Samyj in fragment answers

The goal of this talk is to provide a syntactic analysis of constructions in which Russian samyj is used as part of a fragment answer, see (1).

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

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’.

Properties of Pron+samyj Pron+samyj has a number of very peculiar properties: (i) As illustrated above, it can be used as an affirmative answer to a yes/no-question. (ii) Pron+samyj can be embedded under reportative verbs and epistemic modals, but is deviant under modals expressing desire, see (2). (iii) Pron+samyj is incompatible with negation, see (3). (iv) For most speakers, Pron+samyj cannot surface in a regular argument position, see (4). These properties clearly distinguish samyj from the so-called emphatic reflexives in Russian as in On sam prišel ‘He himself came’ (e.g. Klenin 1980, Weiss 2006). I also show that these two paradigms of self in Russian differ with respect to morphological agreement and stress.

(2) a. Kto eto? Neuželi professor Semenov? - Ja ne znaju, no sudja po who this? NEG-Q-PART professor Semenov I not know but judging on tomu čto vokrug nego vse sobralis’, dumaju, on samyj. that that around him everyone gathered think.1SG.PRES he self.M.SG.NOM
   ‘Who is this? Isn’t this Professor Semenov? - I don’t know, but given that everyone has gathered around him, I think this is he, indeed.’

b. Ne znaju kto budet vesti seminary, no govorjat čto eto not know.1SG.PRES who will lead seminars but say.3PL.PRES that this možet byt’ professor Semenov. - #Xotelos’ by čtoby on samyj.
   may be professor Semenov desirable cond.COND he self.M.SG
   ‘I don’t know who will run the seminars, but it’s rumoured that this may be Professor Semenov. - I’d love it to be him!’

   this Peter no, not he self.M.SG.NOM this his brother
   ‘Is this Peter?’ ‘No, that is not he. This is his brother.’

(4) ?*Ty znajaš’, on sámyj ko mne včera prixdil.
   you know he self.M.SG.NOM to me yesterday came
   ‘You know, he came to me yesterday.’

Analysis The analysis I propose derives the fragment answer On samyj ‘He self’ in (1) from the identity statement ‘He self is Peter’. I argue that ‘he self’ raises to the specifier of a positive Polarity Phrase above TP and triggers an obligatory TP-ellipsis (e.g. Merchant 2004, Progovac 2005, Authler 2013). This is schematically shown in (5):
That is to say, I propose that Pron+*samyj* has an intermediate status between a fragment answer and a positive polarity particle, such as *yes*. Like a fragment answer (e.g. Merchant 2004), it is derived by TP-ellipsis and shows case-connectivity and preposition-stranding effects characteristic of fragment answers in other languages, see (6):

(6) a. Ty imeeš’ v vidu Zubrilovy Veroniku? - Ee samuju! (NRC)
   you have in view Zubrilova-ACC Veronika-ACC her self-F.SG.ACC
   ‘Do you mean Veronika Zubrilova? Her, indeed.’ (lit. Her herself.)

   b. A vy k Kol’ke priexali, k Popovu? - *(K) nemu samomy...
      and you to Kol’ka-DAT came to Popov-DAT to him-DAT self-M.SG.DAT
   ‘Did you come to Kol’ka Popov? To him, indeed...’

However unlike fragment answers, Pron+*samyj* surfaces in PolP rather than FocusP which assimilates it to polarity particles. Like polarity particles, Pron+*samyj* can be used to answer a *yes/no*-question (property (i)), shows the embeddability properties discussed above (property (ii)) and makes the TP-ellipsis obligatory (property (iv)), see Authier 2013. The incompatibility with negation (property (iii)) is explained by postulating that *samyj* is an empathic marker dependent on the positive value of PolP.

**Extension** The proposed account is extended to the cases in which Pron+*samyj* is used with the overt copular focussed by the focus particle *i*, see (7) (which seems to present a counter-example to property (iv)):

(7) On samyj *(i) est’/byl/budet.
   he self * i is/was/will.be
   ‘That is/would be/was the one.’

To account for such cases, I propose that *i* heads a Focus projection above VP and a verb (or copular) head-moves to this projection and right adjoins to *i*. Subsequently, *i*+copular undergoes a head-movement to Pol, as shown in (8):

(8) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[PolP} [DP on samyj]}_i [\text{Pol+T+Foc+V} [i est’/byl]_k] [\text{TP} t_k [\text{FocP} t_k [VP} t_k [\text{DP Petr}]]]
\end{array}
\]

Thus, the fragment answers with Pron+*samyj* in Russian are very different from other non-sentential phenomena in other languages, such as fragment answers to *wh*-questions, polarity particles and the so-called *Ga*-ellipsis in Slovenian. The contrast with the latter is especially revealing as *Ga*-ellipsis shows strikingly different properties and is argued to involve VP-ellipsis rather than TP-ellipsis (e.g. Franks and King 2000, Dvůrák 2007).
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