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6.1 Wh-focus correlation

Our discussion of IS encoding in Russian would be incomplete if we did not consider wh-movement. Crosslinguistic investigations on IS showed that in many languages wh-words have the same distribution as focused constituents. For instance, languages that have a dedicated focus marker use it also with question words, as shown by the question-answer pair in (1) from Gungbe and in (2) from Kitharaka.

   what FOC Kofi eat        rice FOC Kofi eat
   ‘What did Kofi eat?’    ‘Kofi ate RICE.’

(Aboh 2007b: 5)

(2) a. I-mbi Maria a-ta-ir-e FOC-what 1Maria SM1-fetch-PRF-FV
   ‘What did Maria fetch?’

b. I-rû-ji Maria a-ta-ir-e FOC-11-water 1Maria SM1-fetch-PRF-FV
   ‘Maria fetched WATER.’

(Abels and Muriungi 2006:4)

In some languages in which Focus is marked only positionally, the same structural slot that is dedicated to focus is also taken up by a wh-word. This is shown in (3) for Aghem, a language that has a dedicated focus position immediately after the verb.

(3) a. Á mò zi ndûghó bé-kó án sóm EXPL PST eat who fufu in farm
   ‘Who ate fufu in the farm?’

b. Á mò zi ēnáo bé-kó án sóm EXPL PST eat Inah fufu in farm
   ‘INAH ate fufu in the farm.’

(Aboh 2007b: 10, 9)

Moreover, when different strategies are available for Focus encoding, e.g. in situ and ex situ, the same strategies can also be employed for wh-question formation. For instance, the Kitharaka examples given in (2) have counterparts in which the focus/wh-word remains in situ without the focus marker, as shown in (4).

(4) a. Maria a-ta-ir-e mbi
   1Maria SM1-fetch-PRF-FV what
   ‘What did Maria fetch?’
b. Maria a-ta-iř-e
   1Maria SM1-fetch-PRF-FV
   ‘Maria fetched WATER.’

[Abels and Muriungi 2006:3]

Such a perfect match between focus and wh-elements led to the conclusion that the two share the same position in the structure, namely FocP (Rizzi 1997). This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that focus and wh-words are usually mutually exclusive within the same sentence.

In the present work, Focus in SR is argued to be encoded in FocP within the vP periphery. Given the wh-/focus correlation described above, one might expect to find the same position hosting wh-phrases. However, as evidenced by (5), this prediction is not borne out.

   we.NOM tomorrow go.FUT.1PL where
   ‘Where are we going tomorrow?’

   b. *Oni nam prinesli čto?
      they.NOM us.DAT bring.PST.PL what.ACC
      ‘What did they bring us?’

A wh-word in Russian is required to move away from the postverbal field. The most natural way to ask a wh-question is to place a wh-word sentence-initially as in (6a). This is not the only possible landing site of wh-movement though. A question word can also follow the subject as well as some other fronted material (6b). However, the most illustrative example in this respect is (6c), where an auxiliary precedes the wh-word.

(6)  a. O čem ty budeš’ na seminare rasskazyvat’?
      about what you.NOM FUT.2SG on seminar.LOC tell.INF

   b. Ty na seminare o čem budeš’ rasskazyvat’?
      you.NOM on seminar.LOC about what FUT.2SG tell.INF

   c. (?) Ty na seminare budeš’ o čem rasskazyvat’?
      you.NOM on seminar.LOC FUT.2SG about what tell.INF

   ‘What are you going to talk about at the seminar?’

It should be noted that examples like (6c) have been previously claimed to be ungrammatical (Stepanov 1998). But according to my judgments, they are not unacceptable. Although some of my informants marked sentences like (6c) as marginal, none rejected them as unacceptable.

40 In-situ wh-words are marginally possible in echo questions.
The data in (6) put Russian in contrast to the abovementioned (as well as many other) languages in that the dedicated focus position is unavailable for \textit{wh}-words. This triggers a question – why should it be so? In the present chapter, I am going to tackle this mismatch between focus and \textit{wh} in Russian.

To start with, let us consider some previous proposals regarding \textit{wh}-movement in Russian.

\section*{6.2 Previous analyses of Russian \textit{wh}-movement}

There is no unanimity among researchers working on Russian as to whether or not the language has \textit{wh}-movement of the English type, i.e. whether a question word undergoes [\textit{wh}]-driven movement to CP in overt syntax. On the one hand, fronting of a \textit{wh}-element is obligatory (5 vs. 6), which can be taken as evidence that Russian is a normal \textit{wh}-movement language (Liakin and Ndayiragije 2001, Liakin 2005, Zavitnevich 2005). On the other, \textit{wh}-movement shares a fair amount of properties with IS-driven scrambling of non-\textit{wh}-constituents, which brought some researchers to conclude that Russian lacks [\textit{wh}]-driven movement and that the fronting we observe is of a different kind (Stepanov 1998, Strahov 2001, Bošković 2002). In the following two sections I outline these two positions and pinpoint some challenges they face.

\subsection*{6.2.1 Russian as a \textit{wh}-scrambling language}

Stepanov (1998) was the first to propose that fronting of \textit{wh}-words in Russian is not triggered by [\textit{wh}] feature checking. In other words, Russian is argued to be similar to languages like Japanese or Korean in which a \textit{wh}-word can front but the fronting has nothing to do with question formation, i.e. it is not initiated by a feature of the interrogative Co.

The driving force for movement of \textit{wh}-words in Russian, according to Stepanov, is [\textit{Foc}], a feature inherent to a \textit{wh}-word (Horváth 1986). On this view, the fronting operation we see on the surface is related to focusing rather than questioning. To distinguish it from pure \textit{wh}-movement, i.e. movement necessitated by [\textit{wh}] checking, the author refers to this operation as \textit{wh}-fronting, the terminology I adopt here.

Stepanov’s analysis is based on the idea that true \textit{wh}-movement must give rise to Superiority effects. The idea to treat Superiority as a \textit{wh}-movement diagnostics was proposed and thoroughly developed by Bošković (1997, 1999, 2002). Bošković (1999) explains the correlation between Superiority and \textit{wh}-movement through Economy. In particular, if a \textit{wh}-word undergoes real \textit{wh}-movement, it does so in order to check [\textit{wh}] on the interrogative Co. Being driven by a feature of the functional head, this movement must be subject to the Minimal Link Condition that requires an element closest to the attracting head H to check a designated feature of H. Consequently, only the \textit{wh}-word closest to Co should be allowed to undergo movement. Moreover, moving only one question word should be sufficient to check [\textit{wh}] on Co. In order to account for, the so-called, multiple \textit{wh}-fronting languages that are not subject to Superiority, Bošković proposes that \textit{wh}-words in these languages move for reasons independent of [\textit{wh}]-checking.
Stepanov’s analysis is an extension of these ideas to Russian. The author shows that Russian does not exhibit Superiority effects in any contexts, as illustrated in (7-8).

(7) Matrix wh-fronting

a. Kto komu čto podaril?
   who.NOM who.DAT what.ACC give.PST.MASC

b. Komu kto čto podaril?
   who.DAT who.NOM what.ACC give.PST.MASC

c. Čto komu kto podaril?
   what.ACC who.DAT who.NOM give.PST.MASC

‘Who gave what to whom?’

(8) Embedded wh-fronting

a. Mne interesno kto komu čto podaril.
   I.DAT interesting who.NOM who.DAT what.ACC give.PST.MASC

b. Mne interesno komu kto čto podaril.
   I.DAT interesting who.DAT who.NOM what.ACC give.PST.MASC

c. Mne interesno čto komu kto podaril.
   I.DAT interesting what.ACC who.DAT who.NOM give.PST.MASC

‘I am curious who gave what to whom.’

Another property typical of languages that do not have overt wh-movement, e.g. Japanese, is that a multiple wh-question does not necessarily trigger a pair-list answer (Bošković 1997, 2002). Russian in this respect patterns with Japanese: while English (9a) can only be responded to by (9b), Russian (10a) can be answered either by (10b) or (10c), if an appropriate context is provided41.

(9) a. Who screamed at who?

b. Alice screamed at her husband, and he screamed at her mother.

c. # Alice screamed at her husband.

41 There is no unanimity among Russian linguists with regard to the interpretation of multiple wh-questions. While some reject single-pair answers (Strahov 2001, Grebenyova 2004), others admit that they are possible (Stepanov 1998, Liakin 2005). I agree with the latter group.
On the basis of the data in (7-10), Stepanov (1998) concludes that Russian can be considered a \textit{wh}-in-situ language in what concerns [\textit{wh}] checking. The requirement to obligatorily front (all) [\textit{wh}]-words is linked to the tendency of contrastively focused non-[\textit{wh}]-constituents to front as well. Therefore, following Bošković (1997), the author argues that a trigger for fronting is the strong [\textit{Foc}] feature on [\textit{wh}]-words. The fact that the trigger for movement resides on the target and not on the attractor is argued to explain (i) obligatory movement of all the [\textit{wh}]-words present in the derivation\footnote{Bošković (1999) reformulates this idea and attributes the requirement on multiple fronting as well as the lack of Superiority in some Slavic languages as to a specific property of the attracting head. In particular, he proposes that a focus attracting head can, and in fact must, undergo multiple checking. As a result, all the elements carrying [\textit{Foc}] get attracted without violating Economy.}, and (ii) the lack of Superiority effects.

The head that participates in checking [\textit{Foc}] on [\textit{wh}]-words, according to Stepanov, is AgrS to which all the question words adjoin. This is shown to follow from the tendency of [\textit{wh}]-words to precede temporal adverbs and the future auxiliary. In fact, on Stepanov’s judgments, this is the only legitimate position for a question word in Russian.

Despite its attractiveness in what concerns the explanation for Superiority (or rather the lack thereof) and the semantics of multiple \textit{wh}-questions in Russian, Stepanov’s (as well as Bošković’s) analysis gives rise to some predictions which I show below not to be borne out.

First, if the trigger for \textit{wh}-fronting were [\textit{Foc}] on the moved constituent, we would expect to find contrastively focused non-[\textit{wh}]-DPs only in the preverbal field. In other words, (11c), where the focus stays postverbally, should be infelicitous as a response to the context statement, contrary to the facts.\footnote{Stepanov (1998) claims that this is indeed the case. However, my intuitions as well as those of my informants go against such a prediction.}
As shown previously in this work, focused constituents in CR can indeed front either to the middle field (11a) or to the clausal left-periphery (11b). To this extent focused and wh-constituents do behave similarly. However, there is a crucial difference between the two in that a non-wh focus can but does not have to front: (11c) is perfectly felicitous. Wh-words, on the other hand, must obligatorily front (5 vs. 6). In this respect, Russian contrasts with some other in-situ languages, e.g. Korean, in which wh-fronting is never obligatory.

