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THE SYNTAX OF ADVERBIAL PARTICIPLES IN
RUSSIAN REVISITED

Leonard Babby, Princeton University
Steven Franks, Indiana University

1.0 Introduction

We were motivated to return to the morphosyntax of adverbial participles in Russian at this time for two reasons. First, new Russian data have come to light whose diagnostic potential was not recognized in earlier work (see section 4.2). Second, Williams' 1994 theory of theta roles, predication, and binding enables us to propose an analysis of the syntax of adverbial participles that is truly "minimal" since it makes it possible to replace empirically unmotivated underlying syntactic structures with simpler, more explanatory ones. We argue that the combination of Williams' theory of vertical binding and the data involving the case agreement of contrastive sam and odin in adverbial participle phrases makes an important contribution to our understanding of the structures and rules involved in the derivation and control of nonfinite verbal categories. However, we do not claim to have accounted for all the uses of adverbial participles in Russian; as we see in section 5, there remains a range of phenomena that are not well understood. However, since our theory accounts for the canonical data of standard Russian in a highly explanatory way, we believe that it is essentially correct and can serve as the basis of a unified analysis of control phenomena. Our goal in this paper is thus twofold: first, to present our analysis of adverbial participles in standard Russian (sections 1–4) and, second, to point out uses of adverbial participles in standard and nonstandard Russian that do not appear to be consonant with our theory and to suggest how these data might be assimilated to the theory or how the theory might be changed to accommodate the data (section 5). The advantage of an explicit theory applied systematically to the full range of data is that it provides both new solutions to old problems and, equally importantly, it raises new problems based on old data that were erroneously thought to be well understood. Below we demonstrate that our analysis
does what an explicit analysis is supposed to: it has generated new solutions accompanied by interesting new problems.

Russian adverbial participles (*deepričasti*ja), sometimes referred to as "gerunds" or "verbal adverbs", were of considerable interest in earlier transformational models because they seem to have the argument structure of sentences but display less than the full syntactic structure of a finite clause.\(^1\) Properties that make adverbial participles seem smaller than full clauses include the following: they have no inherent tense, they are uninflected, and they cannot have a phonologically overt subject NP (although they have an "understood subject"). These properties of adverbial participles were accounted for by deriving the surface structure of adverbial participle constructions from a fully articulated underlying sentential representation, making use of structure-reducing operations such as Equi-NP deletion and S-node Pruning. For example, it was proposed by Babby (1979) that a surface adverbial participle phrase is underlingly a simple sentence that is generated inside an Adverb Phrase (AdvP), as in (1a), but loses its sentential status through the operation of Equi-NP Deletion and S-Node Deletion (pruning), resulting in the structure in (1b).

\[
(1a) \quad \text{AdvP} \quad \rightarrow \quad (1b) \quad \text{AdvP} \\
\text{S} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{VP} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{VP}
\]

Following proposals in Babby (1974), the AdvP-over-VP configuration is then assumed to define the surface part of speech which has the form of an adverbial participle in Russian. More specifically, the \([\text{AdvP}\text{[VP }\ldots \text{ V }\ldots\text{]}\) configuration triggers affixation of the adverbial participle forming suffix, converting the V stem into an adverbial participle, which projects an adverbial participle phrase. The distribution of adverbial participles is thus determined by their adverbial status. Below we abbreviate the adverbial participle as "G" (for "Gerund Phrase") and its maximal projection as "GP".

There are a number of problems with this type of structure-reducing syntactic derivation. First, it violates the strong version of the lexicalist hypothesis, since it requires that morphological material be introduced by a syntactic rule, i.e., a rule sensitive to syntactic (X-bar) structure. Second, the Equi-NP Deletion analysis does not account for the crucial fact that GPs are canonically controlled by the subject of their matrix clause: it must be stipulated in the Equi account that the subject NP of the clause dominated by AdvP in (1a) cannot be deleted under identity to a matrix object NP, producing a sentence like (2) in which the understood subject of the GP is the object NP žene rather than the matrix subject ty.
In standard Russian, vernuvšis' must be controlled by the matrix subject ty despite the fact that the matrix object is structurally closer. An analysis of adverbial participles can be considered explanatory only if the subject control illustrated in (2) is not stipulated. In the analysis we propose below, the subject control of adverbial participles emerges as a natural consequence of the interaction of independently motivated representations and operations. There is another problem with the transformational analysis represented in (1): although it claims that adverbial participle constructions are bare nonfinite VPs (GPs), as we also maintain below (see Rappaport 1984), it does not account for the fate of the base verb's external theta-role.2 Our main hypothesis is that adverbial participle constructions are one-place predicates, i.e. are bare GPs that retain the base verb's external theta-role, which must be satisfied (saturated). Given this analysis, the central question of the adverbial participle's syntax becomes the following: How is the GP's external theta role satisfied if GP does not have a subject NP to assign it to?

The present paper takes issue with the transformational account, replacing it with a strongly lexicalist one in the general spirit of Williams (1994), which, we argue, provides a natural explanation for the structural and semantic properties of Russian adverbial participles.3 The analysis to be presented below will hug the surface structure in that we will argue that a GP is just what it appears to be: a bare, nonfinite verb phrase (=GP) lacking a subject NP and headed by a particular type of verb form with adverbial features supplied by the adverbial participle suffix, which is affixed to the base verb stem by a morpholexical rule, not a syntactic one. It will be shown that the insights of Babby (1979) can be carried over into our system by treating GPs as base-generated, nonclausal adjuncts and by exploiting aspects of the theory of binding and predication developed in Williams (1987, 1994). Most importantly, we demonstrate that, under this new analysis, no construction-specific or language-specific rules are required to account for the properties of Russian GPs.

The paper will proceed as follows: section 2 summarizes the syntactic and semantic properties of Russian GPs that an explanatory analysis must account for; in section 3 we outline our analysis of GPs, showing how the properties described in the previous section follow straightforwardly from the structures we are proposing; section 4 focuses on the relevance of contrastive sam 'self' to our analysis. This section, which is the empirical core of the paper, discusses the following set of facts: when sam is adjoined to a GP, it is normally in the nominative case (see (6)), but it can, under
certain well-defined circumstances, be assigned the so-called "second dative" samomu instead (see (27)), in a distribution which appears to parallel the nominative ~ dative case realization of sam in infinitival complements. We argue that the occurrence of the second dative in GPs—a fact which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been discussed in the literature—provides striking confirmation for our analysis. In section 5 we discuss potential problems for the analysis we propose in this paper, and suggest directions for further research.

2.0 Adverbial Participles in Russian

This section surveys the properties of Russian GPs that need to be accounted for, and provides the necessary background for the analysis presented in sections 3 and 4.

2.1 Basic Questions. There are two major syntactic issues to be addressed and one central semantic question:

(3) a. What is the internal structure of GP?
   b. Where is GP attached in its matrix clause?
   c. How is the external argument (theta role) of GP satisfied?

Our answer to the first question is that Gs are adverbial forms of the verb that contain aspect but lack tense and agreement. GPs are essentially nonfinite VPs with certain adverbial features contributed by the adverbial participle suffix, which is added to the V stem by a lexical rule. Thus the internal structure of a GP is virtually identical to the internal structure of a finite VP, which explains why transitive Gs assign accusative case, take an object in the genitive case when negated, and so on. Our hypothesis is that GPs do not contain an inaudible syntactically represented PRO subject and do not combine with a PRO subject to form adverbial participle clauses. Adverbial participle constructions are thus not clauses: they are bare GPs (bare nonfinite VPs with a special suffix affixed to its head) with an external theta role to assign. Putting it in slightly different terms, GP is a predicate, i.e., it inherits the external theta role i of the base verb stem, which must be satisfied in order to avoid a violation of the Theta Criterion. A well-formed adverbial participle phrase is therefore represented as Gpi, where i is the index of the external theta role.

Our answer to the second question is that GPs are invariably adjuncts, which can be adjoined to VP or, as discussed in section 5, also to S. The adverbial features contributed by the adverbial participle suffix percolate to the maximal projection of G, which explains why GP cannot combine with the copula in standard Russian to form a complex main-clause predicate: *On byl vernuvšis' domoj pozdno 'He had returned home late'.
Our answer to the third question is that the GP’s external theta role is satisfied by Williams’ mechanism of “vertical binding”, obviating the need for postulating a PRO and full clausal structure. The notion of vertical binding is discussed in detail below.

