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Preface and acknowledgements

This book is the outcome of more than a decade (1993–2006) of at times exceedingly hard work. In the beginning, the idea was to finish off our topic quickly in a joint article. However, relatively soon it became clear to us that Comitatives and related categories are a subject matter which cannot be dealt with satisfactorily within the limits imposed by the general principles of journal articles. Moreover, the whole issue proved to be so intricately interesting from the linguistic point of view that we decided to devote a book-length typological study to it. We set out to collect the necessary empirical data in 1996 when we received the first of altogether three consecutive grants by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) within the Förderungsschwerpunkt Sprachtypologie (1996–2002). This generous long-term financial support enabled us to develop our own line of reasoning in a predominantly inductive manner, i.e. starting from a relative small set of theoretical axioms and a huge amount of concrete language data drawn from a wide variety of languages. At the same time, suggestions put forward by external reviewers of our project proposals impelled us more than once to change track slightly – and thus from 1998 onwards, the project became a decidedly European affair as we were encouraged to give prominence to a much smaller number of sample languages (which originally counted about 320 languages from all over the world). With a view to doing areal linguistics properly, we also applied the most basic principles of corpus linguistics by way of comparing languages on the basis of one and the same sample text, namely the original and the translations of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry’s Le Petit Prince. Clearly, this involved extensive non-linguistic handy work by all members of the project team as a parallel corpus had to be created in a computer-compatible way. In the course of this preparatory work, we also learned to appreciate the advantages of text-based language comparison. Therefore, much of the data presented throughout this book stem from direct analyses of original texts. This additional task notwithstanding, we have published two dozens of articles and other work (dutifully mentioned in the references) related to the topic of this monograph. This was our principle strategy to reduce the size of the then book-to-be because potential side lines and potentially difficult-to-integrate chapters could be relegated to separate publications. The material we collected and the hypotheses we developed are so rich that at the time of
our writing this preface, we are seriously considering to present the (voluminous) statistical side of our research results as a book of its own. Likewise, the occupation with the negative counterpart of the Comitative, the Abessive, has come to the fore again only recently after a long period of negligence and chances are that this topic will keep us busy for some time. Thus, for some of the issues on which we do not dwell in this book follow-up studies are already in preparation. In a way, we are looking forward to the day when we are no longer haunted by the ghosts of Comitatives, Instrumentals and Abessives no matter how close friends we and they have become over the years.

In the process of data collection, we went hunting for translations of Le Petit Prince all over Europe. Some of the translations turned out to be rare items and many were already out of print. With a view to working with a sizeable parallel corpus, we had to spend literally hundreds of Euros from our private purse to acquire these books. The German embassies in a variety of countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Croatia, Moldavia, Slovakia, South Africa) and the Alliance Française in Malta, the Fryske Akademie in Ljouerts, and other culture-political institutions kindly assisted us in our search for the translations. Unfortunately, the book-hunt took some time and the translations were not simultaneously available. We thus, had to work on the individual texts separately which meant that some analyses could be applied to a particular translation only two years after the first of the series had already been subjected to the same procedure. After funding ceased in 2002, we decided to cut our further research short at that point and turn our findings into a book. Exactly when we were hard pressed to finish our work in order to apply for funding of a new project on a completely different topic, ten of eleven chapters of the manuscript disappeared from our hard disc overnight. This was the most depressing moment of the entire project especially because for a couple of days we were not sure whether backups had been made of the most recent versions. Luckily, some not so recent files could be found within a reasonable span of time and we successfully reconstructed part of the lost paragraphs. October 2003 will always be remembered as the time of maximal frustration – whereas December 2003 marks the culmination point of the project as we eventually added the last full stop to our draft version on which this book is based.

For a long time, we considered our book to be without competitor. However, after the completion of the manuscript version early in 2004, we became aware of the fact that we were mistaken as Christian Lehmann and his project team produced a manuscript dealing with a similar topic. Since
we had access to the monographic article by Lehmann, Shin, and Verhoeven (2005) only during the period in which our own book was under review for EALT, we did not want to postpone the date of publication of Comitatives and related categories any further by discussing the findings of our colleagues from Erfurt in detail. Owing to the fact that we could not find any major issue of dissent in the two approaches, we decided to make do with a general reference to the Erfurt paper as the most recent typological contribution to the study of Comitatives without going into the details. We reserve the discussion of Lehmann, Shin, and Verhoeven (2005) for one of our planned follow-up studies. Likewise, we like to mention the unpublished Habilitationsschrift by Annette Endruschat on Komitatlichkeit und Verben: durch ‘mit’ eingeleitete präpositionale Objekte in den romanischen Sprachen (forthcoming which was brought to our knowledge only when we were already giving the final touches to our monograph. As Endruschat draws extensively on various publications of ours in order to develop a theoretical framework for her analyses, it can be taken for granted that the approach resembles the one applied in this book. Thus, we have opted for mentioning Endruschat’s work only in passing – again as a recent contribution to Comitative research. Hopefully, no other pertinent major publication has escaped our notice. Note that the publications listed in the references do not exhaust the bibliography on linguistic work related to Comitatives.

This book has benefited from the help offered to us by a countless number of people. First of all, we are grateful to the other (partly also former short-term) members of our project team at the University of Bremen: Suphi Abdülhayoğlu, Sahin Asik, Cafer Balci, Aline Barthélemy, Maria Fontdevila, Thomas Gebel, Sabine Gorsemann, Kemal Güler, Traude Gugeler, Werner Hackbart, Kai Herkströter, Sonja Kettler, Tamar Khi­zanishvili, Nataliya Levkovych, Tobias Mahlow, Susanne Müller, Ute Roter­mund, Anna Sabater, Nino Sakwarelidse, Daniela Schuto, and Oxana Schwarz. We are also indebted to the many colleagues world-wide who readily gave us access to their publications, helped us find the translations of our sample text and/or filled in the questionnaire we used in the initial phase of the project: Nina Afanasjeva, Jarmo Alatalo, Saulius Ambrazas, Evi Annamalai, Thomas Balke, Laimute Balode, Dror Ben­Arie, Mayrene Bentley, Winfried Boeder, Norbert Boretzky, Sonja Bosch, Jürgen Brosch­art, Gisela Bruche-Schulz, Pierre Cadiot, Éva Ágnes Csató, Oliver Cromm, Mary Dalrymple, Aleksandra Derganc, Mark Donohue, Werner Drossard, Stefan Dyla, Annette Endruschat, Marcel Erdal, Mati Erelt,
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## List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHORT</td>
<td>adhortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>alienable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>anterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOC</td>
<td>associative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>augmentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRC</td>
<td>circumstative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBI</td>
<td>combinative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>completive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDIT</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>connective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTR</td>
<td>contrastive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORR</td>
<td>correlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEB</td>
<td>debitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>direct object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUMMY</td>
<td>dummy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>durative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYN</td>
<td>dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphaser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXI</td>
<td>existential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EZAFE</td>
<td>Ezafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>illative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMED</td>
<td>immediative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERF</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPS</td>
<td>impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INAL</td>
<td>inalienable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCEP</td>
<td>inceptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOMPL</td>
<td>incomplementive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIC</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INESS</td>
<td>inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENS</td>
<td>intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERR</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRANS</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>itive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIG</td>
<td>ligature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>mediative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Modus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>nomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARR</td>
<td>narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONPAST</td>
<td>non past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTR</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORN</td>
<td>ornative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRET</td>
<td>preterit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREV</td>
<td>preverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>proprietive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCPL</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>relator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECIP</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJUNC</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBORD</td>
<td>subordinated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPER</td>
<td>superlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPESS</td>
<td>superessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/A</td>
<td>tense/aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER</td>
<td>undergoer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQ</td>
<td>unified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTR</td>
<td>utrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEN</td>
<td>ventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN</td>
<td>verb noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>first person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part A
The long and winding road leading from intuition via problems to comitatives

1. Introduction

All languages of the world provide ways and means to express relations of instrumentality and accompaniment – no matter whether this is achieved by employing highly grammaticalised and formally condensed expressions or apparent circumlocutions of sorts. In German, for instance, the preposition *mit* ‘with’ is used to encode both relations. Consider example (A1).

(A1) German (Moor 1994: 75)

\[
\]

‘Carrying the boy on one arm and the shopping bag on the other, she kicked the door of the car shut with unnecessary violence.’

This sentence contains three occurrences of PPs headed by the preposition *mit* ‘with’. The relations encoded by this preposition, however, are semantically not identical. The PP *mit dem Jungen* (...*und der Einkaufstüte*) ‘*with the boy* (...*and the shopping bag*)’ can be classified as an instance of Accompaniment, the PP *mit unnötiger Heftigkeit* ‘*with unnecessary violence*’ is an example of Modal and the third PP, *mit dem Fuß* ‘*with the foot*’ instantiates Instrumental. Simplifying, we can characterise the relations involved as follows:
Introduction

- Accompaniment: Two participants of the same predicate fulfil the same role.
- Instrumental: One participant serves as the tool with which another participant carries out an action.
- Modal: an adverbial modification of a predicate.

For linguists and especially for typologists and universals researchers, it is interesting to know whether such relations are associated with each other in other languages beyond the individual language (in this case, German) – and, if they are, whether this is a universal pattern or an option which only certain languages take. Our book is devoted to providing an answer to these questions. Beginning with Chapter 2 (and a modified repetition of example [A1]), we will discuss this and other similar, and less similar, cases in considerable detail. Our conventions for the presentation of examples and other important technical and terminological points are explained in Chapters 2–7. More elaborate definitions of the categories involved are given in Chapter 4. Before we look more closely at the data, we give insights into the theoretical convictions to which we adhere.

General-comparative linguistics investigates the full range of structural diversity and unity of human languages in order to pave the ground for a comprehensive account of the phenomenology of what is possible in language and what is not. To this end, large amounts of data have to be viewed from a crosslinguistic or a typological perspective. General-comparative linguistics is the necessary prerequisite for general-comparative grammar (Lehmann 1984, 1989a), as it provides the empirical component for the latter. Our idea of general-comparative linguistics owes a lot to the concept of Empirische Universalienforschung (Bossong 1985). To our mind, general-comparative linguistics is Empirische Universalienforschung and Empirische Typologie at the same time, pace Seiler (2000: 28; 2004: 3–4). In addition, we are also indebted to many of the ideas put forward by Sasse (1988) as to the problems one inadvertently creates by applying supposedly universal categories to individual languages which themselves have not formed part of the sample of languages whose structures served as the basis for generalisations. The idea of studying Comitatives on a broader scale came to our minds when we read Seiler’s seminal papers on the topic of concomitance (Seiler 1974a–c). Further inspiration has come from the research conducted by the Cologne UNITYP-crew on the dimension of participation (Seiler 1988; Seiler and Premper 1991). The most important reference for much of our argumentation (especially in Section 1.3) is the
pertinent publications of the UNITYP-offspring situated in Erfurt (Lehmann, Shin, and Verhoeven 2000; Lehmann and Shin 2005).

However, Comitatives represent entire distribution profiles of Comitatives, i.e., they comprise

- participant relations
- inter-participant relations
- intra-participant relations

and various other relations as well, and thus cannot be equated with the classic thematic role of COMITATIVE (Lehmann, Shin, and Verhoeven 2000) nor with CONCOMITANCE (Seiler 1974a–c, Lehmann and Shin 2005).³ To our mind, Comitatives are closely associated with these areas but also transcend them as the discussion in the subsequent chapters will amply demonstrate. Comitatives are neither cases (= comitatives or Comitatives ) nor thematic roles (= COMITATIVES) in the usual sense. Rather, they are (semantic/conceptual) networks whose foundations may ultimately be similar to the networks postulated in psycholinguistically-minded connectionism (Berg 2001: 59). Owing to the fact that this study itself is not concerned with psycholinguistic matters but with typological issues, the answer to the question what status the networks actually have must be set aside for follow-up studies dedicated to theory. There is a certain dialectics behind our reasoning: One has to discuss comitatives, Comitatives and COMITATIVES as well as instrumentals, Instrumentals and INSTRUMENTALS in order to come to grips with Comitatives. This is what determines much of our argumentation throughout this book.

