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1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is to provide a syntactic analysis of constructions in which Russian intensifying adjective samyj ‘self’ is used as part of a fragment answer, as in (1):¹

(1) A: Do you remember Peter? He called me yesterday.
   B: Which Peter? Peter who plays the violin?
   A: On samyj.
      he selfM,SG,NOM
      ‘That’s the one.’ (lit. He himself.)

* I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions that helped to improve this contribution. I am also grateful to Barbara Citko, Elizabeth Cowper, Keffayew Gebregziabher, Vera Gribanova, Michela Ippolito, Arsalan Kahemuyipour, Dan Miway, Diane Massam and the audience of FASL 24 meeting for their comments, questions, and discussion. I also want to thank my Russian informants Olga and Serge Goncharov, Yanina Fedosova, Anna Frolova, Iryna Osadcha and Pavel Penenko for sharing their intuitions about the data. All errors and omissions are my own.

¹ Russian has two different lexical items coming from the same root meaning ‘self’: an intensifying adjective samyj and an emphatic pronoun sam. They can be distinguished by stress (samyj always has the stress on the root vowel, whereas sam has the stress on the ending) and their agreement pattern (samyj has so-called adjectival agreement, whereas sam has pronominal agreement), see Unbegaun 1957, Shvedova 1980. This paper discusses only samyj. For the discussion of sam see Klenin 1980, Weiss 2006, inter alia.
In the dialogue in (1), A’s affirmative reply consists of a nominative pronoun and samyj that agrees with it in number, gender and case. This answer has an emphatic flavour when compared to simple answers, such as Da ‘yes’ or On ‘he’, which are also possible in such a dialogue.

The analysis I propose derives the fragment answer ‘He self’ in (1) from the identity sentence ‘He self is Peter’. I argue that ‘he self’ raises to the specifier of a positively valued ΣP above TP and triggers TP-ellipsis, as schematically shown in (2):

(2) [ΣP [DP he self], [Σ: Σ, [TP t is Peter]]]  (simplified)

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, I discuss the properties of Pron+samyj. Section 3 contains evidence that Pron+samyj is a sentential fragment. In section 4, I propose and provide evidence for the analysis of Pron+samyj in terms of TP-ellipsis. Section 5 concludes.

2 Properties of Pron+samyj

2.1 Pron+samyj with 1st and 2nd person pronouns

The first notable property is that samyj combines more freely with 3rd person pronouns, than 1st and 2nd person pronouns, as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st.sg</th>
<th>1st.pl</th>
<th>2nd.sg</th>
<th>2nd.pl</th>
<th>3rd.sg</th>
<th>3rd.pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of tokens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Nominative pronouns + samyj in NRC\(^2\) (1950 - present)

This restriction is not due to pragmatic impossibility. As shown in (3), a context in which a participant in the conversation might need to re-state his or her own identity can be constructed and can trigger a response where samyj is used with the 1st person pronoun. This response, however, has a humorous flavour and in such contexts, it is more natural to use a 3rd person pronoun with a de se interpretation, see (4).

\(^2\) NRC = National Russian Corpus online (http://ruscorpora.ru/en/)
especially illuminating as the responder first uses the 1st person pronoun and when samyj is added for emphasis, s/he switches to the 3rd person.

(3) A: Posvol’te, vy — avtor knigi “Fizičeskie faktory”? excuse-me you author book “Physical factors”
   ‘Excuse me, are you the author of the book “Physical factors”?’
   B: Ja, samyj!
   I self
   ‘That’s right.’ (lit. I myself.) (NRC)

(4) A: Tak eto vy — odin na odin s medvedem?
   so this you one on one with bear
   ‘So, was that you who were one-on-one with a bear?’
   B: Ja, on samyj.
   I he self
   ‘That was me, me, indeed.’ (lit. I, he himself.) (NRC)

2.2 *Embeddability of Pron+*samyj
The second important property of Pron+*samyj* is that it can be embedded under reporting verbs and epistemic attitudes, see (5), but not under attitudes expressing desire, see (6):

(5) A: Kto eto? Neuželi professor Semenov?!
   who this? NEG.FOC.Q professor Semenov
   ‘Who is this? Isn’t this Professor Semenov?’
   B: Dumaju, on samyj.
   think1SG he self
   ‘I think this is he, indeed.’

   not know who will.come may be professor Semenov
   ‘I don’t know who will come. Maybe, professor Semenov will.’
   B: *Xotelos’ by čtoby on samyj.
   desirable COND thatCOND he self
   ‘I’d love it to be him!’

