Mohan a book for Ram yesterday'

b. Mohn-as dis Aslam-an kita:bi Ram-ini khafir rathh  
   'Aslam gave Mohan a book for Ram yesterday'

c. Kita:bi dis Aslam-an Ram-ini khafir rathh  
   'Aslam gave Mohan a book for Ram yesterday'

d. Rathh dis Aslam-an Mohn-as Ram-ini khafiri  
   'Aslam gave Mohan a book for Ram yesterday'

(9)  

   who showed Sheila-DAT new book yesterday  
   'Who showed a new book to Sheila yesterday?'

b. Raj-an kamis he:j nev kita:b Raj-ERG he:j who.DAT showed new book  
   'To whom did Raj show his new book?'

(10)  

Cuo di-car suona jeraz [Ingush: Nichols 2011, 679]  
   dat (Nakh-Daghestanian)  
   3s.ERG AGR.ELL WITNESSED.PAST 1s.DAT 3p  
   "She told them (stories) to me"

(11)  

Maca aara-veal j yr [Ingush: Nichols 2011, 684]  
   when out-AGR.GO WITNESSED.PAST 3s  
   'When did he go out?'

On the other hand, Dinka (Nilotic):

(12)  

a. [ Căn ] a-eçi Ból γ̥̄c áleth r̩̄c.  
   Can 3SG-PRF BOL buy.DTR clothes town.LOC  
   'Can bought Bol clothes at the town'

b. [ Áleth ] a-açi Căn kê γ̥̄c Ból r̩̄c.  
   Áleth 3SG-PRF Can ke γ̥̄c BOL r̩̄c.  
   clothes 3PL-PRF NS Can.GEN PL buy.DTR Bol town.LOC  
   'Can bought Bol clothes at the town'

c. [ R̩k ] a-açi Căn áleth γ̥̄c Ból.  
   R̩k 3SG-PRF Can áleth γ̥̄c Bol.  
   town 3SG-PRF NS Can.GEN clothes buy.DTR Bol  
   'Can bought Bolt clothes at the town'

V2, but wh-movement is optional:

(13)  

a. Yeŋçi eçi Ból t̩̄j?  
   what PRT NS Bol.GEN see  
   'What did Bol see?'

b. Ból eçi 9̊ t̩̄j?  
   Bol PRT what see  
   'What did Bol see?'
problem. But notice from the glosses in (12) that the particle in C bears phi-feature agreement with its specifier (for number, in (12); participants in that position make the morpheme disappear.)

(14) [tɛ:n] O-ci
d1 BM-3G-PREF NS ‘giraffe’
1 3/2-PREF BM buy.DTR.clothes.town.LOC
‘I bought BM clothes at the town’

So Dinka C is not only V2 and (sometimes) a wh-Phrase; it’s a φ-Probe.

To take the easy case first: suppose you’ve got a wh-phrase that doesn’t bear φ-features. Then Multitasking wants C to satisfy its V2 requirement either with the wh-phrase (wh-movement) or with something that bears φ (so, in this case, wh-in-situ). --> bingo: wh-movement is optional.

What if the wh-phrase does bear a φ-feature? Independent twist: turns out you can’t actually have φ-agreement with wh-phrases (with this particular morpheme):

(15) a. Miir ə-ci
giraffe 3SG-PREF.NS BM see
‘A giraffe, BM saw’

b. Yeŋŋi O-ci BM see
‘What did BM see?’

Maybe a case of anti-agreement: it’s common for languages to ban agreement with A-bar extracted phrases.

And, okay, full disclosure: in wh-questions generally, this language loses this particular agreement morpheme, even if the wh-phrase doesn’t move:

(16) a. O-ci
d1 BM-3G-PREF NS
Bol AGV-PREF NS see
Bol
‘What did BM see?’

I can imagine mechanisms: maybe C Agrees both with wh and with Bol, and the general rule is ‘if you’re Agreeing with a wh-phrase, don’t get realized’. But we need to look for more Dinka-like examples.

More generally: Dinka does have wh-in-situ, despite being V2: I want to connect that to the fact that Dinka is also an odd V2 language in that it has φ-agreement with the fronted phrase.