Our approach has clear functionalist leanings (Croft 1995) and is overwhelmingly empirical-inductive. It does not necessarily presuppose any particular formal model of grammar and/or language (cf. Chapter 5 below) although we consider the framework(s) of grammaticalisation theory (Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer 1991; Lehmann 1995) the most fertile for our endeavour. A full-blown theory of language may be developed only later on after our knowledge of the observable and derivable facts has increased substantially. Thus, one of the major goals of general-comparative linguistic research consists in the presentation of new or hitherto neglected data (be they connected to often discussed problems or evidence of something formerly unknown). General-comparative linguistics cannot fulfil its tasks by simply reiterating and re-evaluating isolated examples which have been handed down to us over many generations of mostly theoretically-minded linguists. It is our contention that there is first and foremost an ur-
gent need for an inventory of linguistic phenomena although we do not
deny that even the most data-oriented approach always – as a general
epiphenomenon of any scientific activity – starts from perhaps only implicit
theoretical premises. Likewise, we do not cast doubt on the general value of
proper theoretical-linguistic approaches. Rather, we take it for granted that
theoretical deduction and empirical induction complement each other and
that a faithful picture of what human language really looks like can only be
achieved by a combination of both sides – and thus there will be ample
opportunity for the integration of more theory-oriented ideas after the com-
pletion of this study in follow-up investigations. For the time being, we
adopt a deliberately eclectic approach by drawing on various theories,
models, analyses and hypotheses with diverse backgrounds.

This book-length study of Comitatives and related categories is a con-
tribution to empirical general-comparative linguistics. However, it is by no
means restricted to a simple list of what we have found in our sample lan-
guages. As a documentation of our empirical findings, it contains at the
same time a thorough evaluation in terms of linguistic typology and univer-
sals research. Owing to the fact that we are doing typology, this study aims
at classifying languages according to the ways they organise Comitatives
and related categories, and owing to the fact that we are doing universals
research, this study tries to capture the invariant traits which define Comi-
tatives independent of the idiosyncrasies of individual languages. Step by
step, the importance of the subject at hand for general (and not only gen-
eral-comparative) linguistics will become clearer in the remainder of Part
A, where we introduce the basic notions, concepts and conventions in due
course. In Chapter 2, we approach the topic of our investigation from a
short presentation of some pertinent examples which circumscribe the gen-
eral problems to be solved in the subsequent chapters. Chapter 3 is devoted
to a presentation of the basic goals of this investigation. The definitions of
our basic notions and the categories we focus on are provided in Chapter 4,
where we also explain our terminology and other technicalities. Chapter 5
is devoted to methodological issues, including an outline of the history of
research on Comitatives and related issues, with a short state-of-the-art
report of current contributions to the subject at hand. This is followed by
Chapter 6, where we describe our sample and the empirical basis used for
our analyses and statistics. In Chapter 7, we sketch the structure of the re-
mainning chapters of the book.
2. Some problems with form and function

With a view to facilitate comprehension, we approach the problems to be scrutinised in more detail later on, on an intuitive basis, in a manner of speaking. Let us assume, for a start, that the term “Comitative” is the label for the grammaticalised expression used to encode ACCOMPANIMENT relations – a short-cut working definition which we shall to elaborate upon in Chapter 4. The German preposition *mit* ‘with’\(^4\), like its English counterpart *with* (Croft 1990: 9–10)\(^5\), is a pertinent example of an expression of this kind, as it is used to combine two NPs of the same clause which represent two participants\(^6\) in a situation with one participant accompanying the other (cf. Chapter 4 below). German, however, is a language whose Comitative lacks a distinct encoding of its own, because the preposition functioning as the marker of the Comitative serves a wide variety of other grammatical purposes as well. Irrespective of the fact that various influential theoreticians assume that, within a clause, any semantic case can only be assigned once, (each NP bears a distinct case of its own)\(^7\), examples like (A1) are anything but rare.\(^8\) We repeat (A1) as (A1’) here in slightly modified form. The example is drawn from the German translation of a rather popular English detective novel. In this sentence, there are three occurrences of the preposition *mit* ‘with’ which governs the morphological dative and functions here as the head of altogether four different PPs: The sentence-initial *mit* has scope over the coordinated NPs *dem Jungen PP und der Einkaufstüte PP* and thus there is no need to repeat the preposition after the conjunction *und* ‘and’ (which would have produced a grammatically acceptable structure, nevertheless).

\[(A1’)\] German (Moor 1994: 75)

\[
\begin{align*}
mit & \quad \text{dem} & \quad \text{Jungen} & \quad \text{auf} & \quad \text{einem} & \quad \text{Arm} & \quad \text{und} \\
X/Y & \quad \text{DET.DAT.M} & \quad \text{boy:DAT} & \quad \text{on} & \quad \text{one:DAT.M} & \quad \text{arm} & \quad \text{and} \\
\text{der} & \quad \text{Einkaufstüte} & \quad \text{im} & \quad \text{anderen} \\
\text{DET.DAT.F} & \quad \text{shopping bag} & \quad \text{in:DET.DAT.M} & \quad \text{other:DAT.M} \\
\text{stieß} & \quad \text{sie} & \quad \text{die} & \quad \text{Autotür} & \quad \text{mit} \\
\text{push.PRET.3SG} & \quad \text{she} & \quad \text{DET.ACC.F} & \quad \text{car door} & \quad \text{X/Y} \\
\text{unnötiger} & \quad \text{Hektigkeit} & \quad \text{mit} & \quad \text{dem} & \quad \text{Fuß} & \quad \text{zu} \\
\text{unnecessary:DAT.F} & \quad \text{violence} & \quad \text{X/Y} & \quad \text{DET.DAT.M} & \quad \text{foot} & \quad \text{close} \\
\text{‘Carrying} & \quad \text{the boy on one arm and the shopping bag on the other,} \\
\text{she} & \quad \text{**kicked**} & \quad \text{the door of the car closed} & \quad \text{with} & \quad \text{unnecessary violence.’} \\
\end{align*}
\]
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This triple overt occurrence of *mit* attests to the well-known and hotly debated form-function mismatch which is so characteristic of human languages. Ever since the early days of our discipline, linguists have been intrigued by the fact that supposedly different contents may be expressed by identical formal means (Van Valin 1993: 43 and Chapter 5 below). We agree with those linguists who assume that identity on the expression side is not just a funny coincidence with no importance whatsoever for linguistics. If the phenomenon of formal identity had not been taken seriously, modern approaches such as grammaticalization theory (Lehmann 1995) would never have developed. There is, however, no consensus among scholars as to what counts as an instance of formal identity and what linguistic units are actually involved (Traugott and Heine 1991: 2–3). For the time being, we adopt a rather crude preliminary procedure, presupposing that the distribution of a grammaticalised expression (i.e. the free or bound morpheme) delimits the extension of a category whose exact linguistic status still has to be determined. The intended meaning of our frequently employed expression that ‘something is marked for Comitative/Instrumental’ is that this ‘something bears the same primary relator that is also used to encode the Comitative proper in accompaniment situations’.

This provisional method can be applied to our German example above. If we include the *mit* blocked under conjunction, we observe that, in (A1’), there are at least three different adverbial relations for which *mit* indiscriminately serves as a marker, cf. (A2): ACCOMPANIMENT occurs twice – while animate and inanimate COMPANIONS, MANNER and INSTRUMENTAL occur once each.

\[(A2) \quad \text{Three functions – one form} \]

\[
\text{sie stieß die Autotür zu } [\text{PP mit}]
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
[\text{NP dem Jungen}] & \quad \text{adverbial: ACCOMPANIMENT} \\
[\text{NP der Einkaufstüte}] & \quad \text{adverbial: ACCOMPANIMENT} \\
[\text{NP unnötiger Heftigkeit}] & \quad \text{adverbial: MANNER} \\
[\text{NP dem Fuß}] & \quad \text{adverbial: INSTRUMENT}
\end{align*}
\]

Stylistically, the sentence may not sound absolutely well-formed to every native speaker of German (because of the repeated employment of one and the same marker, which is considered bad style at least in the written register). Notwithstanding these purely stylistic reservations, the sentence is
grammatically correct and is fully in line with colloquial spoken German, where stylistic considerations are less restrictive. Note also that the accumulation of mit-tokens in this sentence is not induced by the English original, where with occurs just once.\textsuperscript{12}

The multi-purpose nature of mit is of course hardly surprising as we find similar constellations in a variety of other languages where the translation equivalents of mit display an almost equally wide or even wider range of functions. Consider the Swedish examples in (A3), for instance, where the preposition med ‘with’ is used in much the same way as its etymological cognate mit. However, shared etymology is not necessarily an indicator of functional identity, cf. Part C.

(A3) Swedish\textsuperscript{13}

(A3.1) ACCOMPANIMENT (Montan and Rosenqvist 1982: 71)

\begin{verbatim}
 p\aa\ s\"ondag-ar-na bruk-ar Maria \aet-a on\ Sunday-PL.UTR.PL use.to-PRES Maria eat-INF
 middag med sin familj titt-a \p\ on\ TV med lunch X/Y POSS.3 family look-INF on\ TV X/Y
 kamrat-er-na och \g\ ut med hund-en buddy-PL.UTR.PL and go-INF out X/Y dog-DEF.UTR
\end{verbatim}

‘On Sundays Maria eats lunch with her family, watches TV with her friends and walks the dog.’

(A3.2) INSTRUMENT (Montan and Rosenqvist 1982: 68)

\begin{verbatim}
 ska jag skriv-a med blyertspenna shall I write-INF X/Y pencil
 eller med kulspetspenna? or X/Y ball-pen
\end{verbatim}

‘Shall I write with a pencil or a ball-pen?’

(A3.3) MANNER (LPP Swedish X 45)

\begin{verbatim}
 \o\ver allting svara-de kung-en over everything answer-PRET king-DET.UTR
 med upph\h\j ti lugen X/Y majestic:UTR calm
\end{verbatim}

‘Over everything, said the king with majestic calmness.’

As in German, one and the same Swedish morpheme covers ACCOMPANIMENT, MANNER and INSTRUMENTAL relations in the realm of adverbial adjuncts. On the basis of a larger Swedish corpus than the one we have made use of for the present purpose, examples of several functionally distinct instances of med within one and the same sentence might have shown up, too.
As a matter of fact, the homologies between German *mit* and Swedish *med* go far beyond the functional domains mentioned above. On superficial inspection, the few differences there are between the two prepositions hardly seem to matter at all. It is therefore tempting to assume that the indisputable similarities can be explained in terms of linguistic genealogy, as both languages are closely related members of the Germanic phylum.

The genealogical argument becomes less convincing as soon as we consider languages like Baka, a Ubangi language spoken in Cameroon. There cannot be any doubt that Baka is too far off from the two Germanic languages – not only in genealogical terms (Indo-European vs. Niger-Kordofanian) but also geographically (Europe vs. Africa) and typologically ([mildly] inflecting vs. [largely] isolating). Nevertheless, the preposition *te* ‘with’ conforms to the pattern known from German and Swedish because it is employed for ACCOMPANIMENT, INSTRUMENTAL and MANNER relations, cf. (A4).

(A4) Baka

(A4.1) ACCOMPANIMENT (Kilian-Hatz 1995: 124)

\[ wɔ\d\ te \ ngà\j \ te \ j\d \]
\[ pass.IMP \ X/Y \ I \ X/Y \ there \]
‘Come with me over there!’

(A4.2) INSTRUMENT (Kilian-Hatz 1995: 159)

\[ ma \ à \ k\d\o \ wà \ te \ ngbala \]
\[ I \ IMPERF \ chop.PRES \ fire_wood \ X/Y \ machete \]
‘I am chopping the fire-wood with a machete.’

(A4.3) MANNER (Kilian-Hatz 1995: 132)

\[ sèkò / ag \ te \ wolo \]
\[ chimpanzee \ 3SG.NARR \ go \ X/Y \ quickness \]
‘The chimpanzee moved quickly.’

