Correlative markers, contrastiveness and grammaticalization: A comparative study of conditional correlatives in Russian and Italian

Olga E. Pekelis

The Institute of Linguistics, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow
<opekelis@gmail.com>

In this paper, I analyze two correlatives used in conditional constructions in Russian (*to* and *togda*) and the only correlative used in conditionals in Italian (*allora*). This comparison is motivated by the fact that *allora* shares important properties with both *to* and *togda*. Like *togda* and contrary to *to*, *allora* can be used when the conditional conjunction combines with a focus particle meaning 'only'. Like *to* and contrary to *togda*, *allora* is compatible with a number of causal conjunctions meaning 'since'. I argue below that despite some apparent similarities with *to*, *allora* is a near semantic and grammatical counterpart of *togda*. Both are proforms of the conditional clause, which means, according to common assumptions, that the conditionals with *allora* and *togda* are a subtype of correlative relative constructions. *To*, instead, is not a proform, hence, not a subtype of correlative relatives. It is anaphorically connected not to the conditional clause, but to the subordinator introducing this clause. This structural difference is manifest both in semantics and grammar: *to* differs from *togda* and *allora* by semantic contribution and by degree of grammaticalization. Thus, *togda* and *allora* on the one hand, and *to* on the other hand, can be said to represent two different types of conditional correlatives. *

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the grammatical functions and the semantic contribution of the Russian correlative words *to* and *togda* when appearing in combination with the conditional conjunction *esli*, and to compare them with the corresponding Italian correlative *allora*. Cf. (1a), (1b) and (1c):[1]

(1) a. *Esli* *sous* *budet* *nedostatočno* *ostryj,* *to*[2] *možno*
       if sauce be.FUT.3SG not_enough spicy then(TO) one_may

   dobavliat' *krasnyj* *molotyj* *perec.*
   add.INF red ground pepper
   'If the sauce is not spicy enough, you can add ground red pepper'. (RNC)

   b. *Esli* *načnjot* *meniat'sya* *obščestvennoe* *mnenije,* *togda*
      if start.FUT.3SG change.INF public opinion then(TOGDA)

   nužno *budet* *i* *taktiku* *peresmatrivat'.*
   one_has be.FUT.3SG too tactics reconsider.INF
   'If public opinion starts to change, the tactics will have to be reconsidered, too' (RNC).

   c. *Se non sei contro di noi, allora sei con noi* (PAISÀ).
      'If you are not against us, then you are for us'.

The previous analysis of these correlatives (see Podlesskaya 1997; Inkova 2014 for *to* and *togda*; Mazzoleni 2001 for *allora*) does not take into consideration the full range of facts and does not aim to compare languages.

What motivates a comparison of *to* and *togda* with *allora* is a question of how two Russian conditional correlatives correspond to the only Italian correlative semantically and grammatically. The answer that I will propose to this question suggests some speculation on the typology of conditional correlatives.

At first glance, it is to be expected that *allora* is more similar to *togda* than to *to,* since *togda* is the nearest semantic counterpart of *allora* when they are used beyond the correlative context. Consider examples like *Togda Mark rešil uehat' / Allora Marco ha deciso di partire*, both meaning 'then Mark decided to leave'. Yet, what seems to contradict this analysis is the fact that *allora* shares some of its properties with *to.* Thus, both *to* and *allora* are compatible with causal conjunctions meaning 'since' (e.g. *poskol'ku* in Russian, *siccome* in Italian), while *togda* cannot combine with them (see Section 2 for details).

Notice that in English, there is also just one correlative, *then,* commonly used in conditional constructions. However, the English *then* does not combine with causal conjunctions, in particular it is not compatible with *since* (cf. **Since the weather is good, then we will go for a walk*). So, what makes a comparison of the Russian *to* and *togda* with the Italian *allora* of particular interest is that *allora* seems to share important properties with both *togda* and *to*.

In what follows, a comparative semantic interpretation of *to, togda* and *allora* is proposed. It serves then as a basis on which the similarities and the differences of the formal properties, displayed

by the correlatives, are explained. I argue that despite some similarities with *to*, *allora* is a near semantic and grammatical counterpart of *togda*. As for *to*, it differs both from *togda* and *allora* in several respects. In particular, it provides a different semantic contribution to the conditional construction and it has a significantly higher degree of grammaticalization.

Yet, the crucial difference between *togda* and *allora*, on the one hand, and *to*, on the other, seems to be a structural one. As I will show, *togda* and *allora* are best analyzed as proforms of the corresponding conditional clause, while for *to* the same analysis is impossible. This difference can be captured using one specific meaning of the term 'correlative'. So, a comment is needed concerning this term.

It is often used to refer to pairs of words that are in some way linked to each other across phrases. This is the sense in which traditional grammars speak about correlative conjunctions like *if… then, either… or, both… and*, etc. (Quirk *et al.* 1972; Chung 2004; Lipták 2009: 1). Until now, I have referred to this traditional meaning (and will refer to it in what follows, unless otherwise stated).

However, the term 'correlative' is also used to refer to a combination of a preposed relative clause and an anaphoric nominal expression, linked to it in the main clause. Here is an example from Russian:

(2) *[Kto   ne   rabotaet]$_i$,   tot$_i$ ne   est.*
       who   not   work.PRS.3SG   that   not   eat.PRS.3SG
       'He, who does not work, does not eat'.

This can be considered a narrow-sense meaning of the term, the first one being a broad-sense meaning.

It has been argued in the typological literature that conditional constructions like the English *if… then* should be treated as correlatives in the narrow sense (Bhatt & Pancheva 2006; Lipták 2009, among others). This exactly means analyzing *then* as a proform corresponding to the *if*-clause:

(3)   [*if-clause*]$_i$ [*then*$_i$ …]

Now, my analysis will show that this narrow meaning can only be referred to *allora* and *togda*. As for *to*, I will argue that it is anaphorically connected to the subordinator introducing the conditional clause, but not to the clause itself. This suggests that treating conditionals as a subtype of correlative relative clauses is not universally justified.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a list of the formal properties which *to, togda* and *allora* have in common

and by which they differ. In Section 3 a comparative semantic inter-pretation for all three correlatives is proposed. It is on the basis of this interpretation that the formal properties of *to, togda* and *allora* are explained in Section 4. Section 5 presents the main results of the study.

2. To*, togda,* allora*: formal similarities and differences*

In this section, I will first specify the formal features of *to* and *togda* (see 2.1). I will then analyze *allora* using the features that became apparent to distinguish the Russian correlatives (see 2.2). The results of this comparison are summarized in 2.3.

2.1. To *vs.* togda

What the correlatives *to* and *togda* have in common is that both can combine with the subordinating conjunctions *esli* 'if', cf. (4a) and (4b), *kogda* 'when', cf. (5a) and (5b), and *raz*, roughly 'since', cf. (6a) and (6b)[3]:

(4) a. *Esli takoj rabočej sily net, to rynok truda*
If such working power not_be.PRS then(TO) market labor

popolnjaetsja za sčjot meždunarodnyh migrantov.
replenish.PRS.3SG.PASS for account foreign migrant
'When there is no such manpower, the labor market is replenished with foreign migrants'. (RNC)

(4) b. *Esli nas ne trogat', togda*
if us not bother.INF then(TOGDA)

i my ne budem.
either we not be.FUT.1PL
'If no one bothers us, we won't either'. (RNC)

(5) a. *Kogda Zoja s Zinoj opomnilis', to*
when Zoja with Zina recover_oneself.PST.PL then(TO)

Šmelja *i sled prostyl.*
Shmel even trace vanish.PST.M.SG
'When Zoya and Zina came to their senses, Shmel was already long gone'. (RNC)

b. *Kogda vse* èti *uslovija sobljudajutsja, togda*
When all these conditions observe.PRS.3PL.PASS then(TOGDA)

professional'nyj kritik načinaet čitat' *tekst kak literaturnyj.*
professional reviewer start.PRS.3SG read text like literary
'When all these conditions are observed, the professional reviewer starts reading the text as if it was literary'. (RNC)

(6) a. *Raz vy možete vyhodit' na balkon,*
since you can.PRS.2PL go_out.INF on balcony

to vy možete udrat'.
then(TO) you can.PRS.2PL run_away.INF
'Since you can go out on the balcony, you can run away'. (RNC)

b. *Raz*   *vse*   *v*   *sbore,*   *togda*   *pošli*
   since   all   in   meeting   then(TOGDA)   go.IMP.1PL

   saditsja   *v*   *mašinu.*
   sit.INF   in   car
   'Since everyone is here, let's go sit in the car'. (RNC)

I will now turn to the features that distinguish *to* from *togda*. I will start by discussing a number of distributional features: the range of conjunctions used with *to* and *togda* (see 2.1.1), the combinability of *esli… to* and *esli… togda* with focus particles (see 2.1.2), and the combinability of the correlatives with *esli* when it has the so-called comparative meaning (see 2.1.3). These are the features most commonly discussed in the literature concerning the conditional correlatives in Russian, Italian and English. I will then turn to some purely grammatical features: the syntactic categories of two correlatives (see 2.1.4), the position of *to* and *togda* in the clause (see 2.1.5), the morphological status of the correlatives (see 2.1.6) and the constraints posed on the correlatives by subject ellipsis in the main clause (see 2.1.7)[4].

2.1.1. The range of conjunctions allowed

To combines not only with the conjunctions *esli, kogda* and *raz*, but also, though less typically, with *poskol'ku, tak kak* (both having a causal meaning close to 'since') and *poka* ('while'). All these conjunctions are considered to be subordinating.

(7)   *Poskol'ku*   *istorija*   *polučilas'*   *dlinnoj,*   *to*   *privedeno*
      since   story   turn_out.PST.F.SG   long   then(TO)   give.PTCP.SG.N

      liš   *neskol'ko*   *èpizodov.*
      just   a_few   episode
      'Since the story turned out long, there are just a few episodes given'. (RNC)

(8)   *Tak*   *kak*   *Sicilija*   *sčitaetsja*   *centrom*   *mestnoj*   *mafii,*   *to*
      since   CNJ   Sicily   consider.PRS.SG.PASS   center   local   mafia   then(TO)

      osmotr   *proizvodilsja*   *osobenno*   *strogo.*
      examination   conduct.PST.M.PASS   particularly   thoroughly
      'Since Sicily is considered to be the center of the local mafia, the examination was conducted with particular thoroughness'. (RNC)

(9)   *Poka*   *po*   *l'du*   *edeš,*   *to*   *sani*   *tak*   *s*   *bugra*   *na*
      while   on   ice   go.PRS.2SG   then(TO)   sled   so   from   hill   to

      bugor   *i*   *brosaet.*
      hill   PTCL   throw.PRS.3SG
      'When you go on ice, the sled is constantly thrown from hill to hill'. (RNC)

For *togda,* combining with *poskol'ku* and *tak kak* is ungrammatical, as in (10) and (11).

(10) **Poskol'ku istorija polučilas'   dlinnoj, togda   privedeno*
     since   story   turn_out.PST.F.SG   long   then(TOGDA)   give.PTCP.SG.N

     liš   neskol'ko   èpizodov.
     just   a_few   episode
     'Since the story turned out long, there are just a few episodes given'.

(11) **Tak kak Sicilija sčitaetsja   centrom mestnoj mafii, togda*
     since CNJ Sicily   consider.PRS.SG.PASS   center   local   mafia then(TOGDA)

     osmotr   proizvodilsja   osobenno   strogo.
     examination   conduct.PST.M.PASS   particularly thoroughly
     'Since Sicily is considered to be the center of the local mafia, the examination was conducted with particular thoroughness'.