### 1.2.2 Ways of satisfying EPP

Multitasking guarantees that English T will prefer moving the subject to its specifier: that way it can satisfy both Affix Support and Probe-Goal Contiguity.

But what about Japanese T?

(16) Zen’in-ga sono tesuto-o ukenakatta
all-NOM that test-ACC took-NEG
‘All didn’t take that test’
∀ > ¬, * > ∀

(17) Sono tesuto-o zen’in-ga __ ukenakatta
that test-ACC all-NOM took-NEG
‘That test, all didn’t take’
∀ > ¬, ~ > ∀

Apparently anything can satisfy Japanese T. Why is that? Here’s an idea:

Remember that when we discussed Affix Support, we posited an operation ‘Rotation’, which:
(1) eliminates the ordering statements ordering a pair of sisters, and
(2) creates a new pair of ordering statements, the reverse of the old ones.

Suppose we divide Rotation into the two operations (1) and (2): call them ‘Untethering’ and ‘Retethering’. And the idea will be that these operations can have other operations in between them (that will be useful when we do head-movement). In particular, we’ll do Untethering quite early, in the narrow syntax, and Rethering will happen quite late, maybe just when a spellout domain is about to spell out.

What would that mean for Japanese?

(18) Taroo-ga

TP

DP

koohii-o

| nom-

Here the ⊗ represent pairs of sisters that are not in an order. So T and vP aren’t ordered at this point, for example.
Let's do some more considering how Contiguity requirements are treated by the derivation. We've seen already that Contiguity relations have to be maintained (or, maybe, that they only can't be at the end of the derivation?)

We can fix that by giving T a new specifier, unless we Untether the specifier, it'll precede T. But can the new specifier become Contiguous with T? Well, no: there's no way to determine what material would be in the φ that you would create in order to create Contiguity with T. At this point, for example, T might follow vP (spoiler: it will), but then again, it might precede it. No way to tell.

Multitasking doesn't drive the movement of anything in particular into the specifier of TP: at this point, there's no way to create Probe-Goal Contiguity with T. So movement is purely driven by Affix Support, and hence can be of anything.

prediction: any metrically dependent suffix, in a head-final language, can trigger movement of anything to its specifier. So such languages ought to have scrambling as long as they have suffixes—and it's been observed that SOV languages typically do have some kind of scrambling (Corver and van Riemsdijk 1996).

---

### 1.2.3 C-final=no overt wh-movement

One of the results I tried to derive in the Contiguity discussion: if you're C-final, you won't have overt wh-movement.

But now there's affix support, which can also drive movement. Is that result still safe?

Thanks to the preceding section, yes. If a final C is an affix, it might drive movement to its specifier, but the movement will now be of any random doodad, not necessarily wh-phrases.

---

### 2. Contiguity and the derivation

We've seen already that Contiguity relations have to be maintained (or, maybe, that they only have to hold at the end of the derivation?)

(19) a. Probably John is happy.
   b. * Is probably John happy?

Let's do some more considering how Contiguity requirements are treated by the derivation.

---

Some VSO languages are described as requiring V, S, and O to be adjacent:

(20) a. Chuala (* ar ndóigh) mé an t-amhrán sin heard of course I that.song
   'I of course heard that song' [Irish: Adger 1997]

b. Phleanaíil an muinteoir (* foísta) an rud amach planned the teacher also the thing out
   'The teacher also planned out the thing'

(21) Ú-dáidh (* chuidte) Juáún bëj ASP-eat slowly Juan fish
   'Juan ate the fish slowly' [San Dionicio Ocotapex Zapotec: Broadwell 2002]

(22) (Iwir) x-e-oqotaj (*Iwir) ri tæli (*Iwir) ri me's yesterday ASP-3SG-ERG-chase yesterday the dog yesterday the cat
   'The dog chased the cat yesterday' [Kaqchikel: Broadwell 2000]

On the other hand, McCloskey demonstrated that this isn't quite true for Irish; there is a class of adverbs that can intervene between S and O:

(23) a. Deireann siad i gceol paidir roimh am luí say they always prayer before time lie
   'They always say a prayer before bed-time' [Irish: McCloskey 1996, 259]

b. Chuala Róise go minic roimhe an t-amhrán sin heard Róise often before.it that.song
   'Róise had often heard that song before'

c. Ní chluinfeadh aon duine choicse aris Ciarán ag gabháil cheoil NEG hear.COND any person ever again Ciarán making.music
   'No-one would ever again hear Ciarán making music'

d. Níor shaolraigh Eoghan ariamh pingín NEG earned Owen ever penny
   'Owen never earned a penny'

Assuming that T and v are both either in or near the verb, Contiguity apparently holds for T and the subject, but not for v and the object.