2.2 Properties of GP. It has been pointed out in Franks (1995: 259–265), and Greenberg (1996) that there is no COMP position in adverbial participle constructions, which means that GPs must be smaller than full clauses. Note that for the expository purposes of this paper we adopt the traditional representation in (4), which should not be taken to make any theoretical claims about the actual functional projections that comprise a sentence.

(4)  
\[ S' (\rightarrow CP) \\
\quad \rightarrow S (\rightarrow IP) \\
\quad \rightarrow NP \quad VP \]

The more highly articulated structures widely accepted in the current literature include at least the functional projections Complementizer Phrase (CP) and Inflection Phrase (IP), so these have been indicated in (4) as points of reference. However, since they will play no role in our analysis, we stick to the traditional labels “S” and “S’” throughout the presentation.

The assumption that COMP is absent in GPs has specific consequences. A primary ramification of the absence of a COMP position is that there can be no possibility for realizing a complementizer or fronted wh-phrase in a GP construction, as demonstrated by the following examples:

(5)  
a. *Vot kniga, kotoruju pročitav, ja ubedilsja v nevinnosti osuždennogo.
   ‘Here is the book, which having read, I became convinced of the defendant’s innocence.’

b. Vot kniga, pročitav kotoruju, ja ubedilsja v nevinnosti osuždennogo.
   ‘Here is the book, having read which, I became convinced of the defendant’s innocence.’

The relative pronoun kotoruju in (5) has nowhere to front to, hence must remain in situ.

Gerunds in modern Russian cannot have overt subjects; see Yokoyama (1979) for discussion of evidence that adverbial participles permitted overt nominative subjects at an earlier stage of Russian. We argue for modern Russian, however, that the nominative case of the italicized floating
quantifiers in sentences like those in (6) cannot be explained in terms of case agreement with a null nominative subject of an adverbial participle clause. Therefore, (6) does not constitute evidence against our claim that adverbial participles are bare nonfinite VPs; see section 4 for discussion.

(6) a. On ćeto skazal, sam ne znaja, počemu.
   ‘He said that without knowing why himself.’

b. Oni priznalis’ v prestuplenii, rešiv každyj, čto priznalsja drugoj.
   ‘They confessed to the crime, each having decided that the other had confessed.’

c. On razdevalsja, ves’ vibriruja ot neterpenija.
   ‘He undressed, all atremble with anticipation.’

We take this state of affairs to be consistent with our claim that GPs are smaller than S. We assume that the external argument of the base verb is assigned externally to VP, as in the traditional analysis and following arguments in Williams (1994) against the VP-internal subject hypothesis. The lack of an explicit subject position thus leads to the conclusion that GPs are simply bare VPs with an external theta role to assign. More specifically, we propose that G is a base V stem to which the adverbial participle suffix, represented as “af”, is affixed by a lexical rule.⁷ It is important to realize that this suffix contributes adverbial features, which determine GP’s syntactic distribution and function.⁸ Thus Gi = [V₁ + af] and GP₁ is its phrasal projection. Since, as noted above, a well-formed G must have an external theta role “i” to assign, the morpholexical derivation of an adverbial participle can be schematically represented as in (7): the composition of V and af to form G is a lexical rule; GP is the syntactic projection of this derived word, as described in Babby (1996); Gi in (7) is therefore the interface of word formation and phrase formation (syntax), i.e., it is the largest unit of word formation, the word, and the smallest unit of phrase structure, the head of the phrase that it projects. GP₁ is a nonfinite VP with exclusively adjunct (adverbial) functions.

(7)    GP₁
         ∣
         G’₁
         ∣
         G₁
         ∣
          [V₁ + af]

Note that (7) correctly predicts that verb stems that have no external theta role do not form adverbial participles. Thus, the paradigm of impersonal verbs does not include an adverbial participle (*stošniv).
There appear to be two positions in the main clause to which GP can adjoin: VP and S, which correspond to the traditional distinction between detached (obosoblennye) and non-detached (neobosoblennye) adverbial participles, as in (8); see Rappaport (1980, 1984).\(^9\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{S}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{GP} \\
\text{GP} \\
\text{S}
\end{array}
\]

We thus expect GPs to have the general distribution and interpretive properties of other adjuncts, such as AdvPs. Given their adjoined position and adverbial semantics, it is not surprising to find that certain adverbial participles are completely adverbialized. They have become dissociated with the verb stem’s paradigm and reanalyzed as underived, lexical adverbs with their own entries in the speaker’s mental lexicon.\(^10\)

The immediately following sections are devoted to GPs adjoined to VP; section 5 deals with GPs that are adjoined higher than VP and the problems these structures present for the analysis of GP we propose in the first four sections. Section 5 also deals with the control (binding) of GP in nonstandard sentences as in (9). In (9a), the antecedent (understood subject) of the GP is the preposed prepositional phrase u menja rather than the postverbal syntactic subject (šljapa). In (9b), the understood subject of the GP is the dative experiencer mne (see Rappaport 1984).

\[(9) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{a. \quad \text{[Podnjavšis’ na goru]}_{GP}, u menja sletela šljapa.} \\
\text{‘Having-climbed the-mountain, my hat blew off.’}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{b. Mne skučno, [slušaja lekciij]_{GP}.} \\
\text{‘I am bored listening to lectures.’}
\end{array}\]

Adverbial participles inherit the full argument structure of the verb from which they are derived. The external theta role i of GP is canonically associated with the external argument of the clause to which it is attached. In other words, as shown in example (2), Russian GPs are strongly subject-oriented, much like the reflexive sebja; see Babby (1979) or Rappaport (1980, 1984). An explicit analysis of GPs should therefore provide a natural account for the observation that GPs and reflexive pronouns both have the subject of the clause containing them as their antecedent. If, as we claimed above, GPs are attached at the VP or higher level, then they are presumably too high up in the tree for non-subjects to be accessible controllers. We shall see below that our analysis of how the GP’s external argument is assigned will make this explicit. In other words, we shall demonstrate that the canonical subject-orientation of Russian GPs follows as a natural conse-
sequence of the bare VP and vertical binding analysis to be proposed in the
next section. In this way we eliminate those aspects of the derivation that
were stipulative in earlier transformational analyses.

3.0 The vertical binding analysis

In this section we present an analysis of GPs in Russian based on con-
cepts presented in Williams 1987 and 1994. Our central claim is that Wil-
liams’ analysis, which relies on English data, enables us to account for the
crucial properties of Russian adverbial participles outlined above without
positing covert clausal structure.

3.1 Bare GPs and vertical binding. The standard approach to control in
most government-binding and subsequent frameworks is to posit a null or
“PRO” subject of a nonfinite clause whenever a subject is “understood,”
i.e., whenever it appears to be thematically present but is structurally
absent. Williams’ approach to adjunct control eliminates the need for pos-
ing full clauses with obligatorily null subjects, thereby providing a simpler
and more intuitive explanation of the properties of adverbial participles.

Williams (1994) accounts for controlled adjunct modifiers in English in
terms of “direct predication,” which is represented in (10); “i” is the index
of a predicate’s external theta role.

(10)

```
S
  /\      \\
 NP_1  VP_1
     /\    /\ \\
 John arrived sad  \\
   VP_1
```

The external theta role i of the adjunct adjective phrase in (10) is vertically
bound by the external theta role i of the finite verb phrase VP_1 that AP_1 is
adjointed to, and a bound theta role is satisfied (saturated). The external
theta role i of the finite VP_1 is then assigned to the matrix subject by main
clause predication. The “direct predication” analysis of controlled adjuncts
thus consists of vertical binding of the adjunct phrase and main clause
predication.

There are two ways to satisfy an external role i of XP_i: either assign it to a
subject NP, forming a clause by main clause predication (i.e. [NP_iXP_i]_s), or
bind it by the external theta role i of an immediately dominating VP_i, as in
(10). Previous analyses standardly assumed the former approach, which
requires the postulation of a null PRO subject to be assigned the external
theta role. Williams provides extensive argumentation that the vertical binding account is to be preferred.

The external theta role i of the finite matrix VP, in (10) is assigned to the subject of the finite clause by main clause predication. Thus the relation between the subject John and the controlled adjunct modifier sad in (10) is established directly by vertical binding and main clause predication; John is for this reason construed as the subject of arrive and sad in essentially the same way. Although John may be said to “control” the adjunct sad in (10), “control” under this analysis is a descriptive term: no formal notion of control or control theory is required. Binding and predication do the work that control did in government-binding analyses, which assumed a PRO subject. To make this clear, let us look at (11), which is a schematic representation of a government-binding type analysis of the sentence in (10).