As the discussion in Part B will amply demonstrate, the pattern familiar from German, Swedish and many of their closest kin also occurs elsewhere on the globe. This observation may give rise to a change of opinion: If the use of one and the same morpheme for three different functions recurs in languages which are in no way related to each other, then this unexpected likeness might reflect something more general, perhaps a linguistic universal. The languages employ the same patterns because this is determined by some independent factor preventing structural variation: In a manner of speaking, German, Swedish and Baka cannot help being similar, because there simply is no choice. This would yield a one-to-many mapping relation between form and function as schematised in (A5). On this basis, one could
also question the validity of postulating a three-way distinction of functions in the first place. The prepositions could either be syncretistic (meaning that despite their identity on the expression side, there are nevertheless three distinct categories) or homophonous (meaning that there are three segmentally identical prepositions – one for each function and thus one-to-one mapping of form and function applies). However, this latter solution is especially unsatisfactory, cf. Part B.

(A5) One-to-many mapping relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>mit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baka</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This universalistic interpretation of the facts cannot be upheld – at least not in its radical form. First of all, example (A4.1) contains two instances of te, of which only one of which is in line with the usages made of mit and med in German and Swedish, respectively. The Germanic languages and Baka too use their prepositions to introduce the COMPANION in an ACCOMPANIMENT relation. In addition, Baka uses te as a marker of directionality in combination with a local adverb: tej3 ‘towards there (= thither)’. A similar usage of the two Germanic prepositions is ungrammatical. Thus, the functional domains of the morphemes which encode the Comitative in the three languages are not exactly the same; they just overlap in an admittedly sizeable segment. Furthermore, many other languages deviate from the above pattern in various ways (which will be discussed in some detail in Part B). Maori, Hungarian and Classical Nahuatl provide interesting examples, cf. (A6)–(A8). For the sake of the argument, we only give a somewhat simplified account of the situation in these languages.

(A6) Maori

(A6.1) ACCOMPANIMENT (Bauer 1993: 285)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T/A} & \quad \text{stand} & \text{DET.PL} & \text{daughter} & \text{at} & \text{DET} & \text{house_front} & \text{right} \\
\text{GEN} & \quad \text{DET} & \text{court} & \text{X} & \text{SG.GEN.3DU} & \text{mother} & \text{X} & \text{Hinemaurea} \\
\text{ka} & \quad \text{tuu} & \text{ngaa tamaahine} & \text{te} & \text{mataihi} & \text{katau} & \text{te marae me tooraaua kookaa me Hinemaurea} & \\
\text{His daughters stood at the right of the front of the house, in the court, with their mother, Hinemaurea.}'
\end{align*}
\]
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(A6.2) INSTRUMENT (Bauer 1993: 283)

\[\text{ka haehae i ngaa ringa ki te mataa}\]
\[\text{T/A cut DO DET.PL arm Y DET obsidian_flake}\]

‘She cut her arms with obsidian flakes.’

(A6.3) MANNER (Bauer 1993: 290)

\[\text{i harihari ia i tooraaua tuutataki-tanga}\]
\[\text{T/A happy he at SG.GEN.3.DU meet-NMLZ}\]

‘He greeted her with joy (= he was glad at their meeting).’

In the Austronesian language Maori, ACCOMPANIMENT and INSTRUMENT relations are encoded by two distinct prepositions, namely \textit{me} and \textit{ki}. Neither of the two can replace the other. In addition, there is no overt marker for the MANNER relation, which is normally expressed by simple verbal modifiers or a separate predication (Bauer 1993: 290) as in (A6.3). Thus, Maori is characterised by a kind of one-to-one mapping relation of form and function (as far as the three categories under scrutiny are concerned).

(A7) Hungarian

(A7.1) ACCOMPANIMENT (Lee 1990: 128)

\[\text{a fiam-mal játszik}\]
\[\text{DET son: POSS.1SG.X/Y play}\]

‘He is playing \textit{with} my son.’

(A7.2) INSTRUMENT (Lee 1990: 129)

\[\text{ceruzá-val írtunk}\]
\[\text{pencil-X/Y write:1PL}\]

‘We are writing \textit{with} a pencil.’

(A7.3) MANNER (Lee 1990: 134)

\[\text{Balogh Tamás uram fanyar-an mosolygott}\]
\[\text{Balogh Thomas Mr unpleasant-SUPESS smile:PRET.3SG}\]

‘Mr Thomas Balogh smiled unpleasantly.’

In contradistinction to the languages discussed above, Hungarian employs bound morphology to encode cases and various categories. The suffix \textit{-vel/-val} is used for ACCOMPANIMENT and INSTRUMENT relations alike.\(^{14}\) Its vowel changes according to Hungarian vowel harmony, and the initial consonantal segment usually assimilates to the final consonant of the (morphologically simple or complex) stem to which the suffix is attached. Functionally, Hungarian conforms to the picture we saw in German, Swedish and Baka. However, MANNER relations require different case markers (although the use of \textit{-vel/-val} is also marginally possible [Lee 1990: 69]): in (A7.3) the superessive \textit{-\(V\)n} occurs, but there is almost a full paradigm of
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other cases which are more frequently employed for the purpose of marking MANNER relations (Lee 1990: 134–136). In a way, Hungarian is intermediate between the languages represented in (A5) and Maori: It allows for one-to-many mapping relations, although to a lesser extent. One-to-many mapping exists side by side with one-to-one mapping.

(A8) Classical Nahuatl

(A8.1) ACCOMPANIMENT (Launey 1981: 125)

mōztla huāl-la-z in Pedro
tomorrow hither-go-FUT DET Pedro

ī-huān in Malin-tzin
POSS.3SG-X DET Maria-DIM

‘Tomorrow Pedro will come together with Maria.’

(A8.2) INSTRUMENT (Launey 1981: 128)

cuahui-tl ic ā-nēch-cocō
wood-ABS Y ANT-OBJ.1SG-harm:PL

‘They have harmed me with a stick.’

(A8.3) MANNER (Launey 1981: 128)

cual-li ic xi-nemi
good-ABS Y IMP-live

‘Live decently!’

The same observation holds for Classical Nahuatl – the only difference being that in this Amerindian language, instrument and manner relations receive identical expressions (the postposition ic) whereas ACCOMPANIMENT requires the obligatorily possessed -huān as a relator. These morphemes are by no means interchangeable. Again, one-to-many mapping applies to only two of the three categories. However, the categories which receive identical expression are not the ones we encountered in Hungarian. At this point, we can also add Latin to our short survey (Kircher 1985: 146–147; Kühner and Stegmann 1955: 379–380 and 507): The inflectional ablative is used among other things for INSTRUMENTAL relations (gladiō interficī ‘to be killed by a sword’), and the preposition cum, which governs the inflectional ablative, is used for ACCOMPANIMENT relations, especially when the COMPANION ranks high on the animacy hierarchy (cum militibus ‘with the soldiers’). Moreover, this preposition is also the first choice when it comes to encoding MANNER relations (cum diligentiā ‘carefully’), although the pure ablative suffices in set phrases (iūre ‘rightfully’) and is optional if the MANNER NP is syntactically heavy (māgnā diligentiā ‘with much carefulness’ [but also: māgnā cum diligentiā]).
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Table (A9) is a synopsis of the above discussion of languages which do not fully conform to the German, Swedish or Baka model. Grey shading marks instances of syncretism. For better understanding, we repeat the Swedish data here.

(A9) Different mapping relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>ACCOMPANIMENT</th>
<th>INSTRUMENTAL</th>
<th>MANNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>-vel/-val</td>
<td>-vel/-val</td>
<td>-(V)n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Nahuatl</td>
<td>-huān</td>
<td>ic</td>
<td>ic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>cum + ABL</td>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>cum + ABL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>med</td>
<td>med</td>
<td>med</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we combine (A5) and (A9), we immediately recognise that the full range of logically possible patterns is attested, namely in five constellations: There are languages which morphologically lump together all of the three relations and, at the same time, we find languages which keep them strictly apart. In between these two extremes, there are three patterns – each with a different pair of categories sharing the same morphological expression. This simple list does not tell us whether any of the patterns is crosslinguistically preferred or dispreferred. It therefore may give rise to the idea that full arbitrariness is at work and that there is thus absolutely nothing to be gained from an investigation into form-function relations of the kind reviewed here. In a field where anything might happen, predictability is next to zero, and therefore no scientific insights can be gained. We do not subscribe to this pessimistic interpretation because among other things it is based on too small a fragment of language structures. An assessment can only be successful if a suitably large section of the structural phenomenology has been scrutinised.

We contend that the very concept of the linguistic sign is at stake if one discards the systematicity of form-function relations on the basis of such fragmentary data alone. As a matter of fact, the different solutions found in the above seven languages are not random, but depend upon a variety of other factors not included in the tripartite paradigm of ACCOMPANIMENT, INSTRUMENTAL and MANNER relations. The five patterns of syncretism (including absence of syncretism) are indicative of linguistic types, i.e., these patterns tend to occur in harmony with other structural solutions (especially the organisation of syncretism beyond the above three categories). Thus, we assume that there are conditions which determine the choice of the appropriate pattern in a given language. With a view to identifying and
properly evaluating these factors, it is of the utmost importance to get a
better idea of the crosslinguistic distribution and internal makeup of syncre-
tistic patterns involving or revolving about the Comitative. In addition,
there are many other important tasks closely connected to the evaluation of
the determining factors. Chapter 3 is dedicated to a presentation of those
tasks which we tackle in this book.

3. Goals

First of all, we intend this study to demonstrate that Comitatives are indeed
worth investigating. Accordingly, we accumulate evidence from as many
languages as possible for the grammatical relevance of Comitatives. This is
mainly done in Parts B–C. On functional grounds, it is legitimate to assume
that every language must provide ways and means to express ACCOMPANI-
MENT. However, there are no a priori reasons for these means to be highly
grammaticalised. One could easily imagine that languages resort to an open
reservoir of circumscriptions and periphrases without any standardised pro-
cedure of encoding a Comitative at all. Much to our own surprise, we have
never encountered any language whose expressions of ACCOMPANIMENT
indisputably fall outside the realm of grammar (in the sense of regular rule-
based and/or construction-framed morphosyntactic patterns). As the exam-
pl es in Chapter 2 suggest, the close association of Comitatives with what is
conventionally called “grammar” does not imply that they must be provided
with an absolutely distinct encoding of their own.

Therefore, another important assignment for this study is to show that
Comitatives exist at all, be it in individual sample languages or in a univer-
sal perspective. With a view to proving our point (namely, that Comitatives
are there, even though one cannot see them on superficial inspection), we
have developed a model of the linguistic sign which assumes a multi-
layered structure and recursive embedding of linguistic signs – to be dis-
cussed in Chapter 5. At the same time, we put forward a model of func-
tional implicitness based on the recurrence of syncretistic patterns which
also cover expressions of ACCOMPANIMENT. We focus on this question
especially in Part B. By way of crosslinguistic comparison, we are able to
draw so-called cognitive maps which, on the one hand, display the
neighbourhood relationships of the Comitative and associated categories,
and, on the other, indirectly corroborate that Comitatives are still present
where grammar fails to single them out by distinct formal means. Given the
As a matter of fact, the **COMITATIVE** in one language is not automatically identical with the **COMITATIVE** in another. We therefore set out to describe at least the most important aspects of the structural and functional phenomenology of **Comitatives** (yielding a kind of grammar of **Comitatives** with a morphological, a syntactic and a semantic component). This catalogue of features provides an adequate basis for identifying classes of languages which are characterised by a substantial degree of similarity (= types). In addition, this procedure enables us to test our sample languages for genealogical, areal and typological parameters. Are there any genealogical, areal or typological correlates which dictate how the Comitative behaves, structurally and functionally, in a given language? Moreover, we can also address the following issue: If we know that certain languages converge as to the list of features of their Comitatives, to what extent do these languages make similar use of this category? With a view to answering this question, we are forced to complement the matrix-typological method with a text-based comparison of languages (cf. Part C). We also develop a quantification procedure in order to determine the degree of similarity between the languages of our European sub-sample.