2.3 *Pron+*samyj with negation
The third property is that Pron+*samyj* can be used only as an affirmative answer. If the identity of a person (or thing) is not verified and the negative particle ne is used, samyj cannot be added, see (7).
(7) [Context: two persons are looking through some photos of children]
   this Peter    no not he self    this his brother
   ‘Is this Peter?’  ‘No, that is not he. This is his brother.’

NRC (sub-corpus 1950 – present) does not contain any example where
Pron+*samýj is used in a negative reply, although there are numerous
examples where in a relevant context, a pronoun is used without *samýj.

2.4 Pron+*samýj in argument positions
The fourth important property of Pron+*samýj is that it cannot be used in
a regular argument position (unless it is used as proper name). This is
illustrated by the ungrammatical examples in (8) where Pron+*samýj is
used as subject — (8a), object of a transitive verb — (8b), and object of
preposition — (8c).

(8) [Context: two persons are remembering their old friend Peter.]
      you know he self to me yesterday came
      ‘You know, he came to me yesterday.’
      you know we yesterday in park saw him self
      ‘You know, we saw him in the park yesterday.’
   c. * Ty znaeš’, my včera govorili o nem sámom.
      you know we yesterday talked about him self
      ‘You know, Masha and I talked about him yesterday.

In section 4.4, I discuss an apparent counterexample to this restriction, in
which Pron+*samýj seems to appear in an argument-like position with the
emphasized copula as in (9).

---

3 In (8b,c), I added the stress on *samýj to avoid confusion with *sam which is felicitous in
argument positions, see fn.1.
(9) On samyj *(i) jest’.  
he self roc is  
‘That’s right, this is he.’ (lit. He himself is.)

To summarize, in this section we saw four important properties of Pron+{samyj}: a) infelicity with 1st and 2nd person pronouns, b) embeddability under reporting verbs, but not desire attitudes, c) deviance under negation, and d) impossibility to surface in the regular argument position.

3 Pron+{samyj} is a sentential fragment

3.1 Comparison with a fixed expression
To answer a yes/no-question, Russian can use the expression Vot to-to i ono, which can be approximately translated as ‘(That’s) true’ or ‘This is so’. It is composed of a proximal presentative particle vot (optional) which is close in meaning and distribution to the French voici (Grenoble 1998:69-72); the reduplicated distal demonstrative in neuter nominative to-to; an additive focus proclitic i, which is a Slavic equivalent of the English unstressed also and German auch (Jasinskaja 2013:18-9) and the 3rd person neuter nominative pronoun ono.4 In what follows, I will gloss the particles using their phonetic form, rather than function. The use of vot to-to i ono is shown in (10):

(10) Aga, a tuxloe jajco vse-taki vozmožno? Vot to-to i ono.  
aha but spoiled egg indeed possible? vot too-to i ono  
‘But a spoiled egg is possible, isn’t it? That’s true.’ (NRC)

In (10), the pronoun in the answer agrees with the subject of the question in gender, number and case. Thus, the response might appear similar to the Pron+{samyj}, especially given examples like (11), in which Pron is neuter and vot is present.

---

4 For some discussion of vot to-to i ono from a cognitive linguistic perspective and its comparison to German discourse particles see Dobrovol’skij and Levontina 2012 and Poppel et al. 2012.
(11) [about a feeling which is neut. in Russian]  
Nakonec... Vot ono samee.  
finally VOT it self  
‘Finally, here is this feeling.’ (lit. Here is it itself) (NRC)

However, there is an important interpretative difference between the responses in (10) and (11). The pronoun ono in (10) does not refer to the noun jajco ‘egg’. Rather, it refers to the event itself (i.e. the possibility that an egg can be spoiled). Ono in (11), on the other hand, refers to the feeling, not to the event of the final attainment of this feeling.\(^5\)

This point is reinforced by the fact that unlike Pron+samyj, the pronoun in vot to-to i ono does not change its gender or number depending on the referent in the question, see (12).

