On Comitative Constructions in Slovak

Jana Sokolová, Constantine the Philosopher University, Nitra

This study describes and explains the semantics, syntagmatics and pragmatics of the comitative case in Slovak. It focuses on defining the comitative and its formal expression, i.e., how comitative constructions syncretize the concepts of accompaniment and gender inequality of personal participants in grammemes of the noun and verb. The types of comitative constructions are interpreted on the background of these principles: (i) the principle of a shared and unified activity; (ii) the principle of an added, absorbed and assigned participant$_2$, and (iii) the principle of the speaker's self-presentation.

It is useful to study the connection of the comitative and coordinative strategy as cognitive and linguistic relations between the hierarchically (un)equal participants of the given situation and the expressions of hypotaxis and parataxis. The study defines the specifics of expressing comitative, coordinate-comitative and coordinative relations. We focus on the central position of the verb in the predicate, which has the ability to bind a number of other lexical complements and which, by its semantics and its valency potential, determines the form of a comitative construction. It introduces the concept of shared activity and shared involvement of participant$_2$, which influences the verb's grammemes and the participant's$_2$ compulsory role in the construction of the proposition.

Keywords: *comitative, participant, sharing, hypotaxis, parataxis*

1. Introduction[1]

The topic of the comitative case, although found in many typologically oriented works, has not been systematically dealt with in the Slovak language. It came to attention via indirect and marginal references as a sociative case or sociative instrumental[2] with the change of the paradigm of scientific view towards the semantic syntax (cf. Tibenská 2004; Vaňko 2010). The comitative in Slavic languages is related to Russian (Dalrymple et al. 1998; Dyła & Feldman 2003; Vassilieva & Larson 2005; Arkhipov 2009), Czech (Skrabalova 2011) and Polish (Dyła 1988; Dyła & Feldman 2003, Trawinski 2005).

The aim of the study is to describe and explain the semantics, syntagmatics and pragmatics of the comitative as a typological phenomenon in Slovak. The topic is narrowed down to its characteristics in Slovak that belongs to Slavic fusional languages. We focus on defining the comitative and its formal representations. The types of comitative constructions are interpreted using the following principles[3]: (i) the principle of a shared and unified activity; (ii) the principle

---

[1] We thank anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on earlier versions of the paper.

[2] The sociative instrumental expresses the participant who, together with the agent, implements the content of the prediction (Vaňko 2010: 314).

[3] In Slovak linguistics the principle is a significant methodological basis for descriptive-explanatory assessment of facts. "The principle is something that constitutes the basis of the studied fact, something in which the section of studied fact is based on that determines the structure of this section and controls its functioning and development

of an added, absorbed and assigned participant$_2$, and (iii) the principle of the speaker's self-presentation. We examine the connection of the comitative and coordinative constructions as cognitive and linguistic relations between the hierarchically (un)equal participants of the given microsituation and the expressions of hypotaxis and parataxis. Further, we describe the comitative and coordinative strategy as a cognitive and linguistic relationship between the hierarchically (un)equal participants of the given microsituation (term by Grepl & Karlík 1998) and the expressions of hypotaxis and parataxis. The semantic-pragmatic characteristics of construction elements are presented in the form of an analytical interpretation (Apresjan 2003) taking into account the contextual (semantic, syntactic and pragmatic) conditions. We use the examples exclusively at the level of demonstration and not as a basis for quantitative analysis. It is the verification of syntactic constructions from the sphere of available resources to the sphere of currently formed expressions. The examples are partly taken from and modified from a linguistic corpus.

2. Comitative

The comitative is a secondary semantic case defined by Fillmore. In the study *Towards a Modern Theory of Case* (1966) he distinguished ergative (later referred to as objective), agentive, dative, comitative and instrumental. In 1968, he excluded the comitative from the set of deep cases, added locative and divided ergative into objective and factitive. Thus, he created the following set of elementary cases: agentive, dative, instrumental, factitive, objective and locative. Therefore, the comitative became a secondary case that is still defined inconsistently in terms of methodology and terminology. Depending on the status attributed to the participants, theory offers the both a narrow and wider definition of the comitative.

In the narrow sense, the comitative anticipates two animate (personal) protagonists – participant$_1$ and participant$_2$. The speaker's intention is to highlight the role of the other agent. The comitative with the personal participant$_2$ is perceived as **sociative**, **associative** or **accompanitive** (for details see Haspelmath 2009). Tibenská describes sociative, which is in the interest of Slovak linguistics, as "the only semantically active object participant depicting the active participant of the activity that, however, within a sentence is depicted hierarchically lower than the subject" (2004: 135).

In the broader sense, the comitative, in the position of the other participant, covers both the personal and impersonal participant. Its formal expression approaches another semantic case – instrumental. When used with an impersonal participant$_2$, it is marked as:

(i) **instrumental** ('with, using'):
(1)   Sedelo tam dievčatko a hralo sa s bábikou.
        'A little girl sat there and played with a doll.'[4]
(ii) **proprietive** ('with, having'):

(Dolník, 1999, p. 9). For example, the theory of conversational implicatures of H. P. Grice is based on a cooperative principle, the theory of naturalness of J. Dolník is based on the principle of markedness, etc.
[4] Note: translation of Slovak examples into English: author (JS).

(2)   Gazda šiel do mesta s drevom.
        'A farmer with wood went to the town.'
or (iii) **ornative** ('endowed with', 'equipped with'):
(3)   Predám starší dom so záhradou v Kamienke.
        'I am going to sell a house with a garden in Kamienka.'

