ON SPLIT COORDINATION

Bruening (2004, 2006) has called attention to a construction in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy in which it appears that the subject of an intransitive verb is expressed by two separate NPs, as shown in (1), where the boldfaced expressions are interpreted as co-agents of the predicate. He describes this construction as involving SPLIT COORDINATION, since the segments of the apparent subject are treated semantically as if they were conjoined.[1]

(1)   ***Píyel*** *ali=wiciyew-tú-w-ok*   ***Malíw-ol***.

       Peter   around=go.with-RECIP-3-PROX.PL   Mary-OBV.SG

       'Peter and Mary are going around with each other (i.e., dating).' (after Bruening

          2006:3, example (8))

As Bruening (2006:4–5) observes, the split coordination construction differs from ordinary coordination with *naka* 'and' in the way in which obviation is handled. When two NPs are conjoined by *naka*, both are proximate if the argument represented by the conjunction as a whole is proximate, as shown in (2). The second of two conjoined NPs may not be obviative if the first is proximate, unless of course it is a possessed noun with a third person possessor, as in (3), since this configuration independently induces obviation.[2]

(2) a. ***Píyel*** ***naka*** ***Máli***   *ali=wiciyew-tú-w-ok*.

       Peter   and   Mary   around=go.with-RECIP-3-PROX.PL

       'Peter and Mary are going around with each other.' (after Bruening 2006:3, ex. (5))

b. *_Píyel naka Malíw-ol_   _ali=wiciyew-tú-w-ok._

Peter   and   Mary-OBV.SG   around=go.with-RECIP-3-PROX.PL

'Peter and Mary (obv.) are going around with each other.' (after Bruening 2006:4, ex.

(9))

(3)   _Cocepíh-hik=yaq_   _n-uhsímis_   _naka_   **_'t-ulŏmení-m-ol._**

separate-(3)-PROX.PL=REPORT 1-younger.sibling   and   3-husband-POSS-OBV.SG

'I hear my younger sister and her husband are separated.' (Francis and Leavitt 2008:112)

Note that verb agreement in all of these examples is for proximate plural subject.[3] The

conjunction of a proximate and an obviative, as in (3), counts as proximate for agreement

purposes.

In split coordination, on the other hand, only one of the semantically conjoined NPs may

be proximate; the other must be obviative. Thus (4) is not a possible alternative to (1) above.

(4)   **_*Píyel_** _ali=wiciyew-tú-w-ok_   **_Máli._**

Peter   around=go.with-RECIP-3-PROX.PL   Mary

'Peter and Mary and going around with each other.' (after Bruening 2006:4, ex. (10))

Bruening (2006) proposes an analysis of split coordination within the framework of the

Minimalist Program of Chomsky 1993, 1995, 2000 according to which the obviative segment of

the agent is generated in object position, but as sister within VP to an intransitive verb, rather

than as a true object. When an Agree relationship is established between the functional category

little _v_, which heads a projection dominating VP, and the NP in object position within VP, a

special semantic operation allows this NP to be interpreted as conjoined with the subject, which is located in Spec, *v*P.

One consequence of the Projection Principle of Chomsky 1981 is that only an argument selected by a verb may be its sister within VP. Bruening's analysis of split coordination violates this principle, since it postulates an NP in object position that is not assigned a thematic role by the associated verb. Bruening accordingly argues that the Projection Principle should be abandoned. He suggests that the desirable consequences of this principle can be derived instead from the less restrictive Principle of Full Interpretation (Chomsky 1993), with which his analysis is compatible. The latter principle essentially states that all syntactic elements that are present at the interfaces to the other components of the grammar should receive interpretations appropriate to those components.

Under Bruening's analysis, the semantics of the predicate in the split coordination construction play no role in determining the properties of the construction. Thus the analysis predicts that any intransitive verb should be able to appear in the construction, and indeed Bruening reports that a wide variety of intransitive predicates participate in split coordination. My own fieldwork suggests, however, that Bruening's data are incorrect on this point. The verbs that appear in the construction are in fact restricted to a particular semantic class: they all refer to an activity carried out jointly by the participants. Bruening is right, however, to see the obviative NP in the construction as generated in object position. It is a secondary object, and the verbs that participate in the split coordination construction belong to the class that Goddard (1974:319) has termed transitivized animate intransitives or AI+O verbs.[4]

I demonstrate that split coordination is in fact a predictable variant of a comitative construction that I have described elsewhere as involving AI+O verbs of a semantically defined

class in Passamaquoddy, namely *verbs of joint activity* (LeSourd 2006:501–4). Like other AI+O verbs, verbs of joint activity typically agree with their secondary objects in the independent indicative mode, the class of forms ordinarily used in main clauses. Their inflection is unusual, however. A verb of this type takes "subject" inflection for the combined features of its subject and its secondary object (which together constitute the agent argument of the predicate), while at the same time taking object inflection for its secondary object alone.

The preverb-verb combination (or verbal compound) *ali=wiciyew-ti-* (around=go.with-RECIP-) 'go around with each other, date' from (1) belongs to the class of verbs of joint activity and may be inflected in just this way, as shown in (5). The subject agreement suffix here is *-ya* 'proximate plural'. It indexes the combined properties of both the subject *Píyel* 'Peter' and the secondary object *Malíwol* 'Mary (obv.)'. These two together constitute a proximate plural, just as the conjunction of a proximate and an obviative yields a proximate plural for the purpose of subject inflection in (3) above. At the same time, the secondary object *Malíwol* is indexed as such by the object agreement suffix *-l* 'obviative singular'.