Second, as stated above, Russian is a multiple-fronting language. If the reason for obligatory fronting of all the question words were their [Foc] feature, it would be expected that multiple [Foc] checking should be allowed not only for wh-elements but also for other types of focused constituents. However, as shown in (12), focus cannot be iterated in Russian, irrespective of the position of the focused constituents (i.e. whether both or just one is fronted).

Furthermore, it might be incorrect in principle to consider question words to be intrinsically focused. Recall from section 6.1 that some languages allow for different question strategies. In particular, Kîîtharaka was shown to have both in-situ and ex-situ wh-questions. Only in the latter case a wh-word can, in fact must, be accompanied by the focus morpheme. Aboh (2007b) carried out a systematic study on question-answer correspondence in languages similar to Kîîtharaka. He showed that questions with ex-situ wh-words must be replied to with sentences containing an ex-situ focus, while in-situ questions require an in-situ focus in the answer. In all the languages possessing a dedicated focus marker, the marker occurred with ex situ wh-words/focus only. On this basis, Aboh concludes that a
wh-word acquires its focus semantics by being focused syntactically rather than intrinsically.

Taking into consideration the inconsistencies between wh-words and non-wh focus, Strahov (2001) proposes to extend Stepanov’s analysis and to equate wh-fronting with IS-driven scrambling in general. That is, she argues that, since scrambling in Russian covers two distinct processes (Topicalization and Focalization), wh-fronting can also substantiate either of these operations. On Strahov’s account, wh-fronting is triggered by the need to check a [Top] or [Foc] feature on Top⁰ or Foc⁰, respectively. Thus, her approach differs from Stepanov’s only to the extent that she allows a wh-constituent to function either as focus or topic. The latter interpretation is claimed to arise in multiple wh-questions. Strahov argues that, although there are no syntactic Superiority effects in Russian, the order of wh-words is constrained by interpretive rules. In particular, she proposes that the leftmost wh-word in a question like (13) must be D-linked in the sense that it functions as a universal quantifier each over a predetermined set of entities⁴⁴.

(13) Kto čto prines?
who.NOM what.ACC bring.PST.MASC
‘Who brought what?’

On Strahov’s analysis kto ‘who’ in (13) is moved to the specifier of TopP and čto ‘what’ to the specifier of FocP within the left periphery of the clause.

Strahov extends the set of triggers for wh-fronting but, just as Stepanov (1998), she refutes the existence of true wh-movement in Russian. The author advances two main arguments in favor of this idea. First, Russian wh-words can function as bound variables in some polarity contexts, such as (14).

(14) Ešli kto pridet, provodi ego v moj kabinet.
if who.NOM come.FUT.3SG take.IMPER.2SG he.ACC to my study.ACC
‘If anyone comes, take him to my study.’

In the above example the wh-element kto ‘who’ stands for an existential quantifier, e.g. anyone. This reading is licensed by the conditional mood in the subordinate clause. This fact is taken to indicate that wh-words in Russian lack inherent quantificational force and are not crucial for typing a clause as interrogative.

Second, Strahov argues that Russian possesses a yes/no-question particle – li. This morpheme is used exclusively in yes/no-questions (15) and is banned from occurring in wh-questions (16).

(15) Priedut li roditeli?
come.FUT.3PL LI parents.NOM
‘Will the parents come?’

⁴⁴ Strahov (2001) does not accept single-pair answers to multiple wh-questions.
On the basis of (15-16) Strahov claims that typing a clause as interrogative is achieved in Russian by merging the question particle that can be either overt, as in (15), or covert, as in (16). Following Cheng’s (1991) Clause Typing Hypothesis, Strahov concludes that, given the properties illustrated in (14-16), Russian falls within the class of wh-in-situ languages.

Although Strahov’s (2001) analysis was envisaged as superior to the previous accounts of Russian as wh-in-situ (Bošković 1997, Stepanov 1998), I do not think the purpose was achieved. A satisfactory answer to the question of what triggers wh-fronting is still missing.

As stated repeatedly above, focus does not have to front in Russian (11). In Strahov’s analysis, the idea of [Foc] as a trigger of wh-fronting is maintained. This is how the author derives ordinary wh-questions like (16). Thus Strahov’s analysis inherits the problem of the previous accounts, since it yields the same false prediction that post-verbal contrastive focus is illegitimate. Moreover, it gives rise to some further wrong expectations.

First, given her assumption that the order of wh-words is subject to the D-linking requirement, such that the leftmost one is obligatorily D-linked, we expect that D-linked wh-words must always undergo movement. I doubt that this is necessarily the case. If we take a D-linked wh-phrase like kakoj iz/kto iz/kogo iz ‘which of’, we can observe that its behavior resembles that of D-linked wh-words in English. Namely, unlike a simple wh-word, it can stay post-verbally. This is unexpected on Strahov’s account.

Generally speaking, it is far from clear what exactly the interpretive effects of the reordering of wh-words in a multiple wh-question are. For instance, Liakin (2005) argues that when the set of alternatives implied by both wh-words is known, the order of the wh-words is really free. This is illustrated in (18).

(18) (Context: I know that both of my friends, Denis and Maksim, are going on vacations soon, and that one of them is going to Greece and the other one to Italy. But I am not sure who is going where.)

a. Kto kuda poedet? b. Kuda kto poedet?

who.NOM where go.FUT.3SG where who.NOM go.FUT.3SG

‘Who is going where?’

On the other hand, if one of the sets is unknown to the interlocutor, Liakin argues, contrary to Strahov, that the wh-word that stands for the undefined set must precede the one which implies the known set. Such a situation is set up in (19).
What we see above are two opposing views concerning one and the same question – what are the interpretive differences of the order of *wh*-words in a question? By claiming such differences both authors try to show that multiple *wh*-words do not target one and the same position.

It is difficult for me to take either side because I do not see the proposed differences as clearly as the abovementioned researchers do. I think that such a difference should exist and that the *wh*-words in a multiple question are not informationally equal. However, I do not see a strong correlation between the order of *wh*-words and their interpretation. In my view, both variants in (19) are felicitous, which means that a D-linked *wh*-word can either precede or follow a non-D-linked one. In other words, for me both (20a) and (20b) are equally acceptable.

(20) a. Kakuju knigu on komu otdal?
    which book.ACC he.NOM who.DAT give.PST.MASC

b. Komu on kakuju knigu otdal?
    who.DAT he.NOM which book.ACC give.PST.MASC

‘Who did he give which book?’

Going back to Strahov’s analysis, we see that the ordering restrictions are not as strict as they are claimed to be. Moreover, D-linking or topicality might not be the triggering force for *wh*-fronting at all. This has been illustrated in (17). A further indication to the same end comes from the following observation: a weak topic is free to stay postverbally as long as it is not preceded by focus, as shown in (21).

(21) (Context: Who did you give this book to?)
    Ja otdala etu knigu / ee svoej podruge.
    I.NOM give.PST.FEM this book.ACC/it.ACC REFL girlfriend.DAT

‘I gave this book/it to my GIRLFRIEND.’

The data in (21) dispense with another prediction generated by Strahov’s analysis, namely that no topical element can be postverbal.

The conclusion to draw from the above discussion is *wh*-words differ from non-*wh*-constituents with respect to topicality as well as with respect to focality. These distributional differences between question words versus non- *wh*-focus or topic undermine assimilation of *wh*-fronting to Focalization or Topicalization.
6.2.2 Russian as a true wh-movement language

There is another group of analyses of Russian wh-questions represented by works of Zavitnevich (1999, 2005), Liakin and Ndayiragije (2001), and Liakin (2005, 2007). The common assumption of these authors is that Russian does not differ from English in what concerns [wh]-checking. A wh-word in both languages is assumed to move to a dedicated functional head which is endowed with [wh], or [Q], a feature relevant for clause typing.

Liakin and Ndayiragije (2001) argue that [wh] is always strong in Russian and a wh-phrase is obligatorily moved to SpecCP, as in English. To explain the obligatory fronting of multiple wh-words, they assume that one of the question words moves due to the strong [wh] of C°, while the rest are attracted by the strong [Foc] of the Foc° which is projected as part of the extended CP domain (Rizzi 1997). In order to account for the lack of Superiority, the authors propose that the feature which is responsible for these effects is a phonological [+affix] feature on the corresponding functional head. In Russian both C° and Foc° are marked [-affix] and as a result the order in which the phrases move to check their syntactic features is irrelevant, i.e. the [- affix] setting makes all the wh-words equidistant from the attracting head.

In his later work Liakin (2005, 2007) modifies the account and proposes that the order of wh-words is constrained by discourse requirements such that the most informative wh-word, i.e. the one that does not imply the existence of the known alternatives, moves to the highest position which he coins D-WhP for ‘the most relevant for the discourse’, and the other wh-words are attracted to FocP (see the previous section for illustrations).

Zavitnevich (1999, 2005), following Cheng (1991), claims that wh-words in Russian do not possess quantificational force of their own. Rather, they are proforms that are combined with one of the operators (interrogative, existential, or universal) in course of the derivation. In Russian, as in English, an interrogative determiner merges directly with the wh-word which, according to Cheng’s theory, means that a wh-word in Russian participates in clause typing. The trigger for wh-movement, according to Zavitnevich (1999), is the strong [Q] feature on C° or/and Foc°. She assumes that both of these heads can carry the feature specification [+focus], [+Q]. This particular assumption is made to account for the fact that a wh-word in Russian is not always sentence-initial. As illustrated earlier, some element(s) can precede a question word. Moreover, in a multiple wh-question, wh-words need not be adjacent but can be separated by some element(s). A sentence like (22a) is assumed by Zavitnevich (1999) to have the structure shown in (22b).

(22) a. Čto otec komu kupil?
   what.ACC father.NOM who.DAT buy.PST.MASC
   ‘What did the father buy for whom?’
As shown in (22b), one of the *wh*-words is moved to SpecCP and the other one to SpecFocP, with TopP intervening between the two. In simple questions, when some element precedes a *wh*-word, the preceding element is also assumed to reside in SpecTopP with the *wh*-word occupying SpecFocP.

In her (2005) work, Zavitnevich amends her previous account and proposes that there is only one position responsible for clause typing, namely SpecCP. A *wh*-word carrying the [Q] feature undergoes movement for scope reasons. In multiple *wh*-questions, only one of the phrases is marked with [Q]. This assumption paves the way to the explanation for the lack of Superiority in Russian.

Similarly to Liakin (2005, 2007), Zavitnevich argues that the leftmost *wh*-phrase functions as a true question operator, i.e. it is [Q]-marked. The rest are argued to be interpreted as universal quantifiers and to move for focus reasons. Thus unlike in her previous analysis, she excludes Foc’ as a clause-typing head in Russian. Instead, all the *wh*-phrases, with the exception of the leftmost one, are devoid of [Q]. They function as variables and are bound by the operator within the highest *wh*-word under c-command.