Now, *poskol'ku* and *tak kak* are true causal conjunctions, whereas the semantics of *raz*, which is compatible with *togda*, are somewhat intermediate between the causal and the conditional one (see details in Section 3.3). The fact that *togda* combines with *raz,* but not with *poskol'ku* and *tak kak*, suggests that *togda*, unlike *to*, does not combine with conjunctions that have purely causal meaning.

A combination with *poka* is not impossible, but marginal. Substituting *to* with *togda* in (9) is hardly acceptable, cf. (12).

(12) *??Poka po l'du edeš,   togda   sani tak s   bugra   na*
     while   on ice   go.PRS.2SG then(TOGDA)   sled   so   from   hill   to

     bugor   i   brosaet.
     hill   PTCL   throw.PRS.3SG
     'When you go on ice, the sled is constantly thrown from hill to hill'.

In RNC, just one instance of the *poka… togda* combination was attested (cf. (13)), whereas the *poka… to* sequence is represented in 47 instances[5].

(13) *Poka kipela   vojna i   každyj vooružjonnyj čelovek   byl*
     while rage.PST.F.SG war   and every armed   person   be.PST.M.SG

     strašen, togda   vse terpeli   i   daže   iskali
     dreadful then(TOGDA) all   put_up_with.PST.PL   and   even   seek.PST.PL

     pokrovitel'stva ljubovnic; no   kogda   gromy   vojny   zamolkali
     protection   lover.PL but   when   horror   war   be_over.PST.PL

     i   imperatrica Ekaterina II reshila   prisoedinit'   k   Rossii
     and empress   Catherine II decide.PST.F.SG   annex.INF   to   Russia

     Litvu,   to   s   mirnymi i   pokornymi žiteljami velela
     Lithuania then(TO) with peaceful and obedient   national   order.PST.F.SG

     postupat'   snishoditel'no i   laskovo – i   oni   obodrilis'.
     treat.INF   patiently   and kindly   and they cheer_up.PST.PL

'When the war raged and every armed person was dreadful, everyone put up with and even sought lovers' protection; but when the horrors of war were over and Empress Catherine II decided to annex Lithuania to Russia, she ordered to treat peaceful and obedient nationals patiently and kindly — and their spirits were lifted'. (RNC)

It seems that a combination with *poka* is favored for *togda* in the contexts where *poka* becomes semantically very close to *kogda* (the latter used with *togda* unproblematically). Unsurprisingly, in (13) the *poka… togda* construction is coordinated with a *kogda… to* construction.

2.1.2. Combination of esli *with focus particles* tol'ko *'only' and* daže *'even'*

To does not combine with *esli* when the *esli*-clause is modified by the focus particle *tol'ko* (however, see footnote 17 for one exception to this rule). Cf.:

(14)   *Tol'ko*   *esli*   *on*   *s*   *trapa*   *svalitsja,*
        only   if   he   from   ladder   fall_down.FUT.3SG

        togda   <*to>[6]   *menja*   *pozovjo*š.
        then(TOGDA)   then(TO)   me   call.FUT.2SG
        'Call me only if he falls down the ladder'. (RNC)

As shown in (14), *togda*, instead, can combine with *tol'ko esli*.

The combination of *to* with *daže esli* 'even if' is possible, but restricted by certain constraints (to be discussed in Section 4.3). Thus, the presence of *to* in (15) is not just possible, but strongly preferred, whereas its presence in (16) is hardly acceptable.

(15)   *Daže*   *esli*   *ona*   *i*   *rešitsja*   *na*   *takoj*   šag,
        even   if   she   even   dare.FUT.3SG   for   this   step

        ^{??}*(to)*   *soveršit*   *ego liš po*   *zaveršeniju sledstvija.*
        then(TO)   do.FUT.3SG it   only after   termination investigation
        'Even if she dares to take this step, she will only do it when the investigation is over'. (RNC)

(16)   *Daže esli u*   *menja est'*   *svojo*   *mnenie,*   (^{??}*to*)   *ja*   *gotov*
        even if   POSS me   be.PRS   own   opinion   then(TO)   I   ready

        vyslušat'   *i*   *drugije točki zrenija.*
        listen.INF   also   other   point view
        'Even if I have my own opinion, I am open to other points of view as well'. (www.yandex.ru)

Again, *togda* behaves differently: its combination with *daže esli* is banned. This is illustrated in (17):

(17) *Daže esli ty ravnodušna k pivu, (*togda)*
Even if you indifferent to beer then(TOGDA)

tebja udivit raznoobrazie
you surprise.FUT.3SG variety

sortov i vidov
sort and kind
'Even if you are indifferent about beer, the variety of its sorts and kinds will
surprise you. (RNC)

2.1.3. Comparative esli

As noted in Podlesskaya (1997), the presence of *to* is strongly
preferable when *esli* has the so-called comparative meaning (see
about it Gladkij 1982). A clause introduced by the comparative *esli*
has a truth value, which normally is lacking in a hypothetical condi-
tional clause. Cf.:

(18) *Esli obraz Borisa statičen, to*
if image Boris static then(TO)

obraz samozvanca pronizan dinamikoj.
image impostor pierce.PRTC.SG.M dynamics
'While Boris' image is static, the image of the Impostor is pierced with dynamics'.
(RNC)

Unlike *to*, *togda* cannot be used with the comparative *esli*:

(19) **Esli obraz Borisa statičen, togda*
if image Boris static then(TOGDA)

obraz samozvanca pronizan dinamikoj.
image impostor pierce.PRTC.SG.M dynamics
'While Boris' image is static, the image of the Impostor is pierced with dynamics'.

2.1.4. Syntactic category of to and togda

The words *to* and *togda* are of different syntactic categories.
Togda, when used both within and beyond the correlative context, is
an adverb (Borkovsky 1983: 224). The correlative *to* is most naturally
treated as a particle, though in the Russian grammatical tradition, it
is simply referred to as a correlative, without specifying the exact syn-
tactic category (RG-80: § 3011). This difference between *togda* and *to*
is historically motivated, see details in Section 3.2.

2.1.5. Position of to and togda in the main clause

Both correlatives most typically occur at the very beginning of
the main clause, but they differ in that for *to*, the initial position is
obligatory, while *togda* can also move to some other position in the
main clause. Cf. (20) and (21):

(20)   **Esli*   *pogoda*   *budet*   *horoshaja,*   *my*   *to*
          if   weather   be.FUT.3SG   good   we   then(TO)

          pojdjom   *guljat'.*
          go.FUT.1PL   walk.INF
          'If the weather is good, we will go for a walk'.

(21)   *Esli*   *pozvonite,*   *a*   *u*   *nas*   *zanjato,*   *vy*
          if   call.FUT.2PL   and   at   us   busy   you

          togda   *ešče raz*   *pozvonite.*
          then(TOGDA)   more time   call.IMP.2PL
          'If you call us, and the line is busy, then please call once again'. (RNC)

2.1.6. Morphological status: clitic vs. word

To and *togda* differ in their morphological status: *to* is a clitic, whereas *togda* is a word. At least three tests used to distinguish clitics from words corroborate this:

- *To*, but not *togda*, usually does not bear an accent.
- *To* is not autonomous in the sense of Plungian (2000: 28-32); that is, it cannot occur as an isolated utterance. *Togda* is decidedly more autonomous, as illustrated in (22). In (22a), *togda* is prosodically organized as an independent utterance. Its substitution by *to* leads to ungrammaticality, cf. (22b), although when not prosodically isolated, *to* is acceptable in this kind of context, cf. (22c):

(22) a. *A*   *esli*   *ja*   *ne*   *soglashus'…* —   *Togda…*   *togda*
       and   if   I   not   agree.FUT.1SG   then(TOGDA)   then(TOGDA)

       ja   *pojdu*   *k*   *gosudarju.*
       I   go.FUT.1SG   to   tsar
       'And if I say no…— Then… then… I will go to the tsar'. (RNC)

    b. **A*   *esli*   *ja*   *ne*   *soglashus'…* —   *To…*   *to*
       and   if   I   not   agree.FUT.1SG   then(TO)   then(TO)

       ja   *pojdu*   *k*   *gosudarju.*
       I   go.FUT.1SG   to   tsar
       'And if I say no… — Then… then… I will go to the tsar'.

    c. *A*   *esli*   *ty*   *ne*   *soglasišsja,*   *to*
       and   if   you   not   agree.FUT.2SG   then(TO)

       ja   *pojdu*   *k*   *gosudarju.*
       I   go.FUT.1SG   to   tsar
       'And if you say no, then I will go to the tsar'.

- A clitic, unlike a word, cannot be subject to syntactic processes (see Zwicky 1985: 288). This means, among other things, that clitics cannot be modified by focus particles and adverbs, such as the abovementioned *tol'ko* and *daže*. *To*, indeed, does not attach these modifiers, whereas *togda* can be modified by them. See (23a) and (23b):

(23) a. *Esli   prekratitsja   dožd', tol'ko togda   <*to>*
       if   stop.FUT.3SG rain   only   then(TOGDA) then(TO)

       my   pojdjom   guljat'.
       we   go.FUT.1PL walk.INF
       'If it stops raining, only then we will go for a walk'.

    b. *Esli dožd' prekratitsja,   daže   togda   <*to>*
       if   rain   stop.FUT.3SG   even   then(TOGDA) then(TO)

       my   guljat' ne   pojdjom.
       we   walk.INF not go.FUT.1PL
       'If it stops raining, even then we will not go for a walk'.

2.1.7. Subject ellipsis

Subject ellipsis in the main clause can render the use of *to* obligatory. This is the case when an elided subject of the main clause is coreferential with an expressed subject of the dependent clause. Thus, *to* in examples (24a) and (25a) is not omittable (though in (24a), for reasons which I do not discuss here, its absence is a bit less impossible). *Togda*, however, is acceptable in the same context only in the presence of *to,* but not as a unique correlative. Substituting *to* with *togda* in (24a), as in (24b), sounds strange, while in (25a) it leads to ungrammaticality, cf. (25b):

(24) a. *S   ideej   ne   tak.   Esli   ona$_i$ nastojaščaja,*
       with   idea   not   so   if   she   real

       $^{??}$(to)   Ø$_i$ podčinit   sebe   vsjo.
       then(TO)   subordinate.FUT.3SG herself everything
       'The idea is not like that. If it's real, it will bring everything into submission'. (RNC)

    b. *$^?$S   ideej   ne   tak.   Esli   ona$_i$ nastojaščaja,*
       with   idea   not   so   if   she   real

       togda   Ø$_i$ podčinit   sebe   vsjo.
       then(TOGDA)   subordinate.FUT.3SG herself everything
       'The idea is not like that. If it's real, it will bring everything into submission'.

(25) a. *Odnako   esli   èto$_i$ proizojdjot,   *(to)*
       however   if   that   happen.FUT.3SG then(TO)

       Ø$_i$ kosnjotsja   prežde vsego turistov.
       affect.FUT.3SG first   all   turist
       'However, if that happens, it will primarily affect tourists. (RNC)

    b. **Odnako   esli   èto$_i$ proizojdjot,   togda*
       however   if   that   happen.FUT.3SG   then(TOGDA)

       Ø$_i$ kosnjotsja   prežde vsego turistov.
       affect.FUT.3SG first   all   turist
       'However, if that happens, it will primarily affect tourists'.