The fact that the comitative and instrumental are closely connected was defined by Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 135) as the principle: "the word or grammatical device that indicates Accompaniment also indicates Instrumentality". Kiparsky (2012: 29) understands the relation of instrumental and comitative on the inclusive basis that leads from sociative to associative, cf.: sociative → comitative → instrumental → associative:

    Sociative 'in the company of' (John saw Fred with Mary);
    Comitative 'in the company of' + 'together with' (John ate cheese with Mary / with wine);
    Instrumental 'in the company of' + 'together with' + 'by means of' (John ate cheese with Mary / with wine / with a fork);
    Associative (John ate cheese with Mary / with wine / with a fork / with care).

Schlesinger sees the comitative and instrumental as two opposites of the cognitive continuum as he says: "the instrumental and comitative are really only two extreme points on what is a conceptual continuum" (1979: 308). On the contrary, Lehman et al. (2017) with the term **concomitative** understands the common acceptance of the instrumental and comitative. Identification of the comitative with instrumental is rejected by Nilsen (1973), Stolz et al. (2007) and others.

    Similarly to other Slavic languages, Slovak does not formally distinguish between the comitative and instrumental. It belongs to languages that implement comitative-instrumental syncretism.

    Referring to the comitative, another semantic case is mentioned, which is a contrasting counterpart of both the comitative and instrumental – **abessive**, also referred as **caritive**, **privative**, **anticomitative** or **deprivative**. The marker of abessive is the preposition 'without' ('bez' in Slovak):

(4)   Nechcem odísť bez teba.   (abessive)
        'I do not want to leave without you.'
(5)   Chcem odísť s tebou.   (comitative)
        'I want to leave with you.'

The abessive is considered a flag member of the opposition comitative/instrumental vs. abessive. Its detailed description can be found in the large study by Stolz, Stroh & Urdze (2007) in which 239 world languages are analyzed. In the study, the comitative, instrumental and abessive are considered semantic cases that specify the functions of grammemes, and not only of bound

morphemes in the traditional sense of the term (Stolz et al. 2007), they are grammemes of the same function.

Kiparsky (2012: 29–30) defines the typological connection of the triplet abessive, instrumental and comitative as follows:

(i)   If a language has a 'without' case, it also has a 'with' case, but not necessarily conversely;

(ii)   An expression meaning 'without' can be morphologically derived from an expression meaning 'with' (but not conversely);

(iii)   For each meaning of the 'without' case, the corresponding 'with' meaning is expressed by means of case.

This part ends with a definition of **comitative** which, in our opinion, defines its essence best: "The comitative usually marks the animate (typically human) which is conceived of as accompanying the participation of some more centrally involved participant in a predication" (*The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* 1994: 453).

Further, we will focus on the linguistic presentation of the comitative in Slovak, more precisely, how comitative constructions syncretize the concepts of accompaniment and role inequality of the participants in noun and verb grammemes[5]. In other words, the fundamental meaning of the comitative as a semantic case is the way of verbalizing accompaniment of the agent and another personal participant. The essence of the comitative as a grammatical phenomenon is the way of expressing the main syntactic grammemes of a noun: case (instrumental), animacy (man), number (singular/plural) and relevant syntactic grammemes of a verb: person (3rd person/1st person) and number (singular/plural). The essence of the comitative as a pragmatic phenomenon is the discursive focus of events and facts by the speaker.

3. Comitative constructions and their alternatives

The comitative has a linguistic expression in the form of a construction. The comitative is defined as a particular construction type used to 'pluralize' a participant – that is, to predicate the same state of affairs of two individual protagonists, such that the main predicate itself is not repeated and the two participants are not equal in their syntactic status (Arkhipov 2009: 223). The comitative construction as a type of an elemental sentence structure (term by Grepl & Karlík 1998) is an expression of the construction principle that is inevitably present in the formation of all types of constructions (Kačala 1998: 19). It reflects the manifestation of the fact simultaneously from the point of view of the semantics of the shared activity, from the point of view of the syntagmatics of participation of two as if hierarchically unequal partners and also from the point of view of pragmatics of the speaker's preferences.

In a semasiological approach, the comitative construction (in the narrow sense of understanding of the comitative) is a grammatical (morpho-syntactical) unit reflecting relations of the protagonists and the share of participants in the activity expressed with a predicate. The comitative requires two entities to be involved in the same spatio-temporal situation participating

---

[5] The 'grammeme' is a value of grammatical category of a particular lexeme and it denotes fundamental grammatical meaning.

in the same causal chain (Stolz et al. 2007: 68). The structure diagram of the relation **(r)** between two personal protagonists – participant$_1$ (**X**) and participant$_2$ (**Y**)[6] is **X r Y**. The relator **r** is a comitative marker that has a conceptual character and, depending on language typology, it can be expressed by means of a preposition or affix. Prepositions are applied in most European languages, for instance, in Slovak 's/so', Czech 's/se', Russian 's/so', English 'with', German 'mit' and so on; suffixes are used in Hungarian, Finnish, Estonian, and many typologically diverse languages in the whole world (for details see Stassen 2000). A preposition is a means of hypotaxis, and exclusively the form **with** + **N$_{Ins}$** is a hypotactic means of a comitative relation in Slovak. If the relator is a coordinator **'and'** ('a' in Slovak), which is an expression of the expansion of the number of participants and fusion (unification) of their activities, we talk about parataxis, and the form **and** + **N$_{Nom}$** is perceived as a means of coordinative relation[7]. In case of the hypotaxis (shared activity of the participants and semantic relation of comitative), a predicate usually expressed in the form of a full verb is in the 3rd person **singular**. In the case of parataxis, (the unified activity of participants in the semantic coordinative relation) it takes the form of 3rd person **plural**. The distinction between a shared and unified activity influences the syntactical function of the participants. In a comitative construction, the participants are in the non-contact syntactic position; the participant$_1$ is the subject and the participant$_2$ has the function of adverbial of accompanying circumstances[8], as it expresses the agent that performs the activity together with the agent expressed in the subject position (Ivanová 2016: 97). In a coordinate-comitative and coordinative construction, the participants are in a syntactically contact position and they have the function of a multiple subject.