(12) a. Pisatelja takogo, Aksenova, znaete? — Vot to-to i ono/*on. writerM such Aksenov know VOT TO-TO1 pronN/M  
‘Do you know the writer Aksenov? — That’s true.’

b. A nužna nam takaja Rodina?  
but need us such MotherlandF  
VOT TO-TO1 pronS/F  
‘Do we need such a Motherland? — True.’ (NRC)

3.2 Additional material

Another indication that Pron+samyj is not a fixed expression comes from the fact that it can co-occur with additional material that seems to be remnants of sentential ellipsis, see (13).

\(^5\) Ono+samyj can also refer to the event, as in (i). What is important for us here is that ono in vot to-to i ono cannot refer to a person or object in the question.

(i) Il’in čto li, produlsja? — Ono samee, —otvetil Lexa.  
‘It’s lost, hasn’t it?’ — So, indeed, — Lexa replied.’ (NRC)
(13)  a. Dlja drugix eto, mož, i ne xolod,
   for others this maybe 1 not cold
   but for old,lady it self
   ‘For others, this may be not cold, but for the old lady, it is.’
   a dlja staruxi on samyj.
   for old.lady it self

   b. Fel’tikul’tjapistaja. — I u nas ona samaja.
   erratic and at us it self
   ‘It is erratic. — And we have the same.’
   (NRC)

3.3 Case-matching connectivity effect
As discussed in Merchant 2004:676–9, fragment answers bear the same morphological case as its corresponding argument in the full sentence, see (14) for English and Russian:

        whom helped Anna  IvanDAT/IvanNOM/IvanACC
        ‘Who did Anna help?’  ‘Ivan.’

     Merchant 2004:678

In the overwhelming majority of cases in which Pron+samj is used, the pronoun is in the nominative case. The reason is that Pron+samj is an answer to an identity question and identity statements in Russian are expressed by a binominative construction (see below). However, the case-matching connectivity effect is found with the verbal construction imeť’ v vidu ‘have in mind’, which assigns accusative, see (15).6

6 The picture in fact is more complex. The nominative case can be used with imeť’ v vidu in some predictable cases. In Goncharov 2015, I argue that Pron+samj is a reply to so-called biased questions, which involves a secondary assertion of identity. The identity assertion (expressed by binominative sentences in Russian) makes the nominative case available, in addition to accusative. However, the nominative option is selected only if the accusative results in confusion due to the syncretism in the Case system. For example, masculine and neuter Pron+samj are distinct in nominative, but not in accusative; therefore, in (ii), nominative is available:
   (ii) Ty imeeš’ v vidu to delo? — Ono samoe.
       you have in view thatACC caseACC itNOM selfNOM
       ‘Do you mean that case? — Yes, indeed.’ (lit. It itself.)
(15) a. Ty imeeš’ v vidu Zubrilovu Veroniku?
you have in view Zubrilova_{ACC} Veronika_{ACC}
— ‘Ee samuju!
her self_{ACC}
‘Do you mean Veronika Zubrilova? — Her, indeed.’ (NRC)
b. Do you mean Veronika Zubrilova? — * Ona samaja.
she self_{NOM}

3.4 Preposition stranding
Another test discussed by Merchant (2004:685–7) involves preposition stranding. The observation is that languages that allow preposition stranding, like English, permit fragment answers without a preposition, see (16a). On the other hand, in languages that do not allow preposition stranding, like Russian, the preposition is obligatory, see (16b).

(16) a. Q: Who was Peter talking with? A: Mary.
with who_{INS} she spoke with Ivan_{INS}/Ivan_{INS}
‘With whom did she talk?’ ‘With Ivan.’

Merchant 2004:685, 687

As shown in (17), the same requirement is in effect for Pron+*samyj:

(17) A vy k Kol’ke priexali, k Popovu?
and you to Kol’ka_{DAT} came to Popov
— *(K) nemu samomu.
to him_{DAT} self_{DAT}
‘Did you come to Kol’ka Popov? — To him, indeed.’ (NRC)

To summarize, in this section, I presented evidence in favour of the analysis of Pron+*samyj as a fragment answer. The evidence came from the contrast with the fixed expression vot to-to i ono and different connectivity effects.