In (26a), *togda* is present together with *to*. Omitting *to* degrades the sentence significantly, cf. (26b):

(26) a. *Esli   oni_i   ob"edinjatsja,   to   togda   Ø_i   smogut*
    if   they unite.FUT.3PL then(TO) then(TOGDA)   be_able.FUT.3PL

    vlijat'   na   processy, iskažaja   real'noe položenie veščej.
    influence.INF   on   process distort.CVB real   state   affair
    'If they unite, they will be able to influence processes, distorting the real state of
    affairs'. (RNC)

   b. *??Esli   oni_i   ob"edinjatsja,   togda   Ø_i   smogut*
    if   they unite.FUT.3PL then(TOGDA)   be_able.FUT.3PL

    vlijat'   na processy, iskažaja   real'noe položenie veščej.
    influence.INF   on process distort.CVB real   state   affair
    'If they unite, they will be able to influence processes, distorting the real state of
    affairs'.

Note that according to positional restrictions, mentioned in 2.1.5, *to* is obligatorily placed at the front of the main clause. So, when *to* and *togda* occur together, *to* always precedes *togda,* though it must not be adjacent to it. Thus, in (26a) *togda* can move to the position after the verb, cf. (27), while the inverted order of *to* and *togda* is ungrammatical, as in (28).

(27)   *Esli   oni_i   ob"edinjatsja,   to   Ø_i   smogut   togda*
    if   they unite.FUT.3PL then(TO)   be_able.FUT.3PL then(TOGDA)

    vlijat'   na processy, iskažaja   real'noe položenie veščej.
    influence.INF   on process distort.CVB real   state   affair
    'If they unite, they will be able to influence processes, distorting the real state of
    affairs'.

(28)   **Esli   oni_i   ob"edinjatsja,   togda   to   Ø_i   smogut*
    if   they unite.FUT.3PL then(TOGDA) then(TO)   be_able.FUT.3PL

    vlijat'   na processy, iskažaja   real'noe položenie veščej.
    influence.INF   on process distort.CVB real   state   affair
    'If they unite, they will be able to influence processes, distorting the real state of
    affairs'.

2.2. Allora in comparison with *to* and togda

The correlative *allora* is characterized below according to the same parameters that showed up to be relevant for the opposition of *to* and *togda* (see Section 2.1).

2.2.1. The range of conjunctions allowed

Allora combines with the conditional conjunction *se* 'if', with the temporal one *quando* 'when' and with the causal conjunctions *siccome* and *visto che* 'since, given that'[7]. Cf. (29)-(32):

(29)   *Se un serpente è velenoso, allora è pericoloso* (De Roberto 2010).
    'If a snake is venomous, then it is dangerous'.

(30)   *Quando sarai grande, allora capirai* (ibid.).
        'When you grow up, then you will understand'.
(31)   *Siccome non si sentiva bene, allora ha deciso di andare dal medico* (ibid.).
        'Since he didn't feel good, (lit.: then) he decided to go to the doctor'
(32)   *Visto che insisti, allora verrò* (Devoto-Oli 2007: 91).
        'Given that you insist, (lit.: then) I'll come'.

Given that *allora* can be used in the causal constructions, it is closer to *to* than to *togda*, as far as its combinability is concerned[8]. Yet, the combinatorial potential of *allora* is not as broad as that of *to*, since *to* also combines, besides *esli, kogda, poskol'ku, tak kak* (the Russian equivalents of *se, quando, siccome, visto che*), with the conjunction *poka* (see Section 2.1). *Allora* combines with *mentre*, which is the Italian counterpart of *poka*, only marginally and mainly in contexts where *mentre* shows up to be semantically very close to *quando* (in this respect *allora* is similar to *togda*, see Section 2.1). In *PAISÀ*, no examples of the *mentre… allora* sequence were found. The constructed example (33) was judged by my informants as possible, but far from excellent:

(33)   ? *Mentre (≈ quando) stavo leggendo, allora è entrata mia sorella.*
        'While I was reading, (lit.: then) my sister entered [the room]'.

2.2.2. Combination of se *with focus particles* solo *'only' and* anche *'even'*

Allora can combine with *se* when the latter is modified by *solo* 'only', cf. (34) and (35). For *anche* 'even', this is not the case, cf. (36):

(34)   *Solo se la fonte, da cui deriva ogni cosa generata, è infinita, allora esistono sempre la generazione e la distruzione.* (PAISÀ)
        'Only if the source from which every generated thing derives, is infinite, (lit.: then) the generation and the distruction exist eternally'.

(35)   *Solo se è un problema persistente, allora la pagina probabilmente dovrebbe essere disattivata.* (PAISÀ)
        'Only if it is a persistent problem, (lit.: then) the page should probably be deactivated'.

(36)   **Anche se domenica ci sara brutto tempo, allora andremo lo stesso a sciare.*
        'Even if the weather is bad on Sunday, (lit.: then) we will still go skiing'.

So in this respect, *allora* behaves identically to *togda*. It should be kept in mind that *to* exhibits the opposite behavior: it permits *esli* to combine with *daže* 'even', but not with *tol'ko* 'only' (see Section 2.1). The Russian counterpart of the example (36) can contain *to*, but not *togda*:

(37) *Daže esli v   voskresen'e budet   plohaja pogoda, to*
      even if   on Sunday   be.FUT.3SG bad   weather then(TO)

      <*togda>   vsjo ravno my poedem   katat'sia na lyžah.
      then(TOGDA)   still still   we go.FUT.1PL ride.INF on ski
      'Even if the weather is bad on Sunday, we will still go skiing'.

2.2.3. Comparative se

Like *togda* and unlike *to*, *allora* cannot be used when *se* has the comparative meaning instead of the conditional one:

(38) *Se Ugo era adirato, (*allora) Maria era tranquilla.* (Mazzoleni 2001: 782)
      'While Ugo was angry, Mary was calm'.

For (38), the comparative interpretation is the most natural one. Still, when (38) is interpreted in the conditional sense ('In those cases when Ugo was angry, Maria was calm'), *allora* is acceptable.

2.2.4. Syntactic category of allora

Allora is originally a temporal adverb (Bazzanella *et al.* 2007: 12). When used as a correlative, it is sometimes considered to be a conjunction (Devoto-Oli 2007: 91). But semantically, the correlative uses of *allora* have much in common with its original temporal uses (Bazzanella *et al.* 2007: 13), so one may assume that the adverbial nature is maintained, at least partly, in the correlative as well. This is very similar to the categorial features of *togda* and contrasts with that of *to*.

2.2.5. Position of allora *in the main clause*

Like *togda* and contrary to *to*, *allora* has no fixed position in the main clause, although it is typically placed at the front of it. Thus, my informants judge that examples (39a) and (39b) are both well-formed:

(39) a. *Se domani farà bel tempo, allora andremo a sciare.*
         'If the weather is good tomorrow, we will go skiing'.
     b. *Se domani farà bel tempo, andremo a sciare, allora.*
         'If the weather is good tomorrow, we will go skiing'.

2.2.6. Morphological status: clitic vs. word

Like *togda* and unlike *to*, *allora* is a word, not a clitic. It usually bears an accent on its own, can attach focus particles (see (40)) and can be prosodically organized as a separate utterance (see (41)):

(40) *Quando e se, tutti saranno stati pagati, solo allora dovranno restituire i soldi avuti in prestito dallo Stato.* (PAISÀ)
      'When and if everyone is paid, only then the money borrowed from the state must be paid back'

(41)   – *E se lui non fosse d'accordo… – Allora… Allora io andrei dall'avvocato…*
        'And if he says no… – Then… Then I'll go to a lawyer'

2.2.7. Subject ellipsis

In the cases of subject ellipsis, discussed in Section 2.1, *allora* differs both from *to* and *togda*. Unlike *togda, allora* is permitted as the only correlative in the sentence, cf. (42a). Unlike *to,* the presence of *allora* is not obligatory in the elliptical construction in question, cf. the Italian example (42a) with the Russian example (25a), repeated here as (42b):

(42) a. *Se questo$_i$ succede, (allora) Ø$_i$ riguarderà soprattutto i turisti.*
          'If this happens, it will concern the tourists first of all'.

b. *Odnako   esli   èto$_i$ proizojdjot,   *(to)   Ø$_i$*
   however   if   that   happen.FUT.3SG   then(TO)

   kosnjotsja   prežde vsego turistov.
   affect.FUT.3SG   first   all   turist
   'However, if that happens, it will primarily affect tourists'. (RNC)

The following examples (43a, b) illustrate the same difference between *allora* and *to*:

(43) a. *Quando c'è un'idea, è diverso. Se l'idea$_i$ è vera, (allora) Ø$_i$ dominerà su tutto.*
          'The idea is not like that. If it's real, it will bring everything into submission'.

b. *S   ideej   ne   tak.   Esli   ona$_i$ nastojaščaja,*
   with   idea   not   so   if   she   real

   $^{??}$(to)   Ø$_i$ podčinit   sebe   vsjo.
   then(TO)   subordinate.FUT.3SG   herself everything
   'The idea is not like that. If it's real, it will bring everything into submission'. (RNC)

Notice that in the case of Italian, the term 'subject ellipsis' is not quite correct. It is well known that Italian is a pro-drop language; that is, it regularly permits an unemphatic null subject in a finite clause. According to common assumptions, the pro-drop phenomenon does not involve post-syntactic deletion, but an empty category pro (see Chomsky 1982; Rizzi 1986 *inter alia*). It is assumed, furthermore, that pro differs from the true syntactic ellipsis in that the phrases deleted under ellipsis are contextually recoverable and need be neither subjects nor pronouns (Franks 1995: 292; Testelets 2011: 656).

In order to unify the terminology, the term 'subject ellipsis' will nevertheless be referred below to both Russian sentences like (43b) and Italian sentences like (43a). Still, the difference between (43a)

and (43b) regarding *to* and *allora* seems to be linked to the fact that Italian is a regular pro-drop language, whereas Russian is not. This problem will be discussed in Section 4.4.

2.3. *Formal properties of* to, Togda*,* allora*: summary*

The formal properties of *to, togda* and *allora* are summarized in Table 1.

The table is organized as follows: the first column contains the list of the relevant contexts and properties discussed in sections 2.1-2.2; the first row presents the correlatives in questions. The characters "+", "-", "+/-" and "+!" mean respectively, that the corresponding correlative 'can be used', 'cannot be used', 'can be used with constraints' and 'must be used' in the corresponding context.

3. *Semantic interpretation of* to*,* togda *and* allora

3.1. Togda

According to Podlesskaya (1997), the function of *togda* is to signal that the conditional clause is a contrastive topic. Based on what is generally assumed about contrastive topics (see, e.g., Krifka 1999; Yanko 2001), this analysis may be interpreted as follows. A statement of the type *Esli A, togda B* has the meaning of a conditional without *togda*, but in addition, it emphasizes an opposition of two alternatives, A→B and ¬A→B, and suggests choosing the first of them[9]. Negation of the second alternative, ¬(¬A→B), gives '¬A can imply ¬B' or, in other words, 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases'. Example (44), for instance, imposes an idea that 'in the case you don't under-

Table 1. The formal properties of *to, togda, allora*.