Let's go back to the concept of shared activity, which is a relevant factor of the comitative. A shared activity means that the activities of the participants in the situation/event are conceptualized as one common activity undertaken by participant$_1$, and the participant$_2$ participates[9]. In the following examples, the second text explains the meaning of the first text:

(8)   a.   Deti odišli s učiteľkami na výstavu.
                → Deti odišli na výstavu. Spolu s deťmi odišli na výstavu aj učiteľky.
                'Children with the teachers went to the exposition.'
                → 'Children went to the exposition. Together with children also the teachers went.'

---

[6] Participants **X**, **Y** are presented in the form of appellatives, proper nouns or personal deictics.

[7] It is interesting to note that the form **with** + **N$_{Ins}$** is also interpreted as a hypotactic means of expressing a coordinative relation (Grepl & Karlík 1998: 334).

[8] Comitative adverbial is also known as a free adjunct. The concept of accompanying activity/state caused a comitative adverbial is set apart in Czech linguistic tradition (cf. *Mluvnice češtiny 3*, 1987: 108–116).

[9] In the case of non-shared activity, which is characteristic for a small group of evaluation and emotional verbs (6) and verbs of confrontation with adversative semantics (7), participants$_2$ are in the syntactic position of the indirect object and do not express the comitative:

(6)   Ľudia súcitia s onkologickými pacientami.
        'People sympathize with oncology patients.'

(7)   Pápež bojuje s pedofilmi. ↔ Pápež bojuje proti pedofilom.
        'The Pope fights against pedophiles.'
        (Lit. "The Pope fights with pedophiles.")

(9)   b.   Róbert odišiel so svojou matkou do USA, kde žije dodnes.
               → Róbert odišiel do USA. Spolu s ním do USA odišla aj jeho matka.
               'Robert with his mother left for the US where he is still living.'
               → 'Robert went to the USA. Together with him went also his mother.'

(10)   a.   Vojtech odcestoval so ženou do Budapešti.
               → Vojtech odcestoval do Budapešti. Spolu s ním odcestovala do Budapešti aj jeho žena.
               'Vojtech with his wife departed for Budapest.'
               → 'Vojtech departed for Budapest. Together with him also his wife went.'

The principle of sharing infers different perceptions of participant's$_2$ obligation and his/her involvement in a joint activity. Compare:

(8)   b.   Deti odišli na výstavu.
               'Children went to the exposition.'

(9)   b.   Róbert odišiel do USA, kde žije dodnes.
               'Robert left for the US, where he is still living.'

(10)   b.   Vojtech odcestoval do Budapešti.
               'Vojtech departed for Budapest.'

Conventional implicatures (approaching pragmatic presuppositions as part of shared knowledge) are involved in interpreting of statements (8b-10b), which, depending on the participant's$_1$ (age) status, require / do not require participant's$_2$ involvement. In case (8b), since children cannot go to an exhibition unaccompanied by an adult who has the status of a person supervising children, the implicit participant$_2$ of the sentence (8b) is in the so-called sphere of invited inferences.

Sharing is a part of semantics of most relational verbs[10], which in their meanings have an integrated component 'together' or 'with one another'. Their core consists of verbs with a reflexive pronoun ('sa' in Slovak), whose ability to participate is encoded in their inherent semantics.

---

[10] The following subcategories belong to relational verbs: (a) verbs of social interaction, distinguishing: (i) verbs of close personal interaction: *bozkávať sa s niekým, flirtovať s niekým, chodiť s niekým* (byť v partnerskom vzťahu), *objímať sa s niekým, schádzať sa s niekým, spávať s niekým,* (*s)poznať sa s niekým, stretať sa s niekým, ťahať sa s niekým* (byť v partnerskom vzťahu), *tykať si s niekým, vídať sa s niekým, vychádzať s niekým, vykať si s niekým, začať si s niekým, zoznámiť sa s niekým, žiť s niekým;* (ii) verbs of interactions between partners: *hrávať sa s niekým, obchodovať s niekým, radiť sa s niekým, rokovať s niekým,* (*spolu)pracovať s niekým, tancovať s niekým;* (iii) verbs of confrontation: *biť sa s niekým, bojovať s niekým, konfrontovať sa s niekým, súperiť s niekým, súťažiť s niekým, zápasiť s niekým;* (b) verbs of communication: *besedovať s niekým, debatovať s niekým, hovoriť s niekým, komunikovať s niekým, konzultovať s niekým, nadávať si s niekým, nerozprávať sa s niekým,* (*po)hádať sa s niekým, (po)chytiť sa s niekým (pohádať sa), písať si s niekým, (po)rozprávať sa s niekým, (po)zdraviť sa s niekým, zhovárať sa s niekým, žartovať s niekým;* (c) verbs of evaluation and emotion: *byť šťastný s niekým, držať s niekým* (prejavovať sympatie), *hnevať sa s niekým, ľúbiť sa s niekým, nenávidieť sa s niekým;* (d) motional and positional verbs: *ísť s niekým, ležať s niekým, odísť s niekým, prísť s niekým, sedieť s niekým, ujsť s niekým, vstúpiť s niekým,* etc.