The main challenge for the analyses discussed in this section are sentences like (23), where the *wh*-word follows the finite verb. Despite their variable status, such data are well attested. They can hardly be explained on an obligatory *wh*-movement account.

(23) a. (?)Ty teper’ vpred’ budeš’ kak postupat’?
   you.NOM now from.now.on FUT.2SG how behave.INF
   ‘How are you going to behave from now on?’

b. (?)My dolzhny vo skol’ko vyjti?
   we.NOM MOD.PL at how.much leave.INF
   ‘At what time should we leave?’

c. (?)Ty otpusk sobiraes’sja kogda brat’?
   you.NOM vacation.ACC be.going.PRS.3PL when take.INF
   ‘When are you going to take your vacations?’
Besides, in all the studies described in this section, the role of focus in multiple \textit{wh}-movement is underlined. This brings us back to the question of why non-\textit{wh} focused phrases undergo optional fronting (at least in CR), as opposed to \textit{wh}-words. Zavitnevich (1999) mentions the licensing of interrogative D\(^{0}\) as a trigger for movement (à la Cheng 1991). But since in her more recent work she assumes that only one \textit{wh}-word can carry [Q], it is no longer clear what this licensing is supposed to mean.

6.2.3 Discussion: \textit{wh}-movement or \textit{wh}-fronting?

In the previous sections we reviewed some existing analyses of Russian \textit{wh}-questions. There is a general assumption that is shared by both in-situ and ex-situ approaches. Namely, the proponents of both positions underline the role of focus in the positioning of \textit{wh}-words in Russian. However, the idea about focus as the primary trigger for movement of \textit{wh}-words has been challenged above. In order to maintain such an idea the difference between \textit{wh}-elements and non-\textit{wh}-focus should be explained. Moreover, as argued in chapter three, preposing in Russian does not have to do with focus at all. It was rather proposed that the fronting operation is licensed by D-linking. If that is true, we can hypothesize that D-linking is what stands behind preposing of \textit{wh}-words as well. On the basis of the definition of D-linking given in chapter three, repeated in (24) below, this seems quite plausible.

\begin{itemize}
  \item A constituent is D-linked if it has been explicitly mentioned in the previous discourse, is situationally given by being physically present at the moment of communication, or can be easily inferred from the context by being in the set relation with some other entity or event figuring in the preceding discourse.
\end{itemize}

The formulation in (24) introduces three types of D-linking: explicit, situational and implicit, or set-related. \textit{Wh}-words can be conceived of as being implicitly D-linked since semantically a \textit{wh}-word is assumed to denote a set of individuals, i.e. a \textit{wh}-word gives some hints as to the possible replacements of it in the answer (Chomsky 1971, Hamblin 1973). Note that the definition in (24) does not require that the set includes only known alternatives. This is why it is wider than the classical understanding of D-linking (Pesetsky 1987). The latter crucially relies on the identifiability of the alternatives in the set. If we were to use the classical definition of D-linking, it would be problematic to hold D-linking responsible for preposing of question words in Russian. We have already seen in section 6.2.1 that \textit{wh}-words which are D-linked in the strict sense (e.g. \textit{kakoj iz} ‘which of’) behave differently from normal \textit{wh}-words in that they are exempt from the obligatory fronting. This means that we should distinguish between weak D-linking for which it is sufficient to have an open set of alternatives and strong D-linking requiring a closed set. Based on this, we can say that all \textit{wh}-words are weakly D-linked but only a subset of them is also strongly D-linked.

With this in mind, we can try to explain the obligatory preposing of \textit{wh}-words in Russian by claiming that they are weakly D-linked and that weak D-linking is sufficient to make these constituents move. However, changing the
movement trigger from focus to D-linking still does not answer the question of why weak D-linking makes the preposing obligatory only for wh-words. In CR a non-wh-focus, even when D-linked (either weakly or strongly) is free to stay post-verbally. The conclusion is that neither focus nor D-linking constitutes a good motivation for the movement of wh-words in Russian. There must be some other reason for these constituents to leave their first-merge positions.

One possibility is that Russian is a true wh-movement language, i.e. (at least) one of the wh-words must always move to satisfy the requirement of clause typing. After all, the clause-initial position of a wh-word is by far the most preferred option. In this case, though, we expect to find some consistency in wh-placement. For instance in English, a wh-word is always clause-initial, which has been analyzed as indicating that the operator which enters into the relation with an interrogative C is inseparable from the wh-phrase (Cheng 1991, Cable 2007).

In Russian, as shown above, the restrictions on wh-word placement are not so strict. Besides the canonical initial position, a question word can appear in a number of other places. Most importantly, it is allowed to occur between an auxiliary and a lexical infinitive. Assuming that the auxiliary occupies the highest head in the IP domain, a wh-word in such cases must be lower than the CP field. This is not quite compatible with an obligatory-wh-movement hypothesis.

In fact, with respect to their placement, wh-words are similar to scrambled non-wh-constituents. The examples in (25) pattern nicely with those in (26).

\[(25)\]
\[
a. \text{Vy sobiraetes'} vo skol'ko vyjti'?  
  you\text{.NOM be\text{-}going.PRS.2PL at how\text{-}early leave\text{.INF}}
\]
\[
b. \text{Vy vo skol'ko sobiraetes'} vyjti?  
  you\text{.NOM at how\text{-}early be\text{-}going.PRS.2PL leave\text{.INF}}
\]
\[
c. Vo skol'ko vy sobiraetes' vyjti?  
  at how\text{-}early you\text{.NOM be\text{-}going.PRS.2PL leave\text{.INF}}
\]

‘What time are you going leave?’

\[(26)\]
\[
a. My sobiraemsja v tri vyjti.  
  we\text{.NOM be\text{-}going.PRS.1PL at three leave\text{.INF}}
\]
\[
b. My v tri sobiraemsja vyjti.  
  we\text{.NOM at three be\text{-}going.PRS.1PL leave\text{.INF}}
\]
\[
c. V tri my sobiraemsja vyjti.  
  at three we\text{.NOM be\text{-}going.PRS.1PL leave\text{.INF}}
\]

‘We are going to leave at THREE.’

A further indication of the similarity between wh-words and scrambled non-wh-phrases is that the latter just like the former do not show any Superiority effects. This is shown in (27).
Given our assumptions concerning the base order of internal arguments from chapter two, their mutual order after scrambling in (27b) and (27d) clearly violates Superiority. Nevertheless the sentences are perfectly acceptable.

On the basis of the abovementioned facts, it is very tempting to conclude that Russian totally lacks *wh*-movement and has only *wh*-fronting. Some arguments in favor of this idea have already been discussed in section 6.2.1. It was shown that Russian patterns with *wh*-in-situ languages with respect to the possibility of non-pair-list answers to multiple questions, context-dependent variability in interpretation of *wh*-elements (interrogatives versus existentials), and the availability of an overt question particle (*li*). If we just relied on these facts, we could admit that Russian is a *wh*-in-situ language which possesses an independently motivated *wh*-fronting operation. But the picture is, in fact, more complex.

There is a crucial difference between *wh*-in-situ languages and Russian which has been ignored by the advocates of the in-situ analysis. True *wh*-in-situ languages do not exhibit any root-embedded asymmetry. As shown in (28), the same strategy, i.e. in situ, is employed for forming matrix as well as indirect questions in Mandarin Chinese.

(28)  a. hufei mai-le sheme [Cheng 1991: 11]
Hufei buy-ASP what
‘What did Hufei buy?’

b. qiaofong xiang-zhidao hufei mai-le sheme
Qiaofong want-know Hufei buy-ASP what
‘Qiaofong wonders what Hufei bought.’

Russian, on the other hand, does not allow for a *wh*-word to occur clause-internally in an indirect question, as evidenced by (29).
Boris sprašivaet kogda Ivan (*kogda) budet (*kogda) vystupat'.

‘Boris is asking when Ivan is going to present.’

This fact is quite surprising if a *wh*-question in Russian is formed by merging a null *wh*-operator in SpecCP (Strahov 2001).

To sum up, one the one hand, Russian *wh*-words are not always in the same position; on the other hand, this variability in placement is restricted. In the sections that follow I am arguing that Russian employs both *wh*-fronting and *wh*-movement. In particular, I propose that Russian patterns with, the so-called, optional *wh*-in-situ languages like French.

6.3 Russian is like French

French is known for allowing both in-situ as well as movement-derived *wh*-questions, as shown in (30).

(30)  a. Qui as-tu vu?  
     who have-you seen

   b. Tu as vu qui?  
     you have seen who

   ‘Who have you seen?’

Extensive research on the issue (Chang 1997, Mathieu 1999, Bošcović 2000, Cheng and Rooryck 2000) has shown that the use of French questions like (30b) is quite constrained.

First of all, as illustrated in (31), such questions are only possible in matrix clauses. As we have seen above, a true in-situ language is not subject to this restriction (28).

(31)  a. Je me demande qui tu as vu.  
     I REFL wonder who you have seen

   b. *Je me demande tu as vu qui.  
     I REFL wonder you have seen who

   ‘I wonder who you have seen.’

Second, in-situ *wh*-words in French cannot occur within the scope of certain operators, such as negation, modals, quantificational adverbs, and quantifiers. As noted in Cheng and Rooryck (2000), Chinese, a *wh*-in-situ language, does not exhibit such intervention effects.

(32)  a. *Tous les filles ont acheté quoi?  
     all the girls have bought what
b. Qu’est-ce que tous les filles ont acheté?
   what EST-CE QUE all the girls have bought
   ‘What have all the girls bought?’

(33) a. * Jean ne mange pas quoi?
    Jean NEG eats NEG what
b. Que Jean ne mange-t-il pas?
    what Jean NEG eats-he NEG
   ‘What doesn’t Jean eat?’

The next property of the French *wh*-in-situ is that such questions have an intonation different from sentences with *wh*-movement. In particular, they are pronounced with the rising contour characteristic of yes/no-questions.

And finally, questions that lack *wh*-movement in French are argued to give rise to a special interpretation. Namely, the presupposition part of such questions, i.e. the sentence minus the question word, is perceived as being necessarily true. This means that (30b) cannot be answered by pas un seul ‘not a single one’. When asking (30b), contrary to (30a), the speaker shows his certainty that the event of seeing somebody actually took place.

Russian is, of course, different from French, as well as from pure in-situ languages, in that it does not allow true in-situ but requires, at least, *wh*-fronting. However, if we consider *wh*-fronting cases, we notice that they bear obvious similarities with the French-style in-situ.

We have already seen in the previous section that *wh*-words in Russian cannot remain in the middle field in embedded clauses. The same holds of the French in-situ (31).