	To	*Togda*	*Allora*
RANGE OF CONJUNCTIONS ALLOWED	CONDITIONAL (*ESLI*), CONDITIONAL-CAUSAL (*RAZ*), TEMPORAL (*KOGDA, POKA*), CAUSAL (*POSKOL'KU, TAK KAK*)	CONDITIONAL (*ESLI*), CONDITIONAL-CAUSAL (*RAZ*), TEMPORAL (*KOGDA*)	CONDITIONAL (*SE*), TEMPORAL (*QUANDO*), CAUSAL (*SICCOME, VISTO CHE*)
Tol'ko esli / *Solo se*	–	+	+
Daže esli / *Anche se*	+/–	–	–
Comparative *esli* / *se*	+	–	–
Syntactic category	particle	adverb	adverb
Position in the clause (fixed vs. not fixed)	fixed	not fixed	not fixed
Clitic (C) vs. word (W)	C	W	W
Ellipsis	+!	–	+

stand what I am talking about, we cannot be confident in that we live through any trouble':[10]

(44)   *Esli*   *pojmjoš,*   *o*   *čjom* *ja* *govorju* –
      if   understand.FUT.2SG about what I   speak.PRS.1SG

      togda   *my ljubuju bedu*   *pereživjom.*
      then(TOGDA)   we any   trouble live_through.FUT.1PL
      'If you understand what I'm talking about, then we'll live through any trouble'. (RNC)

In some cases, the *esli… togda* construction seems to have a stronger meaning 'all ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases' (¬A→¬B). However, it occurs only when the semantics of *togda* are sustained by other contrastive operators, such as the particle *tol'ko* 'only'. It is then this operator, not *togda*, that bears the meaning in question. Thus, both (45) and (46) presuppose ¬A→¬B:

(45)   *Tol'ko* *esli* *odnovremenno* *snimat'sja* *v*   *kino i*   *igrat'*   *v*
      only   if   simultaneously act.INF   in   film and act.INF   in

      teatre,   *togda*   *polučitsja*   *postojanno* *nahodit'sja*
      theater   then(TOGDA) manage.FUT.3SG   constantly   remain.INF

      v   *objazatel'nom dlia professii*   *sostojanii treninga.*
      in   necessary   for profession state   training
      'Only if you star in films and act in theater at the same time, you will manage to remain in the trained state necessary for the profession'. (RNC)

(46)   *Tol'ko esli on s*   *trapa*   *svalitsja,*
      only   if   he from ladder fall_down.FUT.3SG

      togda   *menja pozovjoš.*
      then(TOGDA)   me   call.FUT.2SG
      'Call me only if he falls down the ladder'. (RNC)

In (46), the meaning '¬A → ¬B' (here: 'in all cases, if he doesn't fall down the ladder, you should not call me') is particularly evident. This is because in (46), this meaning is expressed twice, not only by the particle *tol'ko*, but also by the fact that in (46) *togda* has a status of a contrastive focus, whereas in (45), it is associated with contrastive topic. In (45), indeed, *togda* most naturally bears an intensive rising accent, which is characteristic of a contrastive topic, while in (46) it bears an intensive falling accent, characteristic of a contrastive focus.

Now, the distinction between contrastive topics and contrastive foci is that the latter, but not the former, express exhaustivity (Tomioka 2007). Namely, a contrastive focus construction asserts for every alternative whether the respective situation does or does not hold. In (46), the strong meaning in question is thereby generated ('only in the case he falls down the ladder you should call me, not in other cases'), emphasizing the semantics of *tol'ko*.

A terminologically different, but substantially identical semantic interpretation was proposed in Iatridou (1994) for the English conditional construction *if… then*. According to it, *then* contributes a meaning identical to that assumed for *togda*: 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases'. Not surprisingly, *togda* shares with *then* a number of combinatorial properties, including the incapacity to combine with *daže / even* (an account for it for *togda* see in Section 4.3). Cf. the following examples:

(47)   *Even if John is drunk, (*then) Bill will vote for him.*

(48)   *Daže esli John   pjan, (*togda)   Bill progolosuet   za   nego.*
        even if   *John*   drunk then(TOGDA) Bill vote.FUT.3SG for   him
        'Even if John is drunk, Bill will vote for him'.

Then is commonly analyzed as a proform corresponding to the *if*-clause (see Izvorski 1996; Bhatt & Pancheva 2006, *inter alia*). The *If… then* construction is thus considered correlative in the narrow sense, according to the terminology proposed in Section 1. The following structure illustrates this analysis:

(49)   [*if-clause*]$_i$ [*then*$_i$ …].

Given the semantic and the distributional similarities between *then* and *togda*, the same structure seems to be motivated for *togda*:

(50)   [*esli*-clause]$_i$ [*togda*$_i$ …].

Notice that this analysis is generally compatible with that of treating *togda* as a means to express contrastiveness (from Podlesskaya 1997; see above for details). The very nature of a proform, indeed, provides a kind of semantic iteration; now, it is the iteration that generates the contrastiveness effect, cf.:

(51)   *If it doesn't rain, then (= in this case, in other cases presumably not) we will go for a walk.*

Yet the main argument for the suggested analysis of *togda* is that it can serve as a basis to account for the formal properties that distinguish *togda* from *to* and *allora*. This will be the topic of Section 4.

3.2. To

The semantic interpretation of *to* proposed here is based on the analysis from Pekelis (2015). For detailed argumentation, the reader should consult this paper. In what follows, only partial argumenta-

tion, serving the purposes of the present article, namely the comparison of *to* with *togda* and *allora,* will be provided.

Based on numerous facts of *to* distribution, it is suggested in Pekelis (2015) that *to* serves to contrastively emphasize the implicative relation expressed by the conjunction *to* combines with. As in the case of *togda*, the contrast expressed by *to* implies an opposition of two alternatives, a positive and a negative one, and the negation of the second alternative. But while the contrast expressed by *togda* is associated with the dependent clause (*A*-cases are opposed to ¬A-cases), *to* opposes the presence of the corresponding implicative relation to its absence. In the context of the conditional *esli,* this means opposing A→B to ¬(A→B).

(52) Set of alternatives, associated with *Esli A, togda B*:
      {A→B*;* ¬A→B}
(53) Set of alternatives, associated with *Esli A, to B*:
      {A→B*;* ¬(A→B))}

According to what has been concluded so far, negation of the second alternative of (52),¬(¬A→B), gives the following meaning: 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases'. Now, negation of the second alternative of (53), ¬(¬(A→B)), seems to be interpreted twofold: first, as negation of the fact that the same conditional relation holds between *A* and ¬B (¬(A→¬B)); second, as negation of the fact that the same conditional relation holds between ¬A and *B* (¬(¬A→B)). ¬(A→¬B), combined with the basic assertion A→B, gives 'all A-cases are B-cases'; ¬(¬A→B) gives 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases'. Thus, the semantic contribution of *to* is assumed to consist of two parts (one of which is identical to the semantic contribution of *togda*):

(54) - 'all *A*-cases are *B*-cases' (negation of A→¬B)
      - 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases' (negation of ¬A→**B**).

Consider examples (55a,b,c), where (55a) lacks any correlative, (55b) contains *togda* and (55c) contains *to*:

(55) a. *Esli   menja progonjat,   vakansija otkroetsja.*
        if   me   fire.FUT.3PL vacancy   open.FUT.3SG
        'If I get fired, the vacancy will be open'.

     b. *Esli   menja progonjat,   togda   vakansija   otkroetsja.*
        if   me   fire.FUT.3PL   then(TOGDA)   vacancy   open.FUT.3SG
        'If I get fired, the vacancy will be open'. (RNC)

     c. *Esli   menja progonjat,   to   vakansija   otkroetsja.*
        if   me   fire.FUT.3PL then(TO)   vacancy   open.FUT.3SG
        'If I get fired, the vacancy will be open'.

According to assumptions above, (55b) differs from (55a) in that it emphasizes the following: 'not in every case in which I don't get fired, will a vacancy be open'. In (55c), the same meaning is expressed, but in addition, (55c) emphasizes that 'a vacancy will be open in every case in which I get fired'.

The semantic difference assumed for (55a, b, c) is very subtle. To prove it, appealing to intuition may not suffice. A more convincing argument would be finding a link between the analysis suggested for *to* and *togda* and their formal properties. For this kind of argumentation, see Section 4.

Yet, the degree of semantic vagueness seems to be different for *to* and *togda*: the meaning of *to* is definitely fuzzier than that of *togda* and less amenable to explication. One possible explanation of this fact seems to follow directly from the suggested analysis. The semantic contribution of *togda* consists of the only component 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases', while the contribution of *to* is argued to be divided between two components, one of which is identical to the meaning of *togda*. No wonder that in the semantics of *togda*, this shared component is more manifest.

However, the semantic vagueness of *to* seems to have not only a semantic, but also a grammatical reason: *to* is a more grammaticalized entity than *togda*. According to Borkovskij (1983: 221), *to* is derived from the demonstrative pronoun *tot* ('that'), from which it semantically preserves no more than the very anaphoricity. Now, the origin of *togda* is the adverb *togda* meaning 'then', and the semantics of the correlative are not substantially different from that of the (non-correlative) adverb (Borkovskij 1983: 226). According to common assumptions, grammaticalization is usually accompanied by desemantization, that is, by the loss of all or some concrete meaning components (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 3; Plungian 2011: 90). Therefore, both the vagueness of *to* semantics and the fact that its meaning is distant from the original pronoun meaning can be seen as naturally following from *to* being a more grammaticalized item than *togda*. Notice that this analysis is corroborated by the clitic status of *to,* which differentiates it from *togda* and by its fixed position in the clause. Being a clitic, indeed, is more associated with grammaticalized items than being a word (see Hopper & Traugott 2003: 142). Similarly, positional restrictions are more characteristic of grammatical items than of lexical ones (Plungian 2011: 89).

It should be mentioned that *to* is able to lose completely its basic semantics of emphasizing an implicative relation. This happens, for instance, when *to* combines with the comparative *esli*. A compara-

tive relation, indeed, cannot be considered to be implicative, since it expresses neither causative, nor spatio-temporal, nor any other kind of logical interaction between the situations. Thus, using *to* in the comparative context is motivated not by its assumed semantic function, but by some other function (see Section 4.4 for what such function may be). In any case, the very capacity of *to* to lose its basic semantics is a further symptom of its high degree of grammaticalization.

So far, two points that distinguish *to* from *togda* have been mentioned: a semantic and a grammatical one. However, there is also a third difference: the combination of *to* and its *esli*-clause is not correlative in the narrow sense, since *to* is not a proform. It does not serve to substitute the subordinate clause or any of its constituents. The simplest evidence for this is that *to* cannot be paraphrased, while *togda* can be usually substituted by expressions like *in this case*, cf. example (51) above. Notice furthermore that treating *to* as a nonproform is predicted automatically by the fact that *to* is a clitic. A clitic, indeed, is "only a proper part of a word-like construct" (Zwicky 1985: 288), so it can hardly do what a proform does, that is, substitute a phrasal category.

Since *to* is not anaphorically linked to the *esli*-clause, the structure (56a) (=(50)), suggested for *togda* above, for *to* would be incorrect. *To* serves, according to my assumptions, to emphasize the implicative relation expressed by the subordinator that *to* combines with. Hence, it can be seen as anaphorically linked to this subordinator (though still not substituting it). The structure (56b) roughly illustrates this analysis[11]:

(56) a. (=(50)) [*esli*-clause]$_i$ [*togda*$_i$ …].
 b. [*esli*$_i$…] [*to*$_i$ …].