(5)   *Píyel*   *'t-ali=wiciyew-tí-nǐ-ya-l*   *Malíw-ol.*

        Peter   3-around=go.with-RECIP-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG Mary-OBV.SG

        'Peter is going around with (going out with) Mary.'

This comitative construction is used to focus on one member of a set of joint participants in an event or activity, syntactically expressed as the subject of the verb, while backgrounding the other participant(s), expressed as the object. In the case of (5), both Peter and Mary are agents of an activity of dating, but the speaker has chosen to focus on Peter, or to take Peter's

point of view. His role is foregrounded, while Mary's is in the background. The fact that both participants are agents is reflected by the use of proximate plural subject inflection. The background status attributed to Mary is reflected by having this referent realized as a secondary object. Both participants are selected by the verb, however, and both are assigned thematic roles.

While agreement with the secondary object is a common feature of AI+O inflection in Passamaquoddy, it is not obligatory. When this agreement is not carried out, the secondary object is simply not indexed in the verb word, and the verb itself then has exactly the form of the corresponding AI. This is a general property of AI+O inflection, not specific to verbs of joint activity. But consider the result when a verb of joint activity happens to be inflected this way. The verb still takes subject inflection for the combined properties of its subject and its secondary object, but no longer takes object inflection. It is accompanied by one proximate NP (its subject) and one obviative NP (its object), which together represent its agent argument. In short, what we have here is the split coordination construction. Thus split coordination is simply a variant of the comitative construction: it is the comitative construction without object inflection. This is the conclusion that I defend in more detail in the discussion that follows. If this result is correct, then examples like (1) do not, after all, pose any problem for the Projection Principle, since they do not require us to suppose that a verb may take an object to which it assigns no thematic role.

1.   The split coordination construction

As we have already observed, split coordination involves discontinuous expression of the agent argument of what appears to be an intransitive predicate. Both certain basic animate

intransitive (AI) verbs, as in (6), and many reciprocal derivatives of transitive animate (TA) verbs, as in (1) above and (7), allow such discontinuous expression of their agents.[5]

(6)   ***Píyel***   *toli=nis-intú-w-ok*   ***Malíw-ol***.

        Peter   ongoing=together-sing-3-PROX.PL   Mary-OBV.SG

        'Peter and Mary are singing together.'

(7)   ***Máli***   *yuh-útǔ-w-ok*   ***Piyél-ol***

        Mary   tell-RECIP-3-PROX.PL   Peter-OBV.SG

        wen-ĭhì   *keti=nipǔwam-a-hti-c-ĭhì.*

        who-OBV.PL   future=marry-DIR-PROX.PL-3AN-OBV.PL

        'Mary and Peter told each other whom they were going to marry.' (after Bruening
        2006:9, ex. (30))

As Bruening (2006:7–8) notes, neither the subject nor the object of a transitive verb can be given discontinuous expression in this fashion. Despite the very free word order of Passamaquoddy, nothing like (8b) is a possible paraphrase of (8a), and nothing like (9b) is a possible paraphrase of (9a).[6]

(8) a. ***Máli*** **naka** ***Píyel***   *'toli=nǒmiy-á-wa-l*

        Mary   and   Peter   (3)-location=see-DIR-PROX.PL-OBV.SG

        Suséhp-ol   *Kelìsk.*

        Joseph-OBV.SGCalais.LOC

        'Mary and Peter saw Joseph in Calais.'

b. ***Máli*** *'toli=nŏmiy-á-wa-l*   ***Piyél-ol***

    Mary   (3)-location=see-DIR-PROX.PL-OBV.SG   Peter-OBV.SG

    Suséhp-ol   *Kelìsk.*

    Joseph-OBV.SG Calais.LOC

    'Mary and Peter saw Joseph in Calais.'

(9) a. *N-toli=nŏmíy-a-(k)*[7]   *éhpit   naka   skitàp   imiyewikŭwám-ok.*

    1-location=see-DIR-PROX.PL   woman and   man   church-LOC

    'I saw a woman and a man at the church.'

b. **Éhpit n-toli=nŏmíy-a-(k)*   *skitápĭ-yil   imiyewikŭwám-ok.*

    woman 1-location=see-DIR-PROX.PL   man-OBV.SG   church-LOC

    'I saw a woman and a man at the church.'

As we have already noted, the distribution of obviatives in split coordination is different from what we find in cases of ordinary conjunction with *naka* 'and'. Thus the agent of 'tell each other' is represented by the combination of a proximate and an obviative NP in (7) above, but by the conjunction of two proximates in (10).

(10)   ***Máli***   *naka*   ***Píye***l   *yuh-útŭ-w-ok*

    Mary   and   Peter   tell-RECIP-3-PROX.PL

    wen-ĭhì   *keti=nipŭwam-a-hti-c-ĭhì.*

    who-OBV.PL   future=marry-DIR-PROX.PL-3AN-OBV.PL

    'Mary and Peter told each other whom they were going to marry.'

Obviously, there are differences in word order as well. It should be noted, however, that coordinate expressions formed with *naka* may also receive discontinuous expression, as shown in (11). Agreement with a discontinuous subject may be with both conjuncts in such cases, as in (b) below, or only with the first, as in (c). In contrast with cases of split coordination, however, both conjuncts are proximate in such examples, despite the discontinuous expression of conjunction and regardless of the pattern of agreement involved.