Two points about the facts in (23):

• there is a small sort of adverbs that can do this. Prior to McCloskey 1996, it was generally thought that S and O had to be adjacent.
  • the adverbs in question don't have to be where they are in (23); they can be at the end of the sentence (Jim McCloskey, p.c.)
Taking the second point first; looks like, once the O and the v are no longer Contiguous (thanks to verb movement), adverbs feel free to gratuitously make the situation worse. So here’s a limitation on Persistence: English C threatens to destroy T-subject Contiguity, and the relationship is maintained, but Irish T destroys v-object Contiguity, and the relationship is just irrevocably broken, and even gratuitously made worse by adverbs.

Imaginable story (thanks to Gary Thoms, p.c.): Contiguity relations are forgotten at phase spellout. In Irish, a Contiguity relation involving v doesn’t apply any more at T: in English, a Contiguity relation involving T does still apply at C.

Now, why is it such a small set of adverbs that can intervene between S and O? Let’s consider a derivation:

(24) a. VP

[Diagram]

Construct a VP, perhaps the topmost VP of a bunch of Larsonian shells.

b. vP

[Diagram]

v is Merged and Agrees with the object, establishing Contiguity. Any adverbs that were Merged in (54a) had better have been below the object (or perhaps the object moves to this position). The verb raises to v, for reasons we’ll skip for now.

c. vP

[Diagram]

The subject is Merged in Spec vP. v-Obj Contiguity still persists.

d. TP

[Diagram]

T Merges, and causes the verb to raise (again, we’ll ignore that). T doesn’t cause the subject to raise (we’ll see why later. Now we’re outside the vP phase, so v’s Contiguity relation with the object is gone, and adverbs can now be Merged between them.

So there’s a part of the derivation during which adverbs may not be Merged between the verb and the object (steps (54b-c) above). If adverbs are Merged during the derivation (and not all at once at the end of the derivation), then this might explain why low adverbs can’t go between the subject and the object in Irish.

Contrast the situation in French. French is a wh-in-situ language; more generally, Probes and Goals can be arbitrarily far apart as long as the Probe precedes the Goal, because French marks Right edges of maximal projections:

(25) a. Phleanáil an múinteoir (*fosta) an rud amach

[Irish]

planned the teacher also the thing

‘The teacher also planned out the thing’

b. Je lis (aussi) le livre

[French]

I read also the book

‘I am also reading the book’

So it’s possible that we might be able to use adverbs as a kind of ‘clock’: assuming that the same adverbs are Merged at the same points in the derivation in different languages, their placement can sometimes tell us things about when Contiguity relations hold during the derivation (including Contiguity relations which are gone by the time the derivation’s over).
We can find another example of Contiguity relations being broken in Danish.

Danish is like English in many ways:
- it’s got EPP at T (Affix Sappor)
- it doesn’t freely allow wh-in-situ prosodically active on the Left (English, Tagalog…)

Unlike English, Danish has V2, for some reason (something to do with C, presumably)

Until we add that C, though, Danish is English. So we predict that in non-V2 clauses, the verb and the object will have to be adjacent:

(27) a. ...at Johann ofte spiser tomater
   that Johann often eats tomatoes
   ‘...that Johann often eats tomatoes’

   b. *... at Johann spiser ofte tomater
      that Johann eats often tomatoes
      ‘...that Johann often eats tomatoes’

Here v-Object Contiguity prevents Merge of the adverb ofte ‘often’ between the verb and the object.

