HAL
open science

Comitative constructions in Czech

Hana Skrabalova

To cite this version:

Hana Skrabalova. Comitative constructions in Czech. Formal Description of Slavic Languages 4, 2001, Potsdam, Germany. pp.685-696. hal-00599032

HAL Id: hal-00599032

https://hal.science/hal-00599032

Submitted on 8 Jun 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

FDSL IV, XX-XX

Hana Skrabalova

Comitative constructions in Czech[1]

The aim of this paper is to give an account of comitative constructions in the Czech language. I will show that there are at least two syntactically distinct comitative structures in Czech: a comitative coordinate-like structure on the one hand, which contrasts with adjoined comitatives on the other hand. In particular, I will investigate how this comitative coordinate-like structure differs both from comitative VP-adjuncts and from comitative NP-adjuncts.

1. Basic data

The constructions I am dealing with are given in examples (1)-(4). These examples contain a comitative PP [with Mary] where the noun following the preposition 'with' is in the instrumental case, and they also contain a pronominal subject (a full pronoun or a *pro*) in the nominative case.[2]

1.1 Comitative VP-adjuncts

In example (1), the comitative PP follows the verb. Its position can however vary according to the speaker's pragmatic purposes. The auxiliary and past participle show regular agreement in number with the subject pronoun. I assume that in (1) the comitative PP [with Mary] is adjoined to the VP [went to the cinema], since 'we' in (1b) does not include Mary:

(1) a. Já jsem šel (s Marií) do kina (s Marií).
I aux-1SG gone-SG.M with Mary-Instr to cinema with Mary-Instr
'I went to the cinema with Mary.'

b. My jsme šli (s Marií) do kina (s Marií).
we aux-PL gone-PL.M with Mary-Instr to cinema with Mary-Instr
'We went to the cinema with Mary.'

---

1 This work fits into a larger piece of research on coordination in Czech, which is in progress. Some points not developed here for lack of space will be treated within my dissertation.

2 I will mostly deal with examples containing subject pronouns in order to compare exclusively pronominal comitatives (PPC) with other nominal or pronominal comitatives (VP-adjuncts and comitative coodination).

1.2 Comitative Coordination

Contrary to example (1), the comitative PP in (2) is adjacent to the subject pronoun and both precede the verb. The subject-verb agreement is plural whether the pronoun is plural or not. I claim that the construction in (2) differs radically from that in (1) in that the comitative phrase in (2) has to be considered not an adjunct, but a conjunct coordinated with the nominative NP it immediately follows. I refer to this structure as comitative coordination, as opposed to the ordinary 'and'-coordination.

(2) a. Já s Marií jsme šli do kina.
I with Mary-Instr aux-PL gone-PL.M to cinema
'Mary and I went to the cinema.'

b. My s Marií jsme šli do kina.
we with Mary-Instr aux-PL gone-PL.M to cinema
'Mary and we went to the cinema.'

1.3 Pronoun Construction and Verb-Coded Coordination

In (3), the comitative PP is adjacent to the plural pronoun 'we' (realized or not) and the sequence '(we) with Mary' may normally receive the reading 'Mary and I'.[3] This construction has been referred to as Plural Pronoun Construction (cf. SCHWARTZ 1988a,b): the subject pronoun of Plural Pronoun Construction is always a plural one (usually in the 1st or 2nd person). I assume[4] for the time being that the comitative PP in Plural Pronoun Construction is adjoined to the plural pronoun it follows, since 'we' includes Mary:

(3) a. My s Marií jsme šli do kina.
we with Mary-Instr aux-PL gone-PL.M to cinema
'Mary and I went to the cinema.'

b. S Marií jsme šli do kina.
with Mary-Instr aux-PL gone-PL.M to cinema = (3a)

Finally, in (4), the subject pronoun is dropped and the comitative PP follows the verb. This sentence can receive the same reading as those in (1) and (3). When the reading is 'Mary and I', the comitative PP has been analyzed (SCHWARTZ 1988b) as adjoined to the VP and the structure referred to as Verb-Coded Coordination. I claim, however, that Verb-Coded Coordination does not differ from Plural Pronoun Construction (cf. 3b), so that the comitative phrase in (4) has to be analyzed not as adjoined to VP, but as adjoined to an unrealized NP:

(4) Šli jsme s Marií do kina
gone-PL.M aux-PL with Mary-Instr to cinema
'Mary and I went to the cinema.'