(11)
```
(11) S
    NP        VP
    VP        S
    John      arrived
    PRO       sad
```

Sad in (11) assigns its external theta role to its PRO subject by predication inside the adjunct clause and arrived assigns its external theta role to the subject John by predication in the matrix clause. The relation between John and sad is established through control, i.e., John is construed as the antecedent (controller) of the PRO subject of the embedded small clause and is therefore interpreted as the understood subject of sad. The advantage of Williams’ proposal in (10) is two-fold: it both eliminates the need for positing a clause with an obligatory null subject for which there is no empirical evidence, and it reduces the relation of control to the more primitive relations of binding and predication. We shall see in section 4 that the presence of PRO also creates problems when we try to account for the case agreement of floating quantifiers like sam, odin, and ves’. Compare the competing representations in (10) and (11): the obvious advantage of (10) is that it states the understood “subject-of” relation between John and sad in terms of a chain of two local relations directly, without resorting to the unmotivated additional clause structure in (11).

Our hypothesis is that the obligatory subject control of Russian adverbial participle constructions and all their other significant properties can be
accounted for in terms of the analysis of controlled adjunct modifiers illustrated in (10). In other words, our proposal is that an adverbial participle construction is simply a bare GP, adjoined to the main clause VP; (13) is a schematic representation of the crucial binding and predication relations of the typical Russian sentence in (12).

(12) Ona ležala [utknuvšis' licom v podušku]_{GP}.
    'She lay with her head buried in a pillow.'

(13) S
    /   \  
   /    \  
  NP  VP  
     / \   \ 
    /   \   G P_{i}
   /     \
  ona ležala utknuvšis' licom v podušku

The external theta role i of the GP in (13) is vertically bound by the external theta i of the finite VP that GP is adjoined to; the external theta role of the finite VP is assigned to the matrix subject by main clause predication. The subject ona is thus directly related to its adjunct GP by vertical binding and predication, just as he and sad are directly related in the English sentence in (10). The "direct" analysis in (13) is opposed to the government-binding "indirect" one, in which the external theta role i of GP is assigned to a PRO subject, which in turn is controlled by the matrix subject, as in (14). Here S_{2} is intended to represent the putative nonfinite adverbial participle clause.

(14) S_{1}
    /   \
   /     \
  NP   VP
    / \   \ 
   /   \   \ 
  VP   S_{2}
 /     /   \
 NP_{i}GP_{i}
 /     \
 ona ležala PRO utknuvšis' licom v podušku

The "control" of PRO by the matrix subject in (14) is essentially a binding relation: the matrix subject is the antecedent of PRO, i.e., ona ccommands PRO and is thus naturally construed as the understood subject of the adverbial participle. But there must still be an independent statement that ona and PRO are coreferential (coindexed) to account for
sentences like (2), where there is a more local candidate to antecede PRO, namely \( \text{žene} \). This example is repeated here as (15), adjusted to reflect the government-binding type structure we are arguing against.

(15) \( Č\text{to } t_1, \text{skažeš } t_2, \text{ [PRO vernuvišis } t_1, t_2 \text{ domoj tak pozdno]} \)?

\( \text{‘What do you say to your wife when you return (*she returns) home so late?’} \)

This means that an independent statement is necessary stipulating that it is the more distant matrix subject rather than the proximate matrix object \( \text{žene} \) that is PRO’s antecedent in (15). “Control” in its technical use is the term given to stipulations of this kind. Recall from section 1 the rejection of the earlier Equi-NP Deletion analysis of adverbial participle formation for essentially the same reason: the obligatory subject control that characterizes adverbial participles in standard Russian must be stipulated. Another problem with the kind of structure (14) is the case assigned to the putative PRO subject (see below).

Notice, however, that these issues do not arise in the bare GP\(_i\) analysis, which is represented in (13): the only theta role not satisfied inside the matrix VP\(_i\) is the external theta role \( i \); this means that \( i \) is the only one of the matrix verb’s theta roles that is available (high enough) to bind the external theta role of the GP\(_i\) adjoined to VP\(_i\). It is the vertical binding which induces the coreference. Thus the subject orientation of Russian adverbial participles, which is their most salient formal property, follows as a natural consequence from the bare GP\(_i\), vertical binding analysis of adverbial participles. A matrix object like \( \text{žene} \) in (15) is simply not available to bind GP\(_i\) because its theta role is satisfied (discharged) inside the matrix VP and, therefore, cannot percolate to the maximal projection VP, where it would be high enough to vertically bind the external theta role of GP\(_i\). The analysis represented in (13), unlike the clausal analyses of adverbial participles that have been proposed, does not require an ad hoc control statement nor does it require a putative PRO subject of the adverbial participle to take the matrix subject as its antecedent.\(^{11}\)

Williams (1994) proposes that a reflexive pronoun is bound by the external theta role \( i \) of the VP dominating it; the binder \( i \) on VP is then assigned to the matrix subject by main clause predication; cf. (16)–(17). Thus the subject orientation of reflexive pronouns is accounted for by vertical binding and predication.\(^ {12}\) But this is exactly the same way we account for the subject orientation of GP in Russian, which explains the parallelism between reflexive pronouns and GPs noted above.

(16) \( \text{Učenýj naročno zarazil sebja, čumoj.} \)

\( \text{‘The scientist purposely infected himself with plague.’} \)
3.2 Some extensions of the bare VP analysis. The bare VP vertical binding analysis proposed above accounts naturally for the well known fact that the understood subject of an adverbial participle is construed as the subject of its matrix clause. The PRO-subject clausal analysis does not account for this fact, since it requires the stipulation that PRO cannot be controlled by a matrix object. As we see in this and the following sections, there are other reasons why the bare VP analysis is convincing.

The analysis that we proposed in the preceding section actually makes the following claim: the external theta role \( i \) of GP\(_i\) is satisfied by being vertically bound by the external theta role of any XP\(_i\) immediately dominating it. There is only one restriction on this, and this restriction need not be stipulated since it follows from general principles: X must be a category that can be modified by an adverbial modifier. Thus, a well-formed adverbial participle construction is predicted to have the following form:

\[
\text{XP}_i \quad \text{GP}_i
\]

XP\(_i\) vertically binds GP\(_i\) and the understood subject of GP\(_i\) is construed as the category to which the external theta role of XP\(_i\) is assigned. So far we have considered only \( X = \) finite V (with \( i \) of VP\(_i\) assigned to the matrix clause’s nominative subject NP). The representation in (18) correctly predicts that X can be an infinitive, in which case the understood subject of a GP\(_i\) is the dative subject of the infinitive clause, which in Russian can be either overt or null (PRO), e.g.:

(19) Kak (nam) sdelat’ ęto, ne postaviv sebja v glupoe položenie?
    ‘How can we do that without putting ourselves in a foolish position?’

The adverbial participle postaviv has the dative subject of the infinitive clause as its understood subject because, just as in finite sentences with nominative subjects, GP\(_i\) is vertically bound by the infinitive VP\(_i\), which assigns its external theta role \( i \) to the dative subject by main clause predication (see Babby 1998); sebja is bound just as it is in finite clauses.
Now notice that the schematic representation in (18) makes the following crucial prediction: the understood subject of GP\_i need not be the subject of the matrix clause containing it. For example, if X = an active participle, the understood subject of the GP\_i contained in the active participle phrase AP\_i, which does not itself have a subject NP, will be the head of the NP that the AP modifies, no matter what its matrix function and case may be. Thus, in the following entirely well-formed sentence from M. Kozyrev, the GP\_i ([razdvigaja tolp]\_GP) is adjoined to an AP\_i ([šestvjuščego k nam]\_AP), which modifies the head of the direct object NP. Although the understood subject of the GP\_i is the matrix direct object rather than the matrix subject my, the sentence is well-formed because GP\_i is vertically bound by the AP\_i immediately dominating it (AP\_i is itself vertically bound by the external theta role of the NP containing it). This means that the configuration in (18) is satisfied: X = A (participle/adjective), which can be modified by an adverbial expression. Thus the understood subject of the GP\_i razdvigaja tolp in (20) is the direct object šerifa, not the matrix subject my.

(20) My uvideli šerifa, razdvigaja tolp šestvjuščego k nam.
we saw sheriff:acc parting crowd:acc walking:acc toward us
‘We saw the sheriff who walked toward us as he parted the crowd’

The matrix VP in (20) has the following structure:

(21)
```
    VP
   /\V'
    \  \NP:acc
      / \N'
     /   N'
    /     AP\_i
   uvideli šerifa razdvigaja tolp šestvjuščego k nam
```

As expected, reflexive pronouns can also be bound in this configuration: sebja in (22) has the accusative direct object šerifa as its antecedent, not the nominative matrix subject my.