4 Analysis: Pron+*samyj is derived by TP-ellipsis

If Pron+*samyj is derived by ellipsis, as the evidence in the previous section suggests, the natural questions are how much structure is elided
and what the elided material contains. In this section, I provide answers to these questions arguing that Pron+samyj involves TP-ellipsis.

4.1 Binominative copular sentences in Russian

There are two elliptical mechanisms that can be envisaged for deriving Pron+samyj as a fragment answer and that were proposed in the literature for answers to yes/no-questions in other languages (Holmberg 2001, 2007, 2013, Dvorak and Gergel 2004, Dvorak 2007, Kazenin 2006, Authier 2013, Liptak 2013, among others): VP-ellipsis (VPE), see (18a), and TP-ellipsis (TPE), see (18b):

(18) a. [TP [he self], [NP1, is Peter]] (VPE)
    b. [SP [he self], [NP1, [NP2, is Peter]]] (TPE)

The strongest argument for TPE is the absence of subjects in answers (Holmberg 2001). In this section, I consider a case in which Pron+samyj bears the nominative case and seems to be the subject, and argue that the construction is derived by TPE. There are two reasons why I am concerned with investigating this particular case. The first reason is that it is by far the most frequent use of Pron+samyj. The second reason is that it is the hardest case to argue for; the constructions in which Pron+samyj bears non-nominative cases as in (15) or is part of a PP as in (17) will follow automatically.

As already mentioned, Pron+samyj is an emphatic affirmative answer to a question that seeks to verify the identity of a person, e.g. Is he Peter? The question-answer congruence requires that the answer be an identity statement, e.g. He is Peter. Most Slavic literature, both traditional (e.g. Paducheva and Uspenskij 1979, Testelets 2008, Yuzhakova 2011) and generative (e.g. Bailyn and Rubin 1991, Partee 1998, Pereltsvaig 2007a), converges on the idea that identity statements in Russian can be expressed only by binominative copular sentences, i.e. sentences in which both NP1 and NP2 are marked by nominative, see (19a), and contrasts them with predicational copular sentences in which NP2 is marked with instrumental, see (19b):

(19) a. Čexov NOM byl pisatel’ NOM. Pereltsvaig 2007a:1

    Chekhov was writer NOM
    ‘Chekhov was a writer.’ (= identity)
b. Čexov byl pisatelem.
   ChekhovNOM was writeINS
   ‘Chekhov was a writer.’ (≈ predication)

Binominative sentences, as in (19a), pose the following question: which of the two NPs is a subject and which one is a predicate? Consider the following example from the seminal work of Paducheva and Uspenskij (1979:358–9), which aims at determining the criteria that would help to determine subjects and predicates in binominative sentences. In the context of (20a), NP1 is a referential expression and the subject, whereas NP2 is a property, thus, the predicate. In the context of (20b), the situation is reversed. In (20c), the same sentence is an identity statement. Both NPs are referential and there is no way to determine which one is the subject. The conclusion in Paducheva and Uspenskij 1979 is that the syntax of identity statements in Russian is “undetermined”.

(20)  a. [pointing at a woman]
   Eta ženščina — ego žena.
   This womanNOM his wifeNOM
   ‘This woman is his wife.’
   b. Eto mogla sdelat’ tol’ko odna ženščina.
      this could do only one woman
      Eta ženščina ego žena.
      this womanNOM his wifeNOM
      ‘Only one woman could do this. This woman is his wife.’
   c. I tut on uznaet ee: eta ženščina — ego žena.
      and here he recognizes her this womanNOM his wifeNOM
      ‘And finally he recognizes her: this woman is his wife.’

The criteria that Paducheva and Uspenskij (1979) discern and that are still used today (e.g. Partee 1998, Testelets 2008) are ‘degree of referentiality’ of NPs, information structure of the sentence and whether one of the NPs can be interpreted as a predicate and paraphrased with NPINS. In ‘hard cases’, in which one NP is a personal pronoun or definite description and the other NP is a proper name (i.e. both NPs are highly referential) as in (21a), Paducheva and Uspenskij (1979:358) suggest that it is the proper name that assumes an uncharacteristic role of a predicate.
One indication that this is correct comes from the fact that only the proper name can be paraphrased with NP<sub>INS</sub>, cf. (21b) and (21c):