If it is true that *to* is not a proform, this goes contrary to the typological assumptions according to which conditionals are considered to be a subtype of correlative relatives (see Bhatt & Pancheva 2006; Lipták 2009 *inter alia*). Importantly, *esli… to* is the basic and the most frequent conditional correlative construction in Russian. In the *RNC*, its frequency is approximately 40 times higher than that of the *esli… togda* construction.

I will return to discussing the theoretical consequences of the suggested analysis in the section entitled Conclusion.

3.3. Allora
At first glance, *allora* is semantically and syntactically identical to *togda*, since it shares with *togda* the majority of properties consid-

ered in Section 2 (see Table 1). Indeed, both *togda* and *allora* combine with *tol'ko / solo* and do not combine with *daže / anche*. Both cannot be used when *esli / se* has a comparative meaning. Both are words, not clitics. Based on these facts, one may assume for *allora* the same analysis as that proposed for *togda* (see Section 3.1).

Yet, there are a few properties that *allora* shares with *to*, not with *togda*. The most significant one seems to be the ability of *allora* to combine with causal conjunctions like *siccome*. Cf.:

(57) a. *Siccome non si sentiva bene, allora ha deciso di andare dal medico.*
'Since he didn't feel well, (lit.: then) he decided to go to the doctor'.

   b. *Poskol'ku   on   ploho   sebja*   čuvstvoval,   *to*
      since   he   bad   himself   feel.PST.M.SG   then(TO)

      <*togda>   *on   rešil*   *pojti   k   vraču.*
      then(TOGDA)   he   decide.PST.M.SG   go.INF   to   doctor
      'Since he didn't feel well, he decided to go to the doctor'.

Notice that *togda* is compatible with *raz,* which has some features of a causal conjunction. Like causal clauses and in contrast to conditionals, a clause introduced by *raz* has a truth value (see Comrie 2009 (1986): 80 for this difference of conditional clauses from causal ones). This is illustrated in (58a, b). In (58a), but not in (58b), the speaker assumes the proposition 'the weather is good' to be true.

(58) a. *Raz   pogoda   horošaja,   my   pojdjom   guljat'.*
      since   weather   good   we   go.FUT.1PL   walk.INF
      'Since the weather is good, we will go for a walk'.

    b. *Esli   pogoda   horošaja,   my   pojdjom   guljat'.*
      if   weather   good   we   go.FUT.1PL   walk.INF
      'If the weather is good, we will go for a walk'.

Still, as mentioned above, the meaning of *raz* is somewhat intermediate between a causal and a conditional one. *Raz* resembles *esli* in that both can introduce information that is familiar to the hearer, whereas a truly causal conjunction in Russian like *poskol'ku* or *tak kak* requires the information to be, at least partially, new. Consider example (59). The information represented by the subordinate clause ('you are commander') is given in the previous context, hence not new. Both *esli* and *raz* can introduce such a clause, but *poskol'ku* cannot.

(59)   *Vinovat, a   vy,   sobstvenno,   kto?   Komandarm? –   prerval*
         sorry   and you actually   Who commander   interrupt.PST.M.SG

       ego ključik. –   Nikak   net,   otnjud'   ne   komandarm. –
       him key   nowise not   at_all   not   commander

       Ny   raz   <^{OK}esli, *poskol'ku> vy   ne   komandarm,

Well	since	if	since		you	not	commander

to,   *značit,*   *vy*   *angel.*
then(TO)   consequently   you   Angel
' "I'm sorry, but who in the world are you? A commander?" interrupted the key.
"Negative, not a commander at all." "Well, since <if> you are not a commander, then
you are an angel" '. (RNC)

This difference between *poskol'ku* and *raz* is rather subtle, since
the *poskol'ku*-clause also tends to express information that is some-
what unsurprising for the hearer. For this reason, the clause intro-
duced by *poskol'ku* is usually placed at the beginning of the sentence,
as in (57b). But still, when the proposition is strictly given, only *raz*,
and not *poskol'ku,* can introduce it. On the contrary, propositions that
are not strictly given can be introduced only by *poskol'ku* (Panova &
Hadarcev 2000: 166). Consider example (60). Here the information 'I
was under stress at that moment' is naturally interpreted as unsur-
prising for the hearer, but not given. Therefore, only *poskol'ku* is felici-
tous in this context.

(60)   *Vokrug*   *menja*   *bylo*   *mnogo*   *ljudej.*   *Poskol'ku*   *<*Raz>*   *v*
       around   me   be.PST.N.SG   many   people   since   since   at

      ètot   *moment*   *ja*   *nahodilas'*   *v*   *sostojanii*   *stressa,*   *ih*
      that   moment   I   stay.PST.F.SG   in   state   stress   their

      vzgljady   *dostavljali*   *mne*   *dopolnitel'noe*   *bespokojstvo.*
      glance   cause.PST.PL   me   additional   concern
      'There were a lot of people around me. Since I was under stress at that moment,
      their glances caused me additional concern'.

From a typological point of view, *raz* is a complementizer intro-
ducing factual conditionals (see Bhatt & Pancheva 2006: 671).

Now, the Italian *siccome* seems to be a closer counterpart for
(purely causal) *poskol'ku* than for *raz*. In the Italian counterpart of the
example (60), indeed, *siccome* can be used, according to my informants:

(61)   *C'erano un sacco di persone intorno a me. Siccome in quel momento ero stressata, i*
      loro sguardi mi infastidivano ulteriormente.
      'There were a lot of people around me. Since I was under stress at that moment,
      their glances caused me additional concern'.

Since the use of *siccome* is not strictly limited to propositions that
are given, it is not a factual conditional and not a *raz* counterpart[12].
So, *allora* differs from *togda* and resembles *to* in that it is compatible
with truly causal subordinators. Can this fact be accounted for without
abandoning the idea of *allora* as the nearest counterpart of *togda?*

I suggest the answer to be positive. The reason for the broader
combinability of *allora* seems to be the fact that *allora* in general

has a broader meaning than that of *togda*. When used beyond the correlative context, *allora* can have a kind of causal meaning that cannot be expressed with the help of *togda*. Consider examples (62) and (63). In (62a) and (63a), *allora* stays for some sort of conclusion, based on what has been said or what has happened previously. When translated in Russian, as in (62b) and (63b), *togda* cannot be used:

(62) a. *Allora, ci muoviamo?* (Devoto-Oli 2007: 91)
   'So, will we go, or not?'

  b. *Nu* čto   *<*Togda>,* *pošli?*
   so   what then   go.IMP
   'So, will we go, or not?'

(63) a. *E allora?*
   'So what?'

  b. *I*   čto   *<*Togda>?*
   so   what then
   'So what?'

As demonstrated in Podlesskaya (1997), *togda* may express cause in contexts like (64).

(64) *Vanya pobil*   *Vasju.* *Togda*   *Vasja pobil*   *Vanju.*
   Vanya beat.PST.M.SG Vasja then(TOGDA) Vasja beat.PST.M.SG Vanja
   'Vania beat Vasya. Then (after that and because of that) Vasya beat Vanya'.

But the causal meaning is mediated here by the posteriority meaning and is inseparable from the latter. This is not the case in (62) and (63).

Allora is originally an adverb with a temporal anaphoric meaning. According to (Bazzanella *et al.* 2007: 13), the original consequential meaning has been extended, probably simultaneously, to the conditional (hypothetical) and the speaker-related domains, the last one being exemplified in (62a) and (63a). The fact that the conditional uses of *allora* have included causal meanings seems to be in line with the fact that the speaker-related uses also appear to be close to causality semantics. Now, the Russian *togda*, although also a temporal adverb in origin, has not developed the near-causal meaning in the speaker-related domain. Not surprisingly, its hypothetical uses do not include causality meanings either.

So, it seems plausible to explain the difference in question between *allora* and *togda* by the broader meaning of *allora* in general. If so, the compatibility of *allora* with causal conjunctions does not turn out to be contradictory to the idea that *togda*, not *to*, is the near-

est counterpart of *allora*. This suggests, by turn, analyzing *allora* as a correlative proform of the *se*-clause:

(65)   [*Se*-clause]$_i$ [*allora*$_i$…].

The semantic contribution of *allora* is then identical to that of *togda* (and to that of the English *then*): 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases' (see Bazzanella *et al.* (2007: 13) for a similar semantic interpretation of *allora*).

It should be noted that when *allora* is combined with a causal conjunction, this contribution assumes counterfactual modality, since a causal clause, contrary to a conditional one, has a truth value. In other words, the meaning that *allora* in the *Siccome A, allora B* construction serves to emphasize is supposed to be the following: 'if A had not been the case, at least some of ¬A-cases would have been ¬B-cases'. Thus, for sentence (57a) above, *allora* seems to emphasize that if he had not felt bad, at least in some of these cases he would not have decided to go to the doctor[13].

Again, the decisive argument for the analysis proposed above is the possibility to explain formal properties of *allora* on the basis of this analysis. See Section 4 for details.

4. To*,* togda*,* allora*: account for the facts observed*

I will show below that the facts summarized in Table 1 (see Section 2.3) can be explained on the basis of the analysis proposed for *to, togda* and *allora*[14].

In what follows the formal differences between *to* and *togda* will be explained systematically. As for *allora,* just two of its features mentioned in Table 1 will be discussed, those which distinguish *allora* from *togda*. These are features concerning combination with conjunctions and ellipsis. The fact that with respect to all other features, *allora* does not differ from *togda*, can, in turn, be accounted for by the suggested analysis, since the latter assumes a high degree of semantic and grammatical resemblance between *allora* and *togda*, which opposes them both to *to* (see Section 3).

*4.1. The range of conjunctions allowed (*to *vs.* togda *vs.* allora*)*

In this respect, all three correlatives differ. *To* has the broadest combinability (besides *esli* and *kogda,* it combines with *poka* and with causal conjunctions like *poskol'ku*). The next one is *allora* (it combines

with the causal *siccome*, but not with *mentre,* which is the counterpart of *poka*). *Togda* has the narrowest combinability (it combines neither with causal conjunctions nor with *poka*).

The fact that *allora*, but not *togda*, combines with causal conjunctions has already been explained above by the broader meaning of *allora* in general. *Allora* can be used in the causal contexts where *togda* is unacceptable (see Section 3.3). The broadest combinability of *to* is accounted for by its relatively high degree of grammaticalization (see Section 3.2). It is well-known, indeed, that the grammaticalization process involves various kinds of syntactic and/or semantic expansion (see Himmelmann 2004; Traugott 2008, *inter alia*).

One may wonder why *to* followed this path, and not another one, when expanding its combinability. That is, why *poskol'ku, tak kak, poka* and not other conjunctions came to be compatible with *to*. In Pekelis (2015), I propose an answer to this question that seems to be in line with the analysis suggested for *to* above. Briefly speaking, all the non-conditional subordinators combinable with *to* are close to the conditional connectors in that they carry the following implication: there are moments or circumstances in which the situation *A*, hence the situation *B*, does not hold or would not have held. In particular, the constructions *Poskol'ku A, (to) B* and *Tak kak A, (to) B* imply that in different circumstances *A* could have not happened. This, in turn, is due to the fact that the meaning '*A* is the cause of *B*', expressed by *poskol'ku* and *tak kak*, can be seen as a sum of the following semantic components: 'usually, if *A*, then *B*', '*A*', '*B*' (see Latyševa (1982) for elaboration of this analysis). That is, both *poskol'ku* and *tak kak* express the causal meaning via a conditional one. Given this, the fact that *to* has chosen these conjunctions when expanding its use is not surprising.