Now consider Danish V2:

(28) a. [ Om morgenen ] drikker Peter ofte [ kaffe]
    in morning.the drinks Peter often coffee
    ‘Peter often drinks coffee in the morning’

   b. [ Kaffe ] drikker Peter ofte [ om morgenen]
      coffee drinks Peter often in morning.the
      ‘Peter often drinks coffee in the morning’

In (28a), movement of the verb into the V2 slot has broken up the Contiguity relation between the v and the object (the one that enforces V-Obj adjacency in (28)). Again, just as in Irish, the Contiguity relations imposed by v don’t matter by the time we get to C.

In (28b), we can see that Danish C is in fact so ruthless that it is not interested in repairing the Contiguity relation that it had a hand in destroying. In both of the examples in (28), Contiguity for v and the direct object is destroyed in the course of the derivation. But the final word order in (28b) could satisfy Contiguity for both the subject and the object, by Contiguity-adjointing the subject and Grouping the object:

(29) Kaffe drikker-v-T Peter…
    coffee drinks Peter…

Apparently Contiguity relations from previous phases are actually forgotten in later phases; otherwise (28b) would block (28a).

We also expect Danish to be like English in that T should have to be adjacent to the Subject if it precedes it:

(30) a. Næste eftermiddag laa stene næv urorte.
      next afternoon lay the.stones still unmoved

   b. * Næste eftermiddag laa endnu stene urorte.
      next afternoon lay still the.stones unmoved

So Danish obeys the theory nicely, so far; it’s just a V2 version of English.

Now, Danish has relatives:

(31) a. Raykforbudet brot en student kansje allerede i går.
      the.smoking.ban broke a student maybe already yesterday
      ‘A (specific) student might have violated the smoking ban
      as early as yesterday’

   b. Raykforbudet brot kansje en student allerede i går.
      the.smoking.ban broke maybe a student already yesterday
      ‘Some student (or other) may have violated the smoking ban
      as early as yesterday’

   [Swedish: Svenonius 2002, 218]

(32) a. Har någon student möjligen last boken?
      has any student possibly read the.book
      ‘Has any student possibly read the book?’

   b. Har möjligen NÅGON STUDENT last boken?
      has possibly any student read the.book
      ‘Has ANY STUDENT possibly read the book?’

   c. ?? Har möjligen någon student last boken?

In Norwegian and Swedish, examples that are structurally like (32b) are well-formed (though with different adverbs, annoyingly: Svenonius writes as though this isn’t the relevant issue), under certain topic and focus conditions. Why is this?

Interestingly, Norwegian and Swedish are both described as having focus "tonal morphemes" that attach to the Right edge of the focussed phrase (Kristoffersen 2000, Gösta 2007)—and that Danish is famous for lacking such morphemes; Danish focus involves expanding the pitch range of the focused element, making the high tones higher, and the low tones lower (Gronnum 1992, Kristoffersen 2000, Gussenhoven 2004).
And in English, focus seems to involve things like H* L-; that is, a high tone on the stressed syllable of the focused element (so, again, not something that's aligned with the right edge of what's focused).

So Norwegian and Swedish have Focus tonal morphemes that are aligned with the Right edge of what's focussed…

…and Danish and English don't.

Recall that Danish and English are also alike in requiring the subject to be adjacent to T that precedes it…

…and while Norwegian and Swedish are alike in not requiring this, and in linking non-adjacency to something like Focus (or maybe non-Topic).

Really understanding this will have to involve an actual investigation of information structure in this theory, something I haven't tried to do yet. But a possibility is that Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish are all generally languages with prosodic activity on the Left…but that Norwegian and Swedish have focus-related morphemes that attach to Right boundaries of focused phrases, making it possible for focused phrases to participate in Grouping with Probes to their left.

3. Pied-piping

Classic problem: why does wh-movement often move more than just the wh-word?

(33)  a. [Whose mother] did you meet?  
     b. [During which of the talks] should we leave?