A verb, as a central element of a sentence and also the comitative construction, is able to bind a number of other lexical complements and, in the position of a sentence predicate, its semantics, and thus its valence potential, determine the sentence structure. Even in the case of valence structure in Slovak comitative constructions, a verb has a crucial influence on the selection and the semantic content of the participants. Since comitative sentences denote at least two participants of an activity/situation, one of whom is comitatively related, they have two arguments, i.e., two noun phrases (NP). We distinguish a NP of **accompanied X** and an NP of **accompanying Y** or accompanee – companion (Stolz et al. 2006: 17, Lee 2011), orientir – sputnik (Arkhipov 2009), actor – undergoer (Stolz et al. 2006: 59). In the comitative construction, the noun phrase with a higher structural rank is referred to as *core NP*, and to the one with the lower structural rank as *comitative NP* (Arkhipov 2009: 225).

The accompanied (accompanee, orientir, actor) bears a marker [+control], while the accompanying (companion, sputnik, undergoer) has [-control]. Both substantives in the NPs have a specific reference status, i.e., they denote specific persons (individualized or non-individualized). Practically all personal nouns can form a comitative construction[11] if they are content compatible and close. In their background, the knowledge of relatedness is typical of everyday relationships and social roles in them[12]. In Slovak, there is a significant high number of 'comitative' substantives created by the prefix 'co-' ('spolu-' in Slovak).[13]

Let's now consider participation of two hierarchically unequal partners. The idea of inequality may be the result of pragmatic knowledge, for example, equal relationships are between parents, children, adults, etc.; socially unequal relationships are between pupils and teachers, children and parents, children and adults, subordinates and superiors, etc.; or it is the result of the speaker's decision. Identifying relationships is always associated with the speaker and the specific communication event. This means that the use of the comitative is associated with self-presentation and the possibility of reflecting the personal sphere of the speaker[14]. In the following example, we can analyze the method of encoding the meeting of two leading political representatives, in which the speaker, by employing the comitative, has given more prominence to the Czech president (11). In case of parataxis, the speaker would express his/her personal preferences of the Czech president (12):

(11)   Klaus sa stretne s Gašparovičom v stredu.

---

[11] Typical relational substantives express: (a) blood relations: *dcéra, syn, otec, matka, súrodenec, rodič*; *neter, synovec,* etc.; (b) partnership and professional relationships: *priateľ, priateľka, milenec, milenka, manžel, manželka, kamarát, kamarátka, kolega, kolegyňa, sused, suseda/susedka,* (c) fellowship: *spoluobčan, krajan, krajanka, príslušník, príslušníčka*, etc.

[12] I would like to thank the reviewer of this paper for adding a reference to relatedness.

[13] Cf. *spoluautor, spoluautorka, spoluinvestor, spoluinvestorka, spolumajiteľ, spolumajiteľka, spolupáchateľ, spolupáchateľka, spolupodnikateľ, spolupodnikateľka, spolupracovník, spolupracovníčka, spoluriešiteľ, spoluriešiteľka, spoluväzeň, spoluväzeňkyňa, spoluvinník, spoluvinníčka, spoluvlastník, spoluvlastníčka, spoluzakladateľ, spoluzakladateľka, spolužiak, spolužiačka, spolubesedník, spolubesedníčka, spolubojovník, spolubojovníčka, spolubývajúci, spolubývajúca, spolucestujúci, spolucestujúca, spoluhráč, spoluhráčka, spoluidúci, spoluidúca, spoluúčinkujúci, spoluúčinkujúca, spolujazdec, spolujazdkyňa,* etc.

[14] The personal sphere of the speaker was defined by Yu. D. Apresjan (2003) and became the expressive category of the Moscow Semantic School.

'On Wednesday, Klaus is going to meet Gasparovic.'

(12)   Klaus a Gašparovič sa stretnú v stredu.
        'On Wednesday, Klaus and Gasparovic are going to meet.'

Therefore, the division of roles is the speaker's competence to decide upon the **participation strategy**. As indicated, on one hand, he/she expresses the preference and, on the other hand, he/she gives to participant$_1$ some degree of control over participant$_2$ and participant$_2$ receives some degree of autonomy[15] over participant$_1$. Regarding the hierarchy of the proposition, he/she applies the principle of backgrounding, which means that one of the agents hierarchically moves into a less prominent syntactic position, and thus he/she is in background, as the given microsituation is performed from the aspect of the agent remaining in the position of the subject (Grepl & Karlík 1998: 149). The syntactic means of backgrounding the agent is a comitative construction in which the shifted aside agent is placed after the predicate. This is evident in the case of reflexive verbs, in which there is synchronic agent reciprocity of the agent in the nominative and the agent in the instrumental, where the speaker decides upon the position of the shifted aside participant:

(13)   a.   Otec sa zhovára so synom.
              'Father is talking to his son.'

(13)   b.   Syn sa zhovára s otcom.
              'Son is talking to his father.'

(14)   a.   Jerguš Lapin sa pobil s Maťom Kliešťom.
              'Jergus Lapin exchanged blows with Mato Kliest.'

(14)   b.   Maťo Kliešť sa pobil s Jergušom Lapinom.
              'Mato Kliest exchanged blows with Jergus Lapin.'

In addition to the verbs with the reflexive pronoun 'sa' (stretnúť sa, zhovárať sa, pobiť sa in Slovak), the concept of accompaniment is also expressed by some verbs with the pronoun 'si' (písať si, vykať si, nadávať si in Slovak) that indicate the agent-recipient reciprocity (Vaňko 2010: 306). Sentence structures present reciprocity in terms of the actual agent-reciprocal participation of both protagonists who are jointly involved in an activity initiated by the participant acting as an agent:

(15)   Galileo (*agens*) si písal so svojím rovesníkom Keplerom (*recipient*).
        'Galileo (*agent*) corresponded with his peer Kepler (*recipient*).'

---

[15] Autonomy and relatedness are two basic human needs and cultural constructs at the same time.