(21) a. Etot starik—graždanin Korobejnikov.
   this<sub>NOM</sub> old.man<sub>NOM</sub> Mr<sub>NOM</sub> Korobejnikov<sub>NOM</sub>
   ‘This old man is Mr. Korobejnikov.’

b. Etot starik javljaetsja
   this<sub>NOM</sub> old.man<sub>NOM</sub> appears.to.be
   graždaninom Korobejnikovym.
   Mr<sub>INS</sub> Korobejnikov<sub>INS</sub>

c. * Etim starikom javljaetsja
   this<sub>INS</sub> old.man<sub>INS</sub> appears.to.be
   graždanin Korobejnikov.
   Mr<sub>NOM</sub> Korobejnikov<sub>NOM</sub>

Paducheva and Uspenskij 1979:358

The same point can be demonstrated using a pronoun and a proper name in sentences like On — Petr ‘He (is) Petr.’

In the generative framework, the intuition that binominative sentences in Russian have an undetermined syntax is captured in the analysis proposed by Perel’tsvaig (2007a). Following Moro (2000), Perel’tsvaig (2007a) proposes that in binominative copular sentences in Russian, the two DPs are merged symmetrically. One of the DPs then moves to the specifier of TP to satisfy the EPP requirement which is interpreted as an unvalued D-feature on T, as in Pesetsky and Torrego 2000. According to Perel’tsvaig (2007a:53), the choice which DP is raised is free in syntax, but it affects the information structure of the sentence, as the raised DP is interpreted as Topic, whereas the remaining DP receives a Focus interpretation. This is illustrated in (22b) for a prototypical identity sentence with relevant DPs in (22a):

---

7 An alternative would be to postulate a PredP which takes one DP as its specifier and the other DP as its complement, as in Bailyn and Rubin 1991. Either way, all generative approaches to binominative sentences in Russian agree that they do not contain a lexical verb, Voice-head or secondary predication PredP. This property distinguishes them from nom-ins sentences. Many asymmetries in binding (see Perel’tsvaig 2007a:29–30) and extraction (see Bailyn and Rubin 1991:123) can be derived from this structural
FP in (22b) is a verbal functional projection that in different accounts is depicted as AgrP or PredP (different from secondary predication PredP, see fn.7). For the purpose of this paper, I adopt Pereltsvaig’s analysis of binominative sentences in Russian shown in (22) and use her umbrella-label FP. (I will slightly modify this representation in section 4.4.) I will also follow Pereltsvaig (2007a) in assuming that verbs in Russian do not move to T (see Pereltsvaig 2007a:13–4 for arguments).

4.2 Proposal: Pron+samyj is in ΣP

I propose that Pron+samyj is spelled out in the specifier position of a ΣP which triggers an obligatory deletion of TP as with the polar particles yes/no, as illustrated in (23):

---

difference. Nothing in my account hinges on choosing a symmetrical or asymmetrical initial merge of two DPs.
Since the influential proposal by Laka (1994/1990), most researchers who investigate the syntax of answers to polar questions have arrived at the conclusion that in fact we need two Polarity Phrases (or ΣPs): a High PolP/ΣP which hosts polarity particles and triggers TPE and a Low PolP/ΣP which supports sentential negation, affirmation or emphasis (see esp. Progovac 2005, Holmberg 2013, Authier 2013, Citko 2014a). The availability of two ΣPs is remarkably practical when dealing with polar mismatches as positive answers to negative questions in (24):

(24) Is John not coming?  Holmberg 2013:41
    Yes. (‘He is not coming.’)

Although the exact featural make-up and syntactic behaviour of the two ΣPs vary from language to language and from account to account, it seems to be uncontroversial that the High ΣP is situated in the extended C-domain (Rizzi 1997) somewhere above FinP/TP and below TopP/FocP

(25) ForceP > TopP > (FocP) > ΗΣP > FinP/TP

This position of ΗΣP accounts for the following facts: (a) in those languages in which polarity particles can be embedded, they appear below the complementizer (assuming that complementizers are in ForceP), (b) some topicalized and focused material can escape elision
(by raising to TopP and FocP),\(^8\) and (c) HΣP controls the (non-)spell-out of its complement (FinP/TP). Pron+*samýj* patterns with polarity particle in this respect (see below), which justifies the analysis in (23).