I’ll assume, almost following Cable (2007, 2010a, 2010b):

(34)  
     \[ \begin{array}{c}
     \text{QP} \\
     \text{PP} \\
     \text{P} \\
     \text{DP} \\
     \text{with whom}
     \end{array} \]

• QP dominates wh-phrases (universally)  
• C agrees with QP (universally)  
• Q agrees with the wh-phrase itself  
  (universally, in “limited pied-piping” constructions)  
  • wh-movement, restrictive relatives, but not non-restrictive relatives  

(35)  John, [pictures of whom] I do not think you should buy __…

→ no Q-whP Agreement: whom can be deeply embedded.

(36)  a. *[Pictures of whom] do you think I should buy __?  
    b. *[Des photos de qui] penses-tu que je devrais acheter __?  
       [French: Paul Marty, Sophie Moracchini, p.c.]

→ Q-whP Agreement: whom is limited in how far it can be embedded.  
How limited?

Uribe-Etxebarria (2002): conditions on ‘pied-piper’ reflect conditions on wh-in-situ!

Spanish (for some speakers, Jiménez 1997, Uribe-Etxebarria 2002, Reglero 2004) is an optional wh-in-situ language, with a twist:

(37)  a. ¿Tú le diste la guitarra a quién?  
     b. ¿Tú le diste a quién la guitarra?

‘Who did you give the guitar to?’

Spanish wh-in-situ must be clause-final (or ‘big-intonation-break-final’, anyway: (37b) can be saved with a big enough pause after the wh-phrase).

full disclosure: I’m not going to offer an account of why this is.

But Uribe-Etxebarria (2002) points out: the same condition holds on pied-pipers within the moved phrase:

(38)  a. ¿[La estatua en el jardín de qué diosa] te ha dicho Juan que había reconocido __?  

     [‘The statue in the garden of what goddess did Juan tell you that he had recognized?’]

b. *[La estatua de qué diosa en el jardín] te ha dicho Juan [with the] guitar __?  

     [‘The statue of what goddess in the garden did Juan tell you that he had recognized?’]
Only a phrase-final pied-piper can be non-initial in the moving phrase—just as only a clause-final wh-phrase may be in situ. Or in our terms: Q-wh Contiguity, like C-QP Contiguity, is only possible in Spanish if the Goal is as far right as possible.

Another condition on Spanish wh-in-situ, which I’m also not going to explain: it’s impossible in embedded questions (Reglero 2004, 20):

(39) *Pedro ha preguntado que has visto a quién
  Pedro has asked that you have seen DAT who
  ‘Pedro asked who you saw’

And embedded questions have tighter restrictions on pied-piping (Karlos Arregi, p.c.):

(40) a. ¿[El retrato de quién] ha dicho Juan que viste en el museo?
    the picture of who has said Juan that you saw in the museum
    ‘The picture of who did Juan say that you saw in the museum?’

b. * Juan me ha preguntado [el retrato de quién] viste en el museo.
    Juan me has asked the picture of who you saw in the museum
    ‘Juan asked me [a picture of who] you saw in the museum’

French lacks the ‘end-of-the-clause’ restriction in (37):

(41) Tu fait quoi dans la vie?
    you do what in the life
    ‘What do you do in life?’ (Shlonsky 2009)

And it also appears to lack the ‘end-of-the-wh-phrase’ restriction:

(42) ?[Des peintures de qui de Monet] as-tu vu au musée?
    of the paintings of who by Monet have you seen at the museum
    ‘[Paintings of who by Monet] did you see at the museum?’ (Sophie Moracchini, Paul Marty, p.c.)

French is like Spanish in banning wh-in-situ in embedded questions:

(43) *Peter a demandé [tu as vu qui]
    Peter has asked you have seen who

And French is also like Spanish in having tighter restrictions on pied-piping in embedded questions:

(44) a. [Des photos de qui] as-tu achetées?
    of the photos of who have you bought
   ‘[Photos of who] did you buy?’

b. * Je ne sais pas des photos de qui elle as acheté.
    I don’t know [photos of who] she has bought
    ‘I don’t know [photos of who] she bought’ (Sophie Moracchini, Paul Marty, p.c.)