Let us move from the accompaniment strategy to defining the specifics of the comitative, coordinate-comitative and coordinative relation[16]. We have a situation where the participants – father and mother (father is the speaker's preferred participant$_1$ and mom is participant$_2$) – watched television. The situation can be expressed as follows:

(16)   Otec pozeral s mamou televíziu.   **comitative**
         'Father watched TV with mother.'

(17)   Otec s mamou pozerali televíziu.   **coordinate-comitative**
         'Father with mother watched TV.'

(18)   Otec a mama pozerali televíziu.   **coordinative**
         'Father and mother watched TV.'

In sentence (16) the **comitative** is employed. From the point of structure of the construction it has the form $N_{Nom} - VF_{sg} - with\ N_I$. The position N_{Nom} is represented by father, while mother has an accompanying position **with N_I**. Both participants in the sentence are in a distant position. The singular predicate refers to the concept of a shared activity. The sentence assumes the possibility of enforcing a relator using a prepositional expression 'together with' ('spolu s' in Slovak; *Morfológia slovenského jazyka* 1966: 672). The comitative also allows a transformation into the abessive (16c) and into comitative PP adjunct (16d). The singular form of the predicate is in agreement with the grammatical gender of participant$_1$. The comitative infers a higher level of control of participant$_1$ over participant$_2$, a lower level of autonomy of participant$_2$ and the identical spatial location of both protagonists:

(16)   a.   Otec pozeral [spolu s mamou] televíziu.
             'Father [together with mother] watched TV.'
        b.   Otec pozeral televíziu [spolu s mamou].
             'Father watched TV [together with mother].'
        c.   Otec pozeral televíziu bez mamy.
             'Father watched TV without mother.'
        d.   Otec pozeral televíziu s mamou.
             'Father watched TV with mother.'

The comitative pragmatism in sentence (16) reflects the focus of the speaker on the participant$_1$ (father) who performed an identical activity with participant$_2$ (watching television).

    In sentence (17) a **coordinate comitative** construction is employed[17]. Its structure formula is $N_{Nom} - with\ N_{Ins} - VF_{pl}$. From the comitative it differs in two aspects (i) the central NP (father/*otec*) and the peripheral NP (with mother/*s mamou*) are syntactically in the contact

---

[16] Among the papers devoted to syntactic and semantic characteristics of comitative constructions as opposed to NP coordination, see Schwartz 1988, Dalrymple et al. 1998, Maisak 2000, Arkhipov 2009.

[17] Cf. pseudosochinenije (Daniel 2000), kvazisochinenije (Arkhipov 2009), quasi-comitative coordination (Dyła 1988), sochinteľnyj komitativ (Arkhipov 2009), comitative coordination (Gruet-Škrabalová, 2017).

position, which is typical for the coordinative; (ii) the verb is in a plural form. The sentence does not presuppose transformation into the abessive. The coordinate comitative admits but does not pretend the meaning of accompaniment. A comitative idea of accompaniment admits an antepositional addition of the adverbial 'together' ('spolu' in Slovak) to the verb (17a). The coordinate comitative infers a lower level of control of participant$_1$ over participant$_2$, a lower level of autonomy of participant$_2$ and the identical spatial location of both protagonists:

(17)   Otec s mamou [spolu] pozerali televíziu.
        'Father with mother [together] watched TV.'

The pragmatics of coordinate comitative (17) reflects the focus of the speaker on the participants who simultaneously performed two identical activities (watching television). The plural form of the verb implies a collective interpretation.

In sentence (18) a **coordinative strategy** is employed following the formula N_{Nom} – **and** N_{Nom} – VF_{pl}. The coordinative strategy assumes the co-participation of two protagonists who are in an equal relationship. It employs the principle of an added participant and the principle of conjunction of activities, thus allowing a distributive interpretation: father and mother watched the television at the same time, but not necessarily together because everyone could be in another room. The coordinative strategy infers a lower degree of control of participant$_1$ over participant$_2$, a higher degree of participant$_2$ and the possibility of identical and also non-identical spatial location of both participants. It is based on symmetric relations between $X \leftrightarrow Y$. Participants are on the same level of empathic hierarchy (Lehmann & Shin 2005: 99); they both have the same control over the communication situation, so they can be presented as X and Y or Y and X. The initial position of X is determined by the speaker:

(18)   a.   Otec a mama [spolu] pozerali televíziu.
              'Father and mother [together] watched TV.'
        b.   Otec a mama pozerali televíziu [spolu].
              'Father and mother watched TV [together].'
        c.   Otec a mama pozerali televíziu [každý sám].
              'Father and mother watched TV [each alone].'

The pragmatics of coordination in the sentence (18) reflects the focus of the speaker on the participants who performed two identical activities (watching television). The plural form of the verb allows for both the collective and distributive interpretation. The speaker addresses this ambivalence by using appropriate adverbial means that, in addition to elimination of ambiguity, acquire a communication function of emphasis.[18]

It is worth mentioning that all three types of constructions allow the modification of a verb by adverbials with a fixed position before the verb. In addition to the adverbial of manner 'together' ('spolu' in Slovak), resulting from the inherent semantic relation of participation, the adherent adverbials of time and place are employed. They are involved in the discursive

---

[18] This topic requires a deeper analysis in another paper.

interpretation of facts. They develop the sentence through additional information. Demonstratives, spatial and temporal adverbs are interpreted from the perspective of the speaker.

The comitative prefers the adverbial complements of time (19–21):

(19)   Francúzky *teraz* budú bojovať so Slovenkami na antuke v hale v Limoges.
       'French are *now* going to play against Slovaks on a clay indoor court in Limoges.'

(20)   Karči *už tri dni* býval s Etelou, čo neušlo pozornosti dedinčanov.
       'It did not escape the villagers' notice that Karci and Etel have been living together *for the last three days*.'