---

3 There is another possible reading for (3): 'Mary and we'. However, very few native speakers accept this reading as natural.

4 Cf. SCHWARTZ (1988a), MCNALLY (1993).

2. *Some previous accounts of comitatives*

2.1 *Plural Pronoun Construction vs. Verb-Coded Coordination (SCHWARTZ 1988a,b)*

Plural Pronoun Construction has first been studied by Schwartz (1988a) and analyzed as a single-headed construction with the initial pronoun as its head, the comitative PP being adjoined to this head. Schwartz considers the Plural Pronoun Construction as an instance of asymmetric pronominal coordination, the plural form of the pronoun being supposed to be a function of thematic dual coordination. On the other hand, Schwartz posits a structural difference between Plural Pronoun Construction where the pronoun is overt and the comitative PP adjacent to it, and Verb-Coded Coordination where the comitative PP follows the verb and the subject pronoun is dropped. The difference between these constructions would be due to the fact that the pronominal information is placed within the verbal complex in case of Verb-Coded Coordination (since the pronoun is dropped), while it is placed within the coordinate-like NP in case of Plural Pronoun Construction. I will show, however, that both Plural Pronoun Construction and Verb-Coded Coordination can be accounted for as a unique structure (see section 8.2).

2.2 *Comitatives as adjoined structures (MCNALLY 1993, PROGOVAC 1997)*

McNally (1993) gives several examples where a comitative PP in Russian has rather coordinate-like properties and differs from VP-adjoined comitative PPs. In her analysis, comitative coordination is an asymmetric single-headed construction with the comitative PP adjoined to an NP-head, since the first NP always varies in case according to its syntactic position, whereas the second NP is invariably in the instrumental case, being governed by the preposition (cf. (2)). However, such an adjunction analysis fails to account for the fact that comitative coordination exhibits the coordinate properties of an ordinary 'and'-coordination (e.g., plural agreement, plural anaphors, etc.).

McNally also claims that a unified adjunction analysis should be given to both comitative coordination and Plural Pronoun Construction, since both involve a comitative PP-adjunct (cf. Schwartz's analysis of the PPC). This claim is supported by Progovac (1997) who proposes that every (nominal) coordination is multiple adjunction, each conjunct being adjoined to an abstract pronominal head which can be realized overtly with comitatives. Within this approach, Plural Pronoun Construction, 'and'-coordination as well as comitative coordination reflect the same underlying structure.

I will show, however, that comitative adjuncts and comitative conjuncts exhibit different syntactic and semantic properties, and, therefore, cannot receive a unified analysis. In the following sections, I will investigate in detail several pieces of evidence supporting my claims: constituency (section 3), agreement patterns (section 4), anaphoric relations (section 5), occurrences of *pro* (section 6) and semantic interpretation of comitatives (section 7).

3. Comitatives and constituency

3.1 Comitative coordination vs. comitative VP-adjuncts

It has been assumed that coordinate structures behave as a constituent and as such allow neither another element (an adverb, or a clitic) to intervene between two conjuncts, nor a conjunct to be extracted, focussed, or relativized. We can see that the comitative coordination is subject to the very same restrictions as 'and'-coordination. In effect, discontinous constituency turns out to be prohibited with comitative coordination as shows the example (5):

(5) a. clitic insertion:
*Já se tam se sestrou půjdeme podívat.
I Refl there with sister-Instr go-1PL.fut have-a-look

b. wh-extraction:
*[S kým]$_i$ Jan t$_i$ přišli?
with who-Instr John came-PL.M

c. relativization:
*Chlapec se kterým šli Anna do kina, se jmenuje Pavel.
boy with who-Instr gone-PL.M Anna to cinema Refl called Paul
'The boy with whom Anna had gone to the cinema is called Paul.'

d. focussing:
*Včera šli Anna *s Pavlem* do kina,
yesterday gone-PL.M Anna with Paul-Instr to cinema,
ne *s Petrem*.[5]
not with Peter- Instr

In contrast, when the comitative PP is a VP-adjunct, thus when the PP is not predicted to form a constituent with the NP, no kind of disconstituency is prohibited, as shown in (6):

(6) a. clitic insertion:
Já se tam se sestrou půjdu podívat.
I Refl there with sister-Instr go-1SG.fut have-a-look
'I will have a look there with my sister.'

b. wh-extraction:
[S kým]$_i$ jsi přišel t$_i$ / jste přišli t$_i$?
with who-Instr aux-2SG come-SG.M / aux-2PL come-PL.M ?
'With whom did you (sg/pl) come ?'