Comitatives are not isolated from other categories. There is an intriguing interaction between Comitatives and various other categories – especially the Instrumental. We will outline these relationships and explain the moving forces behind the preferences and dispreferences of the Comitative regarding how it associates with certain categories when it comes to forming syncretistic chains. Furthermore, we describe the systematicity that regulates the relationship that holds between the Comitative and the Instrumental. For this purpose, we adopt a markedness-theoretical model. Closely connected to the issue of the markedness relations of the Comitative and comparable categories is the dynamic aspect: The expressions of Comitatives are not static, time-stable phenomena; rather, they have a past, present and future. Thus, we devote ample space to the discussion of grammaticalization channels, thereby identifying the (lexico-semantic) origins of typical expressions of Comitatives and their further fate in the ongoing process of grammaticalization (including a sideways glance at language contact). In all these areas, the notions of prototype and continuum have proven themselves to be immensely helpful if one aims at tidying up what would otherwise look like a mess. Additionally, both the prototype and the continuum are necessary and handy tools to come to grips with the universality of the Comitative, we have to check whether or not Comitatives behave similarly everywhere.
status of many subcategories that cover the space between prototypical Comitatives, prototypical Instrumentals and various other categories.

Some languages stand out from the rest of the world’s languages because of their peculiar way of handling the Comitative. Incidentally, these are exactly those languages with which linguists are most familiar, namely the languages spoken in Europe. Owing to the fact that such European peculiarities have been mistaken for the general linguistic standard, not merely so, but quite pronouncedly even in research on the Comitative, we inspect Europe more closely in order to see whether or not the languages of Europe form a solid block of marked cases. In addition, we compare these languages on the macro-level and on the micro-level and thus are able to determine to what extent there is continent-wide convergence. This areal-linguistic perspective is complemented from the diachronic point of view by our attempt to trace the diffusion of typological features on the geolinguistic map of Europe.

The research project at the basis of this study has not come out of the blue. There is, of course, a rather long history of linguistic controversies about the Comitative. This history has to be documented at least in those parts that are immediately relevant for our own typological undertaking. Likewise, our results and findings have to be explicitly connected to the ongoing discussion about theory and practice of typology and universals research. Only in this way can we assign the Comitative as a research topic its proper place in general-comparative linguistics.

4. Categories, definitions and terminology

In the preceding chapters, we have made use of a small number of terms which are intuitively clear from their role in traditional and received modern linguistics. These terms presuppose notions which are crucial to understand. Therefore, this chapter aims at introducing all the necessary definitions. We start from the most general and proceed down to the particular, i.e., the first question asked is ‘What is meant by ACCOMPANIMENT?’ and the second one ‘What morphological shape can the relator have?’
4.1. The situation and its ingredients

Utterances *inter alia* serve the purpose of describing so-called states of affairs (in German: *Sachverhaltsdarstellung*) in the guise of declarative sentences (Seiler 1988: 114–118). More precisely, the state of affairs is not simply part of real-world ontology with the linguistic expression being a faithful copy of it. Rather, the linguistic expression shapes the state of affairs, gives contours to it or even creates it in the first place.18 This idea is deeply rooted in constructivism – the philosophical movement with which we share a number of basic convictions (without making us full-blown representatives of this school of thought). These shared convictions are also largely in line with the thoughts expressed in the programmatic chapters of the publications by members of the UNITYP-project (e.g. Seiler 2000: 15). The process of creating a state of affairs via the imposition of linguistic structure may of course be influenced by human perception and other non-linguistic factors. However, the particulars of this process are only of minor importance to the concrete subject at hand (although they should not be underestimated in a general theory of language). What should be borne in mind, however, is the fact that language structure may require us to treat something as an instance of a certain state of affairs, although, in extra-linguistic reality, the situation which our utterance refers to has nothing in common with other situations classified as exemplars of the same state of affairs. In addition, other situations which may ontologically resemble one another to a large degree can be allocated to different classes of states of affairs according to the regulations of a given language or the creativity of its speakers. There is no denying that we are facing some kind of relativism which is, perhaps, only rather mild – otherwise we would have to abandon for good the idea that the expression side of linguistic signs is an indicator of anything (semantic networks, for instance). The latter point is a very important distinguishing factor of our own approach: Many scholars working in the field of participation, semantic roles, etc., assume – though most of them only tacitly – that states-of-affair require a propositionally and syntagmatically complete (i.e. primary) predication for their description. However, we want to go beyond this boundary by also including secondary predications – among them adnominal phrases. The use of certain grammatical means does not always respect the boundaries between full and small clause. For methodological reasons (cf. Chapter 5), we will also consider what Lehmann, Shin, and Verhoeven (2000: 22–29) call inter-participant relations (*Interpartizipantenrelationen*).19
4.1.1. Accompaniment

The Comitative is especially interesting in terms of general-comparative linguistics because it does not lend itself to easy classification. There are, of course, numerous suggestions as to where exactly the Comitative should find its proper place in the landscape of say, case-relations. Owing to the fact that the COMITATIVE is of a more complex nature than many of the other well-known categories, attempts to treat the COMITATIVE in an analogous fashion to its supposed fellow-categories unavoidably face serious problems. These problems are such that one is tempted to claim that either the COMITATIVE does not belong to the same paradigm/level of abstraction as the RECIPIENT or the like, or that it is something completely different. This extraordinary character of the COMITATIVE calls for a detailed presentation of its traits.

COMITATIVES are inconceivable without ACCOMPANIMENT relations. ACCOMPANIMENT relations are based on situations in which at least two protagonists are involved: These protagonists are the participants of the state of affairs depicted by an appropriate utterance. This situation model is patterned after the one described for local relations in Lehmann (1992: 627–630). Ideally, there is a tripartite internal logical form which comprises the two participants, namely the ACCOMPANEE and the COMPANION, and a relator which establishes the relation that holds between the two participants, cf. the binary schema in (A10). Note that the relations under scrutiny are (universal) conceptual-semantic ones which could best be termed roles. Their translation into morphosyntactic relations is language-(type)-specific and belongs to a different level of abstraction: An ACCOMPANEE is an ACCOMPANEE, no matter whether the NP which represents it in a given clause is the subject, object or an adjunct of some kind. We repeat that there is absolutely no need for a one-to-one correspondence of roles and relations.

(A10) The ACCOMPANIMENT situation

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{ACCOMPANEE} & \text{RELATOR} & \text{COMPANION} \\
\text{a} & \mathcal{R} & b \\
\end{array}
\]

Despite the fact that (A10) does not look to be too complicated a formula, the precise spelling of the structure is an intricate business, as the above formula only captures the nuclear skeleton of a state of affairs whose description normally requires a number of additional elements (Stolz 2003a: 214–218), among them the nuclear predicate, cf. below. The following is a list of some observations to be made in connection with (A10).
First of all, in a given utterance that shapes a situation as a state of affairs which qualifies as ACCOMPANIMENT not all of the three components of (A10) have to be overtly present.

Secondly, the linguistic expressions representing the two participants as well as the relator may combine in one word.

Thirdly, the relator (and to a lesser degree the two participants as well) may belong to very different morpheme/word classes and distribution classes even within one and the same language.

Fourthly, the linearization and topology of the components in the actual utterance vary according to the regulations of individual languages.

Fifthly, there is ample opportunity for multiple symbolizations of participants and relators in one and the same utterance.

Many of these points can be easily exemplified with examples drawn from German. The following description gives an account of what is possible in an individual language. Whether or not the observed phenomena lend themselves to generalisations is a completely different matter, one which we will return to below (Section 4.2). In any case, German is a practical starting point, because the three components of formula (A10) tend to be represented separately by different syntactic words. However, there are also exceptions to this rule, as (A11.2) demonstrates.

(A11) Absence/Incorporation of participants
(A11.1) German: no ACCOMPANEE, COMPANION = mobile prefix

\[
\text{Peter kommt mit}
\]

Peter comes X/Y

‘Peter is coming along.’

(A11.2) German: relator and COMPANION incorporated in the lexical verb

\[
\text{der Präsident wird zum Palast eskortiert}
\]

det president be:PASS.3SG to:DET.DAT palace escorted

‘The president is being escorted to the palace.’

In (A11.2), the relator is semantically incorporated in the transitive verb eskortieren ‘to escort’. The NP representing the ACCOMPANEE in a situation whose nucleus is a verb like eskortieren is the direct object of this verb in the active and accordingly the subject in the passive. One may even dare to go one step further and claim that the COMPANION is incorporated into the semantics of eskortieren as well because the verb itself presupposes the existence of an escort of some kind. In (A11.1), the mobile verb-prefix mit-
is detached from the finite verb (infinitive *mitkommen* ‘to come along’).\(^{22}\) The sentence is grammatically and pragmatically well-formed. In German, verbs bearing the mobile prefix *mit*- generally allow the explicit identification of the ACCOMPANEE to be suppressed. If the ACCOMPANEE must be mentioned, the relator appears twice:\(^{23}\) As a preposition introducing the NP representing the ACCOMPANEE and clause-finally where the mobile prefix usually winds up in main clauses with finite lexical verb.\(^{24}\) Note that this double occurrence of *mit* distinguishes sentences with rhematic ACCOMPANEE from those with a rhematic COMPANION, cf. (A12).\(^{25}\)

(A12) **German**

(A12.1) rhematic ACCOMPANEE, relator = preposition and mobile prefix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANION</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>ACCOMPANEE</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>kommt</td>
<td>mit</td>
<td>Robert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>comes</th>
<th>X/Y</th>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>X/Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[V [PREP NP] rheme prefix]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Peter *accompanies* Robert.’

(A12.2) rhematic COMPANION, relator = preposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPANEE</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>COMPANION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>kommt</td>
<td>mit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>comes</td>
<td>X/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PREP NP]rheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Peter *takes* Robert *along*.’

If the COMPANION is the rheme, then the verbal prefix is ruled out and thus there is only one occurrence of the relator as in (A12.2). As soon as the second relator is added, the reading of the sentence involves a complete reversal of the roles of the NPs: The COMPANION of (A12.2) corresponds to the ACCOMPANEE in (A12.1), and the ACCOMPANEE of (A12.2) corresponds to the COMPANION in (A12.1).

For obvious reasons, we concentrate on examples of complete patterns, i.e., we work with syntactic units in which all three of the components of formula (A10) are systematically represented by morphosyntactic means.\(^{26}\) Thus, cases of semantic incorporation (*nota bene*: not material incorporation!) of one or more of the members of the ACCOMPANIMENT situation in any other element of the utterance are excluded from our study. Sentences like (A11.2), i.e. those with a verb whose semantics alone presupposes accompaniment, fall outside the scope of our investigation. Moreover, it is indispensable for the relator to be a proper grammeme, i.e., a morpheme with clearly discernible grammatical functions (on the problem of derivational morphology, cf. Part B).
So far, we have looked mostly at cases where the NP representing one of the two participants forms part of the VP (as an adverbial adjunct, for instance), i.e., where there is a higher predicator which, in traditional terms of dependency, governs both the bare NP and the PP. In a way, the PPs headed by *mit* in the above German sentences could be interpreted as a kind of secondary predication (of existence) or as a small clause, roughly paraphrasable as ‘and COMPANION is there [in the same place], too’ (Miller 1985: 96; Stolz 1996: 8–9). In a recent survey of secondary predication, Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann (2004: 87–88) mention the fact that so-called depictives are often marked by morphemes which are otherwise Comitative and/or Instrumental relators. Thus, there is evidently something to the idea that *mit*-phrases are additional predications.

In this and only in this perspective (for a different interpretation, cf. [A32]), the relation between ACCOMPANEE and COMPANION could be considered an indirect one, because the co-presence of the COMPANION is stated in connection to the event, action or state expressed by the lexical verb or nuclear predication. The adverbial adjunct extends this predication and thus belongs to the higher predication as an embedded part (as shown in [A13]).