(22) My\_1 uvideli šerifa\_2, smotraščego na sebja\_1/2 v zerkalo.
‘We saw the sheriff looking at himself (*ourselves) in the mirror.’
It was correctly pointed out by an anonymous reviewer that sentences like (23b) are ungrammatical. The reason for this is entirely straightforward, given the analysis of adverbial participles we are proposing. Although GP, has an external theta role to discharge, as noted in fn. 8, it is nevertheless categorically an adverbial phrase and, therefore, it cannot be the predicate of a "small clause" construction. The reason is because such "secondary predication" never applies to AdvPs (or VPs); it is restricted instead to APs (and also NPs and PPs). This is demonstrated by the minimal pair in (23).\textsuperscript{13}

(23) a. Ja zastal ego [\text{AP ubirajuščim komnatu}].
   ‘I found him cleaning up the room.’

   b. *Ja zastal ego [\text{GP ubiraja komatu}].

Compare (23) to (24): (23b) is ill-formed for the same reason that (24b) is.

(24) a. Ja zastal ego [\text{AP gotovym otpravit’šja}].
   ‘I found him ready:inst.m.sg (=adj) to go.’

   b. *Ja zastal ego [\text{AdvP gotovo otpravit’šja}].

4.0 Contrastive sam\textsuperscript{14}

In this section we present a new argument, based on the distribution of contrastive sam in Russian GPs, that provides unexpected support for the bare VP analysis of GPs presented in section 3. Russian sam has several functions that need to be distinguished; see e.g. Comrie (1974), Schein (1982), Neidle (1988), Greenberg (1983), Franks and Hornstein (1992), or Franks (1995) for discussion. In addition to its contrastive function, shown in (25a), which will be at the center of our arguments, sam has at least two other closely related uses, illustrated in (25b) and (25c).

(25) a. On sam ne znaet.
   ‘He doesn’t know (why) himself (with respect to others).’

   b. On sdelal rabotu sam (= bez čej-nibud’ pomošči)
   ‘He did the work himself (=without anyone’s help).’

   c. On žil sam (= v odinočestve).
   ‘He was-living alone (= in solitude).’

4.1 Sam in infinitival complements. The reason sam has been the focus of so much attention is that it exhibits the following unusual agreement pattern in infinitival complements: it can only have two case values in standard
Russian, nominative or dative. It is nominative in subject control infinitival complements, as in (26); in object control infinitival complements and all other infinitival clause constructions, however, *sam* must be in the “second” dative case. Some examples are given in (27); (27b–e) are cited by Franks (1995).

(26)  On xočet vse sdelat’ *sam.*  
‘He wants to do everything himself (nom).’

(27)  a.  Oni zastavili ego vse sdelat’ *samomu.*  
‘They made him (acc) do everything himself (dat).’

   b.  Dlja nas utomitel’no delat’ èto *samim.*  
‘It’s exhausting for us (gen) to this on our own (dat).’

   c.  Nevozmožno perejeti ètot most *samomu.*  
‘It is impossible to cross this bridge by oneself (dat).’

   d.  Ljuba prièxala čtoby pokupat’ maslo *sama.*  
‘Lyuba (nom) came in order to buy the butter herself (dat).’

   e.  Ivan ne znaet kak tuda dobrat’jja *samomu.*  
‘Ivan (nom) doesn’t know how to get there by himself (dat).’

There is general consensus, apparently stemming from the treatment in Comrie (1974), that the source of the second dative should be attributed to agreement with a covert dative subject. This seems correct since it makes the following accurate prediction: if the PRO subject of infinitives in Russian is assigned dative case, then it must be true that the subject position of infinitival clauses in Russian is a case position and, therefore, it should be possible for there to be infinitival clauses with overt dative subjects as well as covert ones.15 As the examples in (28) illustrate, clauses with overt dative subjects are in fact quite common in Russian. The sentence in (28b) is particularly important since here we see dative *sam* agreeing with an overt dative subject; in (28c), the reflexive pronoun is bound by the dative subject; infinitival clauses are enclosed in square brackets. The examples in (28) are drawn from Babby (1997).

(28)  a.  *[Tebe ujti na pensiju] značilo by kapitolirovat’ pered vragom.*  
‘[For you to retire] would be the same as surrendering to the enemy.’

   b.  *[Počemu by mne ne prodat’ ix samomu]?’  
‘Why shouldn’t I sell them myself?’

   c.  Možet, *[mne vzjat’ ego s soboj]?’  
‘Perhaps [I should take him with me]?’
The claim that the second dative of sam in sentences like (27) is the result of agreement with a covert dative PRO subject, which we shall now take to be uncontroversial, enables us to make the following generalization: sam always agrees in case, number, and gender with its antecedent, which can be either overt or null (PRO, pro, or trace).

A problem for the covert agreement analysis is that if PRO is dative, why then doesn’t the second dative samomu appear freely in all infinitival clauses? Instead, dative agreement is impossible under subject control, as in (26), where we find sam in the nominative case. Our answer to the question of what prevents agreement with a dative PRO subject of the infinitive in sentences like (26) is disarmingly simple: there is no PRO subject of the infinitive in subject control complements. In other words, the subject control complement in (26) is not a clause. More explicitly, subject control of infinitival complements involves a bare infinitival VP whose external theta role is vertically bound by the external theta role of the matrix VP; see Babby (1998) for the details of this proposal. For this reason, dative is not even an option; sam in subject control infinitival complements simply agrees with the matrix subject, which is nominative when the matrix clause is finite. Thus sam in Russian infinitival complement clauses is in fact always dative, but not all infinitival complements are clauses. Note that, according to the analysis of sam just outlined, subject control infinitival complements and GPs are both vertically bound bare nonfinite VPs. They therefore work essentially the same way—sam agrees with the matrix subject, which is nominative when the matrix clause is finite.

The structure of (26) is (29) and that of (27a) is (30).

(29)  [s Oni [vp xočet [vp vse sdelat’ sam ]].

(30)  [s Oni [vp zastavili ego [s PRO:dat [vp vse sdelat’ samomu]]]]

Since there is no embedded infinitival clause in (29), sam simply agrees in case, number, and gender with on, the nominative subject of the main clause. This structure, which involves vertical binding of the bare infinitive’s external theta role by the matrix VP and assignment of the matrix VP’s external theta role to the nominative subject by main clause predication, accounts explicitly for the fact that on is construed as the subject of both the finite verb and of the bare infinitive, and hence is the antecedent of sam. In the object controlled infinitival complement clause in (30), on the other hand, samomu agrees with the dative PRO subject in its minimal clause in case, gender, and number. PRO here is obligatorily bound by the proximate matrix direct object ego, which determines its gender and num-
ber (but not case!) for precisely the same reason that the gender and number of a relative pronoun (but not its case) is determined by its main clause antecedent.

4.2 Agreement of sam in GP. While there has been a great deal of discussion of sam in infinitival complements (especially of the second dative), there has been relatively little discussion of sam in adverbial participle constructions; but cf. Babby (1979), Franks (1993: 259–267). However, as we shall see below, it is sam in its contrastive use that provides the crucial evidence alluded to above that the bare VP analysis of adverbial participles we have proposed is correct. More specifically, as pointed out in Babby (1997a), contrastive sam in GPs is assigned either nominative or dative case, a fact which parallels the behavior of sam in infinitival complements, as discussed in section 4.1. Below we examine the data and consider their significance for the overall analysis of adverbial participles.

Sam in GP is normally in the nominative case, which is precisely what we expect given the bare VP analysis proposed above: since GP is not encapsulated in a GP clause (i.e., there is no PRO subject), sam in GP must agree in case, number, and gender with the matrix subject, which is nominative when the matrix clause is finite. Consider (32), which is the structure of the sentence in (31).16

(31) On ušel, sam (*samomu) ne znaja kuda.

(32)

```
S
  NP_i
    VP_i
      VP_i
        AP_i
          GP_i
```

The external theta role of the AP_i sam in (32) is vertically bound by the external theta role of GP_i, which is itself vertically bound by the finite VP_i, which in turn assigns its external theta role to the nominative subject by main clause predication. This chain of local binding and predication accounts exhaustively for the construal relations we observe in (31): on is construed as the subject/antecedent of the finite verb, of the GP, and of sam. Since sam agrees with the subject of its clause, it agrees in (31) with
on, which is nominative case because it is the subject of a finite clause; there is simply no dative NP in (32) for sam to agree with.