---

5 On the contrary, the whole sequence [Anna s Pavlem] can be focussed :
(i) Včera šli do kina *Anna s Pavlem*, ne *Marie s Petrem*
yesterday gone-PL.M to cinema Anna with Paul-Instr, not Mary with Peter-Instr

c. relativization:
Chlapec, se kterým šla Anna / šli kluci do kina,
boy with who-Instr gone-SG.F Anna / gone-PL.M boys to cinema
se jmenuje Pavel.
Refl called Paul
'The boy with whom Anna / the boys had gone to the cinema is called Paul.'

d. focussing:
Včera jsem šel / jsme šli do kina
yesterday aux-2SG gone-SG.M / aux-2PL gone-PL.M to cinema
s Pavlem, ne *s Petrem*.
with Paul, not with Peter
'Yesterday I / we went to the cinema with Paul, not with Peter.'

3.2 Constituency of Plural Pronoun Construction

According to Ladusaw's (1988) semantic analysis, the comitative PP in Plural Pronoun Constructions behaves as a modifier of the plural pronoun and as such imposes additional reference on it, but does not itself introduce any additional referent. In effect, when exactly two people are involved in the Plural Pronoun Construction in (7), one of them is the referent of the comitative PP:

(7) Včera jsme byli s Petrem v kině.
yesterday aux-1PL been-PL with Peter-Instr in cinema
'Yesterday, Peter and I went to the cinema.'

However, even if the referent of the PP is understood as included in the denotation of the plural pronoun (as in (7)), the comitative PP can be relativized, as shown in (8c). A clitic insertion is also possible between the plural pronoun and the comitative PP (cf. (8a)), whereas the same insertion was impossible with comitative coordination (cf. (5a)). On the other hand, the comitative PP in Plural Pronoun Construction can be neither extracted nor focussed (cf. (8c) and (8d)). In this way, the complex NP in Plural Pronoun Construction behaves as an island.

(8) a. clitic insertion:
My se tam se sestrou půjdeme podívat.
we Refl there with sister- Instr go-1PL.fut have-a-look
'My sister and I will have a look there.'

b. wh-extraction:
*[S kým]$_i$ jste t_i včera byli (i.e., Pavel$_j$ a ty)
with who-Instr aux-2PL yesterday been-PL.M (i.e., Paul$_j$ and you)
v kine? S Pavlem$_j$.
in cinema? with Paul$_j$.
'*With whom did Paul$_j$ and you go to the cinema yesterday?
With Paul$_j$.'

c. relativization:
Pavel, se kterým jsme ještě včera byli v kině, je
Paul, with whom aux-1PL yet yesterday been-PL.M in cinema, aux-3SG
dnes nemocný.
today sick
'Paul with whom I was yet in the cinema yesterday, is sick today.'

d. focussing:
*Včera jsme šli (i.e., já a Pavel) do kina
yesterday aux-1PL gone-PL.M (i.e., I and Paul) to cinema
s Pavlem, ne *s Petrem*.
with Paul, not with Peter

4. *Agreement patterns*

As we have seen in 3.1, comitative coordination behaves as a single NP constituent. This is also supported by agreement facts. In a 'and'-coordinate structure (9a), two singular conjuncts in subject position demand plural agreement on the verb.[6] We see then in (9b) that comitative coordination triggers the same kind of agreement as 'and'-coordination: both NPs are singular, but the agreement is plural in spite of the instrumental case on the second conjunct:

(9) a. Bratr a sestra šli navštívit svou babičku.
brother and sister (aux-ø) gone-PL.M to see their grandmother

b. Bratr se sestrou šli navštívit svou babičku.
brother with sister-Instr (aux-ø) gone-PL.M to see their grandmother

On the other hand, as expected, a comitative adjunt does not contribute to the agreement, since it does not form a constituent with the subject. Thus, singular agreement only is possible in (10), since the nominative NP subject *Jan* is singular :

(10) Jan šel navštívit babičku se svou sestrou.
John gone-SG.M to see grandmother with his sister- Instr

Finally, the Plural Pronoun Construction will always trigger plural agreement, since it always denotes a plural subject:

(11) [(My) se sestrou] jsme šli navštívit babičku.
(we) with sister aux-1PL gone-PL.M to see grandmother
'My sister and I went see our grand'mother.'