The suggested interpretation correctly predicts that the causal subordinators that do not refer to the conditional meaning are not compatible with *to*. Indeed, the Russian subordinators *potomu čto* and *ottogo čto,* both meaning 'because', do not imply a general statement 'usually, if *A*, then *B*' and do not combine with *to*[15].

4.2. Combination with tol'ko esli *(*to *vs.* togda*)*

To differs from *togda* in that it cannot combine with *tol'ko esli*. The reason for it seems to be the following: *to* and *tol'ko* are both contrastive operators, and the sets of alternatives associated with them are incompatible.

In order to illustrate this thesis, the sets of alternatives associated with *tol'ko* and *to* in the context of *esli* are considered below.

In the *Tol'ko esli A, B* construction, *tol'ko* produces a set of alternatives, where *A* is opposed to situations C^1, C^2… C^n, all different from A and B and all linked to *B* by the same *esli*-relation (see about *tol'ko* Nikolaeva 2013 (1985): 25; Yanko 2001: 53—61).

Set of alternatives, associated with *tol'ko*:

(66) $\{A \rightarrow B; C_1 \rightarrow B; … C_n \rightarrow B\}$

The semantics of contrast dictate choosing the first element of (66) and negating other elements. Thus, example (67) implies that in the case we were invited to a party, we got to eat something more decent than sandwiches, while in other, alternative cases, we did not get anything more decent.

(67)   *Obyčno   my   zakusyvali   beljašami i   buterbrodami   s   kolbasoj.*
      usually   we   snack.PST.PL belyash   and   sandwich   with   salami

      Tol'ko   esli   polučali   priglašenie   na   kakoe-nibud'   zastol'e,
      only   if   get.PST.PL invitation   to   which-INDF   party

      nam   perepadalo   čto-to   popriličnee.
      us   come.PST.3SG   what-INDF   more_decent
      'We usually snacked on belyash pies and sandwiches with salami. Only when we were invited to some dinner party, would something more decent come our way'. (RNC)

In *esli A, to B* construction, *to* produces the following set of alternatives (see Section 3.2 for details).

(68)   Set of alternatives associated with *to*:
      $\{A \rightarrow B; \neg(A \rightarrow B)\} \approx \{A \rightarrow B; \neg A \rightarrow B; A \rightarrow \neg B\}$

According to the assumptions above, the negation of the second and of the third elements of (68) produces, respectively, 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases' and 'all *A*-cases are *B*-cases'. Consider sentence (69), which differs from (67) in that *tol'ko* has been omitted and *to* has been added:

(69)   *Esli   my   polučali   priglašenie   na   kakoe-nibud'   zastol'e,*
      if   we   get.PST.PL invitation   to   which-INDF   party

      to   nam perepadalo   čto-to   popriličnee.
      then(TO)   us   come.PST.3SG what-INDF   more_decent
      'When we were invited to some dinner party, then something more decent came our way'.

Here, *to* is argued to emphasize the following: 'at least in some of the cases in which we were not invited to a party, nothing more decent than sandwiches came our way'; 'in all cases we were invited to a party, something more decent came our way'.

Now, it is because the two sets of alternatives, (66) and (68), are incompatible, unifying *to* and *tol'ko* in the same sentence is ungrammatical. In (66), indeed, what serves as a background for the choice produced by the contrast, is the situation *B* ('something more decent came our way', for (67)). In (68), instead, the first and the third elements (A→B and A→¬B, respectively) fix the situation *A* ('we were invited to a party', for (69)) as a background, whereas the situation *B* is here in the focus of contrast. But one and the same situation cannot both be and not be the background of contrast. Hence, *tol'ko* and *to* are incompatible in the same sentence.

There is one seeming contradiction to what has been assumed so far. The first and the second elements of (68) (A→B and ¬A→B, respectively) fix situation *B* as the background of contrast. Accordingly, *B* serves in (68) both as the background and the focus of contrast. If so, why does an incompatibility similar to that assumed above not arise? The point is that a conditional construction usually implies ¬A→¬B (that is, the negation of ¬A→B) beyond the contrastive context as well (see footnote 10). Hence, it is the choice between the first and the third elements of (68) that is fundamentally new in the semantics of *to*. The second element does not fully participate in the choice, since its negation is predetermined by the semantics of the conditional construction. So, the specific contribution of *to* essentially comes to the choice out of the set {A→B; A→¬B} that is not subject to incompatibility.

I will now turn to *togda,* namely, to the fact that *togda*, contrary to *to,* can combine with *tol'ko esli*. The set of alternatives produced by *togda* is assumed to be the following (see Section 3.1 for details).

(70) Set of alternatives, associated with *togda*:
      {A→B; ¬A→B}

This set is very similar to that associated with *tol'ko* (cf. (66)). The difference is, however, that *tol'ko* tends to trigger differentiation of the alternative situations C^1, C^2… C^n, whereas *togda* always implies a generalized alternative ¬A. The following examples illustrate this:

(71) a. *Esli   ne   uspeli   poest'   doma,   togda   nužno*
        if   not   have_time.PST.PL   eat.INF   at_home   then(TOGDA)   one_has

        zahvatit'   zavtrak   na rabotu ili poest'   v   kafe.
        take.INF   breakfast   to work   or   eat.INF in   café
        'If you didn't have time to eat at home, then you'll have to take some breakfast with you to work or swing by a café'. (RNC)

b. *??Tol'ko* *esli* *ne* *uspeli* *poest'* *doma,* *nužno*
   only   if   not   have_time.PST.PL eat.INF at_home one_has

   zahvatit' *zavtrak* *na rabotu ili poest'* *v* *kafe.*
   take.INF   breakfast to work   or eat.INF in café
   'Only if you didn't have time to eat at home, you'll have to take some breakfast
   with you to work or swing by a café'.

In (71a), *togda* is argued to highlight that if you did have time to eat at home, at least in some of these cases you need neither to take breakfast to work nor go to a café. Now, using *tol'ko* instead of *togda* in the same context, as in (71b), is infelicitous, because *tol'ko* produces an idea of a series of alternative situations, which is here pragmatically strange. Indeed, (71b) is intended to mean: 'in all the situations different from the situation 'you did not have time to eat at home', you need neither to take breakfast to work nor go to a café'. It is not quite clear, however, what could constitute a natural series of alternatives to the situation 'you did not have time to eat at home'[16].

Since the sets of alternatives produced by *tol'ko* and *togda* are essentially the same, *tol'ko* and *togda* are compatible and serve to emphasize each other.

4.3. Combination with daže esli *(*to *vs.* togda*)*

As shown in Section 2.1, *to* and *togda* behave differently with respect to *daže esli*: *togda* cannot combine with it, whereas for *to,* such a possibility exists, but depends on the context.

The ungrammaticality of *Daže esli A, togda B* is due to the fact that the meaning of *daže* contradicts that of *togda*. The associate of *daže* corresponds here to an end-point of a scale that ranges situations according to their ability to imply *B*. That is, the situation *A* is marked as the less able to imply *B*, but as, nevertheless, implying *B* (for the semantics of conditional-concessive particles, see Fauconnier 1975; König 1991: 79—83, *inter alia*). This brings about the implication that *B* holds in all circumstances, which clearly clashes with the contribution of *togda* 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases' (for a similar account of the ungrammaticality of *Even if… then*, see Iatridou 1994).

The meaning 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases' is present in the semantics of *to* as well, hence the ungrammaticality of *Daže esli A, to B* in some contexts. Still, in some other contexts *to* is compatible with *daže esli*. There are at least two factors that facilitate this combination:

- the presence of the epistemic expressions like *vsjo ravno* 'still', *naverniaka* 'for sure', and *obiazatel'no* 'certainly' in the main clause;

- the subject ellipsis in the main clause.

Thus, *to* is hardly acceptable in (72a), but when combined with *vsjo ravno*, as in (72b), it becomes much more felicitous.

(72) a. *Daže esli u   menja est'   svojo mnenie, (??to)   ja   gotov*
      even if   POSS me   be.PRS   own   opinion then(TO) I   ready

    vyslušat' i   drugije točki zrenija.
    listen.INF also   other   point view
    'Even if I have my own opinion, I am open to other points of view as well'. (www.yandex.ru)

  b. *Daže esli u   menja est'   svojo mnenie, ^{OK}to   vsjo   ravno*
      even if   POSS me   be.PRS   own   opinion then(TO) still still

    ja   gotov vyslušat' i   drugije točki zrenija.
    I   ready listen.INF also   other   point view
    'Even if I have my own opinion, I am open to other points of view as well'.

Similarly, omitting *vsjo ravno* in (73) makes the sentence infelicitous:

(73)   *Daže esli ih   kto-to   kogda-to   naznačil   byt'*
      even if   them   who-INDF   when-INDF   appoint.PST.M.SG   be.INF

    oligarhami, to   ??(vsjo ravno) ostalis'   tol'ko   te,
    oligharch   (then)TO still   still   remain.PST.PL only   those

    kto   éffektiven.
    who   effective
    'Even if somebody had once appointed them to be oligarchs, all the same the only
    ones to remain were the effective ones'. (RNC)

In examples (74) and (75), the subject of the main clause is omitted. Accordingly, the presence of *to* is strongly preferred:

(74)   *Daže esli   ona_i   i   rešitsja   na   takoj šag,*
      even if   she   even   dare.FUT.3SG   for   this   step

    ??(to)   Ø_i soveršit   ego liš po   zaveršeniju sledstvija.
    then(TO)   do.FUT.3SG it   only after termination investigation
    'Even if she dares to take this step, she will only do it when the investigation is
    over'. (RNC)

(75)   *Daže esli on_i sam   lično   ne   vskryval   pisem Millera,*
      even if   he   himself personally not   open.PST.M.SG   letter Miller
    ??(to)   Ø_i znal   ob   étom i   pol'zovalsja   svedenijami,
    then(TO)   know.PST.M.SG about this and use.PST.M.SG   information
    polučennymi   perljustraciej.
    obtain.PTCP.PL perusal
    'Even if he personally did not open Miller's letters, he knew about that and used
    the information he obtained by perusal'. (RNC)

The effectiveness of the above two factors can be explained as follows.

Epistemic expressions like *vsjo ravno* enhance the component 'all *A*-cases are *B*-cases' in the meaning of *to*. Now, this component

is congruent with the implication that *B* holds in all circumstances, triggered by *daže.* By enhancing one component in *to* semantics, the second component ('at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases'), which is contradictory to the meaning of *daže*, is somewhat enfeebled. The hypothesis that *to* is characterized by this kind of semantic lability is corroborated by the assumption that *to* is a relatively grammaticalized item, since grammaticalization is typically associated with the modification or loss of the original semantics.

The subject ellipsis factor can also be explained by the high degree of grammaticalization of *to*. Note that the subject ellipsis in general facilitates the presence of *to* in the conditional construction (see Sections 2.1 and 4.4 for details). Importantly, this depends neither on the presence of *daže,* nor on any clearly semantic factor. It seems reasonable to conclude that the use of *to* in an elliptical context is motivated not by its basic semantics, but by some other (non-semantic) function (for what this function may be, see Section 4.4). If this is true, in an elliptical context no specific semantics of *to* are at stake; hence, no contradiction with the meaning of *daže* arises. Again, the very ability to lose the basic semantics seems to be due to the relatively high degree of grammaticalization[17].