Furthermore, as shown by (34-35), a *wh*-word cannot follow negation or a quantifier, but can precede them. The contrast between (34b) versus (34c) indicates that the problem with (34b) lies in the presence of the negation marker. (34a), in which the *wh*-word precedes the negation, is possible, although the extraction triggers a presupposition of existence typical of extractions out of Weak Islands (Starke 2001), i.e. a speaker must have some possible substitutions for a *wh*-word in mind. Starke (2001) states that the accommodation of the existential presupposition for an in-situ *wh*-word in French can rescue sentences like (33a). This is not the case in Russian: (34b), according to my intuitions, is bad with or without such a presupposition.

(34) a. Kuda ty ne budeš’ bol’še ezdit’?
       where you.NOM NEG FUT.2SG from.now.on go.INF
b. ?? Ty ne budeš’ kuda bol’še ezdit’?

You.NOM NEG fut.2SG where from.now.on go.INF

‘Where are you not going anymore?’

c. Ty na jogu teper’ budeš’ kuda ezdit’?

You.NOM for yoga.ACC now fut.2SG where go.INF

‘Where are you going for yoga from now on?’

(35) a. Čem vse budut zanimat’sja v vyhodnye?

What inst all.NOM fut.3PL engage.in.INF on weekends

b. ?(?) V vyhodnye vse budut čem zanimat’sja?

On weekends all.NOM fut.3PL what inst engage.in.INF

‘What is everybody going to do on the weekends?’

Whether or not the existential presupposition is present in (35a) is less clear. However, the difference in acceptability between (35a) and (35b) is attested and it is parallel to that observed in the French examples in (32).

Furthermore, Russian questions with wh-fronting to the middle field give rise to the same interpretive effects as French in-situ. Such sentences imply a strong belief on the part of the speaker that the event described in the background part did take place. This is illustrated by the short dialogues below.

(36) A: Kogda my budem delat’ suši?

When we.NOM fut.1PL make.INF sushi.ACC

‘When are we going to make sushi?’

B: Nikogda.

Never

‘Never.’

(37) A: My suši budem kogda delat’?

We.NOM sushi.ACC fut.1PL when make.INF

‘When are we going to make sushi?’

B: # Nikogda.

Never

‘Never.’

A question like the one in (37) is only felicitous in the situation when the making of sushi is a decided plan and the speaker is interested only in the exact identification of the day/time when the event will take place. That is why the response given in (37) is infelicitous. A canonical wh-initial question (36) is devoid of any particular presupposition making the negative answer possible. In fact, there is a clear syntactic indication of the existence of the mentioned pragmatic nuance in wh-fronting. Weak topics, denoting familiar entities, have a strong tendency to scramble in Russian. When a wh-word undergoes fronting to the middle field,
postverbal weak topics are not allowed. That is why the question from (37) becomes worse if the object follows the verb, as it does in (38).

\[(38) \quad ?(?) \text{ My budem kogda delat' suši?} \]
\[
\text{we.NOM FUT.1PL when make.INF sushi.ACC} \\
\text{‘When are we going to make sushi?’} \\
\]
The necessity of scrambling other postverbal constituents under \textit{wh}-fronting can be considered a syntactic reflex of the described presuppositional effect.

Note that nothing changes if the object in (36) undergoes scrambling, i.e. the response remains felicitous. This shows that the implicature present in (37) is triggered not by object scrambling but rather by \textit{wh}-fronting.

And finally, there is a certain correlation between the middle-field position of a \textit{wh}-word and the intonation such sentences can have. Given in isolation and without any prosodic cues, a sentence like (39) is ambiguous in Russian. As reflected in the translation, the question can be understood either as a \textit{wh}-question or as a \textit{yes/no}-question. 45

\[(39) \quad \text{My v vyhodnye kuda pojdem?} \]
\[
\text{we.NOM on weekends where go.FUT.1PL} \\
\text{‘Where are we going on the weekends?’} \\
\text{‘Are we going anywhere on the weekends?’} \\
\]
The question in (39) is disambiguated by intonation. A \textit{yes/no}-question has a sharply rising accent on the finite verb. On the \textit{wh}-question reading, the accent, rising but less so than in a \textit{yes/no}-question, falls on the \textit{wh}-word and the following verb is totally de-accented. The two intonation patterns are indicated by capitals in (40).

\[(40) \quad \text{a. My v vyhodnye kuda POJDEM?} \quad \text{Yes/no-question} \\
\text{b. My v vyhodnye KUDA pojdem?} \quad \text{Wh-question} \]

Recall that French in-situ \textit{wh}-questions have an intonation typical of polar interrogatives. Cheng and Rooryck (2000) argue that they are possible only with such an intonation and take this as a licensing condition on the French in-situ.

Russian facts are somewhat different in that, as we have seen above, \textit{wh}-questions formed by \textit{wh}-fronting are characterized by their own distinct intonation pattern. However, there is a common base here: both in French and in Russian a

\[45 \text{ That bare} \textit{wh}-\text{words in Russian can function as indefinites in conditional clauses is an often-noted and widely accepted fact. The interpretation of bare} \textit{wh}-\text{elements as indefinites in} \textit{yes/no}-\text{questions is not so widely recognized. Nevertheless, my pilot study showed that native speakers have no problem with using bare} \textit{wh}-\text{items in such contexts. In fact, one of the informants who consistently rejected questions with a} \textit{wh}-\text{word in the middle field on the} \textit{wh}-\text{question reading accepted such questions only on the} \textit{yes/no}-\text{reading.} \]
certain phonological feature allows the proper interpretation of an in-situ (or wh-fronted) question word.

The table given below summarizes the similarities between Russian and French wh-questions lacking overt wh-movement. For the sake of comparison, I also include a true wh-in-situ language, Chinese.

Table 6 Properties of wh-questions without wh-movement in French, Russian, and Chinese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>French in-situ</th>
<th>Russian wh-fronting</th>
<th>Chinese in-situ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention effects are</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observed with other quantificational elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed by a special</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted to matrix clauses</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create special pragmatic</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The facts pointed out in table 6 clearly confirm the idea that the classification into wh-movement versus wh-in-situ languages might be too rough as there appears to be an internal typology within both classes (Cheng and Rooryck 2000, Bošković 2002).

Given the discussed data, Russian can hardly be considered either a strict wh-movement or an in-situ language. As shown above, the exact position of a wh-word (sentence-initial or middle-field) has certain syntactic and semantic repercussions. I take this to mean that constructions with the clause-initial wh-word are derived differently in comparison to those where the wh-word is in the middle field. I assume that a canonical question with the clause-initial question word is derived by wh-movement, while ‘short’ movement to the middle field is wh-fronting. An indication of the plausibility of this characterization comes from the fact that constructions with canonical initial wh-words do not exhibit any ambiguity, i.e. sentences like (41), unlike (39), can only be interpreted as wh-questions.

(41) Kuda my pojdem v vyhodnye?  
    where we.NOM go.FUT.1PL on weekends  
    ‘Where are we going on the weekends?’  
    *‘Are we going anywhere on the weekends?’

The impossibility to interpret the wh-word in (41) as an existential does not follow from some general ban on placing existentials sentence-initially. As shown in (42), an existential can scramble to the beginning of the sentence, at least in spoken Russian.
Therefore, I suggest treating Russian on a par with languages like French that possess both in-situ and ex-situ strategies. The latter is the most common way to form a *wh*-question. The “in-situ”, or rather *wh*-fronting, option is subject to speaker variation. Some accept it more readily than others. Generally, *wh*-fronting is restricted to the colloquial language. Interestingly, the same register restriction has been claimed for French in-situ *wh*-questions (Adli 2006).

There are some issues that require consideration once we admit the existence of *wh*-movement on a par with *wh*-fronting in Russian.

One of the arguments in favor of the in-situ analysis for Russian is the lack of Superiority effects discussed in section 6.2.1. In this respect Russian *wh*-movement differs from French. French questions derived by movement exhibit Superiority, as illustrated in (43).

(43) a. Qu’ est-ce qu’il va presenter où?
    what EST-CE QUE he AUX present.INF where

b. * Où est-ce qu’il va presenter quoi?
    where EST-CE QUE he AUX present.INF what

‘What is he going to present where?’

If the sentence-initial position of a *wh*-word in Russian is a result of *wh*-movement, as I assume here, the data like those in (44) are unexpected.

(44) a. Komu Ivan čto podaril?
    who.DAT Ivan.NOM what.ACC give.PST.MASC

b. Čto Ivan komu podaril?
    what.ACC Ivan.NOM who.DAT give.PST.MASC

‘What did Ivan give to whom?’

Does the grammaticality of (44a) as well as of (44b) mean that these questions are derived by some operation different from that involved in the derivation of the French questions in (43)? On Stepanov’s (1998) and Bošković’s (2002) analysis this is indeed the case: (43a) is expected to be the result of *wh*-movement and (44a-b) of *wh*-fronting. However, there might be another explanation for the observed difference between Russian and French.

Cable (2007) works out the theory of *wh*-movement according to which the movement is a syntactic reflex of the agreement relation between an
interrogative head within the C-domain and the Q particle that takes a *wh*-phrase as its complement. That is, within this approach, there is no direct relation between a *wh*-word and an interrogative C\(^0\): C\(^0\) agrees with a QP rather than a *wh*-DP. Superiority violations are assumed to arise when more than one Q-headed phrase is present in the derivation. This is argued to hold universally. In order to account for cross-linguistic variation, Cable proposes that languages differ with respect to the feature specification of the interrogative head itself. In his analysis this head is Force\(^0\). For a language to be able to introduce more than one QP into the derivation it should possess a Force\(^0\) that is capable of entering into multiple agreement relations. Cable coins such a head Force\(^{o2}\). If a language has this type of interrogative head in its lexicon, this language will necessarily exhibit Superiority effects because the agreement between Force\(^{o2}\) and each of the QPs proceeds in the way all other agreement relations proceed, i.e. constrained by the Minimal Link Condition. However, in some languages Force\(^{o2}\) is unavailable. As a result, the Force head incorporates a [Q] feature and consequently it can only agree with one other Q\(^0\). In Cable’s terminology, these languages have a Force\(^{o}\), interrogative head. This means that in a multiple question in such a language only one *wh*-phrase is headed by Q, all the other *wh*-words are just like simple indefinites. Crucially, there are no syntactic constraints that regulate which one of the *wh*-phrases present in the derivation is contained within QP and which one is a Q-less indefinite. Only the number of QPs is constrained, which, in this case, equals one. Because there is only one element which is relevant for agreement with Force\(^{o}\), no Superiority violations are expected to occur: any of the *wh*-phrases can be a complement of Q\(^0\).