English doesn’t standardly allow wh-in-situ, or deeply embedded pied-pipers:

(45) a. U-bona-nil?
    2SG-see-what
    ‘What do you see?’

b. Ngis-buze [ukuthi uPeter u-thenga-nil]
   1SG-asked that 1a.Peter 1a-bought what
   ‘I asked what Peter bought’ (Sabel and Zeller 2006)

And Zulu pied-piping can be by non-initial phrases, even in embedded questions:

(46) a. [Isibonelo sika-bani] oku-melwe si-si-landel-e?
   AUG.7.example 7.ASSOC.1-who 17.REL-ought 1PL.S-7.O-follow-SUBJ
   ‘[The example of who] ought we to follow?’

b. Si-no-valo ngoba a-s-azi
   2PLL-with.AUG.11.fear because NEG-2PL-know
   ukuthi [ingane ka-bani] e-zo-landela
   that AUG.9.child ASSOC-who 9.REL-FUT-follow
   ‘We’re afraid, because we don’t know [child of who] will be next’
   (Claire Halpert, p.c.)

…so Uribe-Etxebarria’s observation that pied-piping and wh-in-situ are similarly restrained seems to work well cross-linguistically, so far.
Recall that Icelandic should have wh-in-situ, given where it can put its adverbs: Icelandic=French.

Neither actually does have wh-in-situ, because of V2 (I suggested).

But Icelandic pied-piping is like French pied-piping: loose in main clauses, stricter in embedded questions:

(50) a. [Málverk eftr hvern] sást þú?
   painting by who saw you
   ’[A painting by who] did you see?’

b. *Ég veit ekkí [málverk eftr hvern] þú sást
   I know not painting by who you saw
   ’I don’t know [a painting by who] you saw’

(Hrafnhildur Bragadóttir, Stefan Olafsson, Helgi Gunnarsson, p.c.)

And Norwegian pied-piping is like English pied-piping:

(51) *[Fotografer av hvem] kjøpte hun? (non-echo)
   photographs of who bought she
   ’Who did she buy photographs of?’ (Oystein Vangsnes, p.c.)

So, slight twist on Uribe-Etxebarria’s generalization: it’s not that pied-piping by non-initial wh-phrases patterns with wh-in-situ possibilities, exactly—it’s that pied-piping patterns with what wh-in-situ possibilities should be, if it weren’t for V2.

Actually, even that is an oversimplification. One of Cable’s (2007) star examples of a language in which wh-phrases can be deeply embedded in QP is Tlingit:

(54) [Wáa kwligeyi xiat] să i tuwá sigóó?
   how it.is.big. REL fish Q you.want.it
   ’How big a fish do you want?’ (lit., ’[a fish that is how big] do you want?’)

Tlingit has obligatory wh-movement (Cable 2007). For that to be true, for me, it should be a language with initial C and a requirement that probes be adjacent to following Goals:

(55) C [wáa kwligeyi xiat sâ] i tuwá sigóó?
   how it.is.big. REL fish Q you.want.it
   ’a fish that is how big’

What about the Agree relation between Q and wh?

(56) [wáa kwlige yi xiat sâ] how it.is.big. REL fish Q
   ’a fish that is how big’

Tlingit Q, unlike (hopefully) Tlingit C, is on the right. So Tlingit’s need for probes to be adjacent to following goals won’t apply here: the Goal for Q precedes Q. It follows that Tlingit wh-words should be deeply embeddable.
Summary

Cable (2007):

(57)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Q \\
\text{with} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{whom}
\end{array}
\]

Cable posited a parameter: some languages have Q Agree with wh, and in such languages, Q and wh must be close together.

Claim I’ve just defended: no need for a (new) parameter. Q can Agree with wh universally (in wh-questions); whether this forces Q and wh to be close together depends on the language, in ways that are predictable from prosody (and relatable to wh-in-situ possibilities and position of adverbs)

If I’m right, it would be a mistake to give ourselves the power to allow the distribution of overt movements of different kinds to vary independently from each other, and from conditions on pied-piping. We should have a more constrained theory than that.

A remaining problem: none of this would stop VP from pied-piping in, for example, nonrestrictive relatives (which don’t have Q-whP Agree, by hypothesis):

(58) *John, [fired whom] I already have…

Something seems to just rule out pied-piping of certain phrases, regardless of the Agree relation between Q and wh. How do we do that? stay tuned…