To summarize, the meanings of both *togda* and *to* contradict the semantics of *daže.* Therefore, a combination with *daže* is problematic for both correlatives. Still, for *to,* such a combination remains possible, because *to* is a (more) grammaticalized item that can change or even lose its original meaning in some contexts. For *togda,* this is not the case.

4.4. Comparative esli / se *and ellipsis (*to *vs.* togda *vs.* allora*)*
Both the comparative and the elliptical contexts seem to be exceptions to the semantic interpretation suggested for *to* in Section 3.2. That is, in neither of these contexts does *to* play the semantic role assumed for it above.

The semantics of comparison, as has already been mentioned, is not implicative, since comparison assumes neither causative nor spatio-temporal interaction between the situations. Therefore, the analysis of *to* as a means to emphasize an implicative relation is simply not applicable to the comparative context.

Consider now the case of ellipsis. The presence of *to* is preferred in sentences like (76a), where the subject of the main clause coreferential with the subject of the subordinate clause is phonetically not realized. Now, in the same sentence with the phonetically realized subject *to* can be omitted, cf. (76b).

(76) a. *Esli oni*ᵢ *privyknut   žit'   na vsjom   gotovom,   �(to)*
       if   they get_used.FUT.3PL live.INF on everything prepared then(TO)

       Øᵢ poterjajut   sposobnost' k vyživaniju.
          lose.FUT.3PL   capability for survival
          'If they get used to living with everything prepared for them, they will lose their
          capability for survival'. (RNC)

   b. *Esli   oni   privyknut   žit'   na vsjom   gotovom, oni*
       if   they   get_used.FUT.3PL live.INF on everything prepared they

      poterjajut   sposobnost' k vyživaniju.
      lose.FUT.3PL   capability for survival
      'If they get used to living with everything prepared for them, they will lose their
      capability for survival'.

Importantly, no semantic modification seems to have occurred in (76b) when compared with (76a). Hence, the use of *to* in (76a) does not seem to be motivated semantically.

So what is the function of *to* in the comparative and elliptical contexts? I argue in Pekelis (2015) that *to* serves here as a marker of some kind of semantic-syntactic symmetry between the clauses. The comparative relation is to some extent semantically more symmetric than the conditional one. The phenomenon of ellipsis is associated with symmetry as well, as evidenced by the well-known link between ellipsis and coordination: there are types of ellipsis that seem to only occur in coordinated structures (see e.g. van Oirsouw 1987; Testelets 2001: 262). Thus, the use of *to* in the comparative and the elliptical contexts seems to be motivated, first, by the fact that both contexts exhibit some kind of symmetry and second, by the role of *to* as a symmetry marker (for further argumentation, see Pekelis 2015).

Based on the above analysis, I will now suggest an explanation for the behavior of *togda* and *allora* in the contexts in question.

That *togda* is not acceptable in the comparative context is due to the fact that *togda*, being less grammaticalized than *to,* cannot lose its basic semantics. Now, the latter serves to elaborate the implicative relation expressed by the corresponding conjunction. The meaning 'at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases', which *togda* adds to the meaning of the *esli*-construction, can be seen, indeed, as a kind of elaboration on the implicative (conditional) relation. But the comparative relation, as mentioned above, is not implicative. Hence, *togda* is incompatible with it.

In the elliptical context, *togda* is usually unacceptable as the unique correlative. It can be used together with *to,* but in this case it is still optional, contrary to *to*. This can be accounted for by the assumption that *togda* does not assume any function supplementary to its basic semantics. In particular, it cannot serve as a symmetry

marker. Consequently, *togda* does not provide symmetry, required by the elliptical context.

Allora behaves identically to *togda* in the comparative context. This is accounted for automatically by the hypothesis that *allora* is the nearest semantic-syntactic counterpart of *togda*. But in the elliptical context, *allora* differs from both *to* and *togda*. Unlike *togda*, *allora* is acceptable as the unique correlative in a conditional construction where the subject of the main clause, coreferential with the subject of the *se*-clause, is not phonetically realized. Unlike *to,* it is usually optional in such a construction (see Section 2.2). This can also be explained in line with the analysis of *allora* as the nearest counterpart of *togda*. Like *togda*, *allora* is little grammaticalized and cannot assume grammatical functions like that of a symmetry marker. But one may suppose that in Italian, no symmetry marker is needed at all in the construction in question, since Italian, being a regular pro-drop language, imposes fewer constraints on the absence of an explicit subject than Russian. Consequently, *allora* can serve as the unique correlative, contrary to *togda*. Now, given that the function of *allora* is a semantic, not a grammatical one, *allora*, unlike *to,* is not obligatory. Its use is motivated by its basic semantic contribution, both in the construction in question and elsewhere.

In sum, the differences that *to, togda* and *allora* display in the comparative and the elliptical contexts are due to two facts. First, *togda* and *allora* are less grammaticalized than *to*. Second, the pro-drop phenomenon is much more regular in Italian than in Russian.

*4.5. Morphological status and positional restrictions (*to *vs.* togda*)*
The fact that *to* and *togda* differ in their morphological status (*to* is a clitic, whereas *togda* is a word), as well as the strictly initial position of *to,* are perfectly in line with the assumption that *to,* contrary to *togda,* is a considerably grammaticalized item (see details in Section 3.2).

5. Conclusion

I have attempted to show in this paper that among two Russian correlatives used in the conditional construction, *to* and *togda,* the latter one is the nearest functional counterpart of the Italian *allora*. Both *togda* and *allora* are best analyzed as correlative proforms corresponding to the conditional clause. Their semantic contribution to the conditional construction *Esli A, togda B* and *Se A, allora B* seems to be the same: both emphasize that at least some of ¬A-cases

are ¬B-cases. No wonder that *togda* and *allora* share a number of formal properties. Both combine with *tol'ko* and *solo*, but not with *daže* and *anche*. Both cannot be used when *esli* and *se* have the comparative meaning. Contrary to *to*, both *togda* and *allora* are words, not clitics.

Still, there are few properties that *allora* has in common with *to*. For instance, both *allora* and *to*, contrary to *togda,* can combine with causal conjunctions. Yet, this runs contrary to the suggested analysis only at first glance. In particular, the broader combinability of *allora* is due to the fact that *allora* has a broader meaning than that of *togda* in general and not only when they are used as correlatives.

To, instead, is not a proform of the conditional clause. It serves to contrastively emphasize not the dependent clause itself, but the implicative relation expressed by the corresponding subordinator. So, it can be seen as anaphorically connected to (though not substituting) this subordinator. When combined with *esli*, *to* emphasizes that the *esli*-relation holds between *A* and *B*, but not between ¬*A* and *B* or between ¬B and *A*. This leads, according to my assumptions, to highlighting that, first, all *A*-cases are *B*-cases and, second, that at least some of ¬A-cases are ¬B-cases. The meaning of *to* is thus broader than that of *togda*, the latter being included in the first.

Apart from semantics, there is an important grammatical feature that distinguishes *to* from *togda* and *allora*: *to* is a considerably grammaticalized item. The consequences of this are twofold. First, the meaning of *to* is somewhat fuzzier than that of *togda*. Second, there are cases (e.g. the case of subject ellipsis in the main clause) in which *to* fulfills grammatical rather than semantic functions.

The analysis suggested for *to, togda* and *allora* is corroborated by the fact that it can serve as a basis to account for the formal properties of three correlatives.

Now, this analysis seems to have an important theoretical consequence concerning the typology of conditional correlative clauses. The data of Russian and Italian suggest that there are at least two types of correlatives used in conditional constructions. One is a proform of the conditional clause, that is, a part of the correlative relative construction. *Togda* and *allora* are instances of this type. The other, like the Russian *to*, is not a proform, hence not a part of the correlative relative construction. As my analysis has shown, in Russian the distinction between two types of correlatives is maintained on different language levels: the semantic vagueness of *to*, which distinguishes it from *togda,* corresponds to the higher grammaticalization degree of *to*, and in particular to its clitic status.

Further research could show whether there is a cross-linguistic variation in parameters which define the *to* and *togda/allora*-types, and whether there are languages with other structural types of conditional correlatives.

Notes

1   Most examples cited in this paper are taken from the *Russian National Corpus* (RNC, www.ruscorpora.ru) and from the corpus of Italian *PAISÀ* (http://www.corpusitaliano.it). I have constructed the examples for which the source is not indicated. Here follows the list of the ABBREVIATIONS used: 1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person; CONJ = conjunction; CNV = converb; F = feminine; FUT = future; IMP = imperative; INDF = indefinite; INF = infinitive; M = masculine; PASS = passive; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; PRS = present; PST = past; PRCL = particle; PTCP = participle; SG = singular.

2   In what follows, I gloss the *to* correlative as "then(TO)" and the *togda* correlative as "then(TOGDA)".

3   This list of conjunctions is incomplete. Both *to* and *togda* also combine with a number of conjunctions that are synonymous with *esli, kogda* and *raz,* but are less common in use (*eželi, koli, kol' skoro*, etc).

4   Due to a lack of space, the list of differences indicated above is incomplete. To mention just one difference not discussed here: *to*, contrary to *togda*, can be used in conditional constructions containing the pronoun è*to* 'this' in the main clause that is anaphorically bound by the preposed conditional clause, as in (i), (ii).

(i)   * *Esli   my   razvedjomsja, togda   dlja   Maksimki   èto*
      If   we   divorce   then(TOGDA) for   Maxim   this

      budet   strašnyj   udar.
      be.FUT.3SG   hard   Blow
      'If we divorce, it will be a hard blow to Maxim'. (Inkova 2014: 391)

(ii) ᴼᴷ*Esli   my   razvedjomsja, to   dlja   Maksimki èto*
      If   we   divorce   then(TO)   for   Maxim   this

      budet   strašnyj   udar.
      be.FUT.3SG   hard   blow
      'If we divorce, it will be a hard blow to Maxim'.

5   The data were retrieved through the following queries: '*poka* first at a distance of 1 to 10 from *togda* after comma', '*poka* first at a distance of 1 to 10 from *to* after comma'. The output of the query was then checked manually.

6   Here and below, a word enclosed in angle brackets is considered as an alternative to the immediately preceding word. So the sequence *to <togda>* means that *togda* is considered as an alternative to *to* within the same example.

7   As in the case with *to* and *togda,* not all the conjunctions compatible with *allora* are mentioned here. *Allora* also combines with a number of conjunctions synonymous to those indicated above (*nel caso che, supposto che, qualora, poiché* and some others).

8   Since the Russian *togda* is compatible with the conjunction *raz,* which was argued to be intermediate between a causal and a conditional one, a question arises as to whether the Italian *siccome*, *visto che* are truly causal. See the argumentation in Section 3.3.

9   In what follows, symbols '¬' and '→' are used to denote negation and implication (more precisely, conditional relation), respectively.

[10]   As Geis & Zwicky (1971) have shown, a conditional construction *if A, B* may imply ¬A→¬B by itself, regardless of any correlative proform being absent or present in the sentence. Therefore, the function of *togda* is not to introduce, but rather to emphasize the meaning in question.

[11]   The structure (56b) is only partially adequate since it does not show that *togda*, but not *to,* is a proform. We leave this problem unresolved here.