(11) a. *Mecimí=te* **Píyel naka Máli** *pŏm-íh-hik.*

      always=EMPH   Peter and Mary along-go-(3)-PROX.PL

      'Peter and Mary are always on the go.'

   b.   *Mecimí=te*   **Píyel** *pŏm-íh-hik*   **naka Máli.**

      always=EMPH Peter along-go-(3)-PROX.PL and   Mary

      'Peter and Mary are always on the go.'

   c.   *Mecimí=te*   **Píyel** *pŏm-íye*   **naka Máli.**

      always=EMPH Peter along-go-(3) and   Mary

      'Peter and Mary are (lit., is) always on the go.'

Bruening (2006:5–6) shows that the NPs that appear to be segments of a single subject in the split coordination construction are actually independent arguments, demonstrating that either NP may be extracted independently of the other. Thus, for example, either of these NPs may be questioned, as illustrated in (12).

(12) a. *Wèn ali=wiciyew-tí-hti-t*   *Malíw-ol?*

who   around=go.with-RECIP-PROX.PL-3AN Mary-OBV.SG

'Who is going around with Mary?' (after Bruening 2006:5, example (14b))

b. *Wén-il*   *Máli*   *ali-wiciyew-ti-htí-c-il?*

who-OBV.SG   Mary   around=go.with-RECIP-PROX.PL-3AN

'Who is Mary going around with?' (after Bruening 2006:5, example (14a))

Relativization may likewise target just one of the two NPs in the split coordination construction, as we see in (13). Example (13a) shows that the verb *nacitaham-ti-* 'hate each other', the reciprocal of *nacitaham-* 'hate', participates in the construction. In (13b), the obviative segment of the apparent discontinuous subject of 'hate each other' is relativized, showing its independence from the proximate segment. The relativized constituent is indexed on this verb in (13b) by the obviative singular participle suffix *-il*. Note that the same verb bears agreement marking for a proximate plural subject (suffix *-hti-*), indexing the combined properties of its (null) proximate argument and the relativized constituent.

(13)   a.   *Nòt*   *ktaqhómuhs*   *nacitaham-tú-w-ok*

that.AN old.man   hate-RECIP-3-PROX.PL

nisŭwi-htí-c-il[8]   *w-ikŭwóss-ol.*

(3)-be.married-PROX.PL-3AN-OBV.SG 3-mother-OBV.SG

'That old man and his wife's mother hate each other.'

b.　*N-itàp 'kisi=matŏn-óku-l*　　　　　　　*níhtol　skitápĭ-yil*

1-friend　　　(3)-past=attack-INV-OBV.SG　　that.OBV.SG　　man-OBV.SG

mecimí=te　　nacitaham-ti-htí-c-il.

always=EMPH　hate-RECIP-PROX.PL-3AN-OBV.SG

'My friend was attacked by that man he was always enemies with (lit., that

he and that man always hated each other).'

Extraction from discontinuously expressed conjunctions with *naka* gives different results. The left-hand conjunct may be extracted in a case like that illustrated in (14), where the conjunction represents the subject of an intransitive verb, but the verb agrees only with the extracted conjunct. Here the second segment of the conjunction *naka Píyel* 'and Peter' is plausibly analyzed as a phrase independent of the extracted subject, as suggested in the translation.

(14)　*Wèn　macáha-t　　naka　Píyel?*

who　leave-3AN　　and　Peter

'Who is leaving with Peter?' (lit., 'Who is leaving and Peter?')

When the verb agrees with the conjunction as a whole, however, as it does in (11b) above, we are more inclined to adopt an analysis that postulates that the conjunction is a single discontinuous phrase. But in fact under these circumstances extraction of a single conjunct is impossible, as shown in (15b). Example (15a), where the first conjunct is the plural form *wénik* 'who (pl.)', is fine, since this NP can govern plural agreement with the verb on its own. But

(15b) is impossible: here *wèn* 'who (sg.)' would be extracted from 'who and Peter', with the verb marked in agreement with the conjunction as a whole. The result would be a violation of the Coordinate Structure Constraint of Ross 1967.

(15) a. *Wén-ik*   *macahá-hti-t*   *naka*   *Píyel?*

          who-PROX.PL   leave-PROX.PL-3AN   and   Peter

          'Who (pl.) are leaving with Peter?'

     b.   **Wèn*   *macahá-hti-t*   *naka*   *Píyel?*

           who   leave-PROX.PL-3AN   and   Peter

           'Who (sg.) are leaving and Peter?'

It seems clear, then, that the segments of a discontinuously expressed conjunction with *naka* form parts of a single constituent in cases in which they jointly control verb agreement. The two segments that together express the agent in the split coordination construction, by contrast, are syntactically independent—even though verb agreement takes both of them into account.

Here, then, is the picture of split coordination that emerges from the discussion in this section. The construction includes two NPs that jointly express the agent of what appears to be an intransitive verb. These NPs are nonetheless distinct syntactic arguments, independently subject to extraction. They also differ in rank with respect to obviation: while one argument may be proximate, the other must be obviative.