The proposal in (23) also partly captures the observation that Pron+*samýj* cannot surface in argument positions by assimilating Pron+*samýj* to polarity particles, which do not usually surface as adverbials in sentences, although they can sometimes surface in the left-periphery of the embedded clause (as for instance argued by Authier (2013) for French *oui ou non*).

4.3 Pron+*samýj* and polarity particles

It has been noticed in the recent literature (e.g. Authier 2013) that some languages, like French, German, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian and Spanish, allow polarity particles, such as *yes* and *no*, to be embedded, see (26a). This is also true of Russian polarity particles, see (26b).

\[(26) \quad \begin{align*}
    a. & \quad \text{Je crois que oui.} \quad \text{Authier 2013:368} \\
         & \quad \text{‘Lit. I believe that yes.’} \\
    b. & \quad \text{Dumaju, čto da/net.} \\
         & \quad \text{think}^{1SG} \quad \text{that yes/no}
\end{align*}\]

In Russian, fragment answers to *wh*-questions can also be embedded, see (27):

\[(27) \quad \begin{align*}
    & \quad \text{Čto Ivan pjet? — Dumaju, čto vino.} \\
         & \quad \text{what Ivan drinkst hink}^{1SG} \quad \text{that wine} \\
         & \quad \text{‘What does Ivan drink? — I think wine.’}
\end{align*}\]

Authier (2013:362–4) discusses an interesting constraint on the embeddability of polarity particles in French. He argues that they can be embedded under epistemic attitudes (expressed by verbs or adverbs), see (28a), but not under desire attitudes, see (28b):

---

\(^8\) I assume that the additional material discussed in section 3.2 escapes TPE by raising to TopP or FocP. I thank an anonymous reviewer for raising this question.
(28) a. Je crois/crains/soupçonne/suppose que oui/non.  
I think/fear/suspect/suppose that yes/no  
b. * Je sais pas s’ils vont gagner,  
I know not if they will win  
mais Celine veut que oui/non.  
but Celine wants that yes/no  
‘I don’t know if they will win, but Celine wants them (not) to.’

Authier (2013:364 and sect.2) explains this observation in terms of selectional restrictions of the main predicate. In his analysis, polarity particles lexicalize clause-typing features (e.g. Cheng 1991) and thus, must meet selectional requirements of the embedding predicate (the way CPs selected by think vs. wonder do).9

What is interesting and seems to support Authier’s general intuition is that at least in Russian fragment answers to wh-questions do not have this restriction and can appear with either epistemic or desire attitudes, see (29). (30) illustrates that Russian polarity particles are infelicitous with verbs expressing desire.

(29)  a. [Context: At a party, you see Paul drinking something that could be either wine or juice.]  
Q: What is he drinking?  
A: Ne znaju. Dumaju, čto vino/sok.  
not know think that wine/juice  
‘I don’t know. I think he’s drinking wine/juice.’

---

9 See Authier 2013, fn.12 for some criticism of this logic and the author’s reply to it. For the purpose of this paper, I will tentatively adopt Authier’s explanation, although this raises some non-trivial questions for my analysis. For example, is the embeddability restriction syntactic or semantic? If it is syntactic, does this mean that desire predicates select clauses with a less-elaborated C-domain? Is the use of complementizer (čto vs. čtoby) relevant? I thank an anonymous reviewer for raising these interesting questions. I will leave them for future research.
b. [Similar context, but now Paul and yourself are leaving soon, Paul is driving and thus, should not drink any alcohol.]
Q: What is he drinking?
A: Ne znaju. Xotelos’ by ětoby sok.
I don’t know want that juice
‘I don’t know. I’d rather he’s drinking juice.’

(30) ?? Ja ne znaju pobeditis li Ivanov
I not know will.win q Ivanov
no Marija xočet ětoby da/net.
but Maria wants that yes/no
‘I don’t know if Ivanov will win, but Mary wants him to.’

With respect to this restriction, Pron+samjy patterns with polarity particles in being infelicitous under desire predicates, as discussed in section 2.2. This provides support to the effect that Pron+samjy occupies the same position as polarity particles, as proposed above.10

4.4 Apparent counterexample
In this section, I discuss an apparent counterexample to the claim that Pron+samjy cannot surface in regular argument positions and propose an account of this counterexample.

Consider (31), in which Pron+samjy is used with the copula focused by the focus particle i.

