What can silent elements tell us about Grammar?

In this talk, I examine the distribution of PRO in Russian gerundive clauses (RGCs). I claim that 1) PRO in RGCs has properties of Obligatory Control (OC) standardly associated with binding, and 2) RGCs are TP-adjuncts opaque for Agree. 1) and 2) result in a Binding without Agree (BWA) puzzle. I explain BWA by analyzing PRO as a definite description with a free individual concept and a bound situation variable. I show that my proposal extends to phenomena, unrelated to BWA. I also discuss the consequences of BWA for the syntax-semantics interface.

BWA 1) PRO in RGCs has OC properties, such as the need for a c-commanding antecedent - (1), sloppy readings, and a *de se* interpretation (Landau 2000).

- (1) *Petina_i sestra ušla, [PRO_i ne pobrivšis'].

 Peter's sister left not having shaved

 '*Peter's sister left without shaving himself.'
- 2) Evidence for RGCs being TP-adjuncts: a) RGCs do not permit the agreeing nominative and the 'second dative' on secondary predicates (2) (Franks and Hornstein 1992). This suggests that the two routes for Control in Russian are unavailable for RGCs (Landau 2008).
- (2) [Vernuvšis' domoj ?*p'janyj /*odnomu] Ivan srazu leg spat'. having.returned home drunk.nom /alone.dat Ivan.nom at.once lay.down to.sleep 'Having returned home drunk/alone, Ivan lay down to sleep at once.'
- b) RGC is a separate domain for *ni*-words licensing; c) diachronically, RGCs had the status of independent clauses (Yokoyama 1979). <u>It follows from 1) and 2) that Binding is possible</u> without Agree.

Analysis RGCs are TP-adjuncts that lack a CP layer, which explains the failure of Agree. This failure does not preclude PRO from having bound properties because PRO is decomposed into a free individual concept (u_5) , a bound situation variable (s_1) , an identity relation R, and a D-head, as in (3) (Wolter 2006, Elbourne 2008).

- (3) $[PRO]^g = D[R[u_5(s_1)]] = [\lambda f_{et}.\iota x f(x)=1](\lambda y \lambda z.y=z([\lambda s.u_5(s)](s_1))) = \iota x x=u_5(s_1)$ defined iff there is exactly one x such that $x=u_5(s_1)$
- (4-a) has the LF in (4-b) and the derivation in (4-c). The situation variables in (4-b) are bound by the same index 1 and eventually saturated by the topic situation (s^*) .
- (4) a. Guljaja, Ivan vstretil prijatelja. promenading Ivan met friend 'Ivan met a friend while promenading.'
 - b. [s^* [1 [[$_{TP-ing}$ [PRO in s_1] [$_{VP}$ s_1 promenading]] [& [[Ivan in s_1] [$_{VP}$ s_1 met a friend]]]]]]
 - c. $[\lambda s.[TP]^g \wedge [TP ing]^g](s^*) = [\lambda s. \text{ Ivan in s met a friend in } s \wedge \iota x = u_5(s) \text{ promenades in } s](s^*) = Ivan in s^* met a friend in s^* <math>\wedge \iota x = u_5(s^*)$ promenades in s*

Extensions 1. My proposal correctly predicts that TP-ing does not have an independent reference time anchoring (Shvedova 1980). 2. My proposal extends to PRO with quantifiers like *každyj* 'each' and *oba* 'both'.

Consequences BWA requires us to reconsider the syntax-semantics interface. A strong revision states that Bind-if-Agree is a false correlation and has to be abandoned. But, then, we will lose the explanation for well-documented cases of Binding-when-Agree. I propose a weaker revision postulating an economy principle that permits BWA in definable cases.

References Elbourne, P. 2008. Demonstratives as individual concepts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31:409-466; Franks, S., and N. Hornstein. 1992. Secondary predication in Russian and proper government of PRO. In *Control and Grammar*, 1-50. Dordrecht: Kluwer; Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of Control*. Dordrecht: Kluwer; Landau, I. 2008. Two routes of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26:877-924; Shvedova, N.Yu. 1980. *Russkaja Grammatika*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka; Wolter, L.K. 2006. That's that. PhD thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz; Yokoyama, O.T. 1979. Studies in Russian Functional Syntax. PhD thesis, Harvard University.