Up to now we have confined ourselves to looking at GPs in finite clauses. We come now to the crucial data. The analysis of GP and sam proposed above makes the following correct prediction: if a GP is embedded in an infinitival clause, sam in GP should be dative, not nominative, because, as we saw above, sam agrees with the subject of the minimal clause containing it, and infinitival clauses in Russian all have dative subjects. The following are examples of dative sam in GP contained in an infinitival clause:

(33) Ščel’ v doskax dala mne vozmožnost’ vse videt’, samomu (*sam) ostavajas’ nezamečennym. 
    ‘The-crack in the-boards gave me the-opportunity to-see every-
thing, myself (dat) remaining unseen.’

(34) Ėto pozvoljalo emu razgljadet’ togo, kto byl na drugom konce 
    otseka, samomu (*sam) ostavajas’ ploxo vidimym. 
    ‘This allowed him₁ (dat) to see the person₂ who was at the other 
end of the compartment, himself₁,₂ remaining barely visible.’

(35) Mat’ poprosila ego žit’ v dovol’stve, samomu (*sam) ne trevožas’ o 
    sud’be bednyx. 
    ‘Mother asked him (acc) to live in contentment, himself (dat) un-
troubled by the plight of the poor.’

Compare (33) with (36):

(36) Ja vse videl, sam (*samomu) ostavajas’ nezamečennym. 
    ‘I (nom) saw everything, myself (nom) remaining unseen.’

In (36) the bare GP is contained in a finite clause and sam is therefore
nominative. But in (33), the sentence in (36) has been made the infinitival 
complement of a noun and it must therefore be an infinitival clause; see 
Babby (1998). Since vertical binding of the infinitive VP by the finite VP is
blocked by the intervening NP, as in (33), the infinitive VP has no option 
other than to assign its external theta role to a subject NP, forming an
infinitival clause. Now, if the infinitival complement in (33) is a clause, it
must have a covert dative subject ( = PRO), as proposed in section 4.1. 
This scenario correctly predicts the dative case agreement of samomu in
(33). The internal syntactic structure of the matrix object NP in (33), which
is the crucial portion of the sentence, is given in (37).\(^{17}\)
It is important to note that the dative case of samomu in sentences like (33)–(35) does not constitute evidence that the GP is the predicate of an adverbial participle clause. Since GPs are always subject controlled, there is no need to make the entirely ad hoc claim that the bare GP in (36) somehow becomes a verbal adverb clause in (33) when the finite clause containing it happens to be embedded as the complement of the noun vozmožnost'. The evidence we have presented supports instead our hypothesis that GPs in Russian are bare VP predicates, which predicts that sam in GP should be in the same case as the subject of the clause containing the GP. This analysis thus accounts for the fact noted above that sam is restricted to two cases, either nominative or dative. The reason is because there are only two kinds of clauses in Russian: finite clauses, which have nominative subjects, and infinitival clauses, which have dative subjects; sam simply agrees with the subject of its clause.18

We can summarize the evidence presented in the first four sections as follows: GP in standard Russian is a bare VP whose external theta role is vertically bound by the external theta role of the matrix VP containing it. This accounts for the obligatory subject control of GPs in Russian. If the VP binding GP is finite, then sam in GP is correctly predicted to be nominative. If this matrix VP is infinitival, our hypothesis correctly predicts that sam in GP must be dative. We take these data to constitute conclusive evidence for the bare VP analysis of GP in Russian.

5.0 Residual problems

In this final section we discuss some conceptual and empirical problems with our analysis of adverbial participles that appear to challenge our hypothesis that GPs are always bare VPs whose external theta role is vertically bound by the external theta role of the VP containing it.
5.1 Preposed GPs. First we consider common Russian sentences like (38) in which the GP precedes the subject of the matrix clause; cf. (5).

(38)  Pročitav knigu, otec ubedilsja v nevinnosti osuždennogo.
    ‘Having-read the-book, father became-convinced of the-
    defendant’s innocence.’

If the GP in (38) is base generated in its preposed position, there is an obvious problem with claiming that its external theta role is vertically bound by the external theta role of the matrix VP: GP in (38) must be adjoined to S (= IP), but S has no external theta role that can bind GP’s external theta role; see (40). This follows from the fact that the distribution of GPs is roughly that of AdvPs. Given that GPs can precede subjects but follow rather than precede the complementizer čto, as shown in (39), initial GPs are adjoined to S rather than S’ (= CP), as in (40).

(39)  a.  Ja dumaju, čto, pročitav knigu, on ubeditsja v nevinnosti osuždennogo.
    ‘I think that, having-read the-book, he will-be-convinced of
    the-defendant’s innocence.’

   b.  *Ja dumaju, pročitav knigu, čto on ubeditsja v nevinnosti osuždennogo.\textsuperscript{19}

(40)

```
  S
 /   \     
GP\textsubscript{i} S
   /   \     
  NP\textsubscript{i} VP\textsubscript{i}
```

The problem then is that preposed adverbial participles are attached too high for the external theta role i of GP\textsubscript{i} to be vertically bound: S is not a predicate, i.e., it does not have an external theta role that could serve to vertically bind GP\textsubscript{i}. Such GPs are referred to as “detached”, in the traditional sense explored by Rappaport (1980, 1984).

One way of handling this problem is to claim that preposed adverbial participle constructions, but not postposed ones, are full clauses (see Rappaport 1984: 137–141). This would mean that the control of infinitives and adverbial participles is essentially the same. In both cases a bare nonfinite VP’s external theta role i is vertically bound if possible; in contexts where vertical binding is excluded, i is assigned to a subject NP, forming a nonfinite clause. But there are also problems with this solution. As we saw above, infinitive clauses have both null (PRO) and overt lexical dative subjects, but the subject position of the putative adverbial participle clause
would have to be obligatorily null, a fact that would need to be stipulated since it does not appear to follow naturally from the properties of adverbial participles. (Recall that the fact that adverbial participles do not have overt subjects is an automatic consequence of the bare VP analysis of GP proposed above in section 3: there is simply no subject position.)

If on the other hand we wish to retain the bare VP analysis of GP (and avoid the problem of PRO's case in putative adverbial participle clauses), we must account for how GP's external theta role can be satisfied even if it is adjoined too high to be vertically bound by VP. A solution to this problem is suggested by the fact that preposed GPs in sentences like (38) are still obligatorily subject controlled, just as postposed GPs are. Thus sentences like the following are not acceptable in standard Russian on the reading in which the understood subject of vernuvšis' is Viktor:

(41) *Vernuvšis' domoj, Viktora poprosili pogovorit' s det'mi.
    'Having-returned home, Victor was-asked to-speak to the-children.'

Given that the GP is subject controlled in sentences like (38), we can account for the position of the preposed GP, and for the satisfaction of its external theta role, if we simply assume that the GP is base generated in a position under the matrix VP. In this position its external theta role can be vertically bound by VP before the GP moves and adjoins to S. In other words, the bare GP analysis of adverbial participles can be retained without emendation if we assume that a sentence like (38) is derived from the underlying structure in (42), in which case the structure of (38) can be represented in (43). The symbol "t" denotes the trace left by GP when it moves to its preposed position; see the adjunction analysis of scrambling proposed in Bailyn 1995.

(42) Otec, [vp[pročitav knigu]gp, [ubedilsja v nevinnosti osuždennogo]vp].
    'Father, having-read the-book, became-convinced of the-defendant's innocence.'

(43)

```
      S
     /\  
    GPi  S
   /   \  /  
  NPi  VPi   VPi
     /   \    /   
    pročitav knigu  t  ubedilsja v nevinnosti osuždennogo
    otec
```
While this analysis accounts for the subject orientation of preposed GP in the same way as postposed GPs and, therefore, allows us to handle the formal properties of adverbial participles in Russian in terms of the bare VP and vertical binding hypotheses, it is not immediately clear that this analysis accounts fully for the dependence of the semantics of GPs on their syntactic position in the sentence. Unfortunately, we are not able to pursue this issue further since it presupposes an explicit analysis of the semantics of GPs and their interaction with the theme/rheme structure of Russian sentences, something which is beyond the scope of this paper. We shall assume that the bare VP and vertical binding analysis of adverbial participles is correct for standard Russian, and go on briefly to consider the nonstandard use of adverbial participles in colloquial Russian. This phenomenon constitutes a far more serious challenge to the direct predication analysis of adjuncts presented in sections 1–4.20

5.2 Nonstandard (noncanonical) use of $GP_i$. Consider sentences like (44a), which are common in nonstandard Russian; (44b) is standard. Subscripts indicate coreference and subjects are in square brackets.21

(44) a. Perexodja, čerez rel' sy, rebenka, ispugal [svistok paravoza].
   'Crossing over the-tracks, a-locomotive whistle frightened the-child.'

   b. Perexodja, čerez rel' sy, [rebenok,] uslyšal svistok paravoza.
   'Crossing over the-tracks, the-child heard a-locomotive whistle.'

