

## The syntax of correlatives and feature-driven *wh*-movement

In this paper, I examine the syntax of correlatives in Russian (1a), opposing them to headed relatives (1b). First of all, I review arguments for and against CP-movement in Russian, following Bhatt's (2003) analysis of correlatives in Hindi. Subsequently, I show that Russian correlatives do not have a covert *if*-clause that could hypothetically be the source of the conditional semantics characterizing correlative constructions (Izvorsky 1996, Bittner 2001, Bhatt and Pancheva 2006, Arsenijević 2009).

- (1) a. Kto pridët pervym, tot polučit bilet besplatno.  
who come.3SG first that(person) receive.3SG ticket for.free  
[Lit.: 'Who comes first, that (person) will receive a ticket for free.']  
b. Tot, kto pridët pervym, polučit bilet besplatno.  
that(person) who come.3SG first receive.3SG ticket for.free  
[Lit.: 'That (person) who comes first will receive a ticket for free.']

According to my analysis, *kto* in (1) is a *wh*-pronoun moving to Spec,CP: [<sub>CP</sub> *kto*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>C'</sub> C [<sub>TP</sub> <*kto*<sub>i</sub>> ... ]]]. C and *kto* share their features under Agree and C ends up by bearing the same set of features as *kto*. This set (referred to as {*wh*}) is also available in CP. I assume that the demonstrative (DEM) is a variable that is interpreted deictically when it is free. When CP is adjoined to TP, as in (2a), DEM falls under the scope of {*wh*} and becomes a bound variable (cf. Srivastav 1991). High adjunction of CP is a function of DEM's topicalization (Lipták 2012).

- (2) a. [<sub>TP</sub> CP<sub>{wh}</sub><sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> DEM<sub>i</sub>] ... ]]  
b. [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub> DEM<sub>i</sub>] CP<sub>{wh}</sub><sub>i</sub>] ... ]

As for (1b), it is a low-adjunction structure (2b) where DEM is bound by {*wh*} of a DP-adjoined CP. That is, both (2a) and (2b) have the same *wh*-DEM relationship with a non-interrogative meaning of {*wh*}. This analysis opens the door to a discussion about the nature of *wh*-features and their interpretation at LF.

## References

- Arsenijević, Boban. 2009. {Relative{conditional{correlative clauses}}}. In Anikó Lipták (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically*, 131-156. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 2003. Locality in correlatives. *NLLT* 21:485-541.
- Bhatt, Rajesh and Roumyana Pancheva. 2006. Conditionals. In Martin, Everaert, Henk van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans and Bart Hollebrandse (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax I*, 638-687. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bittner, Maria. 2001. Topical referents for individuals and possibilities. In Rachel Hastings, Brendan Jackson and Zsófia Zvolenszky (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT XI*, 36-55. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Izvorski, Roumyana. 1996. The syntax and semantics of correlative proforms. In: Kiyomi Kusumoto (ed.) *Proceedings of NELS 26*, 133-47. Amherst: GLSA Publications.
- Lipták, Anikó. 2012. Correlative topicalization. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 59:245-302.
- Srivastav, Veneeta. 1991. The syntax and semantics of correlatives. *NLLT* 9:637-86.