## Another Account on Russian multiple wh-questions

Although Russian and Bulgarian are taken to represent two different sub-types of multiple whfronting languages, a closer look reveals that the differences between the two are very shallow.

It has been argued (Bošković 1998, 2002; Stepanov, 1997) that Russian is a language with no overt movement to [Spec, CP], even a wh-in-situ language. I take issue with this claim and based on the fact that data as in (1) have been largely neglected I study Russian multiple wh-questions in detail, following the analysis introduced by Krapova and Cinque (2004) for Bulgarian.

- 1. a. Kto kogo videl? who whom saw a'. ??Kogo kto videl?
- b. Kto čto videl? c. Kuda začem on hodil?

  who what saw where why he went
  b'. \*Čto kto videl? c'. \*Začem kuda on hodil?

Krapova and Cinque study the order of wh-adjuncts with respect to wh-objects and wh-subjects and reveal the following order:

Tabe 1.

| D-linked wh-   | Non-D-linked wh-phrases |                      |                |                 |  |  |              |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--|--|--------------|
| koj/koja/koe/koi (N) (which) (kogo) (whom) (marked)kakvo <sub>Sub/Obj</sub> (marked) kâde/koga | kogo<br>(whom)          | na kogo<br>(to whom) | koga<br>(when) | kâde<br>(where) | kakvo <sub>Subj</sub><br>(what)<br>kolko <sub>Subj</sub> N<br>(how many) | kakvo <sub>Obj</sub><br>(what)<br>(na) kolko <sub>Obj</sub> N<br>(to how many) | kak<br>(how) |

Following their lead I study the order of Russian multiple wh-questions in two environments: embedded and matrix clauses. I conclude that Russian exhibits a superiority effect, while this is more evident in embedded clauses (Table 2) than in matrix ones (Table 3).

Table 2

| D-linke      | ed wh-                     | Non-D-linked wh-phrases |                |                 |                         |                                      |                                   |                           |              |
|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
|              | :                          | [-h]<br>subject         | [+h]<br>d.obj  | [+h]<br>ind.obj | [+h]<br>ind.obj         | [-h], uspec<br>[h]d.obj              | Adjunct                           | Uspec[h] ind.obj          | Adj          |
| kto<br>(who) | kakoj<br>kakaja<br>(which) | čto<br>(what)           | kogo<br>(whom) | komu<br>(whom)  | s kem<br>(with<br>whom) | skolko N<br>(how manyN)<br>čto(what) | gde<br>(where)<br>kuda<br>(where) | p skolko N<br>(how manyN) | kak<br>(how) |

Table 3.

| D-linked wh-    |                         | Non-D-linked wh- |   | D-linked wh-            | Non-D-linked wh-                   |                                      |
|-----------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| [+h]<br>subject | D-linked<br>subject     | [-h]<br>subject  | Objects   | D-linked obj            | Adjunct                            | Adjunct (p)ind. obj                  |
| kto(who)        | kakoj/kakaja<br>(which) | čto(what)        | kogo(whom)<br>komu(whom)<br>skolkoN(how manyN)<br>čto(what) | kakoj/kakaja<br>(which) | gde<br>(where)<br>kogda<br>(where) | kak(who)<br>p skolkoN<br>(how manyN) |

The data reveal (i) a hitherto unnoticed similarity with Bulgarian and (ii) a surprising matrix/embedded clause asymmetry.

- (i) D-linked wh-phrases and 'who' are located higher than non-D-linked ones (different in Russian matrix questions).
  - [+human] wh-objects are higher than [-human] objects and adjuncts.
  - 'how' is the lowest wh-element.

The difference between two systems is the location of [-human], underspecified objects and adjuncts.

(ii) The order in Russian embedded clauses seems to be stricter than in matrix ones.

More tentatively, I also propose to capture Superiority effects under a version of Rizzi's (1997) cartographic approach which distinguishes Focus/Topic within the C system. Russian data as in (2) show the possibility of positioning wh-elements higher than Topic which strongly suggests the presence of wh-movement in Russian (contra Bošković).

2. a. Kogda **Maša** komu zvonila?

when Masha whom called

b. \*Kogda **každyj rebenok** komu zvonil?

when every child whom called

The paper concludes that Russian does exhibit superiority effects, making Russian look more like Bulgarian than commonly assumed.

## References:

Bošković, Željko. 1998. Wh-Phrases and Wh-movement in Slavic. Position paper. "Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax."

Bošković, Željko. 2002. On multiple wh-fronting. Linguistic inquiry 33/3: 351-383.

Krapova, Iliyana and Guglielmo Cinque. 2004. On the order of wh-phrases in Bulgarian multiple wh-fronting. Ms paper. to appear in *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages*, Leipzig. <a href="http://venus.unive.it/cinque/On%20the%20order%20of%20wh-phrases.rtf">http://venus.unive.it/cinque/On%20the%20order%20of%20wh-phrases.rtf</a>

Rudin, Catherine. 1988. On multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 445-501.

Stepanov, Arthur. 1997. On wh-fronting in Russian. In *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society* 28. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.