(45) Podnjavšis', na goru, menja, zastal [dožd'].
   'Having-climbed up the-mountain, rain overtook me.'

The most striking property of sentences like (44a) is that GP is controlled by the matrix direct object (rebenka) rather than by the overt nominative matrix subject (svistok paravoza). This is not possible in standard Russian, where GPs are obligatorily subject controlled; see (2). The external theta role of the GP in these sentences cannot therefore be accounted for by base generating a bare GP inside the matrix VP, where its external theta role is vertically bound, and then moving it to its surface position, as in the case of standard Russian sentences like (38). The problem in (44a) is not the position of the GP, but rather the fact that the GP's understood subject (controller) is the matrix direct object. Given that the direct predication analysis is excluded here, our next step is to examine these sentences, determine what their criterial properties are, and induce a plausible working hypothesis.

Sentences like (44a) turn out to have a cluster of properties that suggest
an analysis which, while different from the one proposed for GPs in standard Russian, is still consonant with the theory of control, binding, and predication developed in Williams (1994). We first list these properties and then propose an explanation.

i. The nonsubject controller is not restricted to the direct object NP or, for that matter, to an NP, or even to an argument of the matrix verb. In the following sentences, the nonsubject controller of the adverbial participle is a prepositional phrase:

(46) Nakurivšis', meždu soldatami, zavjazalsja [razgovor].
    ‘Having-smoked, a conversation sprung-up among the-soldiers.’

(47) Poobedavši, za nami, priexala [mašina].
    ‘Having-eaten, a-car came for us.’

ii. The reference of the nonsubject controller is typically human, while the overt matrix subject is typically nonhuman (and most often inanimate); e.g. soldatami vs. razgovor in (46).

iii. The nonsubject controller typically occupies the absolute initial position in the matrix sentence; it can be preceded only by the GP it controls.

iv. The matrix subject typically follows the verb, just as it does in existential, presentative, and definitional sentences.

(48) V komnatu vošel čelovek v pal’to. Èto byl (*bylo) [moj otec].
    ‘Into the room (there) came a-man in a-coat. It was my father.’

v. The nonsubjects that can control GPs in these sentences can also serve as the antecedent of a reflexive pronoun. Recall that GPs and reflexive pronouns pattern alike in standard Russian: the antecedent of a reflexive pronoun is canonically the subject of the clause.

(49) Skol’ko u nee bylo s soboj (*nej) deneg?
    ‘How-much money did she have with her(self)?’

These facts suggest that the nonsubject controller in these sentences is the theme or, perhaps, topic, which adjoins to S. Traditional Russian grammar classifies these sentences as an independent type of sentence and refers to the preposed animate NP (PP) as sub”ject ‘non-syntactic or “logical” subject’ and the rest of the sentence as predikat ‘nonsyntactic or “logical” predicate’; see Kokorina (1979). The intuition here is that the nonsubject controller and the rest of the sentence form two separate major constituents, which is consistent with a topic-comment structure or an adjunction structure such as [₃ NP/PP S]. Thus, as a first approximation, we represent
the structure of (45) as (50), which helps to explain its binding and control relations under the assumption that in colloquial Russian, the \([s\ NP/PP\ S]\) configuration mimics the clause-internal subject-predicate relation and, therefore, accounts for why the nonsubject controller can control GP and bind reflexives. But this still does not account for how the external theta role of GP in (50) is satisfied; it cannot originate in and be vertically bound by VP since this would predict that the understood subject of GP should be the matrix subject \(dožd'\).

(50)

We can conclude on the basis of what we have seen so far that control of GP in standard Russian is strictly syntactic, as described in the first four sections, while control of GP in colloquial Russian appears to be semantically based, i.e., it appears that GP here is controlled by the most prominent NP in the sentence, and a nonsubject NP with human reference is evidently higher on the prominence hierarchy than a nonhuman subject NP.\(^{22}\) While this generalization seems to be correct, it is essentially descriptive and does not provide us with an explicit account of GP control in nonstandard Russian.

Williams’ (1994) theory of adjunct control makes a distinction between direct predication, which employs vertical binding to satisfy the adjunct’s external theta role, as described in sections 1–4, and a second type of adjunct control, namely, “logophoric control” (LC), which comes into play when vertical binding of the adjunct’s external theta role is structurally impossible. Under LC, the external theta role of the adjunct is assigned to the “logophoric center of the sentence,” which, as discussed below, is not a structurally definable notion. The LC strategy thus appears to offer a potential explanation for the preposed (detached) GP in nonstandard sentences like (44)–(49), where the GP is too high in the tree to be vertically bound and its antecedent is not the matrix subject. As a matter of fact, Williams’ (1994) theory predicts the coexistence of these two control strategies. If this theory is correct, the striking thing about modern standard Russian would
be the fact that it does not make use of the LC strategy. Below, we attempt
to determine whether LC is in fact applicable to the cases of nonsubject GP
control in nonstandard Russian.

Williams (1994: 85–88) shows how explicit and even implicit logophoric
antecedents can control gerunds and other adjuncts, as in (51):

(51) a. Having spent my day with Bill, Mary was a wonderful change.
    b. Standing in the corner, everything seemed fine.
    c. Having travelled all day, the hotel was a vision indeed.
    d. While in a coma, it seemed to me that the world was on fire.

Logophoric control of adjuncts has the following characteristics:

a) The antecedent of the adjunct under LC is the logophoric center of
the sentence, which, according to Sells (1987: 445) is as either the “source
of the report, the person with respect to whose consciousness (or ‘self’) the
report is made,” or the “person from whose point of view the report is
made.” Nonhumans are inappropriate logophoric antecedents; compare
for example the following sentences due to Williams, in which Bill is the
logophoric center and the adjunct phrase is in brackets.

(52) a. [Having just arrived in town], the main hotel seemed to Bill to
    be the best place to stay.
    b. *[Having just arrived in town], the main hotel collapsed on
    Bill.

(52b) is strange because, while the adjunct control must be logophoric, Bill
is not “logophorically appropriate” here.

We saw above that the nonsubject GP controller in Russian is human and,
therefore, qualifies as the logophoric center, but there are no sentences like
(52a) in Russian. Also, the nonsubject human GP controller in sentences
like (44a)–(47) above appears to be a fixed, topic-like position, which is not
ture of the examples of LC control in English cited by Williams.

b) A preposed adjunct is far more favorable to LC than one in
postposition. As far as we have been able to determine, GP with a
nonsubject controller in Russian must be preposed. Consider the examples
in (53), reported by Rappaport (1980: 282).

(53) a. Vozvraščajas’ domoj, menja zastal dožd’.
    b. *[Menja zastal dožd’ vozvraščajas’ domoj.
    c. *Dožd zastal menja, vozvraščajas’ domoj.

    c) The logophoric adjunct is set off with commas, which corresponds to
an intonation break. This is precisely what we find in Russian: the preposed
GP is "detached," i.e., it is set off by commas which signal a major constituent boundary; cf. (50).

d) A further distinction claimed by Williams (1994: 94–95) is that extraction, although marginal out of direct predication adjuncts, is strongly unacceptable out of logophorically controlled ones. It again seems to us that a comparable distinction may be made for Russian GPs.