(A13) German

ACCOMPANEE NUCPRED \( \langle \) COMPANION \( \rangle \) Z

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Erich} \quad \text{[tanzt } ([\text{mit } \text{Erna}]_{\text{adjunct}}) \text{ (Walzer)])} \\
\text{Eric} \quad \text{dances} \quad (X/Y \ \text{Erna}) \quad (\text{Waltz})
\end{array}
\]

---------- primary predication
+++ secondary predication +++

‘Eric is dancing (the Waltz) *(with Erna).*’

This supposed closer connection of the COMPANION to the nuclear predication can, however, be challenged. If we employ the nominalization test, it turns out that the resulting structures do not sound especially felicitous with transitive verbs, cf. (A14). The nominalised nuclear predicate is marked by underlining.

(A14) German nominalizations

(A14.1) complex intransitive verb/predicate *tanzen* ‘to dance’

ACCOMPANEE NUCPRED \( \langle \) COMPANION \( \rangle \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Erichs Tanzen \text{mit Erna war holperig}} \\
\text{Eric:GEN dancing } (X/Y \ \text{Erna was clumsy})
\end{array}
\]

‘Eric’s dancing with Erna was clumsy.’
The situation and its ingredients

(A14.2) transitive verb/predicate Zaun anstreichen ‘to paint a fence’

ACCOMPANEE NUCPRED \( \mathbb{R} \) COMPANION

Erichs Zaunanstreichen mit Erna dauerte lange

Eric:GEN painting_the_fence X/Y Erna took long

‘Eric and Erna took a long time painting the fence.’

(A14.2) is particularly awkward, as it almost invites an INSTRUMENTAL reading (cf. below) in which the COMPANION Erna would be turned into the TOOL or MATERIAL used for the painting of the fence. In order to prevent this oddness, the preposition mit could be disambiguated by the addition of the adverb zusammen ‘together’ – a technique that we will return to in Part B. Zusammen requires that the participants joint by mit (directly or indirectly) are on roughly equal terms, meaning that they must be (more or less) at the same rank on the animacy hierarchy and must belong to the same macro-role. Moreover, the optional use of zusammen suggests that there is indeed a closer relationship between the two participants than between the COMPANION and the nuclear predicate. This is also reflected by the use of the coordinating conjunction and in the English translation of (A14.2).

This leads us to the problem of natural conjunction (McNally 1993), which we shall only touch upon here (for a more extensive discussion, cf. Part B). For the time being, it is sufficient to bear in mind that COORDINATION and COMITATIVE are closely connected to each other (Stassen 2000: 18–21). Owing to the fact that neither German nor English provides good and direct examples, we look at the Baltic language Latvian – a language that we will return to in more detail later. In Latvian, the association of COMITATIVE and COORDINATION with each other is easier to recognize. This language possesses a highly frequent coordinating conjunction un ‘and’ (borrowed from [Low] German und) and a preposition ar ‘with’, which governs the accusative in the singular and the dative in the plural (dative government in the plural is compulsory for all Latvian prepositions). However, if two human participants are co-agents in a given situation, the use of un is disfavoured. In its stead, Latvian resorts to the preposition ar, cf. (A15).

(A15) Latvian (Donuleja 247)

ACCOMPANEE \( \mathbb{R} \) COMPANION

un Nelda ar Rudolfu loti nozīmīgi

and Nelda:NOM X/Y Rudolf:ACC very significantly

paskatījās uz Ernestīni

PREV:look:PRET:REFL.3 on Ernestine:ACC

‘And Nelda and Rudolf looked very knowingly at Ernestine.’
Un could replace ar and still yield a grammatical structure – this time with the COMPANION NP in the nominative (Rüdolfs). However, this generalisation of un would violate stylistic constraints.

However, the relation between ACCOMPANEE and COMPANION can also be indisputably direct: German mit-phrases also occur functioning of adnominal attributes, cf. (A16). Notwithstanding the fact that the attribute is clearly a constituent of the NP this time, the mit-phrase can still be interpreted as a predication in its own right. However, the attributive cases do not state co-presence in relation to nuclear predication, but rather connect more closely to the NP representing the ACCOMPANEE. In (A16), ACCOMPANEE and COMPANION are represented by NPs which form together an immediate constituent of the VP (again, appropriately marked by the use of the coordinating conjunction and in the English translation). In contradistinction, the two NPs in (A14) do not form a higher syntactic unit – although one could easily paraphrase the sentence as ‘Eric and Erna dance the Waltz together’.

(A16) German

```
  Q   NUCPRED   ACCOMPANEE \R
  Erich   fotografiert  //[die Mutter  //[mit
dem Kind]PP/attribute]NP//direct object
det:dat   child
`'

In (A16), the adnominal attribute mit dem Kind is not extractable unless we intend to give the sentence a different reading. If the PP is moved, there are only two sites where it could possibly wind up, namely either in the immediate post-verbal position or in the immediate pre-verbal one – in the latter case, the subject NP would automatically be re-positioned to the slot to the right of the finite verb. No matter where mit dem Kind moves, it would always produce a structure that invites an interpretation according to which the AGENT Erich and the child form a group. Thus, we would have a sentence equivalent to English Erich and the child take a picture of the mother, meaning: the COMPANION of the ACCOMPANEE in PATIENT function becomes the COMPANION of the ACCOMPANEE in AGENT function.

In sum, the secondary predication which states the co-presence of the COMPANION in the above examples can come in two different varieties which make use of one and the same relator in German (but cf. Section 4.2): One is adverbal, the other adnominal. The adverbal one modifies the
nuclear predication, since it forms part of the VP, but it is also semantically related to the other participant. The adnominal one modifies the NP representing the ACCOMPANEE. Only in the latter case do we have a head-modifier relation between the NP representing the ACCOMPANEE and the one representing the COMPANION. We encounter similar phenomena when the INSTRUMENTAL relation is taken into consideration too.

4.1.2. Instrumental

Very often, Comitatives and Instrumentals are considered two sides of the same coin. This idea of a very tight relationship between the two categories dominates the linguistic discussion on our subject matter, past and present, and is also in the foreground of Parts B–C. Therefore, we include a characterisation of the INSTRUMENTAL situation right here. The Instrumental is the grammaticalised expression of an INSTRUMENTAL situation.

Both ACCOMPANIMENT and INSTRUMENTAL situations allow for nuclear predicates of various degrees of transitivity. Thus, we encounter COMITATIVES in clauses whose nucleus is an intransitive, a transitive or a ditransitive lexical verb. The same holds for the INSTRUMENTAL, although there is a higher degree of association with typically transitive verbs, which prompts us to postulate a more complex formula for the INSTRUMENTAL (as a matter of fact, the two situations do not differ categorically as to their compatibility with transitivity!). This formula is more complex, as it contains the two binary relations $c \mathcal{R} d + c, d \mathcal{R} e$, which, in combination, yield the complete structure, cf. (A17). With a view to avoiding confusion, the role of the participant that employs an INSTRUMENT to carry out a certain action is labelled the USER (instead of AGENT). TOOL is the name given to the role assigned to the INSTRUMENT. The choice of this label is motivated by considerations of prototypicality (cf. Section 4.2).

\[(A17) \quad \text{The INSTRUMENTAL situation} \quad \text{\begin{tabular}{cccccc}
USER & RELATOR & TOOL & RELATOR & PATIENT & NUCPRED \\
c & \mathcal{R} & d & \mathcal{R} & e & \verb
\end{tabular}}\]

German *mit*-phrases of the INSTRUMENTAL type are adverbal, as in (A18), which is a modified version of (A16) above: We have replaced the adnominal COMITATIVE with an optional INSTRUMENTAL adjunct representing the TOOL. The explicit mention of the TOOL is optional for various reasons – one
being the fact that the verb *fotografieren* ‘to photograph’ semantically incorporates the prototypical TOOL used for such purposes, namely a camera.

(A18) German

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{USER} & \text{NUC\textsc{Pred}} & \text{PATIENT} \\
\text{Erich} & \text{fotografiert} & \text{det} & \text{Mutter} \\
\text{Eric} & \text{photographs} & \text{DET} & \text{mother} \\
\text{\textsc{R}} & \text{TOOL} \\
\text{mit} & \text{der Kamera} & \text{adjunct} \\
\text{X/Y} & \text{DET:DAT} & \text{camera} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Eric is taking a photo of the mother with the camera.’

The sequence of words in (A18), however, is ambiguous, because two very different readings are possible: Not only is it possible to interpret (A18) as an instance of an instrumental situation (most likely the first option for the majority of German native speakers) where the camera is the TOOL used to take the photo(s), but it is also legitimate to analyse (A18) as involving a kind of COMITATIVE (more precisely: ORNATIVE/CONFECTIVE, cf. 4.2): In this case the PP *mit der Kamera* is again an adnominal attribute modifying *die Mutter*. In this version, the USER Erich would take a picture of a mother who herself has a camera on her (or is associated with a certain camera known from contextual information). Erich’s TOOL would then be incorporated in the verb, and it would not be identical with the camera explicitly mentioned in (A18). The INSTRUMENTAL reading is exempt from ambiguity only if the *mit*-phrase is moved to a different position: When immediately adjacent to the verb, be it to its left or to its right (both positions being associated with focus), *mit der Kamera* allows only one interpretation, namely that of a TOOL. The potential ambiguity already suggests that ACCOMPANIMENT and INSTRUMENTAL situations may have something in common, that they may be linked to each other in such a way that it becomes hard to keep them apart. As the expressions for both are formally identical in German anyway, this observation only seems to state the obvious. Yet, not all languages are like German.