As is clear from Cable’s analysis, there should not necessarily be a correlation between the availability of *wh*-movement and Superiority effects in one and the same language. There is no variation as to whether or not a language is subject to the Minimal Link Condition that underlies Superiority violations. All languages are expected to conform to this principle. Moreover, there is no need to postulate a mechanism of feature checking that is different from what is generally assumed to be the case. Recall that on Stepanov’s/Bošković’s account, the trigger for *wh*-fronting is a feature of the *wh*-word itself, not of a functional head. Thus languages on this analysis are supposed to differ with respect to the properties of the elements undergoing movement. Cable, on the other hand, does not have to make any such additional assumptions. Crosslinguistic variation within his approach is restricted to the properties of functional heads, in the case at hand - Force\(^0\). In this respect his analysis is superior.

If Cable’s theory is correct, the lack of Superiority in Russian reflects the lack of Force\(^{o2}\). Most importantly, his work is a good example of an alternative way to account for the Superiority facts across languages. In light of analyses like Cable’s, Superiority as a test for *wh*-movement/*wh*-in-situ loses its strength.

Another fact which needs our attention is the putative existence of an overt Q-particle in Russian. As argued by Cheng (1991), there is a strong crosslinguistic correlation between the existence of overt Q-particles and in-situness, such that languages which have overt question morphemes lack *wh*-movement. Cheng also comes up with the generalization that the existence of an overt yes/no-particle implies the existence of a (possibly covert) *wh*-particle. This type of dependency has been used as an argument for the presence of a covert *wh*-particle in Russian
and thus for the lack of *wh*-movement, because the language has been claimed to have an overt *yes/no*-particle – \( li \) (King 1995, Strahov 2001).

Assuming the Clause Typing Hypothesis, if \( li \) is indeed a question particle, then the *wh*-fronting analysis seems to be the preferred option. In this case, the differences between Russian and Chinese, on the one hand, and the similarities between Russian and French, on the other, require some other explanation.

In the following section, I consider \( li \) in some detail and present arguments against treating it as a question particle in Russian.

6.3.1 \( Li \) is not a question particle
It is indeed the case that the particle \( li \) is used in *yes/no*-questions. However, its presence is obligatory only in embedded questions.

(45) Mama sprašivaet pridet *(li) Anna.
mother.NOM ask.PRS.3SG come.FUT.3SG LI Anna.NOM
‘The mother is asking whether Anna is coming.’

Matrix *yes/no* questions can optionally contain \( li \) (46). Once \( li \) is present in the derivation, the verb undergoes obligatory movement to the sentence-initial position, as is shown by the contrast between (46)-(47). Nothing can precede the verb in such questions.

(46) Pridet *(li) Anna?
come.FUT.3SG LI Anna.NOM
‘Is Anna coming?’

(47) * Lidija pojdet li v otpusk?
Lidia.NOM go.FUT.3SG LI to vacation.ACC
‘Is Lidia going to have vacations?’

Although (46) is a possible *yes/no*-question, it is not the preferred option. As a rule, matrix questions correspond in form to declaratives and are only marked intonationally, as indicated by capitals in (48).

(48)

a. Anna PRIDET?
Anna.NOM come.FUT.3SG
‘Is Anna coming?’

b. Lidija POJDET v otpusk?
Lidia.NOM go.FUT.3SG to vacation.ACC
‘Is Lidia going to have vacations?’

Strahov (2001) interpreted data like those in (45) and (46) as indicating that Russian, just like Chinese, contains an overt question particle. However, there are some problems that arise under such a treatment of \( li \).

First of all, as evidenced by (46) versus (47), \( li \) obligatorily triggers verb movement. This movement is not required and even dis-preferred, when \( li \) is
missing (48). Based on this we can safely conclude that fronting of the verb indicates that *li* is present in the derivation. The parentheses in (46) show that it can either be spelled out or remain silent. My informants showed a clear inclination to spell out the particle if the verb is moved. In other words, *li* always attracts the verb, irrespective of its phonological visibility. From this it follows that sentences like those in (48) do not contain *li* at all. This, however, leads to a puzzle – how can these questions be derived in the absence of the question particle?

One can undermine our conclusion that the lack of movement presupposes the absence of *li* and assume that the particle is also present in (48). On such an analysis, verb movement must be considered obligatory when *li* is overt, but optional if it is devoid of any phonological features. That is, movement should be conceived of as some sort of phonological requirement. After all, *li* is usually described as a clitic that attaches only to the first phonological word in a string (King 1995). This option, however, is suspicious in light of the fact that questions of the form in (46) and those of the form in (48) do not have the same interpretation.

First of all, speakers find sentences like (46) rather strange or archaic on a usual question interpretation. Instead, questions with *li* are mostly interpreted as rhetorical. In particular, they have an implication that the speaker presupposes an answer with the opposite polarity. This property is a hallmark of rhetorical questions, as shown by the English examples in (49)

(49)  
   a. Did I ask you to stick your nose into my affairs?  
       (implication: No, I didn’t).
   b. Didn’t I ask you to keep away from me?  
       (implication: Yes, I did).

No such implication is present in (48). Moreover, the questions in (48) can only marginally function as rhetorical yes/no-questions. Thus we have the following distribution of labor: *li*-questions are good as rhetorical, while unmarked yes/no-questions are true information questions. Rhetorical questions are not real questions at all. They are not seeking for information. The fact that *li*-questions have a tendency to be interpreted in such a way casts a serious doubt on the assumption that *li* is a question particle. It obviously has to do with something other than questioning. The interpretive properties of *li*-questions indicate that the particle affects clause-typing by reducing the interrogative power of the question. The following data show the sensitivity of *li* to focus.

It has been observed that yes/no-questions containing a disjunction are usually ambiguous between a yes/no and an alternative reading (Han and Romero 2004). The ambiguity can be resolved by intonation.

(50)  
   a. Did John DRINK coffee or tea?  only yes/no-reading
   b. Did John drink COFFEE or TEA?  only alternative reading

Interestingly, a Russian *li*-question with a disjunction is unambiguous with respect to these two interpretations. This is illustrated below.
The sentence in (51a) is only acceptable if it asks whether any of the mentioned individuals is coming to work. Similarly, (51b) can only mean - are you going to have any of these drinks? Neither (51a) nor (51b) is felicitous as a question of the type which of these two. If we try to stress the alternatives in (51) in order to force the alternative interpretation the sentences simply turn degraded.

Yes/no-questions lacking li and formed, instead, with the help of intonation do exhibit the ambiguity. In this respect, they pattern with their English equivalents. As in English, the ambiguity is resolved by stress.

What is important for us in contrasting (52) with (51) is that the difference in the interpretation between the two sets of questions stems from the absence versus the presence of li. If li were a mere question particle we would not expect to find any such contrast.

Interestingly, alternative questions are not totally incompatible with li. Rather they differ structurally. In order to construct a well-formed alternative li-question, the focused constituent should be placed to the sentence-initial position followed by the particle.

As with yes/no-questions, alternative questions of the form shown in (53) are not readily accepted by speakers on the real question reading. The usual way to ask an alternative question is to mark focus intonationally, as in (52b). Questions like (53) are more commonly interpreted as rhetorical, i.e. the implication in (53) is that we are most probably going not to the sea but somewhere else.
The facts described above point to two main properties of questions containing the putative question particle. First, such questions are not ordinary questions. Second, the constituent preceding \( \text{li} \) functions as focus.

On the basis of the facts described above, I suggest that \( \text{li} \) is not directly related to interrogation. As a matter of fact, the particle is not even restricted to interrogative sentences. An online Russian dictionary (www.gramota.ru) enumerates the following functions of \( \text{li} \): (i) \( \text{li} \) is used as a disjunction marker in the enumeration, (ii) \( \text{li} \) is used as a conditional particle close to \textit{whether}; (iii) \( \text{li} \) is used in the modal meaning to express surprise, doubt (in this function it is used in rhetorical questions), and (iv) \( \text{li} \) is used for emphasis in yes/no-questions. The examples with \( \text{li} \) we have seen so far can be classified under meaning (iv). The following examples illustrate the other uses of \( \text{li} \).

(54) \( \text{Li} \) as a conditional particle

\[
\text{Polućit\ li\ on\ eto\ mesto\ ili\ net\ ešče\ get.FUT.3SG\ LI\ he.NOM\ this\ position.ACC\ or\ not\ so.far\ neizvestno.\ unclear}
\]

`} Whether he gets this position or not is unclear so far.\`

(55) \( \text{Li} \) as a disjunction marker in the enumeration

\[
\text{Doma\ li,\ na\ rabote\ li,\ vezde\ ona\ home.LOC\ LI,\ at\ work.LOC\ LI\ everywhere\ she.NOM\ oščuščala\ svoju\ nenužnost'.\ feel.PST.FEM\ REFL\ uselessness.ACC}
\]

`} At home, or at work, everywhere she felt her own uselessness.\`

(56) \( \text{Li} \) as a modal particle

\[
\text{Ne\ vypit’\ li\ nam\ vodki?\ NEG\ drink.INF\ LI\ we.DAT\ vodka.GEN}
\]

`} Shouldn’t we have some vodka?’ or ‘Let’s have some vodka!’\`

Looking at the data in (54-56), one can suppose that there are several lexical items \( \text{li} \) in Russian, each with its own semantics. However, such an assumption seems superfluous because all the examples shown so far share a number of properties. In all of them a \( \text{li} \)-marked constituent occurs at the left-edge of the clause. Furthermore, in all the examples the marked constituent is directly or indirectly related to disjunction, and the word preceding \( \text{li} \) is a focus exponent.

To sum up, an analysis of \( \text{li} \) must capture the following facts: (i) its function as a disjunction; (ii) its focus orientation; (iii) its influence on clause-typing, and (iv) its syntactic position. I suggest that all these properties of the particle follow naturally if we assume that \( \text{li} \) is an overt realization of the complex head formed by head movement of Force\( ^2 \) to Force\( ^3 \). The syntactic representation for (46) is given below.
The head movement of \( Foc'^2 \) to \( Force^0 \) ensures the double function of \( li \): it signals the focus and influences clause-typing in the way described above. The verb in (57), just as in the derivation of verb focus described in section 5.3.5, enters into parallel checking relations: with \( Asp^0 \) and \( Force^0+Foc'^2 \), being spelled-out in the Edge position. Importantly, there is no \( InterP \) in (57), which was assumed to import the interrogative component. Its absence is not surprising given that \( li \)-questions are rhetorical.