[12]   This does not mean that *siccome* and *poskol'ku* are used in the same contexts. Example (59), when translated in Italian, can contain *siccome,* though in Russian, the version with *poskol'ku* is infelicitous. (i) was judged as acceptable by my informants:

(i)   *Mi scusi, ma Lei chi è? Un comandante? – lo interruppe Kliuchik. - No, non sono affatto un comandante. – Allora, se <*^OK^*siccome> non è un comandante, vuol dire che è un angelo.*
"I'm sorry, but who in the world are you? A commander?" Kliuchik interrupted.
"Negative, not a commander at all." "Well, if <since> you are not a commander, then you are an angel".

It seems that there is no strict counterpart of *raz* in Italian. The features according to which *raz* is opposed to *poskol'ku* in Russian turn out to be irrelevant for the causal conjunctions in Italian. Consequently, *siccome* can be used both in the contexts typical for *poskol'ku* and those favorable to *raz*.

[13]   The contribution of *togda* seems to undergo the same modification in the context of *raz*. As for *to*, the question of how its meaning is modified in the context of non-conditional conjunctions needs further investigation. See some considerations in Pekelis (2015).

[14]   The only fact from table 1 that I will not discuss below is the difference between *to* and *togda* in terms of syntactic categories. This difference is motivated historically, see Section 3.2 for details.

[15]   An anonymous IJL referee suggests treating *to, togda* and *allora* as occupying different points on a kind of factivity scale, where *to* is "the most" factive, *allora* is "less" factive and *togda* is "the least" factive. Several facts seem to corroborate this idea. Both *to* and *allora,* but not *togda,* combine with causal subordinators, which are known to introduce clauses having a truth value. *To* is compatible with the so-called comparative *esli*, which also introduces a clause with a truth value, whereas for *togda* and *allora*, the combination with the comparative *esli*/*se* is banned. (An additional fact pointed out by the referee is that *daže esli* 'even if'-clause*,* which is compatible with *to* only, sometimes assumes a truth value as well, but in Russian this does not seem to be the case.) I am grateful to the IJL referee for drawing my attention to this alternative interpretation. However, the generalization in terms of factivity does not seem to capture the essence of the opposition between *to*, *togda* and *allora*, since it leaves unexplained a number of important facts. In particular, the range of causal subordinators compatible with *to* remains far from clear: why *to*, if it is "the most factive" correlative, does not combine with the abovementioned causal subordinator *potomu čto* 'because', which is the basic and the most frequent causal subordinator in Russian, whereas the less common *poskol'ku* and *tak kak* are compatible with *to*. More generally, the factivity hypothesis, even if descriptively adequate, does not shed light on why *to*, being a predominantly conditional correlative, expands its use to the causal contexts, which contrast drastically with the conditional contexts exactly by the presence of factivity. On the contrary, my analysis (the idea of *to* as a grammaticalized item serving to stimulate the comparison between *A* and ¬A-cases, which is typical for conditionals, combined with the idea of *poskol'ku* and *tak kak* as causal conjunctions close to conditional ones in the above sense) seems to provide the explanation in question.

[16]   Notice that changing the clause order in (71b) makes the sentence sound better, cf.:

(71) c. *Nužno   zahvatit'   zavtrak   na   rabotu   ili   poest'   v   kafe,*
       one_has   take.INF   breakfast   to   work   or   eat.INF   in   café

   tol'ko   esli   ne   uspeli   poest'   doma.
   only   if   not   have_time.PST.PL   eat.INF   at_home
   'You'll have to take some breakfast with you to work or swing by a café, only if you didn't have time to eat at home'.

The reason for this seems to be the following. In (71c), the *esli*-clause associates with contrastive focus, whereas in (71b) it is a contrastive topic. Now, contrastive foci, contrary to topics, express exhaustivity (see Section 3.1 for details). For (71c), this means highlighting that in all situations different from A = 'you didn't have time to eat at home'), situation B = 'you'll have to take some breakfast' does not hold. This makes the differentiation of situations alternative to A pragmatically less important.

[17]   Ellipsis seems to be the only context that facilitates the combination of *to* with *tol'ko esli* (which is generally excluded for semantic reasons, see Section 4.2 for details). Cf. the following *RNC* example borrowed from Fortuin (2011: 113):

(i)   *Tol'ko   esli   oni   sami   voz'mutsja   pomogat'   milicii,   to*
     only   if   they   themselves   start.FUT.PL   help.INF   police   then(TO)

   dobjutsja   porjadka   v   svojom   dome.
   gain.FUT.3PL   order   at   their   home
   'Only if they start to help the police themselves, they can preserve order at their own home' (RNC).

This also is naturally accounted for by the hypothesis that in the elliptical context, *to* loses its basic semantics, assuming instead a certain grammatical function that is somehow related to ellipsis.

Bibliographical References

Bazzanella, Carla; Bosco, Cristiana; Garcea, Alessandro; Gili Fivela, Barbara; Miecznikowskii, Johann & Brunozzi Tini, Francesca 2007. Italian allora, French alors: Functions, Convergences and Divergences. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6. 9-37.

Bhatt, Rajesh & Pancheva, Roumyana 2006. Conditionals. In Everaert, Martin & van Riemsdijk, Henk (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. *Vol. 1.* Oxford: Blackwell. 638-687.

Borkovskij, Viktor I. 1983. *Struktura predloženija v istorii vostočnoslavjanskih jazykov*. Moscow: Nauka.

Chomsky, Noam 1982. *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chung, Daeho 2004. Semantics and syntax of correlative adverbs. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 14. 307-328.

Comrie, Bernard 2009 (1986). Conditionals: a typology. In Traugott, Elizabeth Closs; Ter Meulen, Alice; Reilly, Judith S. & Ferguson, Charles A. (eds.), *On Conditionals.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 77-99.

Crnič, Luka 2008. Correlatives, conditionals and contrast. In Antonenko, Andrej; Bailyn, John & Bethin, Christina (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal*

Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL). Vol.16. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

De Roberto, Elisa 2010. Correlative, strutture. In Simone, Raffaele ed., in cooperation with Berruto, Gaetano and d'Achille, Paolo, *Enciclopedia dell'italiano*. Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana. <http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/strutture-correlative_(Enciclopedia_dell'Italiano)/>.

Devoto-Oli 2007 = Devoto, Di Giacomo; Oli, Gian Carlo (Serianni, Luca & Trifone, Maurizio eds.). *Vocabolario della lingua italiana 2007*. Le Monnier.

Fauconnier, Gilles 1975. Pragmatic Scales and Logical Structure. *Linguistic Analysis* 6. 353-375.

Fortuin, Egbert 2011. Iconicity, economy and frequency: the paratactic conditional perfective present construction in Russian. *Russian Linguistics* 35. 89-123.

Franks, Steven 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geis, Michael & Zwicky, Arnold 1971. On invited inferences. *Linguistic inquiry* 2. 561-566.

Gladkij, Aleksej V. 1982. O znachenii souza ESLI. *Semiotika i informatika* 18. 43-76.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2004. Lexicalization and grammaticalization: Opposite or orthogonal. In Bisang, Walter; Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. & Wiemer, Björn (eds.), *What makes Grammaticalization? A Look from its Fringes and its Components*. Mouton de Gruyter. 19-40.

Hopper, Paul & Traugott, Elizabeth 2003 (first edition 1993). *Grammaticalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iatridou, Sabine 1994. On the contribution of conditional *then. Natural language semantics* 2. 171-199.

Inkova, Olga 2014. *La corrélation en russe - Structures et interprétations*. Berne, Peter Lang.

Izvorski, Roumyana 1996. The Syntax and Semantics of Correlative Proforms. In Kiyomi Kusumoto (ed.), *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society 26*. Amherst: Graduate Linguistics Student Association. 133-147.

König, Ekkerhard 1991. *The meaning of focus particles*. London: Routledge.

Krifka, Manfred 1999. Additive particles under stress. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 8. 111-128. Cornell: CLC Publications.

Latyševa, Alla N. 1982. O semantike uslovnyh, pričinnyh i ustupitel'nyh sojuzov v russkom yazyke. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta*, *Ser. 9. Filologija* 5. 51-59.

Lipták, Anikó 2009. The landscape of correlatives: an empirical and analytical survey. In Lipták, Anikó (ed.), *Correlatives cross-linguistically*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins. 1-47.

Mazzoleni, Marco 2001. Le frasi ipotetiche. In Renzi, Lorenzo; Salvi, Giampaolo & Cardinaletti, Anna (a cura di), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione (nuova edizione). Vol. II. I sintagmi verbale, aggettivale, avverbiale. La subordinazione*. Bologna: il Mulino. 751-817.

Nikolaeva, Tatjana M. 2013 (1985). *Funkcii častic v vyskazyvanii (na materiale slavjanskih jazykov*. Moscow: Librocom.

PAISÀ = *Corpus della lingua italiana*. <www.corpusitaliano.it>.

Panova, Julija N. & Hadarcev, Oleg A. 2000. Epistemičeskij status kak para-

metr tipologičeskoj klassifikacii implikativnyh konstruktsij (na materiale russkogo i persidskogo jazykov). In Latyševa, Alla N. & Tsvetkova, Tatjana M. (eds.), *Složnoe predloženie: tradicionnye voprosy teorii i opisaniya i novye aspekty ego izučeniya*. No. 1. Moscow: International Cooperation Russian Learning Centre.

Pekelis, Olga E. 2015. Pokazatel' *to* kak sredstvo akcentuacii implikativnogo otnošenija (na primere sojuza *esli…to*). *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2. 55-96.

Plungian, Vladimir A. 2000. *Obščaja morfologija: vvedenie v problematiku*. Moscow: Èditorial URSS.

Plungian, Vladimir A. 2011. *Vvedenie v grammatičeskuju semantiku: grammatičeskie značenija i grammatičeskie sistemy jazykov mira*. Moscow: Russian State Univ. for the Humanities.

Podlesskaya, Vera I. 1997. Syntax and semantics of resumption: some evidence from Russian conditional conjuncts. *Russian linguistics* 21. 125-155.

Quirk, Randolph; Greenbaum, Sidney; Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan 1972. *A Grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.

RG-80 = *Russkaja grammatika*. Švedova, Natal'ja Ju. et al. (eds.). Moscow: Nauka. Vol. II, Sintaksis.

Rizzi, Luigi 1986. Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of 'pro'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17. 501-557.

RNC = *Russian National Corpus* (Nacional'nyj korpus russkogo jazyka). http://www.ruscorpora.ru

Testelets, Jakov G. 2001. *Vvedenie v obščij sintaksis*. Moscow: Russian State Univ. for the Humanities.

Testelets, Jakov G. 2011. Padež kak priznak identičnosti pri ellipsise v russkom. In *Trudy meždunarodnoj konferencii po kompjuternoj lingvistike i intellektual'nym tehnologijam «Dialog' 2011»*. Moscow: Russian State Univ. for the Humanities.

Tomioka, Satoshi 2007. Contrastive Topics, Speech Acts, and AntiExhaustivity. *Talk given at Stony Brook University*.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2008. Grammaticalization, constructions and the incremental development of language: Suggestions from the development of degree modifiers in English. In Eckardt, Regine; Jäger, Gerhard & Veenstra, Tonjes (eds.), *Variation, Selection, Development--Probing the Evolutionary Model of Language Change*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 219-250.

van Oirsouw, Robert 1987. *The syntax of coordination*. London: Croom Helm.

Yanko, Tatjana E. 2001. *Kommunikativnye strategii russkoj reči*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. Clitics and Particles. *Language* 61. 283-305.