(21)   Nemecký kancelár Gerhard Schröder *koncom minulého týždňa* telefonoval so svojím britským kolegom Tonym Blairom.
       'German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder *at the end of the last week* called his British peer Tony Blair.'

Even when the word order is changed, the adverbial complement of time is antepositioned, i.e., it is placed before the verb:

(22)   *Vo štvrtok večer* slávil Ježiš poslednú večeru so svojimi učeníkmi.
       '*On Thursday evening* Jesus celebrated the Last Supper with his apostles.'

The coordinate comitative allows the adverbial complement of time (23–24) and place (25) to be added to the construction:

(23)   Ivan s Petrom sa *znova* stretli zoči-voči 17. augusta. Polícia tomu hovorí konfrontácia.
       'On 17th August Ivan and Peter *once again* met face to face. The police called it confrontation.'

(24)   Mama s otcom *často* chodili na zábavy, veľmi rada tancovala.
       'Mom and dad would *often* go to dances; she loved to dance.'

(25)   My sa *tam* s vami radi znova stretneme.
       'We would like to meet you again *over there*.'

The coordinative prefers the adverbial complement of time (26–27):

(26)   Otec a matka sa *medzitým* venovali čítaniu novín.
       '*Meanwhile*, mother and father dedicated themselves to reading the newspaper.'

(27)   Hewlett a Albarn sa *vtedy* pohádali a budúcu spoluprácu vylúčili.
       'Hewlett and Albarn argued *back then* and ruled out any cooperation.'

In our analyses of comitative strategy employed in the Slavic languages, there appears a construction that in linguistics is known as the inclusory construction (Moravcsik 2003), plural pronoun construction/PPC (Schwartz 1988; Vassilieva & Larson 2005; Gruet-Škrabalová 2017), inclusive plural pronoun constructions (Feldman 2002), inclusory pronominal (Lichtenberk 2000), etc. It is a pronominal construction in which the pronoun 'we' appeared to mean just 'I', for example:

(28)   Rodičia počúvali rádio a **my s bratom** sme sa hrali Človeče.
         'Parents listened to the radio and my brother and I played Ludo.'
         (Lit. "Parents listened to the radio and we with my brother played Ludo.")

(29)   Vieš predsa, že **my s otcom** máme najradšej jednoduché jedlá.
         'You know that father and I prefer simpler meals.'
         (Lit. "You know that we with father prefer simpler meals.")

An inclusive interpretation means that in sentence (28) 'my/we' stands for 'ja a brat/brother and I', in sentence (29) 'my/we' represents 'ja a otec/father and I'. The construction belongs to the sphere of self-presentation of the speaker who acts as an incorporated participant$_1$. It employs a pragmatic stereotype of the relevance of the speaker's self-presentation. Since the construction '**we with Y**' ('my s Y' in Slovak) actually means '**I and Y**' ('ja a Y' in Slovak), it has characteristics of the **coordinate comitative**. Formally, the construction first signals that the number of participants is more than one, i.e., the speaker and participant$_2$ and then only participant$_2$ is lexically specified who seems to be counted twice – once in 'my/we' and the second time in the NP 's Y/with Y'. M. A. Daniel (2000) calls this phenomenon 'the absorption of a referent' (in Russian 'pogloshchenije referenta') when the referent of participant$_2$ is 'absorbed' by the plural referent of pronoun 'my/we'. The construction 'my s Y/we with Y' shows that the dual in Slovak has no expression in the form of a grammeme, but it has a mental anchor and a specific lexical-grammatical representation.

It has been stated above that the construction with an absorbed participant is of the coordinate comitative type (30a) with the syntactical function of a subject. Its alternate is a comitative interpretation (30b), in which the adverbial of accompanying circumstances ('ako Eva/as Eva') is comitatively linked to the negated/unspoken subject 'ja / I'. In Slovak the use of parataxis in (30c) is ungrammatical. A plural form of the implicit 'my/we' in sentence (30d) implies a higher number of participants, including the speaker and Eva:

(30)   a.   My s Evou chodíme do rovnakej školy.
                'Eva and I go to the same school.'
                (Lit. "We with Eva go to the same school.")
         b.   Chodím do rovnakej školy ako Eva.
                'I go to the same school as Eva.'
         c.   *Ja a Eva chodíme do rovnakej školy.
                'Eva and I go to the same school.'
                (Lit. "I and Eva go to the same school.")

d.　　　Chodíme do rovnakej školy ako Eva.
　　　　'We go to the same school as Eva.'

A proprial-subjective comitative can be modified by adverbial complements of time (31) and manner (32):

(31)　S Františkom sa *dlhšie* poznáme, hrávali sme spolu futbal.
　　　 'I have known Frantisek *long*; we used to play football together.'
(32)　S Luckou sa *dobre* poznáme.
　　　 'I know Lucka *very well*.'

Another possibility of interpreting the difference in the meaning of utterances with the coordinate comitative and coordinative strategy was offered by Dalrymple et al. (1998: 600). In the following sentences (33–34) she demonstrated the interpretation of meaning of propositions on the collective or distributive basis. While the coordinate comitative in sentence (33) assumes that the entire win was $100, the coordinative in sentence (34) infers also the possibility that everyone won $100. We assume that the interpretation with the coordinate comitative (33) is related to the idea of all winning together, while the interpretation with the coordinative construction (34) is linked with the idea of one joint win or the idea of distribution of the win (i.e. each participant won $100:

(33)　Petja s Vasej vyigrali $100.
　　　 'Petja with Vasja won $100.'

(34)　Petja i Vasja vyigrali $100.
　　　 'Petja and Vasja won $100.'