Following Kratzer 1996, Bruening (2006:5–7) assumes that a transitive verb is a two-place predicate taking an individual argument (corresponding to the object) and an event argument. This predicate combines with its internal argument (the object) to produce a one-place predicate of events. Another predicate is contributed by the head of the next higher level of syntactic structure (little *v*, in Bruening's terms). This predicate again takes two arguments: the "external argument" of the verb (the subject, actually an argument of *v* and represented in Spec, *v*P) and an event argument. The two predicates are semantically combined by identifying their event arguments, yielding an interpretation for the expression as a whole.

Ordinarily, under such an account, only a transitive verb is expected to occur with an NP sister. But suppose, Bruening suggests, that verbs in general may take such a sister. In particular, suppose that an *intransitive* verb may be accompanied by an NP, one that is not a selected argument, contrary to what we would expect on the basis of the Projection Principle. Such a structure will be ruled out at the interface between the syntax and the semantics by the Principle of Full Interpretation—unless there is a way for this extra NP in the VP to receive an interpretation.

Bruening goes on to suggest a way for such a process of interpretation to take place. As an intransitive verb, the verb that is sister to this extra NP is only a predicate of events, not of individuals, and cannot combine with the translation of its sister NP. Suppose semantic composition proceeds without this step, however, and the predicate represented by the verb combines with the predicate introduced by little *v* through event identification, as usual. If we simply proceed to incorporate the interpretation of the subject without doing anything about the

12

sister of the verb, then the derivation will crash. But Bruening proposes that *v* is permitted to agree with the sister of the verb in VP as well as with the subject in its specifier. Moreover, he suggests that a predicate associated with a head that (like *v*) is involved in more than one agreement relationship (here, with the NP in its specifier and the NP sister of V) is subject to a special type-shifting rule. This rule converts the predicate from one taking a single argument to one taking two arguments, and it interprets these arguments as a set. This rule, among other things, will produce a plural interpretation for the combination of a singular subject and a singular NP in VP.

The upshot of these proposals for the analysis of the split coordination construction is this. The proximate NP *Píyel* in a sentence like (1), repeated here as (16), is analyzed as the subject of the verb (generated in Spec of *v*P).

(16)   ***Píyel***   *ali=wiciyew-tú-w-ok*   ***Malíw-ol****.*

　　　 Peter   around=go.with-RECIP-3-PROX.PL   Mary-OBV.SG

　　　 'Peter and Mary are going around with each other (i.e., dating).'

The obviative NP *Malíwol* is analyzed as a nonthematic sister of the verb in VP. Semantic interpretation works by gathering together the translations of these two NPs and forming a single argument out of them at the *v*P level by (i) establishing an Agree relation between *v* and the sister of the verb (as well as between *v* and the subject in its specifier); and (ii) applying a type-shifting operation to the interpretation of *v*P that creates a two-place predicate out of the one-place predicate that *v*P would normally represent, namely a predicate whose value is the set of entities with which *v* has agreed (the referents of *Píyel* and *Malíwol*, the subject and the sister of V). The

effect of these moves is that two distinct NPs that occur together with an intransitive verb are interpreted as the equivalent of a conjoined subject, which is what we seem to find in the split coordination construction.

SEMANTIC RESTRICTIONS ON PARTICIPATING PREDICATES

The account of split coordination that Bruening suggests assigns no role to the semantics of the verbs that appear in the construction. There is no reason, on such an account, to expect that the construction will be restricted to any particular class of verbs. As it turns out, however, most AI verbs do not occur in the construction. For example, (17a)–(20a), cannot be paraphrased as (17b)–(20b).

(17) a. *Máli   naka   Píyel   kisi=cipqahsín-uk.*

          Mary   and   Peter   past=have.nightmare-(3)-PROX.PL

          'Mary and Peter had nightmares.'

      b. **Máli kisi=cipqahsín-uk*   Piyél-ol.*

(18) a. *Súsehp naka   Píyel   apŏlahsatpí-hik.*

          Joseph and   Peter   be.bald-(3)-PROX.PL

          'Joseph and Peter are bald.'

      b. **Súsehp   apŏlahsatpí-hik   Piyél-ol.*

14

(19) a. *Máli   naka   Téles   mecimí=te   kespoqsú-w-ok.*

Mary   and   Alice   always=EMPH   oversleep-3-PROX.PL

'Mary and Alice always oversleep.'[9]

b. **Máli   mecimí=te   kespoqsú-w-okTelés-ol.*

(20) a. *KeqsèyPíyel   naka   Máli   ítŏm-uk?*

what   Peter   and   Mary   say-(3)-PROX.PL

'What did Peter and Mary say?'[10]

b. **Keqsèy Máli ítŏm-uk Piyél-ol?*

I should note, however, that the results of my fieldwork are at odds here with what Bruening has reported. He gives examples parallel to (17b)–(20b) as grammatical (Bruening 2004:14, example (61); 17, examples (68a–c)).

To see how the interpretation of the predicate determines whether split coordination is possible, consider the verb *nŏmiy-uti-*, the reciprocal of *nŏmiy-* 'see'. Much as in English, this expression can have either its literal meaning 'see each other', or an idiomatic sense 'go out together, date'. Thus (21) is ambiguous: it can either refer to two people who are seeing each other around, as a game warden and a hunter might do in the woods, or to two people who are romantically involved.

(21)   *Ali=nŏmiy-útŭ-w-ok*   *nìkk.*

       around=see-RECIP-3-PROX.PL those

       'Those two are seeing each other.'[11]

On the idiomatic reading, (21) can be paraphrased using split coordination, as shown in (22a). On the literal reading, however, no such as paraphrase is possible. Thus (22b) is excluded.