Another point where COMITATIVES and INSTRUMENTALS show parallel behaviour is in their use as adnominal attributes. In (A19), the verbal structure *mit dem Hammer schlagen* ‘to hit with the hammer’ is the basis for the nominalization *der Schlag/das Schlagen mit dem Hammer* marked by an asterisk, as being based on a nuclear predicate. The internal PP of this subject NP functions as an adnominal attribute. This modifying relation with its INSTRUMENTAL semantics together with the head-modifier relationship is an inheritance from the above mentioned verbal structure.
The prototype and its derivations

(A19) German

\[\text{NUCPRED} \quad \text{\textsc{R}} \quad \text{TOOL}\]
\[\text{[der Schlag }/[\text{mit dem Hammer}]_{\text{PP/adjunct}}/_{\text{NP}}\]
\[\text{DET \text{\textsc{X/Y}}} \quad \text{DET:DAT} \quad \text{hammer}\]

\text{NUCPRED} \quad \text{PATIENT}\n
\text{traf ihn } \quad \text{unerwartet}\n
\text{hit him } \quad \text{unexpectedly}\n
‘The blow with the hammer hit him unexpectedly.’

The difference between adnominal COMITATIVES and adnominal INSTRUMENTALS is one of relationality: The INSTRUMENTAL is characterised by a very close association to the nuclear predication underlying the nominalization, whereas the adnominal COMITATIVE displays a much closer association of the two participants to one another, although this does not rule out the possibility of a weaker connection to the nuclear predicate as well. We try to capture this difference schematically in (A20).

(A20) The different leanings of COMITATIVE and INSTRUMENTAL

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{COMITATIVE} \\
\text{ACCOMPANEE} \quad \text{COMPANION} \\
\text{\textbf{\textless}------- participants \textbf{\textgreater}-------- predicate --------\textbf{\textgreater})}} \\
\text{leaning towards} \\
\text{\textbf{\textless}------- predicate \textbf{\textgreater}--------}} \\
\text{\textbf{\textless}TOOL \textbf{\textgreater} NUCPRED} \\
\text{\textbf{\textless}INSTRUMENTAL \textbf{\textgreater}))))
\end{array}
\]

4.2. The prototype and its derivations

The notion of the prototype belongs to the common vocabulary of many linguists of different scientific convictions no matter to what extent they actually use the term and with what implications. Lakoff’s (1987: 5–154) widely known study is the most influential application of this psychological notion to proper linguistic subject matters. Meanwhile, the concept of the prototype has proved to be a very handy tool, especially for typological and crosslinguistic investigations (Croft 2001: 102–104), including those which are dedicated to issues of grammaticalization (Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeier 1991: 39–64). For the time being, it suffices to observe that, to our mind, prototypicality need not be synonymous with high token frequency. In a way, we have also tacitly employed a kind of prototype concept in the
examples discussed so far. In the light of the massive evidence in support of the idea that language structure has a strong anthropocentric tinge\textsuperscript{34}, it is absolutely legitimate to start from a prototype that relies heavily on features of the [+human] kind, cf. (A21).

(A21) The human factor in the prototypes

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l|l|l|l}
ACCOMPANIMENT & " & COMPANION & NUCPRED \\
USER & " & TOOL & NUCPRED \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

In practically all of these (except the alternative reading of [A18]), the ACCOMPANEE and the USER rank high on the animacy hierarchy and bear the feature [+human]; the same holds for the NPs representing the COMPANIONS in our examples of COMITATIVES. On the other hand, the TOOL is of course considered an inanimate material object in our examples of INSTRUMENTAL relations. For the nuclear predicate, we very often employed movement verbs. This solution is in line with the idea of Lehmann, Shin, and Verhoeven (2000: 6), that “Instrument und Komitativ sind prototypisch Begleiter des Agens in dynamischen Situationen” (for the postulated connection to the AGENT role, cf. Part B, Section 9.1). The prototype is, however, only a prototype, and thus does by no means exhaust the full range of possibilities. Before we address this crucial issue, we summarise the prototypical traits of the two participants:

ACCOMPANEE: The ACCOMPANEE is the more prominent participant of the ACCOMPANIMENT situation in the sense that the ACCOMPANEE is construed as being more directly involved in the action, event, and situation described by the lexical verb. The prototypical ACCOMPANEE bears the feature [+human]. The expression representing the ACCOMPANEE may be a noun, a pronoun, or a pronominal affix. It may also be discontinuously marked in several slots.

COMPANION: The COMPANION is the less prominent participant of the ACCOMPANIMENT situation in the sense that the COMPANION is construed as only indirectly involved in the action, event, or situation described by the lexical verb. The COMPANION participates only via its association with
the ACCOMPANEE. As the ACCOMPANEE, the prototypical COMPANION has the feature [+human]. The expression representing the ACCOMPANEE may be a noun, a pronoun, or a pronominal affix. It may also be discontinuously marked in several slots.

The question arises whether our choice of certain semantic features has to be necessarily valid for all contexts in which the relator appears as the constant element. The answer is no, as the two prototypes represented in (A21) only have the high animacy of ACCOMPANEE and USER in common – beside the employment of the same relator. Given the strong ties that are said to exist between ACCOMPANIMENT and INSTRUMENTAL situations, we have to abandon the restriction to human participants in order to come to a better and full understanding, not only of the interconnectedness of the two situation types, but also of the nature of the COMITATIVE itself. The distributional properties of the relator morpheme will lead the way.

4.2.1. Orientation and roles

Semantic roles are conceived of as largely independent of syntactic relations. To mention just one well known case, the agent role is dissociated from the subject relation just as the subject is in no way tied to the semantic role of AGENT (Sasse 1982: 269–272). There is no one-to-one mapping relation between semantic roles and fundamental syntactic relations although there may exist preferences of association between them, be it in individual languages or in a crosslinguistic perspective. This dissociation is also valid for the COMITATIVE and the INSTRUMENTAL.

First of all, both the ACCOMPANEE and the COMPANION can be represented by subject or object NPs. Accordingly, the morphosyntax of a given utterance may be either ACCOMPANEE-oriented or COMPANION-oriented.35 This is undoubtedly true of clauses whose nuclear predicate is itself a verb of ACCOMPANIMENT or the like. For Croft (1991: 178), however, there is an obligatorily strong association of the COMITATIVE with the subject when it defines the former in the following way:

Comitative: An entity that participates in a causal chain at the same point and in the same role as the subject of the main verb. It is likely that the comitative role also requires that the subject be the initiator of an act of volitional causation […].
As the fundamental grammatical relation of the subject has been explicitly mentioned, we shall have a look at the syntax of comitatives first before we consider their semantic role more closely.

It is doubtful that Croft’s definition can be upheld without modifications if we look beyond his own examples (Stolz 1993: 10 note 22). Sentence (A16) above is a case in point: the mit-phrase contains the COMPANION of an ACCOMPANEE that itself is the direct object of the main verb. There is no syntactic bond with the subject of the same clause, nor is there any volitionality on the part of the COMPANION involved as far as the causal chain is concerned. Given the fact that cases of object or oblique-oriented COMITATIVES cannot simply be discarded as supposed exceptions, we have to decide what to do with Croft’s definition. There are of course several options (some of which are logically interconnected):

- reserve the term COMITATIVE exclusively for those cases which fit the definition,
- introduce a distinct term for those cases where subject-orientation does not apply,
- demonstrate that the problematic cases belong to a completely different class of phenomena,
- give up the idea of subject-orientation altogether, etc.

Indeed, Croft (1991: 237–239) also mentions a thematic role ASSOCIATIVE – without elaborating on it, however. ASSOCIATIVE or SOCIATIVE is a frequently encountered term used for NP-internal relations between an ACCOMPANEE and a COMPANION (cf. [A32]). One could try and reformulate the above definition of the COMITATIVE in such a way that ASSOCIATIVE becomes the cover term for those constellations that are in disagreement with the original definition. It remains to be seen whether anything could actually be gained by this ad hoc solution, (cf. Chapter 5). We strongly believe that the most one can achieve in this way is to show that COMITATIVE and ASSOCIATIVE have too much in common to be strictly kept apart, especially since formal syncretism including both categories is widespread and frequent. We therefore argue that it makes more sense to look at the COMITATIVE from a broader perspective in order to understand the conceptual ties that (we are about to show to) exist between the thematic roles on the clause level and the relations that hold within NPs.

As a matter of fact, the dissociation of proper syntax and semantics does not stop here. Admittedly, the phrase marked for Comitative is very often an adjunct or adverbial phrase modifying the verb – but this highly frequent
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pattern is by far not the only one. Consider the examples in (A22)–(A24) where the complement of the verbs corresponding to the English *to marry somebody* is marked for Comitative in three languages of very different genealogical, areal and typological affiliations (Stolz 1993: 23; 1996: 21–22). There is no overt element in the English translations that corresponds to the relator morpheme in the original sentences.

(A22) Saami (Bartens 1989: 95)