5. *Plural anaphors with comitatives*

We have seen in (9b) that the nominative NP and the comitative PP adjacent to this NP (i.e., comitative coordination) trigger plural agreement on the verb, as coordination

---

6 I do not consider here post-verbal subjects where partial, singular agreement appears quite normally.

normally does. We may, however, ask what happens when the comitative PP is still adjacent to the nominative subject NP, but the agreement is singular as in (12):

(12) Jan se sestrou šel navštívit babičku.
John with sister-Instr (aux-ø) gone-SG.M to see grandmother

I would not think that (12) can be analyzed as an instance of comitative coordination, because partial (i.e., singular) agreement never appears with a coordinate preverbal subject referring to two distinct entities. Rather, the PP here is a VP-adjunct which has moved to adjoin to the left of VP, for instance for some pragmatic reason (see section 8.1). If it is so, the fact that the PP does not contribute to agreement is not surprising. So the difference between (9b) which shows plural agreement and (12) which shows singular agreement is that the NP and the PP form a unique constituent in (9b), but not in (12). This constituency effect is also supported by anaphoric relations we can observe in (13). In (13a), a singular anaphoric pronoun 'him' takes the singular nominative NP 'John' for its antecedent. The NP and the PP here do not form a constituent. The plural anaphoric pronoun 'them' is acceptable, but less natural, precisely because it must take both the subject NP and the comitative PP for its antecedent (split antecedent):

(13a) Jan šel navštívit babičku se svou sestrou.
John gone-SG.M to see grandmother with his sister
Když se Jan se sestrou vrátil, rodiče se ho / ?jich ptali,
when Refl John with sister returned-SG.M, parents Refl him / ?them asked
jak se jí daří.
how Refl she-Dat is

On the contrary, the plural pronoun 'them' taking the whole sequence 'John with sister' for its antecedent is the only possible one in (13b). Since the NP and the PP form here a single constituent, no singular antecedent is available and the singular anaphoric pronoun 'him' is unsurprisingly ruled out:

(13) b. Jan šel navštívit babičku se svou sestrou.
John gone-SG.M to see grandmother with his sister
Když se Jan se sestrou vrátili, rodiče se *ho / jich
when Refl John with sister returned-PL.M, parents Refl *him / them
ptali, jak se jí daří.
asked how Refl she-Dat is

So, in spite of their (linear) adjacency to the NP 'John', the comitative PP in (13a) must be an adjunct, but it must be a conjunct in (13b).

6. *Types of (pro)nominals in comitative constructions*

Both nouns and pronouns, singular and plural, can appear in comitative coordination, exactly as in 'and'-coordination.[7]

[7] On this point, Czech differs from Russian which disallows singular pronouns in comitative coordination.

(14) Já s Pavlem budeme nosit dřevo, a ty s ní
I with Paul-Instr will-1PL.fut bring wood, and you with her-Instr
budete dělat oheň.
will-2PL.fut make fire

However, only overt NPs can occur in 'and'-coordinate structures:

(15) Petr a já / *pro odjíždíme příští týden.
Peter and I / *pro leave-1PL next week

So, the *pro* is not licensed (by the conjunction 'and' or for other reason) in a coordinate structure. On the other hand, *pro* can normally occur with comitatives. In (16), where the comitative PP is a VP-adjunct, the covert subject will be singular or plural according to the number agreement on the verb. In case of Plural Pronoun Constructions (cf. (17)), the only possible plural agreement on the verb allows to recover a plural subject:

(16) VP-adjunct:
Odjíždím / Odjíždíme s Petrem příští týden.
pro-1SG leave-1SG / pro-1PL leave-1PL with Peter next week
'I am leaving / We are leaving with Peter next week.'

(17) Plural Pronoun Construction:
S Petrem odjíždíme příští týden.
[pro-1 with Peter]-PL leave-1PL next week
'Peter and I are leaving next week.'

If we admit that the pronoun within the complex NP in (17) may drop, it is difficult to posit a structural difference between Plural Pronoun Construction and so-called Verb-Coded Coordination: rather, it should be possible to consider Verb-Coded Coordination (cf. (18)) as an instance of Plural Pronoun Construction with a covert pronoun:

(18) Odjíždíme s Petrem příští týden.
leave-1PL [pro-1 with Peter]-PL next week = (17)

As for the comitative coordination, the issue here is whether it does not license *pro* in virtue of being a coordinate structure, or whether it licenses *pro* in virtue to be a comitative structure. If we assume that the comitative coordination can keep its plural value even if its first conjunct NP is covert, comitative coordination and Plural Pronoun Construction would appear as rather similar structures:[8]

(19) S Petrem odjíždíme příští týden.
[pro-1SG with Peter]-PL leave-1PL next week

[8] I do not pursue this issue here, as it would be rather complex matter, but am going to investigate it within my dissertation.