The derivation drawn in (57) can account for all the properties of \( li \) enumerated above. Perhaps the only one that might require some explication is (i), i.e. relation to disjunction. I assume that the above-mentioned facts (i) and (ii) are, in fact, interconnected. Disjunction has been shown to be intimately linked to focus (Han and Romero 2004). Two disjoined clauses differ from each other only in the focal part. The constituents standing in the disjunction relation are always foci. For instance, when two full-fledged clauses are disjoined (58a), the Focus corresponds to the entire clause. To account for disjunction of separate clausal constituents, Schwarz (1999) proposes that what happens in such situations is deletion of the presupposed part of the clause, as shown in (58b) and (58c). I adopt this deletion analysis of disjunction.

\[
(57) \quad \begin{array}{c}
| \text{ForceP} \\
| \text{Force}' \\
| FocP_2 \\
| \text{Foc}'_2 \\
| t_{Foc} \\
| \text{TP} \\
| \text{Anna} \\
| \text{AspP} \\
| \text{Asp}' \\
| t_{Asp} \end{array}
\]

(58) a. Either [they put John to the other office]_{foc} or [I will leave]_{foc}

b. Either they [put John to the other office]_{foc} or they [lose me]_{foc}

c. Either they put [John]_{foc} to the other office or they put [me]_{foc} to the other office.

On this view, the scope of Focus can be said to coincide with the scope of disjunction. In other words, the two are different sides of the same coin.

To sum up, in this section I argued against treating the Russian particle \( li \) as an interrogative head. It was shown that its usage is not limited to questions. Moreover, its occurrence in a question turns a real question into a rhetorical.
Instead, it was proposed that *li* is rather an overt realization of the Foc$^o$+Force$^o$ complex.

By proposing this analysis for *li* I dispense with the argument in favor of the *wh*-in-situ analysis for Russian, according to which the language is assumed to have an overt question particle. Instead, I would like to follow the view expressed in section 6.3 that Russian is like French; namely, it is a *wh*-movement language that under certain conditions allows *wh*-words not to undergo *wh*-movement.

### 6.4 The syntax of questions in Russian

In section 6.3 it was established that Russian *wh*-questions are formed either by *wh*-movement or by *wh*-fronting. The latter is an operation that has been defined as dissociated from checking of [wh] on the interrogative C$^o$.

The purpose of this section is twofold. First, I am going to consider the optionality of *wh*-movement in the language and propose a derivation for *wh*-movement and *wh*-fronting. Second, I will address the question of what drives *wh*-fronting.

#### 6.4.1 The optionality of *wh*-movement

In 6.3 I drew a number of parallels between Russian and French in what concerns *wh*-movement. On the basis of Cheng and Rooryck’s (2000) analysis of French, I showed that the *wh*-fronting option in Russian is constrained in the same way as the French in-situ. In particular, in both languages the respective operations are limited to matrix clauses, they trigger specific pragmatic effects, they are subject to the intervention condition, and they are licensed by a special intonation. The last point, i.e. special intonation, is of crucial importance to Cheng and Rooryck’s account. I summarize their proposal below.

The authors argue that the main licensing condition for the French in-situ is a special intonation with which such questions are uttered. In particular, a *wh*-in-situ question must be pronounced with the intonation typical of *yes/no*-interrogatives, i.e. with the rising contour. If it has a non-rising intonation characteristic of ex-situ questions the sentence is ungrammatical. On this ground, the authors propose that the *yes/no*-question intonation is syntactically represented by the question morpheme Q merged in C$^o$. The ability of the morpheme to license *wh*-in-situ depends on the specification of its [Q] feature: if it is specified as [Q: *wh*] or [Q: *yes/no*], it can only give rise to a *wh*-question or a *yes/no*-question, respectively. This is, for instance, what happens in English, where [Q] always carries one of the values. In some languages Q can be underspecified, i.e. it takes the value [Q: _]. If this happens, Q is valued in the course of the derivation. Namely, the default value it can take is [Q: *yes/no*]. However, it can also get valued as [Q: *wh*], if there is a *wh*-word whose [wh] feature can provide the specification for the morpheme by LF raising of [wh]. An important point of this analysis is that this LF movement is only for the purposes of Q valuation. The [Q] feature on C$^o$ is checked by the intonation morpheme. In other words, as in Cable’s (2007) analysis described in section 6.3, there is no direct feature checking going on between C$^o$.
and a \textit{wh}-word. Cheng and Rooryck conclude that a \textit{wh}-movement language can allow \textit{wh}-in-situ only if its Q morpheme can be underspecified.\footnote{They also show on the example of Korean that a pure \textit{wh}-in-situ language can also have unvalued Q.}

I would like to adopt Cheng and Rooryck’s analysis in accounting for Russian \textit{wh}-fronting. As a starting point, I assume, following much recent research (Cheng and Rooryck 2000, Cable 2007, Abol and Pfau forthcoming), that the agent responsible for clause-typing in questions is not the \textit{wh}-word itself but rather a question particle, call it Q, that can be either overt or covert. This means that in \textit{wh}-movement languages the goal of movement is Q which pied-pipes the \textit{wh}-element. In these languages, Q is inseparable from the \textit{wh}-word, possibly because the two enter into agreement (Cable 2007). In-situ languages, on such an account, are those where no agreement holds between Q and the \textit{wh}-word and where Q can be separated from its \textit{wh}-associate. But in some languages both options seem to be possible. This, I argue, is the case of Russian and French.

Q in Russian is always phonologically null. We have already seen in the previous section that attempts to postulate an overt Q for Russian run into various problems. For a question to be formed, Q must enter into agreement with the interrogative Co, or rather the [Q] feature on Q\textsuperscript{o} enters into checking with [Q] on C\textsuperscript{o}. Since throughout this work I adopt the split CP-hypothesis, I take this agreement to hold between Inter\textsuperscript{a} and Q\textsuperscript{o}. I further assume that this checking relation can proceed either via Move or Merge depending on when Q enters into the derivation. If Q is merged with the DP containing a \textit{wh}-word, it has to move to SpecInterP pied-piping the \textit{wh}-phrase. As a result, we get a derivation with \textit{wh}-movement schematized in (59).

\begin{equation}
(59) \begin{array}{l}
{ a. \text{Kogo ty videla?}} \\
{ \text{who.ACC you.NOM see.PST.FEM}} \\
{ \text{‘Who did you see?’}} \\
{ } \\
{ b. } \\
{ } \\
{ } \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

Adopting Pesetsky and Torrego’s (2007) model of feature checking, described in chapter one, I assume that [Q] is interpretable on the Q particle. Moreover, when it merges with the DP it is also valued as [Q: wh]. Inter\textsuperscript{a} is assumed to carry uninterpretable and unvalued [Q], which gets valued via agreement with the QP. In the other type of the derivation, [Q\textsuperscript{c}:] on Inter\textsuperscript{o} is checked via Merge. In this case Q is merged directly with Inter\textsuperscript{o}. Since \textit{wh}-words are not crucial for
clause-typing no *wh*-to-InterP movement needs to take place and a question word can stay low. In this way we obtain structures with *wh*-fronting represented in (60).

\[
(60) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{a. My na vyhodnýh budem čto delat’?} \\
\text{we.NOM on weekends.LOC FUT.1PL what do.INF} \\
\text{‘What are we going to do on weekends?’}
\end{array}
\]

Along the lines of Cheng and Rooryck (2000), I propose that *wh*-fronting can take place only if Q is underspecified for the [yes/no]/[wh] value. A valued Q, i.e. [Q:\ph] always takes a *wh*-phrase as its argument and forms a larger QP. The value on Q in this case can be viewed as a result of agreement between Q and a *wh*-DP (Cable 2007). If, on the other hand, Q lacks any value it merges directly with Inter\(’\). This ensures checking [Q:\ph] on Inter\(’\) but leaves the feature unvalued. Since unvalued features must be eliminated prior to LF, the [Q:\ph] of the Q+Inter\(’\) complex head will search the work space to get valued. If it cannot find a proper goal, it acquires the default [yes/no] specification. Thus, on this analysis, yes/no-questions result from the default setting of unvalued [Q:\ph] on the Q+Inter\(’\) head. If there is a *wh*-word in the structure, the question particle acquires [wh] value by agreeing with the question word at a distance.

In section 6.3 it was shown that questions in which a *wh*-word remains low are ambiguous between a *wh-* and a yes/no-reading. On the one hand, this fact supports the analysis in terms of underspecification of Q. On the other, it raises a question – what decides whether Q gets the default value or enters into agreement with the *wh*-word. In the spirit of Cheng (1991) and Cheng and Rooryck (2000), I assume that the choice is predetermined by the internal structure of the *wh*-element. Suppose that when functioning as an indefinite the *wh*-word is headed by D\^ which differs in its feature content from D\^ heading a question word. Russian, in fact, has different morphological instantiations of D\^ depending on the syntactic environments in which a *wh*-element occurs. This is exemplified in the table below using the *wh*-word *kto* ‘who.NOM’.
Table 7 provides morphological evidence in favor of the complex structure of Russian \( w_h \)-words. With respect to questions, I assume that when functioning as a question word, \( kto \) ‘who’ is a complement of \( D^0 \) which carries an uninterpretable \( [Q] \), while an existential \( kto \) is selected by \( D^0 \) which does not have this feature. Given that agreement is feature matching, an unvalued \( Q \) on the interrogative head will be able to get value only from an item containing the same feature, i.e. from a \( w_h \)-DP carrying \( [Q] \).

As stated earlier, potentially ambiguous sentences with \( w_h \)-fronting are disambiguated by intonation: on the \( yes/no \)-interpretation the finite verb is accented (61a), while on the \( w_h \)-reading there is stress on the \( w_h \)-word (61b).

\[(61) \quad \text{a. My we.NOM vvyhodnye ACC kuda POJDEM? go.FUT.1PL FUT.1PL ‘Are we going anywhere on the weekends?’} \]

\[(61) \quad \text{b. My we.NOM vvyhodnye KUDA pojdem? go.FUT.1PL FUT.1PL ‘Where are we going on the weekends?’} \]

As follows from table six, another disambiguating strategy is to spell-out the existential \( D^0 \), which in this case has the phonological form \( -nibud’ \).

Note that with respect to the phonological properties, Russian \( w_h \)-fronting differs from the French in-situ in that such constructions in Russian cannot be pronounced with the \( yes/no \)-intonation on the \( w_h \)-reading. This, I assume, follows from the fact that in Russian a bare \( w_h \)-word is ambiguous and intonation plays a crucial role in fixing the meaning. In French, indefinites and question words are morphologically distinct. Moreover, as noted in Aboh and Pfau (forthcoming), French ex-situ \( w_h \)-questions are also compatible with the rising intonation typical of \( yes/no \)-questions. This means that this phonological property might be a general characteristic feature of questions in the language.
To sum up, I have proposed that what distinguishes *wh*-fronting in Russian is underspecification of the interrogative particle *Q*. The lack of value allows it to merge directly with *Inter* thus ensuring clause-typing. The valuation of [Q] on Q+*Inter* is carried out either by feature matching with a *wh*-item or by default. The exact mode of [Q] valuation has consequences for interpretation: in the default situation [Q] obtains the value [yes/no], while under matching its value is set to [Q: *wh*].