```
ACCOMPANEE  NUCPRED  COMPANION-R
son         náitala  Siri-in
he           marries   Siri-X/Y
```

‘He is marrying Siri.’

(A23) Indonesian (Kwee 1981: 123)

```
ACCOMPANEE  NUCPRED  R  COMPANION
ia           kawin     dengan se-orang janda
he           marry      X/Y one-CL.human widow
```

‘He married a widow.’

(A24) Turkish (Ersen-Rasch 1980: 78)

```
COMPANION-R  NUCPRED-ACCOMPANEE
Ahmet-le     evlen-di-m
Ahmet-X/Y    marry-PAST-1SG
```

‘I have married Ahmet.’

In contradistinction to many of our previous examples, the nuclear predicate is no longer a verb of movement (which is normally intransitive and thus not a good candidate for requiring an additional NP [discounting locative complements for the sake of the argument]). In numerous societies, marrying is not a symmetrical reciprocal act, but a combination of two distinct sub-acts distributed unevenly over the participants. For the sake of the argument, we neglect these cultural differences for the time being, though. The situation frame of the event of marrying nevertheless involves two participants who cooperate: The action is reciprocal, as the one marries the other and vice versa. This reciprocity does not, however, translate into an absolute balance of power of the participants: the situation is depicted as oriented towards the participant whose NP functions as subject of the clause. Nevertheless, these cases still conform to Croft’s definition of the Comitative given above, because the NPs introduced by a comitative marker can be ascribed similar semantic properties as the ones ascribed to the subject NP. In all three languages, the relator is the same as the one that would be used to introduce the COMPANION in situations whose nuclear
predicate is a movement verb (and the same relator is also used for the marking of INSTRUMENTAL relations).39

If we go by the criterion of formal identity (cf. Chapter 5), we have to accept as fact that the relator morpheme has a distribution which reaches far beyond the prototypical constellation. Not only do static verbs or nuclear predications replace dynamic ones: the ACCOMPANEE and the COMPANION can no longer be taken too literally, or the terms become simple labels for the participants involved in a situation whose description requires the use of the same relator that is also employed in case of prototypical ACCOMPANIMENT relations. In (A25) from Estonian, the NP representing the COMPANION depends on the adjectival predicate nominal ühevanune ‘of the same age’, which forms a discontinuous nuclear predicate with the copula.

(A25) Estonian (Hasselblatt 1992: 96)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{ACCOMPANEE} & \text{NUCPRED}^1 & \text{COMPANION-ℜ} & \text{NUCPRED}^2 \\
\text{isa} & \text{on} & \text{ema-ga} & \text{ühe-vanune} \\
\text{father} & \text{is} & \text{mother-\text{X/Y}} & \text{one-aged} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Father is as old as Mother.’

In this case, the NP ema-‘with the mother’ is compulsory, since removing it from the sentence would produce an ungrammatical torso. The use of the morphological comitative40 in this construction is one of the options that speakers of Estonian have to express the equative – and it is obligatory with all predicative adjectives bearing the prefix ühe- ‘one-/same-’ (Hasselblatt 1992: 96). The two participants are depicted as being on equal terms – a constellation that fits in well with the reciprocity mentioned above. This reciprocal nature of the relation that holds between ACCOMPANEE and COMPANION does not, however, extend to all contexts in which the same relator is employed.

In Malaccan Creole Portuguese, there is an object marker ku (< Portuguese com ‘with’41) which is extensively (but not exclusively) used with object NPs which rank high on the animacy hierarchy (Baxter 1985: 156), cf. (A26).

(A26) Malaccan Creole Portuguese (Baxter 1985: 150)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
eli & ja & dali & ku \\
he & PERF & hit & X/Y \\
\text{John} & \text{John} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘He hit John.’

Ku has also retained the functions of marking the COMITATIVE and the INSTRUMENTAL in the appropriate grammatical contexts, cf. (A27).
(A27) Malaccan Creole Portuguese

(A27.1) ACCOMPANIMENT (Baxter 1985: 115)

\[
\text{ACCOMPANEE} \quad \text{COMPANION}
\]
\[
yo \ sa \ \text{papa} \ ta \ \text{bai} \ \text{mar} \ ku \ yo \ sa \ \text{kanyóng}
\]
\[
I \ \text{GEN} \ \text{father} \ \text{PROG} \ \text{go} \ \text{sea} \ \text{X/Y} \ I \ \text{GEN} \ \text{elder_brother}
\]

‘My father is going fishing with my elder brother.’

(A27.2) INSTRUMENTAL (Baxter 1985: 162)

\[
\text{USER} \quad \text{TOOL}
\]
\[
eli \ ja \ \text{kotrá} \ aké \ \text{kandri} \ ku \ \text{faka}
\]
\[
\text{he} \ \text{PERF} \ \text{cut} \ \text{that} \ \text{meat} \ \text{X/Y} \ \text{knife}
\]

‘He cut the meat with a knife.’

Object marking is a function that cannot be accounted for in terms of reciprocity, as it occurs also in combinations with transitive verbs whose semantics clearly imply a one-sided directionality (Baxter 1985: 151–153), thus precluding an egalitarian status of the two participants, as in (A28).

(A28) Malaccan Creole Portuguese (Baxter 1985: 157)

\[
aké \ \text{tempu} \ sa \ \text{jenti} \ \text{midu} \ ku \ \text{deus}
\]
\[
\text{that} \ \text{time} \ \text{GEN} \ \text{people} \ \text{fear} \ \text{X/Y} \ \text{God}
\]

‘People of those times feared God.’

In the light of this evidence, it becomes necessary to question whether or not it is legitimate at all to compare the various uses which relators like Malaccan Creole Portuguese \textit{ku} are put to in individual languages and crosslinguistically. Before we face this crucial issue, we inspect further evidence from the realm of inter-participant relations, namely the adnominal uses of phrases marked for Comitative. We now enter the territory of those relations for which the term ASSOCIATIVE would most probably have been used in Croft’s model (cf. above).

In adnominal cases, the syntactic relation between the constituents representing ACCOMPANEE and COMPANION, respectively, is of the usual head-modifier type. Example (A29) from Saami documents, an interesting case where the comitative phrase modifies a pronoun in the genitive which is itself the modifier of a possessed noun.

(A29) Saami (Bartens 1989: 94 note 2)

\[
\text{ACCOMPANEE} \quad \text{COMPANION-Ř}
\]
\[
dat \ lea \ munno \ Biera-in \ \text{goahti}
\]

\[
\text{this} \ \text{is} \ \text{my} \ \text{Peter-} \ \text{X/Y} \ \text{house}
\]

‘This is the house of me and Peter.’
There is a complex possessor comprising two NPs, the second one of which lacks any relational marking that would link it to the possessed noun. In lieu of a genitive affix, we find the comitative suffix, which connects one possessor to the other. The pronoun of the first person singular, however, is inflected for the genitive and thus bears the relational marker for the two possessors as a complex unit (almost yielding a kind of group inflection). The best way to translate the relator morpheme is once again by a coordinating conjunction. As with the cases discussed in the preceding paragraphs, the two NPs joined by the comitative relator have the same semantic role: both are possessors. This equality of roles is not directly reflected by morphosyntax, though.

What is more interesting, however, is the fact that the complex NP that the attributive COMITATIVE is embedded in is free to occur in any syntactic relation. This relation hierarchically overrules the internal relation holding between ACCOMPANEE and COMPANION. This higher-order relation is identical to the one which affects the head of the NP – and thus the entire NP including the modifier. Consider the two sentences (A30)–(A31) taken from the Romanian translation of Le Petit Prince.43

(A30) Romanian (LPP Romanian V, 14)
ACCOMPANEE Ṣ COMPANION
ideea cu turma de elefanți
idea:DEF X/Y herd:DEF of elephant:PL
il făcu pe micul prinț să râdă
him make ACC little:DEF prince SUBORD laugh:3 SG.SUBJUNC
‘The idea of the herd of elephants made the Little Prince laugh.’

(A31) Romanian (LPP Romanian I, 18)
oamenii mari m-au povățuit să
man:PL:DEF big:PL me-have:3 PL advise:PTCPL SUBORD
le las încolo
them let there
ACCOMPANEE Ṣ COMPANION
de desene cu șerpi boa
of picture:PL X/Y snake:PL boa
‘The grown-ups have advised me to let them alone with pictures of boas.’

In (A30), the complex NP idea cu turma de elefanți is the higher grammatical subject of the causative construction whose nuclear predicate is the finite verb făcu ‘they made’. In (A31), on the other hand, the equally complex NP desene cu șerpi boa is a constituent of the VP with the status of a
complement or adjunct. Both NPs contain an adnominal PP headed by *cu* ‘with’. These PPs cannot be considered to be in a semantically reciprocal relation with the nominal head of the complex NP. With a little bit of good will, both attributive NPs can be analysed as being in a part-whole relationship with their respective heads. *Turma de elefantes* is the most important aspect of the simile the narrator of the story uses to describe a situation to the Little Prince. Likewise, *serpi boa* are the only visible entities reproduced on the picture which the narrator of the story used to impress the adults. In terms of syntactic relations to the main verb, the elephants and the boas are only indirectly involved in the situations described by (A30)–(A31), whereas the idea and the pictures qualify as proper participants of the nuclear predication. However, what amuses the Little Prince is the elephants (standing on each other’s back) and what fails to scare the adults is the boa (resembling a hat more than a snake). Thus, the involvement of the respective entities in the situation cannot be sweepingly denied.

Given this hierarchical order of the more directly involved head noun and the indirectly involved adnominal attribute, it is tempting to analyse the entire NPs as representing one complex but unitary participant which has internal structure inasmuch as there is an intra-participant relationship between its constituents. At least on superficial inspection, the modifier participates in the description of the state-of-affairs only by virtue of its relation to the head. Lehmann, Shin, and Verhoeven (2000: 29) focus on inter-participant relations proper. However, as they also include possessor-possessee relations, (i.e. adnominal attributes) in their study, we consider it justified to extend the domain of participation to intra-participant relations in general as well. Intra-participant relations establish a third level of participation, namely the most remote one in terms of conceptual distance to the nuclear predication as the centrepiece of the situation, cf. (A32). The question remains to be answered whether the relations on all three levels obey the same principles.

In (A32.2), the property of being bald headed is perhaps important for the identification of the referent of the subject NP. However, the bald head itself cannot be considered a full-blown participant of the nuclear predicate *fährt*. Indeed, it stands in a modifying (adnominal, i.e. intra-participant) relationship to the true participant *der Mann*. Notwithstanding its marginal status in terms of conceptual closeness to the nucleus of the situation, the attribute is still part of the description of the state of affairs and thus cannot simply be neglected on the grounds of its only mediated involvement in the situation.
(A32) The three levels of relations

(A32.1) The levels separated

I level participant → predicate → participant relation

II level participant → predicate → participant

III level participant → predicate → participant

Relation networks in a situation

\begin{align*}
\text{USER/} & \quad \text{ORNATIVE} & \text{NUCPRED} & \text{MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION} \\
[\text{der Mann [mit der Glatze]}] & \text{fährt} & [\text{mit seinem Sportwagen}] & \text{the man X/Y the bald head drive:3SG X/Y his:DAT sports_car} \\
\end{align*}

‘The bald headed man is driving in his sports car.’
In terms of syntactic relations, NPs marked for Comitative (and, in case of syncretism, Instrumental) can be either arguments, adjuncts, objects, complements or attributes. They may also be a sub-constituent of a subject NP. Thus, it is clear that there is no purely syntactically motivated definition of Comitatives and Instrumentals. If syntax is not decisive, perhaps semantics is. A closer look at the semantic roles usually assigned to syntactic units reveals, however, that not all of the problems can be solved in a satisfactory way. The most serious problem is a very fundamental one, as it affects the interplay of form and function. Given that what we have been calling COMITATIVES (and INSTRUMENTALS) is attested in all kinds of NPs used in different syntactic relations, it comes as no surprise that our COMITATIVES (and INSTRUMENTALS) also occur in a wide range of semantic roles. In the framework of Role and Reference Grammar, Van Valin and Wilkins (1996: 306) distinguish three macro-roles to which they add a level of micro-roles. Macro-roles and micro-roles are connected to one another systematically, cf. (A33). We adopt the diagram with minor modifications from Lehmann, Shin, and Verhoeven (2000: 19).

(A33) Micro-roles and macro-roles

Micro-roles

- AGENT
- FORCE
- COMITATIVE
- INSTRUMENT
- EXPERIENCER
- EMITTENT
- RECIPIENT
- BENEFICIARY
- SYMPATHETICUS
- SOURCE
- LOCATION
- GOAL
- THEME
- PATIENT

Macro-roles

- ACTOR
- INDIRECT
- UNDERGOER

The two roles which interest us most – COMITATIVE and INSTRUMENT – belong to the same macro-role, namely ACTOR. Being classified as ACTOR is tantamount to being active in a situation. Note that in contradistinction to many other micro-roles which are listed below them, COMITATIVE and INSTRUMENTAL associate with only one macro-role. The order of micro-roles...
in the above figure is not random but reflects their internal conceptual closeness or distance in a kind of topological metaphor. What is more, Van Valin (1993: 43) assumes that the use of identical means of expression is not only indicative of neighbourhood relations on the level of micro-roles. He also suggests that formal syncretism is determined by association to the same macro-role. Where there are identical markers, some kind of conceptual bond must exist. Since identity of formal expression is not restricted to the micro-roles enumerated in (A33) but occurs frequently with many other categories, there is no a priori reason to restrict a description of Comitatives to Comitatives, i.e., to the usual thematic roles proper. Notwithstanding their outsider status, categories other than the classic thematic roles must also be connected to their partners in syncretism by conceptual association.

For the sake of the argument, we take issue with Van Valin’s (1993) hypothesis, according to which formal syncretism remains within the boundaries induced by the extension of the macro-role. For a start, consider some evidence in favour of this idea. In the Celtic language Breton, the relator gant ‘with’ is not only used in instances where the terms Comitative and Instrumental seem appropriate, but, is also used as a marker of the Agent in passive constructions (Press 1986: 161), cf. (A34).

(A34) Breton
(A34.1) INSTRUMENTAL and passive AGENT (LPP Breton IV, 9)

\[
\text{ar steredennig-se n-eo bet spurmantet nemet ur}
\]

DET asteroid-DEM NEG-is been seen except one

\[
\text{wech gant ar bellsellerez e 1909 gant ur}
\]

time X/Y DET telescope in 1909 X/Y a

\[
\text{steredonjour turk}
\]

astronomer Turkish

‘This asteroid was seen just once through a telescope by a Turkish astronomer.’

(A34.2) ACCOMPANIMENT (LPP Breton IV, 50)

\[
\text{c’hwec’h vloaz ‘zo endeo ez eo aet}
\]

six year is already that is gone

\[
\text{va mignon gant e zañvad}
\]

my friend X/Y his sheep

‘It has already been six years since my friend went away with his sheep.’

The comitative marker is also used to encode the (passive) Agent. This syncretistic pattern corroborates Van Valin’s prediction: Three micro-roles