Williams (1994: 88) admits that "the logophoric interpretation is governed by a number of complex factors, most of which I do not understand." It is thus obvious that logophoricity and the control of GP in nonstandard Russian requires a great deal more research. It appears to us at this point in our investigation of nonsubject control of GP in colloquial Russian and of the phenomenon of logophoricity that sentences like (44a)–(47) may involve a hybrid type of logophoric control: it is far less constrained than the tight, local direct predication of standard Russian, but, on the other hand, it is more constrained than the English examples of logophoric control discussed by Williams. It seems that enough of the canonical properties of LC are found in Russian nonsubject controlled GPs to conclude that a more syntactically constrained type of LC is involved in colloquial Russian adjunct control. But much more work will have to be done defining LC and expanding the data on nonsubject GP control before a formal analysis of Russian LC can be offered.23

5.3 GP, in passive constructions. When a verb is passivized, its direct internal theta role j is made external and its external theta role i is made implicit. The implicit argument can also license an optional instrumental-case adjunct NP, the so-called "by-phrase." According to Icković (1982), a GP, in standard Russian adjoined to the VP of a passive sentence can be controlled by either the external j or the implicit i; see examples in Icković (1982: 135–139). We shall be interested in the latter case, which appears to be a clear example of a sentence type in standard Russian in which GP, is not vertically bound by the external theta role of the XP immediately dominating it. The following is a representative example:

(54) Polučiv dannye, budet vybran samyj blagoprijatnyj moment dlja nanesenija udara.
    'Having received the data, the most propitious moment for the blow will be chosen.'

The understood subject of the GP, polučiv dannye is not the subject moment but the implicit agent i of vybran. The sentence in (55) demonstrates that the implicit theta role i also binds reflexives in passive constructions.
(55) Novoe germanskoe pravitel'stvo, staralos' sobljudat' obzajatel'stva, prinjatye na sebjja pravitel'stvom GDR,
'The new German government tried to honor the obligations assumed (lit. taken on itself) by the government of the GDR.'

While the external theta role of the participial phrase containing the reflexive is assigned to obzajatel'stva, the reflexive sebjja is coreferential with pravitel'stvom GDR, which is an adjunct phrase licensed by the implicit theta role i of the passive participle prinjatye (cf. section 3.1).

Assuming that an "implicit" theta role is a theta role that is mapped onto the verb (or its passive affix) in the sentence's syntactic structure rather than onto one of its NP arguments, sentences like (54) and (55) demonstrate that an implicit theta role can control adverbial participles and bind reflexives. The crucial questions here can thus be formulated as follows: how does implicit i bind GP, and how do we account for the fact that implicit i can block vertical binding of GP, by j, the external theta role of the passive VP? Recall, as Icković points out, GP, can be vertically bound by j, especially if j = human. Consider for example (56).

(56) Podnjavsí' na 5 ètaž, my, byli vpuščeny v poluetemnuju perednjaju.
'Having walked up to the 5th floor, we were admitted to a dark hall.'

Once again we see two binding strategies at work (cf. section 5.2): a strictly local strategy in which GP, is vertically bound by the external theta role of the XP, immediately dominating it and a less local strategy where GP, is bound by a more distant antecedent. Under this latter strategy, following Williams (1994), while the implicit i still binds GP, under c-command, it does not vertically bind it. Thus, while the data from passive sentences do not undermine our claim that adverbial participle constructions are bare VPs, they do provide more evidence that the understood subject of all GP,s can be accounted for in terms other than vertical binding. Note finally that many speakers find GP in passive sentences to be infelicitous, which enables us to make the following broad generalization: adverbial participles in standard Russian are bare VPs (GP,s) that are vertically bound by the XP, immediately dominating them; GP, bound in any other way produces a sentence which is felt to be unnatural or infelicitous by speakers of standard Russian.

To summarize, we saw in this section that there are two potential binders of the GP,'s external theta role in passive sentences: the external theta role j of VP and the verb's initial external theta role i, which is normally an agent. In active sentences, i is the external argument (hence agent is
the external theta role), but in passive sentences the two are separated and independent. The speaker is therefore faced with the choice of controlling the GP\(_i\) (and binding the reflexive) by either the external theta role j (= initial direct object) or the agent i, which is no longer external. It is this situation that contributes to the speaker's impression that GP\(_i\)s in passive sentences are somewhat infelicitous.

5.4 GP\(_i\) in Derived Nominal NPs. It was pointed out in section 3.1 that, according to (18), repeated here as (57), a GP\(_i\) should be able to adjoin to the maximal projection of any category X that can be modified by an adverb phrase.

\[(57)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP}_i \\
\text{XP}_i & \quad \text{GP}_i
\end{array}
\]

While nouns are not normally modified by adverbs, derived nominals can take adverbial modifiers, since these are nouns derived from verbs with full retention of the base verb's argument structure. This correctly predicts that adverbial participles should be able to occur inside the NP projection of a derived nominal, as in (58); see Icković (1982) for additional examples.

\[(58)\]  
\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. [NP perexod tverdogo veščestva v gazobraznoe, [GP minuja Žižkoe]}} \\
\quad \text{‘the change of a solid substance into a gas, skipping the liquid state’} \\
\text{b. [NP prodolženie vojny, [GP opirajas’ na pomošć sojuznikov]}} \\
\quad \text{‘continuing the war by relying on the help of the allies’}
\end{array}\]

The relations inside derived nominal NPs are essentially identical to those in the sentence: the understood subject of the GP\(_i\) is coreferential with the understood subject of the derived nominal. In other words, the external theta role i of the derived nominal binds the external theta role of the GP\(_i\). From the perspective of the analysis in this paper, the crucial question these examples raise is thus whether GP\(_i\) is vertically bound by an immediately dominating XP (X = N).

It has been argued by Grimshaw (1990) and Babby (1997b), among others, that when a verb is nominalized, its internal arguments are inherited intact by the derived nominal and the verb's initial external theta role i is assigned to an internal position in the NP. This position is determined by the verb's transitivity, so that when the initial verb is transitive, i is normally made implicit, just as in passive sentences; cf. (58b). The external theta role of a derived nominal NP is thus not the initial verb's external theta role i (it refers to the event itself, and not to one of its participants), which excludes the possibility of vertically binding GP\(_i\). The evidence from
derived nominals therefore confirms the conclusions we reached based on
the behavior of passive sentences described in section 5.3. Adverbial partici-
plies are bare nonfinite VPs whose external theta role must be bound by
either the external theta role or i of the category it modifies. It is thus
obvious from this discussion that there must be strategies other than verti-
cal binding to bind the adverbial participle’s external theta role.

5.5 \( GP_i \) in Impersonal Sentences. An anonymous reader has pointed out
that adverbial participles occur also in impersonal sentences. This fact
appears to pose a serious challenge to our analysis, since there is no exter-
nal theta role in impersonal sentences to bind the adverbial participle’s
external theta role. Recall that our main hypothesis is that adverbial partici-
plies are bare VPs whose external theta role must be bound, which is why
their behavior parallels that of reflexives, which also must be bound.

In his discussion of \( GP_i \) in impersonal sentences, Ickovič (1982: 139–
141), who finds adverbial participles in impersonal sentences to be only
peripherally acceptable, makes the following crucial observation: \( GP_i \) can
occur in impersonal sentences only when they have a sub’ekt ‘logical sub-
ject’. What this means is that there must be a preposed oblique topic-like
NP whose function parallels that of subject NPs. Note also that this sub’ekt
binds reflexive pronouns as well as adverbial participles. Thus, the binding
of \( GP_i \) in these impersonal sentences is the same phenomenon as \( GP_i \)
binding in the nonstandard sentences already discussed in section 5.2,
where the \( GP_i \) is also bound by an oblique sub’ekt. The only difference is
that in those examples there was a nonhuman postposed nominative sub-
ject present and the sentence was therefore not classified as impersonal.
For this reason, we conclude that what is crucial for Russian is not whether
the sentence is impersonal or not, but rather whether there is a potential
binder for the \( GP_i \).

(59) a. Vspominaja ćeti vstreči, mne dumaetsja, čto . . .
‘Recalling those meetings, it seems (lit. thinks) to me that . . .’

b. Razdumyvaja takim obrazom, mne vdrug prišlo na um,
čto . . .
‘Thinking in this way, it suddenly dawned on me (lit. came into
my head) that . . .’

c. Vypolnaja poručenie, Girpatriku ne xotelos’, čtoby . . .
‘Carrying out the order, G. did not want (lit. it didn’t want to
G.) that . . .’

While canonical uses of \( GP_i \) in standard Russian typically involve vertical
binding of \( GP_i \)’s external theta role, we have shown in this article that \( GP_i \)’s
external theta role can be bound in other, less local ways, which typically
results in a grammatical but stylistically infelicitous sentence. We therefore
conclude that the occurrence of GPs in impersonal sentences is not an instance of unbound adverbial participles. They thus do not constitute a counterexample to the main hypothesis put forward in this article, which can be recapitulated as follows: adverbial participles are bare nonfinite VPs with an adverbial function whose external theta role is obligatorily bound.