The self-presentation principle, in addition to the participant preference that is reflected in their linear sequence, also marks the actual arrangement of elements in the utterance. Since the comitative allows us to make a border between NPs of actual structuring, it creates either theme-rheme order of the components, i.e., companion-orientation (35) or rheme-theme order, i.e., accompanee-orientation (36)[19]:

(35)　Odvolaný arcibiskup Róbert Bezák sa zhováral *s pápežom Františkom*. O čom konkrétne hovorili ale známe nie je.
　　　 'The recalled archbishop Robert Bezak spoke *with the Pope Francis*. What they talked about is not known.'

(36)　*Larry King* sa rozprával so všetkými americkými prezidentmi počnúc Richardom Nixonom.
　　　 '*Larry King* interviewed all American presidents beginning with Richard Nixon.'

---

[19] See Stolz, Stroch and Urdze (2006) for discussion of languages which explicitly distinguish between 'companion-orientation' and 'accompanee-orientation'.

We would like to add that the use of comitative and coordinative strategy results from the typological characteristics of the language. As noted by L. Stassen (2000), many of the world's languages use the same marker for expressing comitative ('X with Y') and conjunctive ('X and Y') relations. In his typological study of noun phrase conjunction in 260 languages L. Stassen distinguishes two types of languages: AND-languages and WITH-languages. The former are the languages which use both comitative and coordinative strategies for noun phrase conjunction, whereas the latter adopt only comitative strategy. Contrasts between the two strategies L. Stassen (2000: 21) sees in the following:

Coordinative strategy:	**Comitative strategy**:
NPs have same structural rank.	NPs differ in structural rank.
Unique coordinate marker.	Unique comitative particle.
NPs form a constituent.	NPs do not form a constituent.
Plural/dual agreement on verbs.	Singular agreement on verbs.

According to this classification, Slovak, similarly to Russian (cf. Arkhipov 2009: 234), meets the AND-language criteria.

4. Conclusions

In the article we describe and explain comitative constructions in the Slovak language that are analyzed in terms of linguistic formation of the comitative as a semantic case. Their function is the presentation of the second, hierarchically lower-rated participant of the activity/situation. Therefore, comitative constructions are linguistic means of coding the semantic, syntactic and pragmatic position of the other participant. The types of comitative constructions are interpreted following these principles: (i) principle of a shared and unified activity, (ii) principle of the added, absorbed and assigned participant2, (iii) principle of the speaker's self-presentation. We draw from the knowledge that comitative constructions in semiotics are a linguistic expression of coding the relation 'who with who' as an expression of participation primarily in a shared activity and secondarily in a unified activity.

From the coherence of cognitive and linguistic (hypotactic and paratactic) relations between non-equivalent and equivalent participants of the microsituation, the following links between comitative and coordinative constructions emerged.

The comitative construction is a means of expressing an activity mutually performed by two protagonists (one event, as if one activity, two 'unequal' participants, while the second participant takes part in the activity performed by the main participant). However, there are only a few cases of unshared activity resulting from the semantics of antagonism encoded in a verb. The proposed content of the sentence does not change by changing the positions of the participants.

The coordinate-comitative construction expresses one event, with two identical mutually coordinated activities of two 'unequal' participants.

The coordinative construction is a means of expressing identical activities that are independently performed by two participants (one event, one unified activity that is a linguistic expression of two identical mutually coordinated activities carried out by two 'equal' participants).

Depending on the linguistic means that belong to a given language, the comitative constructions have features that are common to other languages and features that for the particular language are specific and unique. Slovak is a fusional language and its comitative constructions have the following characteristics:

(a) Participant$_2$ expressed by an appellative or propium has grammemes of case (prepositional instrumental), animacy (man) and number (singular/plural);

(b) Participant$_2$ expressed by a personal deictic has grammemes of case (prepositional instrumental), person (2nd/3rd person) and number (singular/plural);

(c) Participant$_1$ expressed by an appellative or propium has grammemes of case (nominative), animacy (man) and number (singular/plural);

(d) Participant$_1$ expressed by a personal deictic has grammemes of case (nominative), person (1st person) and number (plural);

(e) Participant$_1$ expressed by a personal deictic, syntactically it can be omitted (dropped) and its presence is signaled by the grammatical form of the verb;

(f) The verb in the function of predicate has grammemes of person (3rd person), number (singular) and anteposition (syntactically it is placed before participant$_2$);

(g) In case of (d), the verb has grammemes of person (1st person), number (plural) and postposition (syntactically it is placed after participant$_2$).

In Slovak, the idea of participation has a lot of representations at the lexical level: in the form of adverb 'together' ('spolu' in Slovak*)*, expression with the prefix 'co-' ('spolu-' in Slovak) denoting the participant$_2$, preposition 'with' ('s/so' in Slovak) and prepositional phrase 'together with' ('spolu s' in Slovak).

Numerous examples demonstrated that in Slovak a comitative construction with the preposition 'with' ('s' in Slovak) is primarily oriented on a personal participant. Even though the orientation on the object (instrument, tool) can be expressed by both the non-prepositional and prepositional instrument, the former is preferred.

The addition of a pragmatic aspect to our interpretation and explanation of comitative structures in Slovak has shown that the discursive behavior of the speaker is strongly motivated by personal preferences. Therefore, the comitative can also be seen as a means of hidden manipulation.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benacchio, Rosanna. 2010. *Вид и категория вежливости в славянском императиве. Сравнительный анализ*. München, Berlin: Kubon und Sagner.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. The imperative in English. In Halle, M., H. Lunt, H. McClean & C. van Schooneveld (eds.), *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*. vol. 1. 335–363. The Hague: Mouton.

Buzássyová, K. & Jarošová, A. (eds.). 2006. *Slovník súčasného slovenského jazyka. A – G.* [Dictionary of Contemporary Slovak Language. A – G.] Bratislava: Veda.

