## 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 that.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!'
- (3) A: Eto Petr? B: Net, ne on (\*samyj). Eto ego brat.
  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 znaeš', on sámyj ko mne včera prixodil.

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):

- (5)  $[PolP [DP \text{ he self}]_i [Pol' Pol_+ [TP \text{ t}_i \text{ is Peter}]]]$  (simplified) 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 embeddebility 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)  $[p_{olP} [p_{olP} [p_{ol+T+Foc+V} [i est'/byl]_k]] [p_{ol+T+Foc+V} [i est'/byl]_k] [p_{o$ 

References Authier, J.M. 2013. Phase-edge features and the syntax of polarity particles. Linguistic Inquiry 44:345-389. Dvŏrák, B. 2007. Slovenian clitic pronouns and what is so special about them. Slovenski jezik 6:209-233. Franks, S., and T.H. King. 2000. A handbook of Slavic clitics. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Klenin, E. 1980. Sentential and discourse prominence: The case of the emphatic pronoun. Russian Linguistics 4:269-280. Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. Linguistics and philosophy 27:661-738. Progovac, L. 2005. A syntax of Serbian: Clausal architecture. Bloomington, IN: Slavica. Weiss, D. 2006. Counting one's selves: the emphatic pronoun 'sam' in Russian and Polish. In La focalisation dans les langues, ed. H. and A. Wlodarczyk, 243-264. Paris: L'Harmattan.