7. *Semantic interpretation of comitative PPs*

On the semantic point of view, the Russian data in McNally (1993) and Dalrymple (1998) suggest that comitative coordination exclusively concerns human NPs. However, at least in Czech, the restriction on comitative coordination seems to concern the semantic homogeneity of the coordinated NPs, rather than a specific semantic feature. The same can be observed with comitative VP-adjuncts. So, the comitative PP 'with Peter' in (20a) cannot be considered as coordinated with the object NP 'book', because it can be semantically associated only with the subject NP 'John'. On the other hand, the comitative PP 'with flowers' in (20b) has to be considered as a conjunct, for it can be semantically associated only with the object NP 'book':

(20) a. Jan daroval Marii knihu s Petrem.
John gave Mary-Dat [book-Acc] [with Peter-Instr]
adjunct reading : 'John and Peter gave Mary a book.'
conjunct reading : # 'John gave Mary [a book and Peter].'

b. Jan daroval Marii knihu s květinami.
John gave Mary-Dat [book-Acc with flowers-Instr]
conjunct reading : 'John gave Mary a book and flowers.'
adjunct reading : # 'John and flowers gave Mary a book.'

In contrast with (20a) and (20b), both readings are available for the sentence in (21), since all NPs involved are semantically homogenous ([+human]). Thus, the comitative PP 'with Peter' can be read as either coordinated with the object NP 'Mary', or adjoined to the VP and associated with the subject NP 'John':

(21) Jan viděl Marii s Petrem.
John saw Mary-Acc with Peter-Instr
conjunct-reading : 'John saw [Mary and Peter].'
adjunct-reading : 'John saw Mary (when he was) with Peter.'

8. *Structures for comitatives*

Given the syntactic behaviour of comitatives as described in the previous sections, I will propose now the following syntactic structures (for the adjuncts in 8.1 and 8.2 and for the conjuncts in 8.3):[9]

8.1 *Comitative VP-adjuncts*

(22) shows a comitative PP adjoined to the VP, but semantically associated with the subject NP. The subject NP can be either overt, as in (22a), or covert, as in (22b):

(22) a. [IP já [I' jsem [VP [VP [V' šel do kina] [PP s Mariií]]]]]
b. [CP šel$_i$ [IP pro [I' jsem [VP [VP [V' t$_i$ do kina] [PP s Mariií]]]]]
c. [IP já [I' [PP s Mariií]$_j$ [I' jsem [VP [V' šel do kina] t$_j$]]]]

9 I use GB conventions, leaving out irrelevant projections.

In case the comitative PP is adjacent to the subject NP, my hypothesis is that the PP adjoins to some projection to the left of the VP. In effect, the position of a comitative VP-adjunct within a VP reflects the rhematic or a contrastive value of this PP (i.e., the PP either contains new information or contrasts with another possible PP). The adjunction of the comitative PP to the left reflects, on the contrary, its giveness.[10]

8.2 Comitative NP-adjuncts

(23) shows a comitative PP adjoined to the subject NP in case of Plural Pronoun Construction. The pronoun can be either overt or covert:

(23) a. [IP [NP my [PP s Mariií]]$_j$ [I' jsme [VP t$_j$ [V' sli do kina]]]]
b. [IP [NP pro [PP s Mariií]]$_j$ [I' jsme [VP t$_j$ [V šli do kina]]]]
c. [CP šli$_i$ [IP [I' jsme [VP [NP pro [PP s Mariií]] [V' t$_i$ do kina]]]]

In (23a) and (23b) the complex NP subject is in the standard subject position in Spec-IP. I assume that the complex NP 'my s Marii' in (23a) moves into the Spec-IP position in order to provide the subject pronoun with nominative case (or check it). In (23b), the complex NP also moves into the subject position, but I suggest that this movement is not obligatory, but rather optional, for the *pro* does not need to bear nominative case: I assume that the Case Filter is a PF constraint, rather than a visible condition for theta-role assignment. If it is so, the Plural Pronoun Construction with a *pro* may remain in its original position in Spec-VP as shown in (23c). Thus, in my proposal, the so-called Verb-Coded Coordination is just an instance of Plural Pronoun Construction which does not move to subject position when the pronoun is covert. If it is correct, I predict that a Plural Pronoun Construction with an overt pronoun cannot occur in postverbal position. And, we see in (24) that this is indeed ruled out:

(24) *Šli jsme my s Mariií do kina.
gone-PL.M aux-1PL we with Mary-Instr to cinema

8.3 Comitative conjuncts

Finally, (25) shows Conjunction Phrase structure with the conjunction as a functional head for comitative coordination.[11] I suggest here that the morpheme 'with' within comitative coordination functions as a conjunction (and thus as a head of ConjP), rather than a preposition. The conjunction 'with' would differ from the conjunction 'and' in that it still bears some lexical and semantic properties of the preposition, i.e., the property of assigning (or checking) instrumental case and the comitative interpretation. As such, it could be considered a (semi)lexical variant of a functional conjunction-head (cf. (25a)). An other possibility would be to analyze comitative coordination as a ConjP involving a zero-conjunction and a comitative PP as its complement (cf. (25b)).

---

10 In such cases, some intonational effects (e.g., pauses) may appear.

11 Following KAYNE (1994) and JOHANNESSEN (1998), I assume ConjP to be the structure for coordination.

(25) a. [IP [ConjP Ja [Conj' s Marii]] [I' jsme [VP sli do kina]]]
b. [IP [ConjP já [Conj' e [PP s Marií]]] [I' jsme [VP šli do kina]]]

The advantage of (25b) is to maintain the Conjunction Phrase analysis without positing two different morphemes 'with'. Unfortunately, neither analysis does not account for the fact that 'with' (conjunction or preposition) does not take a comitative coordination as its complement. In effect, the comitative coordination may not iterate:

(26) *Já s Marií s Petrem jsme šli do kina.
I with Mary-Instr with Peter-Instr aux-1PL gone-PL to cinema

I will suggest that a solution may come from specific properties of the conjunction/ preposition 'with' (following from its particular functional/lexical status). This point will however require further research on the specific syntactic and semantic properties of comitative coordination in comparison with 'and'-coordination.[12]

9. *Conclusion*

In this paper, I have argued for a structural difference between comitative conjuncts and comitative adjuncts. I have shown that comitative constructions differ with respect to constituency, agreement, anaphora, occurrences of (pro)nominals, and semantic interpretation. This has allowed me to propose the following structures for comitatives: adjunction within the VP domain for comitative VP-adjuncts, adjunction within the NP domain for Plural Pronoun Construction, and the Conjunction Phrase for Comitative Coordination.

However, I am aware of the fact that, first, comitative coordination requires more study in order to account for its properties in comparison with 'and'-coordination. Second, there should be a deeper study of adjunct properties in order to account for the semantics of VP-adjuncts. Finally, there need to be further pieces of evidence to decide about the relatedness of Plural Pronoun Construction and Comitative Coordination.

References

DALRYMPLE, MARY, IRENE HAYRAPETIAN & TRACY HOLLOWAY KING (1998) The semantics of the Russian Comitative construction. In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16.3:597-631.

JOHANNESSEN, JANNE BONDI (1998) *Coordination*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

KAYNE, RICHARD S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge University, MIT Press.

LADUSAW, WILLIAM (1988) Group reference and the Plural Pronoun Construction. In *Papers on the Plural Pronoun onstruction and Comitative Coordination*, UCSC Syntax Research Center Report SRC-89-02, 1-7.

MCNALLY, LOUISE (1993) Comitative coordination: a case study in group formation. In: *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11:347-379.

12 Cf. note 1.

PROGOVAC, LJILJANA (1997) Slavic and the Structure for Coordination. In: LINDSETH, MARTINA & STEVEN FRANKS (eds.) *Proceedings of 1996 Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, 207-224. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

SCHWARTZ, LINDA (1988a) Asymmetric feature distribution in pronominal coordinations. In: BARLOW, MICHAEL & CHARLES A. FERGUSON (eds.) *Agreement in Natural Language*, 237 –349. CSLI, Stanford University.

SCHWARTZ, LINDA (1988b) Conditions for Verb-Coded Coordination. In: HAMMOND, MICHAEL T. (ed.) *Syntactic Studies in Typology*, 53-73.

Hana Skrabalova
University of Paris 3 & LACITO, CNRS
ILPGA, 19 rue des Bernardins
75005 Paris
hanaskrabal@yahoo.fr