(22)   a.   *Píyel   ali=nŏmiy-útŭ-w-ok*   *Malíw-ol.*

            Peter   around=see-RECIP-3-PROX.PL Mary-OBV.SG

            'Peter and Mary are seeing (dating) each other.'

       b.   **Kúkec*   *ali=nŏmiy-útŭ-w-ok*   *kotunkewinúw-ol.*

             gamewarden around=see-RECIP-3-PROX.PL hunter-OBV.SG

            'The game warden and the hunter are seeing each other around.'

It appears that the split coordination construction is not available for describing just any kind of event with more than one participant, but is instead restricted to the description of activities with joint participants—participants who carry out the activity in concert. So while each of the game warden and the hunter in (22b) sees the other, they are not involved in a joint activity of seeing. But two people who are "seeing" one another *are* participants in a joint activity, namely a romance. The same reasoning applies in the case of examples (17)–(20). 'Having nightmares', in (17), is not a joint activity, so split coordination is not allowed. Likewise for 'being bald' in (18), 'oversleeping' in (19), and 'saying' in (20).

The seemingly contradictory judgments that I obtained for the following pair of examples can be explained in much the same way.

(23)   a.   *Assélŏma   al-kawŏtú-w-ok   Suséhp-ol.

              Samuel   around-dual.walk-3-PROX.PL Joseph-OBV.SG

              'Samuel and Joseph are walking around.'

       b   Máli   al-kawŏtú-w-ok   Piyél-ol.

              Mary   around-dual.walk-3-PROX.PL Peter-OBV.SG

              'Mary and Peter are walking around (i.e., going around together).'

(adapted from

              Bruening 2004:8, example (32a))

My principal consultant rejected the use of the verb *alkawŏtúwok* 'they (dual) walk around' in the split coordination construction in (23a), but accepted the seemingly parallel example (23b). But notice the difference in subjects. It seems reasonable to suppose that the activity represented by Samuel and Joseph walking around together struck my consultant simply as two instances of walking, while that represented by Mary and Peter walking around together once again readily lent itself to a construal as dating, an activity with joint participants.

Consider, finally, the following pair of examples with verbs based on *-intu-* 'sing'.

(24)   a.   *Píyel tol-intú-w-ok   Malíw-ol.

              Peter ongoing-sing-3-PROX.PL   Mary-OBV.SG

'Peter and Mary are singing.'

b.   *Píyel   toli=nis-intú-w-ok   Malíw-ol.*

Peter   ongoing=together-sing-3-PROX.PL   Mary-OBV.SG

'Peter and Mary are singing together.'

In (24a), Peter and Mary are described simply as singing. Whether they are singing together or separately is left unspecified. Under these circumstances, split coordination is infelicitous. In (24b), by contrast, Peter and Mary are explicitly stated to be singing together: the root *nis-* 'together' specifies that the singing in question is a joint activity. Here split coordination is natural. It seems clear, then, that split coordination is restricted to clauses with predicates that express a joint activity on the part of the participants.

A COMITATIVE CONSTRUCTION

The constraints that govern the predicates that appear in the split coordination construction are highly reminiscent of the restrictions on the class of AI+O verbs that occur in a comitative construction in Passamaquoddy that is likewise used to indicate joint participation in an activity (LeSourd 2006:501–4). This construction is used to present an activity from the point of view of a subset of the participants, syntactically expressed as the subject of the verb. The verb also takes a secondary object, however, which represents the backgrounded participants. Verbs appearing in the construction typically refer to activities like arguing, fighting, or drinking

together that are necessarily performed in concert by more than one agent. Thus they may appropriately be termed *verbs of joint activity*.

An AI+O verb in Passamaquoddy is usually inflected in agreement with both its subject and its secondary object in the independent indicative mode, the type of form most often found in main clauses.[12] Some of the affixes used to index the arguments of AI verbs are also used in AI+O inflection, but some distinct morphemes are involved as well. A characteristic feature of AI+O inflection in the independent indicative is the suffix *-(ŏ)n(e)-* (glossed as '-N'), which appears in all forms of this mode that agree with a secondary object.

A typical example showing the use of an AI+O verb is given in (25). The inflection here is for proximate plural subject (understood as dual, since the verb stem lacks a multi-plural marker). A third-person prefix with the underlying shape /w-/ indexes the (null) subject here, but is phonologically deleted. The proximate plural suffix *-ya* also indexes the subject. The obviative singular suffix *-l* indexes the secondary object *puhtáyal* 'bottle (obv.)'.

(25)   *Mokuk-ŏn-otí-nĭ-**ya-l**   *puhtáya-l.*
        (3)-deprive-by.hand-RECIP-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG   bottle-OBV.SG
        'They (du.) try to grab the bottle (an., obv.) from each other; they struggle
together

                        over the bottle.'

The inflection of a verb of joint activity departs from the usual pattern for AI+O verbs, however. A verb of this class receives subject inflection not simply for the person and number of its syntactic subject, but for the properties of the whole set of participants in the situation that the

verb is used to describe—that is, for both the subject and the secondary object, taken together. At the same time, the verb takes object inflection for the secondary object. It should be noted, however, that inflection for proximate singular objects is null.

To see how the system works, consider the examples in (26).