(31) On samjy *(i) jest’/byl/budet.
he self rOC is/was/will be

The focus particle i in Russian is homophonous with a simple conjunction equivalent to and and additive particles tože/takže ‘also’, see for example Paillard 1986. According to traditional Russian grammars,

10 Further support comes from the fact that other elliptical answers, for example V-stranding as in (iii), can be embedded under desire attitudes, unlike Pron+samjy. This shows that the embeddability restriction is connected to the polarity property/position, rather than ellipsis.

(iii) Maša kupila moloko? — Xotelos’ by čtoby kupila.
Masha bought milk want PRT that PRT bought
‘Did Masha buy the milk? — I would rather she did.’ (lit. I want that bought)
this particle when used before a verb signifies that the event corresponds to what has been expected or anticipated, see (32a,b) (Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka 1935 and 1999).

(32) a. Tak ono i slučilos’, (Dictionary 1935) so it happened
    ‘So did it happen.’
    b. On i vyšel (kak sovetovali ili kak sam rešil). he happened as advised or as himself decided
    ‘He did leave (as he was advised or as he decided himself’).

To account for these cases, I propose that \( i \) heads a Focus projection above FP and a verb (or a copula) head-moves to this projection and right adjoins to \( i \). In cases like (31), where only Pron+\( \text{sam}yj \) and the focused copula are pronounced, I propose that \( i+\text{copula} \) undergoes further movement to \( \Sigma \), as shown in (33).

---

11 As suggested by an anonymous reviewer, support for this proposal also comes from cases like (iv) which involve elliptical answers to \( \text{wh} \)-questions. The answer to the question in (iv) can either be \( \text{Pet}\text{ja} \) as in A1 or \( \text{Pet}\text{ja} i V \) as in A2.  
(iv) Q: Ja znaju čto Petja vsjo vremja darit Maša podarki, no kto I know that Petja all time gives Maša gifts but who 
ě kupil ej mašinu? PRT bought her car
    ‘I know that Petja always gives gifts to Maša, but who on earth bought her the car?’
A1: Petja.
A2: Petja i kupil. Petja FOC bought
    ‘Petja bought it.’
4.5 No Low $\Sigma P$ with Pron+*samj*

One property of Pron+*samj* has not been accounted for so far, namely its inability to occur with negation, as in (7):

(7) [Context: two persons are looking through some photos of children]
          this Peter    no not he self    this his brother
     ‘Is this Peter?’    ‘No, that is not him. This is his brother.’

In this section, I propose that this property can be accounted for if we assume that the source for fragment answers Pron+*samj* is an identity statement that does not have Low $\Sigma P$ that hosts sentential negation in ordinary sentences. As we will see shortly, negation in identity statements with a zero copula can be expressed only by constituent negation. However, *samj* is deviant under constituent negation, see (34).\(^{12}\) As a result, Pron+*samj* cannot be used with ne ‘not’. Another consequence of the absence of Low $\Sigma P$ is that *samj* cannot check its

---

\(^{12}\) Note that *samj* in (34) is a DP-internal modifier ([tu samju sonatu…]) and the restriction on surfacing in argument positions does not apply, see Goncharov 2015 for discussion.
emphatic feature locally (within TP) and thus, must move to High ΣP (the only ΣP in identity statements with a zero copula).

(34)  * Daša igrala ne tu samuju sonatu
      Dasha played not that self sonata
      kotoruž učila vesnoj.
      which studied spring
      ‘Dasha didn’t play the very sonata that she studied in spring.’

Let me begin with the observation made by Testelets (2008). Following his work in collaboration with Borschev, Partee, Paducheva and Yanovich (2005), he argues that sentences with zero copula in Russian can be divided into two groups. The first group consists of binominative sentences (excluding identity statements) and sentences with short-form adjectives (hereafter, SF). This group allows for sentential negation, see (35a). The second group, which includes identity statements and copular sentences with PPs, has only constituent negation, see (35b).

(35)  a. [DP, not Ø_be [DP/SF]]   (sentential negation)
       b. [DP, Ø_be [not DP/PP]]   (constituent negation)

Testelets (2008) uses two tests to demonstrate this. The first test involves scopal ambiguity. As is well known, sentential negation can out-scope quantified subjects or circumstantial phrases giving rise to scopal ambiguity, see (36a). Constituent negation, however, does not have wide-scope readings, see (36b) from Testelets 2008:780.