6.4.2 Why fronting is obligatory

In the above discussion Russian *wh*-movement was given the same treatment as French with a proviso that in French the choice is between moving a *wh*-word to CP versus leaving it in situ, while in Russian the options are movement versus fronting. Leaving a *wh*-word in situ when the *wh*-question reading is intended is impossible. An obvious question is why this should be the case?

The claim of the previous analyses is that fronting is independently triggered by focus considerations. *Wh*-words are assumed to be inherently contrastively focused and this property is argued to force fronting. I have dismissed this view on basis of the fact that focus (including contrastive focus) in Russian does not have to be preposed. Moreover, in chapter four and five, I argued that what drives focus movement is not so much [+info] as some additional feature, which I coined [D] for D-linking.

Bošković (2002) makes a short remark on the difference between *wh*-words versus focused non-*wh*-constituents (2002: p. 356, fn.7). He suggests that, unlike non-interrogative foci, *wh*-words can only be interpretable in the focus position, which underlies their obligatory fronting. This is a plausible assumption given that semantically *wh*-words clearly differ from ordinary foci. For example, Cable (2007) proposes that the distinction between the two stems from the fact that *wh*-words do not have an ordinary semantic value but possess only a focused semantic value, i.e. they denote sets of alternatives (Rooth 1996)47. Along these lines, it can be suggested that *wh*-fronting is some sort of overt QR – after all, *wh*-words are quantificational elements. However, it is easy to illustrate that quantifiers, and in particular existentials, are not banned from occurring post-verbally in Russian (62). This weakens a QR approach to *wh*-fronting.

(62) a. Ty mne kupil čto-nibud’ vkusnen’koe?
you.NOM I.DAT buy.PST.MASC anything.ACC tasty.ACC
‘Did you buy me anything tasty?’

b. On naverno otdal komu-nibud’ tvoju
he.NOM probably give.away.PST.MASC someone.DAT your
knigu.
book.ACC
‘He probably gave your book away to someone.’

47 Treating *wh*-words as variables stems from such works as Cheng (1991) and Lipták (2001).
One of the claims of the present thesis is the existence of FocP₁ above vP. If it is true that question words are uninterpretable in situ, what prevents them from checking their focus feature against Foc₁? Movement to SpecFocP should also be sufficient to construe a quantifier-variable configuration. Therefore, the insufficiency of \textit{wh}-to-FocP₁ movement for the purposes of question formation must follow from something else.

My suggestion is that a \textit{wh}-word cannot stay either in situ or in SpecFocP₁ because of the deficiency of the lower phase Edge. As described in chapter five, the Edge of the lower phase does not contain all of the projections included into the Edge of the higher phase. In particular, there is no counterpart of InterP on top of the lower phase. The question particle Q in \textit{wh}-fronting contexts is merged directly with Inter₁, i.e. it is situated at the higher phase Edge. I propose that a \textit{wh}-word in SpecFocP₁ cannot be reached by Q to enter into checking relations. As a result, the \([Q]\) feature on the \textit{wh}-word remains uninterpretable and that on Q unvalued. The default valuation, i.e. \([Q: \text{yes/no}]\), cannot save the situation. Given the assumptions about the internal structure of \textit{wh}-words from 6.4.1, it would result in a mismatch between the interpretation of the question and that of the \textit{wh}-item.

What exactly prevents a \textit{wh}-word in the Spec of FocP₁ from entering a long-distance Agree with the Q+Inter₁ head located at the higher phase Edge? After all, this type of agreement is argued to take place under \textit{wh}-fronting.

I propose to address this problem by building on the idea that parts of the structure become opaque for further operations at certain points in the derivation. An orthodox view is that only the Domain of a phase (where phase heads are taken to be v and C) is sent to Spell Out and becomes impenetrable. However, some recent research on the issue (Svenonius 2000, Den Dikken 2007, Pesetsky 2007, among others) has shown that languages may differ with respect to how much of the structure becomes opaque at a given stage in the derivation. As a result, the identification of phases, and thus points of Spell Out, becomes parameterized. This parameterization is argued to be contingent on the phase-head movement. In particular, when a phase head H moves and adjoins to a higher head Z, it brings with it (some of) its phasal properties. The consequence is that, depending on the exact approach, the phase HP is extended to ZP (Den Dikken 2007) or, in other words, H proceeds exhibiting its phasal property in its landing site (Pesetsky 2007).

In the present work, I adopt the phase extension hypothesis. I also assume the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) stating that only the Head and the Edge of a phase are visible to probes outside the phase, with the Domain being opaque. Given the possibility of phase extension, PIC becomes relativized. Depending on the landing site of a moving phase head various chunks of structure turn untouchable.

In chapter two I argued that the verb in Russian obligatorily leaves vP and moves at least as high as Asp°. Within the phase extension hypothesis this means that the first phase gets extended and what used to be the Edge of the phase turns into its Domain. Given PIC, the elements within the Domain are unavailable for agreement with heads beyond the phase. In order to become visible for potential probes they have to move out of the Domain, to the Edge. Within the present proposal this is exactly what forces a Russian \textit{wh}-word in a \textit{wh}-question to front to the preverbal area. They cannot stay either in situ or at the vP periphery, e.g. in
FocP, because it would make them invisible for a higher probe, Q+Inter. Therefore in order to save the derivation a wh-DP has to move close enough to the probe, presumably to the edge of the newly constructed phase, e.g. AspP. In other words, wh-fronting is an attempt to reduce the distance between the probe and the goal. The explanation for the obligatoriness of wh-fronting in terms of phase extension also finds the following motivation.

First, as argued by Svenonius (2000), there is a strong correlation between verb movement and the possibilities of moving other vP-internal material out. In his analysis this correlation is accounted for by proposing that in languages with extensive head movement Spell Out is delayed which gives more possibilities for word order alternations. In other words, items within the domains not yet spelled out remain visible for higher goals. In essence, this is the same state of affairs we obtain with phase extension. Russian is a heavily scrambling language. As described in chapter three, apart from the clause-final focus and the clause-initial strong topic positions the placement of scrambled elements is quite free. If we assume that V-movement creates new phasal boundaries, we can try to explain the observed word order freedom by taking the scrambled constituents to occupy Edges of the newly constructed phases.

Another partial support for the PIC-based analysis of wh-fronting in Russian comes from the fact that Russian successive cyclic movements are, in general, heavily restricted. In particular, Russian totally lacks long wh-movement out of that-headed clauses. I am going to discuss Russian long wh-movement in some detail below. At this point, I would like to draw the parallel between the lack of pure wh-in-situ and the overarching ban on that-trace configuration. The common ground for the two phenomena, I argue, is that they depend on the mechanism of phase extension: wh-fronting occurs because of phase extension, while long dependencies over the complementizer that are banned due to the lack thereof.

6.4.2.1 Long wh-movement in Russian
Unlike English, Russian wh-movement (both subject and object) is strictly clause-bound in clauses headed by the complementizer čto ‘that’. Note that the type of the matrix predicate (bridge/non-bridge) does not influence the acceptability.

(63) a. ??/*Kogo Olga skazala čto oni videli twh?
   who.ACC Olga.NOM say.PST.FEM that they.NOM see.PST.PL
   ‘Who did Olga say that they saw?’

   b. ??/*Kto Olga skazala čto twh videl
   who.ACC Olga.NOM say.PST.FEM that see.PST.MASC
   Raju?
   Raja.ACC
   ‘Who did Olga say that saw Raja?’
Sentences like (63) become grammatical if the complementizer is dropped. However, following Stepanov (2001), I take such sentences to be mono-clausal structures with the putative matrix clause being a parenthetical.\footnote{The restructuring analysis proposed later on in the text for \textit{\textit{kak/kogda/čtoby}}-subordinates can be extended to complementizer-less clauses as well.}

For a long time, \textit{wh}-extraction out of non-matrix clauses in Russian has been argued to be restricted to infinitival (64) and subjunctive (65) contexts\footnote{The judgments differ slightly with respect to extractions out of subjunctive clauses. Some grade them as marginal, others as fully acceptable. But in any case, there is a sharp contrast between \textit{čto} ‘that’ versus \textit{čtoby} ‘that.SUBJ’ clauses.}.

(64) Komu Ira nadeetsja otdat’ t\textsubscript{wh} kotjat?
who.DAT Ira.NOM hope.PRS.3SG give.away.INF kittens.ACC
‘Who does Ira hope to give the kittens to?’

(65) Komu Ira hočet čtoby my otdali t\textsubscript{wh} kotjat?
who.DAT Ira.NOM want.PRS.3SG that.SUBJ we.NOM give.away.PST.PL kittens.ACC
‘Who does Ira want that we give the kittens to?’

Inspired by a recent study on long-distance scrambling in Russian (Glushan 2006), I argue that cross-clausal \textit{wh}-movement is also possible from complements headed by complementizers other than \textit{čto} ‘that’. These are complementizers such as \textit{kak} ‘how’ and \textit{kogda} ‘when’. The relevant examples are given in (66).

(66) a. Čto ty videla kak ona emu what.ACC you.NOM see.PST.FEM how she.NOM he.DAT give.away.PST.FEM
‘What did you see that she was giving away to him?’

b. Čto ty ljubiš’ kogda podajut na what.ACC you.NOM love.PRS.2SG when serve.PRS.PL for zavtrak t\textsubscript{wh}?
breakfast
‘What do you like when (they) serve for breakfast?’

A characteristic feature of sentences like (66) is that the embedded clause is interpreted as indicative not interrogative, i.e. \textit{kak} ‘how’ cannot be interpreted as ‘in which manner’ and \textit{kogda} ‘when’ as ‘at what time’.

It is not clear whether the licit extractions described above exhibit the Subject/Object asymmetry. There is a massive speaker variation. To be on the safe side, I only discuss examples with object extraction.

The data presented above show that infinitival, subjunctive, and \textit{kak/kogda/čtoby}-subordinate clauses pattern together and contrast with \textit{that}-
clauses. What is the difference between the two groups, besides the morphological shape of the complementizer?

A cue for answering this question comes from infinitival complements. Research on this type of complementation has shown that these clauses are defective in the sense that they form a unity with the higher clause, or, in other words, undergo restructuring (Rizzi 1978, Cinque 2004). As a result, the sentences containing infinitive clauses display a number of transparency effects. The data in (65) and (66) show that transparency effects are also possible with finite embedded clauses. The contrast between (63) versus (65-66) prompts that despite the superficial resemblance of subjunctive and kak/kogda-subordinates to normal finite clauses (e.g. Tense on the verb and Nominative case on the subject) these clauses are structurally deficient and also undergo restructuring. Antonenko (2006) defends this idea with respect to Russian subjunctive clauses, and I am going to adopt his analysis here.