(26) a. *Píyel 't-ahtŏli=kŏlul-tí-nĭ-**ya-l**   't-uletí-m-ol.*

Peter (3)-keep.on=argue-RECIP-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG 3-wife-POSS-OBV.SG

'Peter keeps on arguing with his wife.'

b. *Wásis 'kisi=matŏn-otí-nĭ-**ya-l**   uhsimís-ol.*

child (3)-past=fight-RECIP-N-PROX.P-OBV.SG   (3)-younger.sibling-

OBV.SG

'The child fought with his younger sibling.'

c. *N-totŏli=nis-ossŏmi-nè-**n**   k-itàp.*

1-ongoing=together-drink-N-1PL   2-friend

'I am drinking with your friend.' (Francis and Leavitt 2008:613, accent marking

supplied)

The verbal inflection in (26a, b) is the same as that in (25), except that the third-person prefix appears in its prevocalic shape /wt-/ (surface *'t-*) in (26a). Note that the proximate plural suffix -*ya* is used in these examples despite the fact that the subject of the verb is now singular:

Píyel 'Peter' in (26a), *wásis* 'child' in (26b). It is not the subject alone that governs the choice of the subject marker here, but the combined number of the subject and the secondary object. Note further that the additional suffix *-l* 'obviative singular' indexes the secondary object, even though the latter is already reflected in agreement by the suffix *-ya*. The verb in (26c) is inflected for a first-person plural subject (suffix *-n*), which represents the combined features of the (covert) first-person singular syntactic subject and the third-person singular secondary object *kitàp* 'your (sg.) friend'. No overt object agreement suffix represents the latter NP, however, since it is proximate as well as singular, so that object inflection is null. (The presence of the suffix *-(ŏ)n(e)-* nonetheless indicates that the verb here agrees with a secondary object.)

Given that the predicates that appear in the split coordination construction have the same semantic properties as the predicates that participate in the comitative construction, it is logical to ask whether verbs of the former class can in fact occur in the latter construction. Indeed, we have already seen one predicate that occurs in both constructions, *ali=wiciyew-ti-* 'go around with, date'; see examples (1) and (5).

As it turns out, every example of the split coordination construction that we have seen above can be rephrased using the comitative construction simply by giving the verb of the sentence appropriate AI+O inflection. Thus corresponding to (7) above with *yuh-uti-* 'tell each other' we have (27a), corresponding to (13) with *nacitaham-ti-* 'hate each other' we have (27b), corresponding to (22a) with *ali=nŏmiy-uti-* 'see each other, date' we have (27c), and corresponding to (23b) with *al-kawŏti-* 'walk around (dual), go around with (dual)' we have (27d).

(27)   a.   *Máli*   *'t-iy-utí-nĭ-ya-l*   *Piyél-ol*

Mary   3-tell-RECIP-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG   Peter-OBV.SG

wen-ĭhì   *keti=nipŭwam-a-hti-c-ĭhi.*[13]

who-OBV.PL   future=marry-DIR-PROX.PL-3AN-OBV.PL

'Mary and Peter told each other whom they were going to marry.'

b.   *Mecimí=te   nòt   ktaqhómuhs   nacitaham-tí-nĭ-ya-l*

always=EMPH that.AN old.man   (3)-hate-RECIP-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG

nisŭwi-htí-c-il   w-ikŭwóss-ol.

(3)-be.married-PROX.PL-3AN-OBV.SG 3-mother-OBV.SG

'That old man was always enemies with his wife's mother.'

c.   *Píyel   't-ali=nŏmiy-utí-nĭ-ya-l   Malíw-ol.*

Peter   3-around=see-RECIP-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG   Mary-OBV.SG

'Peter is seeing (going out with) Mary.'

d.   *Máli   't-al-kawŏtí-nĭ-ya-l   Piyél-ol.*

Mary   3-around-dual.walk-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG   Peter-OBV.SG

'Mary is going around with (lit., walking around with) Peter.'

On the other hand, AI verbs that cannot appear in the split coordination construction also cannot appear in the comitative construction: the secondary objects that appear in this construction are selected only by verbs of joint activity. Thus (28a) cannot be paraphrased either as (28b) or as (28c).

(28) a.   *Píyel   naka   Máli   cikŏpú-w-ok.*

              Peter   and   Mary   sit.quietly-3-PROX.PL

              'Peter and Mary sit quietly.'

      b.   **Píyel cikŏpú-w-ok Malíw-ol.*

      c.   **Píyel 'cikŏpí-nĭ-ya-l Malíw-ol.*

Likewise, (29a) is excluded: since *tol-intu-* 'be singing' does not appear with split coordination, as we noted in connection with (24a) above, it cannot appear in the comitative construction either. *Nis-intu-* 'sing together', on the other hand, does occur in the split coordination construction, as seen in (24b), and also in the comitative construction, as shown in (29b).

(29) a.   **Píyel 'tol-intú-nĭ-ya-l   Malíw-ol.*

             Peter (3)-ongoing-sing-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG Mary-OBV.SG

             'Peter is singing with Mary.'

      b.   *Píyel   'toli=nis-intú-nĭ-ya-l   Malíw-ol.*

             Peter   (3)-ongoing=together-sing-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG   Mary-OBV.SG

             'Peter is singing with Mary.'