Dokulil, Miloš. 1948. Modifikace vidového protikladu v rámci imperativu v spisovné češtině a ruštině. [Modification of aspectual opposition within imperative in standard Czech and Russian.] In Grund, A. & A. Kellner ad. (eds.), *Pocta Fr. Trávníčkovi a F. Wollmanovi*. 71–88. Brno.

Dvonč, Ladislav. 2003. Tvorenie tvarov imperatívu v spisovnej slovenčine. [Formation of imperative forms in standard Slovak.] *Slovenská reč* 68(2). 65–77.

Fortuin, Egbert. 2010. Explicit second person subjects in Russian imperatives: semantics, word order, and a comparison with English. In: *Linguistics* 48(2). 431–486.

Grepl, Miroslav. 1979. Imperativní postoje a imperativ. [Imperative attitudes and imperative.] *SPFFBU A* 27. 165–174.

Grepl, Miroslav & Karlík, Petr. 1998. *Skladba češtiny*. [Syntax of the Czech language.] Olomouc: Votobia.

Ivanová, Martina. *Valencia statických slovies*. [Valency of static verbs.] Prešov: Filozofická fakulta Prešovskej univerzity.

Jarošová, Alexandra (ed.). 2015. *Slovník súčasného slovenského jazyka. M – N.* [Dictionary of Contemporary Slovak. M – N.] Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.

Jarošová, Alexandra & Buzássyová, Klára (eds.). 2011. *Slovník súčasného slovenského jazyka. H – L.* [Dictionary of contemporary Slovak. H – L.] Bratislava: Veda.

Jary, Mark & Kissine, Mikheal. 2014. *Imperatives.* CUP: Cambridge.

Jary, Mark & Kissine, Mikhael. 2016. *When terminology matters: the imperative as a comparative concept. Linguistics* 54. 119–148.

Karlík, Petr. 2017. IMPERATIV. [Imperative.] In Karlík, Petr. & Nekula, Marek & Pleskalová, Jana (eds.), *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. (https://www.czechency.org/ slovnik/IMPERATIV (Accessed: 2019-04-04)

Karlík, Petr & Nübler, Norbert. 1998. Negace a vid českého imperativu. [Negation and aspect of Czech imperative.] In Karlík, Petr & Krčmová, Marie (eds.), *Jazyk a kultura vyjadřování. Milanu Jelínkovi k pětasedmdesátinám*. 159–166. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Lamiroy, Béatrice & Swiggers, Pierre. 1991. Imperatives as discourse signals. In Fleischman, Susanne & Waugh, Linda R. (eds.), *Discourse-Pragmatics and the Verb: The Evidence from Romance.* 121–146. London/New York: Routledge.

Lehmann, Volkmar. 1989. Pragmatic functions of aspects and their cognitive motivation. Russian aspects in the context of the imperative and the infinitive. In Larsson, L. G. (ed.), *Proceedings of the second Scandinavian symposium on aspectology,* 77–88. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Pauliny, Eugen. 1947. Tvorenie imperatívu v spisovnej slovenčine. [Formation of imperative in standard Slovak.] *Slovo a tvar* 1. 103–105.

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R., 1979. *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sokolová, Miloslava. 1995. *Kapitolky zo slovenskej morfológie.* [Chapters from Slovak morphology.] Prešov: Slovacontact.

Sokolová, Miloslava & Bónová, Iveta. 2008. Tvorenie imperatívu v slovenčine a lexikografická prax. [Formation of imperative in Slovak and lexicographic practice.] *Slovenská reč* 73(5). 271–280.

Stefanowitsch, Aanatol & Gries, Stefan Th. 2003. Collostructions: on the interaction between verbs and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8. 209–243.

Swearingen, Andrew. 2017. Crossing the categorial divide: Imperative and interjection conversions in Romance. In Van Olmen, D. & S. Heinhold (eds.), *Imperatives and Directive Strategies,* 291–318. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Takahashi, Hidemitsu. 2012. *A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of the English Imperative. With Special Attention to Japanese Imperatives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Van Olmen, Daniël. 2019. *A three-fold approach to the imperative´s usage in English and Dutch. Journal of Pragmatics* 139. 146–162.

Van Olmen, Daniël & Heinold, Simone. 2017. Imperatives and directive strategies from a functional-typological perspective: an introduction. In Van Olmen, D. & S. Heinold (eds.), *Imperatives and Directive Strategies*. 1–49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

von Waldenfels, Ruprecht. 2012. Aspect in the imperative across Slavic – a corpus driven pilot study. In Grønn, A. & A. Pazelskaya (eds.), *The Russian Verb, Oslo Studies in Language* 4(1). 141–154.

Wiemer, Björn. 2008. Zur innerslavischen Variation bei der Aspektwahl und der Gewichtung ihrer Faktoren. In K. Gutschmidt, U. Jekutsch, S. Kempgen & L. Udolph (eds.), *Deutsche Beiträge zum 14. Internationalen Slavisten kongreß, Ohrid 2008 (Die Welt der Slaven. Sammelbände / Sborniki 30)*. München: Sagner. 383–409.

Zinken, Jörg. 2016. *Requesting responsibility: the morality of grammar in Polish and English family interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

r	relator
X	participant$_1$
Y	participant$_2$
N	noun
Ins	Instrumental
Nom	Nominative
NP	noun phrase
PP	with N$_{Ins}$
PPC	Plural Pronoun Construction
VF	verbum finitum
sg	singular
pl	plural

Jana Sokolová
Department of Russian Studies, Faculty of Arts
Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra
Štefánikova 67
949 01 Nitra
Slovakia
jsokolova@ukf.sk