NOTES

1 Although the discussion in this paper will concentrate on adverbial participles, the analysis should carry over to “adjectival” participles with minimal modification (see section 3.1).

2 This problem might however be rectified by adoption of the VP internal subject hypothesis.

3 While we have made crucial use of Williams’ (1994) concepts of direct predication, vertical binding, the predicate complex, relativized head, and theta-binding to account for adjunct control in Russian, there are nevertheless many ways in which the theory of control we propose differs from his analysis of control in English. This is especially true of the analysis of argumental infinitive control outlined in section 4.1. However, space does not permit us to present a systematic comparison of the differences, and they are not relevant to the goals of this paper.

4 We consider apparent challenges to this hypothesis in section 5.

5 Adverbial participles are not formed from impersonal verbs, which do not have an external theta role (e.g. *stošniv). This fact must either be shown to follow from independently motivated principles or be stipulated (e.g., as part of the lexical rule that derives adverbial participles from verb stems or as a syntactic well-formedness condition). We see below that this restriction on impersonal GPs follows from the binding theory: the external theta role i of a GP must be bound in the same way that anaphors are bound; a free GP, makes the sentence containing it ungrammatical just as a free reflexive pronoun does. Thus, “GP,” (a one-place predicate) is well-formed when bound, while “GP”, i.e. an adverbial particle without an external theta-role, cannot be bound, making the sentence containing it ungrammatical. The same is true of adjectival (“active”) participles, but not of infinitives, which can be formed from impersonal verbs when the matrix verb in an auxiliary verb (e.g., Menja perestalo tošnit ‘I stopped feeling sick’; see Babby (1997a) for discussion of impersonal infinitives. The existence of finite impersonal sentences containing GP is a more complex issue; see section 5 for discussion.

6 It was pointed out by an anonymous reviewer that some Russian dialects permit a GP to combine with the copula, which forms something like a perfect tense (On vypivši ‘He is drunk’ is a reflex of this in standard Russian), e.g.:
   (i) Nu vy pridete s kuortu, otdoxnuvišs’ budete.
      ‘You’ll return from the resort and you’ll be rested.’

   We assume that, unlike the rule in standard Russian (which eliminates the base verb’s subject NP), the lexical rule responsible for the derivation of adverbial participles in these dialects allows for an optional subject NP. This permits the GP, to combine with an auxiliary verb, which is a functor, i.e. not specified for an external argument (V_o), to form a one-place main predicate:
   (ii) [VP [VP [V_b budete] [IP otdoxnuvišš]]]

   In (ii), i of GP percolates up to VP, (which then vertically binds GP) and is assigned to the subject of its clause by main clause predication. (Compare also the lexical rule of passivization, which makes the base verb’s subject NP optional in Ukrainian and some Russian dialects, and is thus responsible for the transitive impersonal passive (-noi-to) construction we find there.)
The “af” suffix is usually, but not always, predictable in terms of the verb stem’s aspect: af = -a when the verb is imperfective and af = -v(ši) when perfective.

In this way, the fact that GP has the internal structure of a VP but the external distribution of an AdvP is expressed, it is just that for us the conversion from VP to AdvP takes place in the lexicon rather than in the syntax, as in (1) and (2). The GP thus bears verbal and adverbial features contributed by V and af, respectively. Although this level of detail is adequate for present purposes, it should be noted that simply combining verbal and adverbial features obfuscates the fact that af is the head of GP. That is, as captured in Babby’s (1979) transformational account, GPs are AdvPs on the outside and VPs on the inside. A more explicit representation of a GP, therefore, might be as follows: \[\text{AdvP} \otimes [\text{VP} \ldots V[\ldots]\ldots]]\]. The gerund might then “check” (in the sense of Chomsky 1995) its adverbial features against the higher phonologically null adverbial head, but our point remains that no actual word-formation operates in the syntax.

Word-order is not significant in (8).

Consider for example the modern Russian adverb молчать ‘in silence’, with stress on the first syllable, as opposed to the adverbial participle молчали ‘being silent’, with expected desinential stress.

Note that there appears to be a hidden stipulation in our analysis, namely, that a G can only be formed from a base verb stem that has an external theta role (impersonal verbs do not form adverbial participles). But G-formation is a lexical rule and this restriction is an empirically motivated s-selection property of the adverbial participle forming suffix. Thus, as far as the syntax of GPs is concerned, the subject orientation of bare GPs follows automatically from the principles of binding and predication as formulated in Williams (1994) and no ad hoc stipulation whose purpose is to exclude object control of GPs is required.

Unlike in Russian, English reflexives are not subject oriented; Williams’ theory does not offer any explanation for this difference.

The status of GPs in derived nominal NPs, i.e. X = N in (18), is discussed below in section 5.4.

Other adjectives that exhibit the second dative in modern Russian are один, казенный and вест, but we do not discuss these here due to lack of space.

As noted above, this is a problem for the government-binding approaches to PRO since PRO as the putative ungoverned subject of nonfinite clauses cannot be case-marked and should be obligatorily null. This issue is discussed in depth for Icelandic in Sigurðsson (1991). The mechanism of “null Case”, introduced in chapter 1 of Chomsky (1995), might offer a solution from the perspective of the current “minimalist program.” See also Laurençot (1997) and Franks (1998) for discussion of null Case PRO in Russian.

We assume that quantifiers/adjectives like сам adjoin to the XP predicate of the subject NP they modify, as argued for by Williams (1994). This assumption is however not crucial to the main hypothesis of this paper.

In this example мне, which is the antecedent of PRO, just happens to be dative; cf. (35) with accusative еgo.

When quantified subjects in West Slavic show genitive morphology on the head noun, predicate adjectives (including сам) display genitive agreement, as in the following Polish examples from Franks (1995: 278–279):

(i) a. Wielu studentów jest młodych/*młodymi.
   many students:gen.pl is young:gen.pl/*inst.pl
   ‘Many students are young.’

   b. Wielu studentów idzie samych/*samym
   many students:gen.pl goes alone:gen.pl/*dat.pl
   ‘Many students go alone.’

This is pattern is retained under obligatory control, as shown by (ii).
(ii) a. Wielu studentów chce [VP być młodych/*młodymi]
   'Many students:gen.pl want to-be young:gen.pl/*inst.pl.'

   b. Wielu studentów chce [VP iść samych/*samym].
   'Many students:gen.pl want to-go alone:gen.pl/*dat.pl.'

   This is perfectly consistent with our bare VP analysis of obligatory control. See Comrie (1974) for a Slovak example and Franks (1995) for further discussion of this phenomenon in Polish.

19 Sentence (39b) is of course grammatical under the irrelevant reading where the GP refers to the main clause subject ja, in which case it is simply attached to the matrix VP.

20 Williams (1994: 84) notes that English sentences like Sad, John left the room are instances of direct predication and, therefore, are to be treated the same as John left the room sad. But he does not discuss the syntactic and semantic relations between postposed and preposed sad or how preposed adjuncts satisfy their external theta roles.

21 The examples in (44) and (45) are from Babby (1996). These sentences are deemed to be unacceptably ungrammatical in normative grammars of standard literary Russian, but since speakers produce them and have to be taught not to use them, a comprehensive theory of adverbial participle must include them. See also Rappaport (1980, 1984) for discussion.

22 The notion of "prominence" is clearly reflected in the syntactic structure of these sentences: the preposed human NP (PP) is higher in the phrase structure representation in (50) than the subject. One problem this correspondence raises however is that there is no purely structural way to take advantage of this fact, since GP is higher than both menja and doźda. A possible formal solution to this dilemma would be to let the GP be interpreted below menja but above doźda. We do not pursue these ideas here, since they would involve considerable technical details, such as distinguishing "A" vs. "A-bar" movement and fleshing out the X-bar structure of (50), which are not central to the proposals made below.

23 An additional issue which we do not address in this paper is how sam differs from ordinary secondary predicates; but see Franks and Hornstein (1992) or Franks (1995) for some specific proposals on this question. Thus, although our analysis accounts for why a GP whose interpretation is determined through direct predication is necessarily controlled by the subject, it leaves unexplained the fact that ordinary secondary predicates can be predicated of direct objects as well. Bailyn (1995), adapting work by Bowers (1993) to Russian, solves this by adjoining secondary predicates (his "Predicate Phrases") to V', thereby allowing them to be c-commanded by both subject and object. While this solution is somewhat stipulatory and crucially relies on generating direct objects above V', i.e. in the specifier position of VP, it is in no way incompatible with our theory.
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