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However, the range of functions of the preposition *ku* in Malaccan Creole Portuguese cannot be accommodated with what the theory expects: Sentences (A26)–(A28) above document syncretism between COMITATIVE, INSTRUMENTAL and THEME/PATIENT, i.e., formal likeness of micro-roles which belong to two different macro-roles, namely ACTOR and UNDERGOER. According to the association lines in (A33), ACTOR and UNDERGOER never overlap as far as COMITATIVE and INSTRUMENTAL on the one hand and THEME and PATIENT on the other are concerned. Put differently, a constellation of the Malaccan Creole Portuguese type would not only be beyond the predictability of Van Valin’s model, but it also runs counter to all (model-internal) expectations. The same holds for the spatial micro-roles subsumed under the macro-role of UNDERGOER. According to the same putative restriction, syncretistic patterns involving COMITATIVE/INSTRUMENT and SOURCE/LOCATION/GOAL should be ruled out. However, the examples under (A35) show that this restriction is hardly tenable in this absolute form (Stolz 1997a: 144–147; 2001a: 341).

(A35) Syncretism of spatial micro-roles and COMITATIVE/INSTRUMENT

(A35.1) Irish (Ó Sidhail 1985: 105): LOCATION

\[ \text{tá droim Chait leis an mballa} \]

‘Cáit is standing (with her back) against the wall.’

(A35.2) Malayo (Amaya 1989: 60): GOAL

\[ \text{maestra-ga gumush-ina une-ka ihkuela-} \text{mba} \]

‘The teacher takes the children to the school.’

What comes first to mind is of course the syncretism of INSTRUMENT and SOURCE in Latin, where both micro-roles are encoded by the inflectional ablative. Consider *domī sum* ‘I am at home’, *domum eō* ‘I go home’ and *domō venīō* ‘I come from home’. The noun *domus* ‘house’ occurs in three different case forms, namely the residual locative in -**U** when combined with the static copula verb *essere* ‘to be’, the directional accusative in -**um** when combined with the motion verb *īre* ‘to go’, and the ablative in -**ō** when combined with the motion verb *venire* ‘to come’. Thus, the different case forms reflect the different semantic relations that hold between the locative adverbial and the main predicate: LOCATION, GOAL and SOURCE. The ablative fulfils the latter function (traditionally called *ablativus separativus/
originis). Syncretism of LOCATIVE and INSTRUMENT is especially frequent, whereas the COMITATIVE partakes in syncretic patterns involving LOCATIVE only if it has the same encoding as the INSTRUMENT (Stolz 2001a). Example (A35.1) from the Celtic language Irish reflects this condition. Much the same can be said for the syncretistic compatibility of COMITATIVE and GOAL: A combination of this kind always includes the expression of the INSTRUMENT also. If no syncretism of COMITATIVE and INSTRUMENT applies, only the latter can have the same expression as GOAL. This case is exemplified by (A35.2) from the Amerindian language Malayo spoken in Colombia.

Moreover, Wilkins (1989) argues that in the Australian language Arrarnta (attributed to the Pama-Nyungan phylum), the morphological ablative, whose primary function is to denote SOURCE, also displays functions which are typically associated with the COMITATIVE, cf. (A36).

(A36) Arrarnta
(A36.1) ACCOMPANIMENT (Wilkins 1989: 186)
Les Kathy-nge petye-rne
Les Kathy-ABL come-PAST.IMMED
‘Les just arrived with Kathy.’

(A36.2) SOURCE (Wilkins 1989: 185)
re pmere-nge the-ke here-werne
he camp-ABL go-PAST.COMPL creek_bed-ALL
‘He went from the camp to the creek.’

In example (A36.1), Kathy is the instigator or controlling participant, whereas Les appears to be less actively involved in the situation described. According to Wilkins (1989: 186), a translation that would reflect this difference in control exerted by the two participants more closely would read either *It was Kathy’s idea that she and Les came* or *Kathy drove Les to the place.* The functional range of the ablative does not follow the same-macro-role constraint which would normally exclude the identity of formal means not only for SOURCE and COMITATIVE but also for SOURCE and AGENT. If the ablative in (A36.1) marks the higher agentivity/volitionality (qua control) of one of the participants, the morphological syncretism is at odds with the idea that ACTOR and UNDERGOER do not overlap in those micro-roles that imply either high(est) or no agentivity at all.

Moreover, this aspect of asymmetrical control distinguishes the ablative from the regular morphological comitative in Arrarnta, cf. (A37).
According to Wilkins (1989: 211), the comitative suffix -larlenge does not convey any information as to differential involvement of the participants. The suffix is attached to the NP, which is not in focus (lack of comitative marking therefore is indicative of focus). The comitative is used when both participants have equal status: -larlenge does not ascribe control to one of the participants. The ablative is used to mark the participant that exerts a higher degree of control, whereas a third case category is used to identify the participant which is controlled (Wilkins 1989: 212). This third category is the so-called proprietive, cf. the minimal-triplet in (A38).

The differential ascription of control in ACCOMPANIMENT situations constitutes a problem for the prototype approach because the latter does not specify whether there is symmetry or asymmetry of control among the participants. Is the prototypical scenario egalitarian or hierarchical? Furthermore, these differences in control are also suggestive of different micro-roles (or even macro-roles): One of the participants may be more active than the other, and thus only the former qualifies as full-blown AGENT. The other one (being taken along, lacking initiative or volition), on the other hand, lacks some of the crucial features. Nevertheless, both participants in the
three versions of (A38) pass as ACTORS – though the one without control also displays traits of an UNDERGOER. This combination of the seemingly incompatible is one of the aspects which make Comitatives a very promising field of research.

Again in Arrarnta, the proprietive is also frequently employed in adnominal attribution. Temporary possession, corporal and other properties as well, such as objects carried along, etc. can be encoded by a NP marked for proprietive (Wilkins 1989: 192–198), cf. (A39).


\begin{verbatim}
artwe angkwerre urrpetye-m-urrepetye-kerte re
man sister few-UQ-few-PROP he
yanhe petye-me
there come-NONPAST.PROG
\end{verbatim}

‘The man with (= who has) six sisters is coming just over there.’

Discounting the possessive case (Wilkins 1989: 198–202), this function is unique to the proprietive – the remaining two case categories which otherwise classify as Comitatives do not occur in adnominal constructions. This restriction is absolutely in line with the fact that adnominal attributes introduce secondary properties associated with a participant. These properties have no independent status and should therefore be considered subordinate to, if not controlled by, the participant they are ascribed to. The ablative cannot serve this purpose, as it marks the superordinate participant (a marking strategy that would cause conflicts with further relational marking of the head noun). Likewise, the comitative itself is not appropriate for encoding relationships as the one in (A39) because this case category assigns equal status to both participants. Thus, the proprietive is the best choice for intra-participant relations of this kind.

What the examples from Arrarnta suggest is the following:

\begin{itemize}
  \item there may be several Comitatives with distinct functions in one and the same language,
  \item there may be restrictions on their admission to attributive and/or predicative constructions,
  \item the relators specify the exact spelling out of the relation that holds between ACCOMPANEE and COMPANION,
  \item none of the various Comitatives must be syncretistic with the Instrumental.
\end{itemize}

Languages differ from one another as to how many Comitatives (and Instrumentals, for that matter) they tolerate, what functions they assign to
them, whether any of them is subject to distributional restrictions in an-
nominal and/or predicative contexts, and what syncretistic patterns are ad-
missible. Independent of the solutions that individual languages use, the
simple fact that many of them – and not only those of Australia and adja-
cent areas where the patterns described for Arrarnta are indeed very wide-
spread – make use of more than just one Comitative suggests that the case-
role hierarchy (A33) does not tell the whole story. There is evidence for at
least one more level whose proper place is below the present micro-level.

4.2.2. Below the micro-role level

The terms COMITATIVE and INSTRUMENTAL cover a wide range of addi-
tional, more specific relations. From what we know about SAE languages
such as German, there appears to be no need to distinguish more than the
two ‘classic’ thematic micro-roles, because solid evidence for the existence
of further subdivisions is hard to come by, as direct primary markers are
missing. There are, however, structural facts outside the realm of morphol-
ogy which are suggestive of more implicit distinctions, cf. Chapter 5. Fur-
thermore, language comparison reveals that where German morphologi-
cally subsumes these 2nd order micro-roles under 1st order micro-roles,
other languages keep them strictly apart by formal means.

For convenience, we start from a survey of contexts in which German mit
is presently used. For this purpose, consider the list of examples in (A40).

(A40) German: a (simplified) paradigm of mit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A40.1)</td>
<td>Agnes trinkt mit Werner Kaffee.</td>
<td>CO-OPERATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes is drinking coffee together with Werner.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A40.2)</td>
<td>Agnes unterhält sich mit Werner.</td>
<td>RECIPROCAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes is chatting with Werner.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A40.3)</td>
<td>Agnes geht mit ihrer Tochter spazieren.</td>
<td>ACTIVE COMITATIVE/HUMAN COMPANION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes is going for a walk with her daughter.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A40.4)</td>
<td>Agnes geht mit ihrem Hund spazieren.</td>
<td>PASSIVE COMITATIVE/ANIMATE COMPANION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes is walking her dog.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A40.5)</td>
<td>Agnes geht mit dem Regenschirm nach draußen.</td>
<td>CONFECTIVE/INANIMATE COMPANION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes goes out with her umbrella.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A40.6)</td>
<td>Agnes kommt mit roten Augen vom Friedhof zurück.</td>
<td>ORNATIVE/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes returns from the cemetery, red-eyed.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A40.7)</td>
<td>Agnes trinkt immer Kaffee mit Milch.</td>
<td>TEMPORARY PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes always drinks coffee with milk.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are altogether fourteen different contexts in which the preposition *mit* occurs. None of the examples is stylistically marked. As a matter of fact, this list could easily be extended. The following discussion will demonstrate that (A40) covers only part of the distribution profile of the relator. The selection and the order of relations in the above list, however, are by no means random. At this point, a short characterisation of what is meant by the labels used under the heading relation is in order because these relations will keep us busy in the subsequent paragraphs and beyond:

- **CO-OPERATIVE:** Both participants are actively involved in the event, share the same macro-role and act together in order to achieve a common goal; their actions affect the same PATIENT (if present).
- **RECIPROCAL:** Both participants are actively and passively involved in the event, share the same two macro-roles and act in such a way that the action of each of them affects the other.
- **ACTIVE COMITATIVE/HUMAN COMPANION:** Both participants are actively involved in the event but one of them is assigned a higher degree of control, cf. CO-OPERATIVE for additional features.
- **PASSIVE COMITATIVE/ANIMATE COMPANION:** The non-human animate COMPANION lacks control, whereas the human ACCOMPANEE exerts control; cf. CO-OPERATIVE for additional features.
- **CONFECTIVE/INANIMATE COMPANION:** An animate ACCOMPANEE carries along or transports a concrete object; the inanimate COMPANION has a different macro-role than the animate ACCOMPANEE and it in no way affects any further participant; a typical instance of an in-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A40.8</td>
<td><em>Die Agnes mit den braunen Augen wohnt woanders.</em></td>
<td>PART-WHOLE/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The brown-eyed Agnes is living somewhere else.’</td>
<td>PERMANENT PROPERTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40.9</td>
<td><em>Die Agnes mit dem Porsche hat keinen Führerschein.</em></td>
<td>POSSESSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The Agnes with the Porsche has no driving licence.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40.10</td>
<td><em>Agnes terrorisiert mit ihren Kindern die Nachbarschaft.</em></td>
<td>HUMAN INSTRUMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes terrorises the neighbourhood with her children.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40.11</td>
<td><em>Agnes schreibt den Brief mit der linken Hand.</em></td>
<td>BODY PART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes is writing the letter with her left hand.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40.12</td>
<td><em>Agnes kommt mit dem Bus vom Friedhof zurück.</em></td>
<td>MEANS OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes returns from the cemetery by bus.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40.13</td>
<td><em>Agnes baut ein Haus mit Legosteinen.</em></td>
<td>MATERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes is building a house using lego bricks.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40.14</td>
<td><em>Agnes schlägt das Fenster mit dem Hammer ein.</em></td>
<td>TOOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Agnes smashes the window with the hammer.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The prototype and its derivations

tra-participant relation (adnominal attribution); the ACCOMPANEE controls the COMPANION.

- ORNATIVE/TEMPORARY PROPERTY: An ephemeral bodily property of an animate participant; this property has no effect on further participants, but normally escapes control by the ACCOMPANEE; a typical instance of an intra-participant relation (adnominal attribution).

- COMBINATION: Two prototypically inanimate entities occur in more or less conventionalised (but dissolvable) combinations which may be asymmetrical (cf. PART-WHOLE below), and thus one of the entities is seen as super-ordinate to the other (= a weaker kind of control); a typical instance of an intra-participant relation (adnominal attribution).

- PART-WHOLE/PERMANENT PROPERTY: Two entities (not necessarily of identical animacy) are permanently associated with each other; the one cannot normally be conceived without the other; typically, one entity is an integral part of the other (= a weaker kind of control); a typical instance of an intra-participant relation (adnominal attribution).

- POSSESSION: A human participant owns a prototypically inanimate entity and thus exerts control over it; possession by means of Comitative markers can be of the attributive kind as well as the predicative.

- HUMAN (OR ANIMATE) INSTRUMENT: The ACCOMPANEE/USER causes animate participants to act to achieve a certain goal; the subordinated animate participants are similar to causees in causative constructions; the ACCOMPANEE/USER exerts control over the ANIMATE INSTRUMENT and thus has a different micro-role.

- BODY PART INSTRUMENT: The USER carries out an action employing his/her body parts alone; usually the body part is controlled by the USER; volitionality and agentivity are reserved for the USER.

- MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION: The USER employs a vehicle to move from one place to another; the vehicle may be under the control of the USER or of a third party (a chauffeur, for instance) and lacks autonomy.

- MATERIAL: The USER employs certain substances or other to achieve a certain goal; these substances are controlled by the USER; they may be used to effect or affect an additional participant.

- TOOL: The user employs a concrete instrument in order to carry out a given action; this instrument may be specifically designed for the purpose at hand; the tool is under the control of the user.

This list does not exhaust the possibilities. In many cases, various degrees of animacy, asymmetrical control, permanence, etc. could be distinguished. Likewise, the distinction of concrete vs. abstract plays an important role, as