(36)  a. Vše baleriny ne budut v Londone. ∀ > Neg, Neg > ∀
       all ballerinas not will.be in London
       ‘All ballerinas won’t be in London.’

       b. Vše baleriny budut ne v Londone. ∀ > Neg, *Neg > ∀
       all ballerinas will.be not in London
       ‘All ballerinas won’t be in London.’

As shown in (37), with respect to this test, identity statements and sentences with PPs pattern with sentences with constituent negation —
cf. (37c,d) with (36b), whereas specificational binominative copular sentences and structures with SF behave like sentences with sentential negation — cf. (37a,b) with (36a) (from Testelets 2008:781–3).

(37) a. Oba oni ne lingvisty.  (specificational)
    both they not linguists
    ‘They both are not linguists.’  both > Neg, Neg > both
b. Obe raboty pokak ne gotovy.  (SF)
    both works yet not ready
    ‘Both works are not ready yet.’  both > Neg, Neg > both
c. Vse prem’ery ne v etom godu.  (PP time)
    all premiers not in this year
    ‘All the premiers are not this year.’  ∀ > Neg, *Neg > ∀
d. Po vsem priznakam...
    by all clues...
    ‘According to all clues...’
    avtor “Poslanija k evrejam” ne Pavel.  (identity)
    author Appeal to Jews not Pavel
    ‘the author of the Appeal to Jews is not Pavel.’
    ∀>Neg, *Neg>∀

The second test concerns licensing negative concord items (n-words) that start with *ni*- in Russian. Only sentential negation can license *ni*-elements. As shown in (38), this test also divides zero-copular sentences into the same two groups (from Testelets 2008:785–6).

(38) a. Ni pervaja, ni vtoraja kniga
    first second book
    — ne roman.  (specificational)
    not novel
    ‘Neither the first nor the second book is a novel.’
b. Ničto ne večno.  (SF)
    nothing not eternal
    ‘Nothing is eternal.’
c. ?? Ni pervyj, nivtoroj tom
   ni first ni second volume
   ne na polke. (locative PP)
   not on shelf
   ‘Neither the first nor the second volume is on the shelf.’

d. ?? Ni to zdanie, ni eto — ne moj dom. (identity)
   ni that building ni this not my house
   ‘Neither that building nor this one is my house.’

Testelets (2008:786) accounts for these observations by proposing that identity statements and copular sentences with locative and temporal PPs are even smaller than ordinary binominative sentences. They do not contain any functional projection apart from agreement, which he labels as φP, see (39):

(39) a. [CopulaP DP, (Neg+)Copula [sc t, DP ]] (ordinary binomintive)
    b. [φP DP, (*Neg+)φ [sc t, DP ]] (identity and PPs)

Recasting Testelets’s intuition that identity sentences have an impoverished functional inventory in terms of ΣP/PolP, I propose that the observations above suggest that identity sentences with zero copula lack the Low ΣP which is present in ordinary sentences. If the source of Pron+ samyj is an identity statement with zero copula, the lack of Low ΣP straightforwardly accounts for two facts: i) the incompatibility of Pron+ samyj with negation and ii) the obligatory movement of Pron+ samyj to High ΣP (the only ΣP in this case), where Pron+ samyj checks [emph] feature of samyj and triggers TPE.

5 Conclusion

This paper discussed the use of personal pronouns modified by samyj as answers to polar questions. It was argued that Pron+ samyj is a hybrid fragment answer in the sense that it combines properties of fragment answers to wh-questions with properties of polarity particles. The analysis put forward in this paper proposes that an emphatic positive answer On samyj ‘he self’ to the question ‘Is he Peter?’ is derived by ‘he self’ moving out of TP to the specifier of High ΣP — a head that is commonly assumed to host polarity particles like yes and no and trigger
the elision/non-spell-out of its sister TP. This analysis of Pron+samj was shown to account for its major properties such as acceptability under reporting verbs and epistemic attitudes, but not predicates expressing desire, incompatibility with negation, and inability to surface in argument position. Furthermore, it was suggested that the last two properties are consequences of the absence of Low ΣP in identity sentences with zero copula in Russian.
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