What we find, then, is that clauses with split coordination can always be paraphrased with a verb that takes object inflection for what we had taken to be a segment of the subject of an intransitive verb. This fact suggests that we were mistaken in our initial impression that split coordination involves a special mode of expression for subjects. Rather, it appears that certain seemingly intransitive verbs actually take an object complement as well as a subject: we have really been dealing all along with AI+O verbs. The verbs that permit this complement to appear have the additional option of agreeing with it, yielding the comitative construction.

AN OPTION FOR AI+O INFLECTION

We have seen that AI+O verbs in Passamaquoddy may agree with their objects when the verb is inflected in the independent indicative mode. There is another option, however: the verb may agree with its subject alone, leaving the object unindexed.[14] Thus *ksinuhka-* 'be sick, have pain' has an optional valence for a secondary object referring to the affected body part. The verb may either agree with this object, as in (30a), or take it as an unindexed complement, as in (30b). Similarly, *lahke-* 'throw' takes a secondary object expressing its theme argument. As shown in (31a, b), agreement with this object is optional. Both of these verbs may also be used without an object as AIs, as in the (c) examples below. AI+O forms without object agreement are identical with the corresponding AI forms.[15]

(30)　a.　*'Kosinuhká-n-ol*　　*'sísk-ul.*

　　　　　(3)-be.sick-N-IN.PL　(3)-eye-IN.PL

'He has pain in his eyes.'

b.   *Ksinúhka   'sísk-ul.*

be.sick-(3)   (3)-eye-IN.PL

'He is sick, has pain in his eyes.'

c.   *Cán   nicán-ol   ksinúhka.*[16]

John   (3)-child-OBV.SG   be.sick-(3)

'John's child is sick.' (Francis and Leavitt 2008:328, accent marking

supplied)

(31)   a.   *Nut-áhke-t   't-ol-ahká-n-ol   epeskomákŏn-ol.*

occupation-throw-3AN   3-thus-throw-N-OBV.SG   ball-OBV.SG

'The pitcher throws the ball.'

b.   *Nut-áhke-t   l-áhke   epeskomákŏn-ol.*

occupation-throw-3AN   thus-throw-(3) ball-OBV.SG

'The pitcher throws the ball.'

c.   *Nut-áhke-t   l-áhke.*

occupation-throw-3AN   thus-throw-(3)

'The pitcher throws.'

Consider now how the comitative construction is realized if we take the option of not marking the verb in agreement with its secondary object. Compare (32a), for example, where 'drink together' has the usual inflection for the comitative construction, with (31b), where we dispense with object inflection. In (32a), 'drink together' receives both proximate plural subject inflection (suffix *-ya*), reflecting the combined properties of its subject and its secondary object, and obviative singular object inflection (suffix *-l*), indexing the object alone. In (32b), where the object is not indexed as such, the verb continues to take inflection for proximate plural subject, but does so after the fashion of an AI verb, with *-ok* instead of *-ya* reflecting the combined features of the proximate singular subject and the obviative singular object. (Compare the inflection of the strictly AI *cikŏpi-* 'sit quietly' in (28a) above.)

(32) a.   *Skitàp 'totŏli=nis-ossŏmí-nĭ-**ya-l***   *w-itápĭ-yil.*

man   (3)-ongoing=together-drink-N-PROX.PL-OBV.SG   3-friend-

OBV.SG

'The man is drinking with his friend.'

b.   *Nòt   skitàp toli=nis-ossŏmú-w-**ok***   *w-itápĭ-yil.*[17]

that.AN man   ongoing=together-drink-3-PROX.PL   3-friend-OBV.SG

'That man is drinking with his friend.'

26

The examples in (33) are comparable to (32b), but correspond to the comitative examples with 'argue' and 'fight' in (26a, b) above. Forms agreeing with the object have again been replaced by forms that show only subject inflection—where subject inflection actually reflects the combined properties of the subject and an otherwise unindexed complement.

(33)   a.   *Píyel   ahtŏli=kŏlul-tú-w-ok*   *'t-uletí-m-ol.*

              Peter   keep.on=argue-RECIP-3-PROX.PL   3-wife-POSS-OBV.SG

              'Peter keeps on arguing with his wife.'

       b.   *Wásis kisi=matŏn-ótŭ-w-ok*   *uhsimís-ol.*

              child   past=fight-RECIP-3-PROX.PL   (3)-younger.sibling-OBV.SG

              'The child fought with his younger sibling.'

Each example includes what appears to be an intransitive verb (although the obviative NP in the sentence is actually a secondary object). The agents of the activity are represented by two NPs that are indexed together by subject inflection on the verb, but which are nonetheless distinct syntactic arguments. Thus what we have here is precisely the split coordination construction: when an AI+O verb in the comitative construction is inflected according to the optional pattern on which the object is left unindexed, the result is a structure in which the subject and the secondary object exhibit split coordination.

In the end, then, the split coordination construction is seen to be nothing more than a predictable variant of the comitative construction. Split coordination simply reflects the fact that object agreement is optional in the comitative construction, which in turn reflects a general

property of AI+O inflection in Passamaquoddy. No special grammatical mechanisms are needed to account for split coordination.

We began our investigation of split coordination by observing how two NPs in certain sentences appear to be the joint expression of the subject of an intransitive verb. But syntactic tests show these nominals to be independent constituents. Moreover, the predicates that occur in the construction turn out to be restricted to verbs of joint activity. These facts suggest a different perspective: the NPs involved in split coordination are distinct arguments of the verb. When we compare the split coordination construction with the comitative construction, it becomes clear that we are actually dealing with the subject and object of an AI+O verb.