Antonenko’s analysis is based on the mechanism of feature checking proposed by Pesetsky and Torrego (2007) and adopted in this thesis. To recap, interpretability and valuation, within this approach, are assumed to be two independent properties of a syntactic feature. Thus a feature can be interpretable but unvalued and, conversely, uninterpretable but valued. Antonenko assumes that an indicative lexical verb carries the specification \([T_u: \text{val}]\), while a subjunctive verb is marked \([T_u: \text{}]\). T* in both types of clauses has the feature content \([T_i: \text{}]\). The major derivational difference between indicative and subjunctive clauses is that in the former the [Tense] feature on T後 gets valued within its own clausal domain. A subjunctive clause, on the other hand, can only get its T valued from the matrix clause because no verbal head within the clause can provide any value. Importantly, the valuation of all the unvalued [T] features happens when the matrix T後 enters the derivation. This means that the subjunctive complement is temporally anchored by the root predicate. The fact that a subjunctive verb in Russian carries the Past Tense morphology can be an idiosyncrasy of the language.

One crucial aspect of the analysis is that Russian lacks T-to-C movement in matrix indicative clauses. This idea is defended by Antonenko as well as by Khomitsevich (2007). One of the motivations for this assumption comes from the fact that Russian does not exhibit Sequence of Tense. This is most clearly illustrated in a sentence like (67).

(67) Ivan skazal čto Olga gotovila.
Ivan.NOM say.PST.MASC that Olga cook.PST.FEM
‘Ivan said that Olga cooked.’

In the English translation of (67), the Past Tense in the embedded clause expresses simultaneity of the action, i.e. *cooking*, with the speech activity of the matrix subject, i.e. *saying*. The simultaneity of the two events can be underlined by using the Progressive Aspect in the embedded clause *(Ivan said that Olga was cooking)*. In the Russian sentence, however, the Past Tense on the embedded verb can only marginally be interpreted as simultaneous past (Khomitsevich 2007). The most natural interpretation is that *Olga’s cooking* occurred before *Ivan reported about it*. 
Thus, what we see from (67) is that in English the two clauses ‘communicate’ with respect to tense, while in Russian no such ‘communication’ is necessary.

Interestingly, as shown by Khomitsevich (2007), simultaneous past is well attested, in fact obligatory, with perception verbs. These verbs take complements which are introduced by the complementizer kak ‘how’. The same holds of kogda ‘when’-headed subordinates. In both sentences in (68) the event described in the embedded clause can only be understood as being simultaneous with that of the matrix clause.

(68) a. Vse videli kak ona plakala.
   all.NOM see.PST.PL how she.NOM cry.PST.FEM
   ‘Everybody saw that she was crying.’

   b. Mne nравило kogda k nam prihodil
      I.DAT like.PST.NEUT when to we.DAT come.PST.MASC Pavel.
      Pavel.NOM
      ‘I liked when Pavel came to our place.’

I conclude that it is not accidental that extraction is possible from exactly those clauses that exhibit some sort of Sequence of Tense with the matrix predicate. The tense ‘communication’ observed here can be viewed as another manifestation of transparency.

I consider Antonenko’s (2006) and Komitsevich’ (2007) analyses of subjunctive to be on the right track and propose to extend it to sentences with kak/kogda-headed complement clauses. This means that, just like in subjunctives, the [Tense] feature on T° moves to C° in these cases. The syntactic reflex of this movement is transparency for extraction, and the semantic reflex is simultaneous tense interpretation. Following Cardinaletti and Shlonsky (2004), we can take verbs requiring kak/kogda –headed complements to belong to the class of, the so-called, quasi-functional predicates. They differ from run-of-the-mill restructuring predicates in that they exhibit a mixture of functional and lexical properties. In the case at hand, the functional nature of these verbs in Russian is manifested in the discussed transparency effects.

In the previous section it was assumed that head movement is able to postpone the Spell Out and thus prolong the active life of features in the derivation. If in Russian matrix clauses as well as in that-subordinates C° does not have a [Tense] feature and no T-to-C movement takes place (Antonenko 2006, Komitsevich 2007), we expect the clause to be spelled out as soon as the highest head within the CP domain is merged. All the other features must be checked by that point. Given the split-CP hypothesis, the highest head is Force°. On the basis of the facts discussed in the present section, I argue that the indicative complementizer čto ‘that’ in Russian merges as the head of ForceP and it is only compatible with valued and interpretable [T] on T°. In fact, I assume that indicative čto can only head a clause containing no uninterpretable or unvalued features. Once it enters the derivation, the whole clause is spelled out and becomes opaque for further operations. This accounts for the impossibility of extractions out of čto-clauses.
Interestingly, čto-headed complements are not incompatible with interrogation. As illustrated in (69), a complement clause introduced by this complementizer can be a question, albeit marginally.

\[(69) \quad \text{Olga skazala čto kogo oni videli t-wh?}
\]
Olga.NOM say.PST.FEM that who.ACC they.NOM see.PST.PL

‘Who did Olga say that they saw?’

A sentence like (69) is derivable, unlike those in (63), because in (69) the [Q] on Inter is valued clause-internally and by the time the complementizer is introduced no more features need to be checked so that the clause can be successfully spelled out. The derivation of the embedded clause from (69) is illustrated in (70).

\[(70) \quad \text{ForceP spells out and becomes opaque}
\]

The checking of uninterpretable features is indicated by strikethrough and the features that get valued as a result of Agree with the corresponding item are given in italics.

The subordinate clauses headed by kak ‘how’, kogda ‘when’ and čtoby ‘that.SUBJ’ are derived differently. These complementizers head ‘deficient’ clauses. Note that in the presence of a wh-word inside a kak/kogda/čtoby-complement the wh-word can marginally stay inside the subordinate clause.

\[(71) \quad \text{a. Ty hočeš’ čtoby kogo ja priglasila?}
\]
you.NOM want.PRS.2SG that.SUBJ who.ACC I.NOM invite.PST.FEM

‘Who do you want me to invite?’

\[(70) \quad \text{ForceP spells out and becomes opaque}
\]

\[(71) \quad \text{a. Ty hočeš’ čtoby kogo ja priglasila?}
\]
you.NOM want.PRS.2SG that.SUBJ who.ACC I.NOM invite.PST.FEM

‘Who do you want me to invite?’
The examples in (71) are similar to that in (69). Only the order COMP > wh is possible in both cases. Based on this similarity, I assume that kak and čtoby complementizers in (71) occupy the same structural position as čto in (69), i.e. the head of ForceP. However, in (69) there is no [Tense] feature in C and the structure spells out as soon as čto enters the derivation. In (71), on the other hand, there is a [Tense] feature within the CP domain, which triggers T-to-C movement. I assume this feature to reside in Fin°. Assuming that the verb in kak/kogda/čtoby-clauses has an unvalued [Tu: ] feature (Antonenko 2006), by the time the clause is constructed there are still illicit features, namely [T\textsubscript{su: } ] on the verb, [T\textsubscript{i: } ] on T° and, I assume, [Tu: ] on Fin°. As a result, the clause cannot be spelled out and the elements within the complement CP remain accessible for probes from the matrix clause. Namely, the matrix T°+v° values all the unvalued [T] features inside the subordinate CP. Similarly, the matrix Inter° can reach the embedded wh-word and attract it to its Spec. However, [T] on Fin° cannot agree with the matrix T°+v° over the subordinate Force° without violating Relativized Minimality. To circumvent the problem I assume that the [T] on Fin° moves further to Force°. There is in fact a morphological reflex of this movement. The subjunctive complementizer čtoby is morphologically complex and consists of čto plus the irrealis particle by, which I take to be generated in Fin°. Kogda/kak-clauses are argued to follow the same derivation with the only difference that there is no overt element in Fin° and the Fin°-to-Force° movement is not visible on the surface.

The derivation of the subordinate clause from example (72a) proceeds as shown in (72b). Sentences with kogda- and kak-subordinates are derived in essentially the same way.

(72) a. Kogo ty hočeš’ čtoby ja who.ACC you.NOM want.PRS.2SG that.SUBJ.I.NOM priglasila? invite.PST.FEM
   ‘Who do you want me to invite?’
b. value for [T: ] comes from the matrix clause

In (72a), the *wh*-movement targets the matrix InterP and transits via the embedded InterP, which is indicated by strikethrough in (72b). As shown by the marginally possible (71a), it can also be spelled out at the SpecInterP position of the embedded clause.

If we compare (70) to (72b), we see that the deficiency of *kak/kogda/čtoby*-complements stems from the tense properties of the embedded tense-related heads rather than from the structural deficiency. The head-movement preconditioned by the lack of value on [T] ensures phase extension and, as a result, the successive-cyclic *wh*-movement.

6.5 Summary

In this chapter we considered Russian *wh*-movement. The interest in this issue is caused by the crosslinguistic tendency of *wh*-words to exhibit the same distribution as focused constituents.

Russian has been shown to be somewhat different in this respect. While the canonical focus position is post-verbal in the language, the same position cannot be occupied by question words. Instead, a *wh*-item has to move to the preverbal area, either to the clause-initial position or into the middle field.

In the present chapter I argued that the two potential landing sites are targeted by different syntactic operations. *Wh*-words in the canonical clause-initial position undergo true *wh*-movement, while middle field positions are derived by *wh*-fronting, an operation akin to scrambling. In both cases the underlying trigger is the same, namely the requirement to check the [Q] feature. However, the exact mechanism of checking varies depending on certain factors.
Following much recent research, I adopted the idea that a wh-question requires the presence of an independent Q head. This head can merge either with a wh-DP or with the interrogative head Inter\(^o\). In the former case, Q pied-pipes the whole DP into the SpecInterP position where it enters into local agreement with the corresponding feature of Inter\(^o\). If Q merges directly with Inter\(^o\) it is unvalued with respect to \{wh; yes/no\} specification. Therefore it starts searching the structure for an element which can provide the required value. If no such licenser is present, the default \{yes/no\} value is assigned. However, if there is a wh-DP of the appropriate type, the complex Q\(^o\)+Inter\(^o\) head agrees with the wh-DP and gets valued. Agreement can be carried out at a distance, i.e. a wh-DP is not required to move overtly to SpecInterP. However, it still has to undergo wh-fronting into the preverbal field.

The explanation for the obligatory wh-fronting relied heavily on PIC and the mechanism of phase extension. It has been proposed that because of v-to-Asp movement the lower phase in Russian gets extended to (at least) AspP. As a result, a wh-item which remains inside the vP phase (including its Edge) becomes invisible for agreement with Q\(^o\)+Inter\(^o\) situated at the Edge of the higher phase. Since a question word carries an uninterpretable [Q], it represents an illicit LF object. Consequently, such a derivation crashes. Moving a wh-item to the edge of a newly obtained phase, say AspP, saves the derivation. In this way the present proposal accounts for the insufficiency of wh-to-FocP\(_1\) movement in order to form a wh-question in Russian.