Bruening's analysis of split coordination is based on an invalid premise: that any intransitive verb may appear in the construction. Reasoning on this basis, he proposes a special process of interpretation to allow a non-thematic NP in object position to be interpreted as conjoined with the subject. But allowing an NP to occur in object position without receiving a thematic role from the verb runs afoul of the Projection Principle.

On the account proposed here, the obviative NP in the split coordination construction is a secondary object and thus a selected complement of the verb. The construction accordingly poses no problem for the Projection Principle. The interpretation of the subject and the secondary object as co-agents of the verb is a reflection of the comitative semantics of the construction, which in turn reflects the argument structures associated with the verbs of joint activity on which the construction is based.

The inflection of verbs of joint activity remains challenging for theories of agreement, since the combined features of the subject and object of a verb of this class are reflected by morphology used with other verbs to index the subject alone. Bruening's solution to this problem

is not helpful, however. It is both too general, since it is applicable to any intransitive verb, and too specific, since it does not generalize to the comitative construction. Moreover, any purely syntactic account misses an obvious generalization: the NPs that together govern subject inflection in the split coordination and comitative constructions jointly express the agent argument of the verb. What is needed, it would seem, is a theory that ties agreement in these constructions directly to argument structure.

NOTES

[1] Passamaquoddy examples are given in a modified version of the standard orthography: *o* represents phonemic /ə/, while *u* is /o/, *c* is /č/, and *q* is /kʷ/. Phonemic /h/ before a consonant at the beginning of a word is written as an apostrophe. The location of the distinctively stressed vowel in the word is marked with an accent: the acute accent indicates that this vowel is pronounced at a relatively high pitch, while the grave accent indicates a pronunciation without such a pitch rise. Phonologically "weak" vowels are marked with a breve. These are ignored in stress assignment, which yields an alternating pattern of nondistinctive stresses to the left of the distinctively accented syllable. The following abbreviations are used in glosses: 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person; AN animate; DIR direct; EMPH emphatic; IN inanimate; INV inverse; LOC locative; N suffix *-(ŏ)n(e)-* (indicates agreement with a secondary object); OBV obviative; PL plural; POSS possessive; PROX proximate; RECIP reciprocal; REPORT reportative; SG singular. Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape and for the third-person prefix /w-/ where this is realized as surface *h* that is written as an apostrophe. The double hyphen is used to join an enclitic to its host and to connect a preverb to a following

verb. I am grateful to Estelle Neptune of Indian Township, Me., for serving as my principal consultant for the work presented here. Other speakers who have made important contributions include David A. Francis, Sr., Wayne Newell, and the late Anna Harnois. Rex Sprouse provided helpful comments on an earlier draft of the paper.

[2] Ives Goddard (personal communication) informs me that the conjunction of a proximate with a non-possessed obviative is permitted in Meskwaki. Evidently, then, the Passamaquoddy treatment of obviation in conjunction is not a necessary property of such structures.

[3] The verbs in these examples are actually dual forms. Passamaquoddy makes a distinction between dual and plural forms for AI verbs through the use of multi-plural suffixes: *wíkŭ-w-ok* 'they (dual) dwell' (stem /wiki-/), *wik-ultú-w-ok* 'they (three or more) dwell' (stem /wik-ulti-/). There are also stems that are inherently dual or plural in meaning.

[4] Secondary objects include not only the complements of AI+O verbs, which are based on formally intransitive stems, but also the second objects of ditransitive (TA+O) verbs (e.g., the theme arguments of 'give' and 'show'). Secondary objects are reflected differently in inflection from primary objects, the objects of transitive animate (TA) and transitive inanimate (TI) verbs and the first objects of TA+O verbs.

[5] Verbs of speaking take expressions representing the content of the speech in question as oblique complements. Thus 'tell each other' is intransitive in (7) despite taking a sentential complement.

[6] Bruening (2004:8–9) reports that an AI+O verb may appear in the split coordination construction with a discontinuously expressed subject in addition to a secondary object. He cites (i) below, with *saputiy-ahke-* 'throw through', as a grammatical example of this type. This example was rejected by my consultant, however.

(i) ***Máli*** *’kisi=saputĭy-ahká-nĭ-ya*   ***Piyél-ol***   *pŏnápsq possĭyantésk-ik.*

Mary (3)-past=through-throw-N-PROX.PL Peter-OBV.SG   rock   window-LOC

‘Mary and Peter threw a rock through the window.’ (Compare Bruening 2004:9,

example (33).)

[7]Conjoined singular objects typically trigger plural object agreement in Passamaquoddy only when the referents of the conjoined items are regarded as closely related in some fashion. Here the use of the proximate plural suffix *-k* to index *éhpit naka skitàp* ‘woman and man’ brings with it an implicature that the people in question are a married couple.

[8] The noun *nisŭwi-htí-c-il* ‘his or her spouse’ is a participle (a relative clause form) in origin, with the same inflection as *nacitaham-ti-htí-c-il* ‘the one he was always enemies with’ in (13b). The literal meaning is ‘the one with whom he or she is married’, with the verb taking plural subject agreement. This word has been reanalyzed as a noun, however, and now takes possessive inflection, even though many speakers continue to vary the verbal inflection as well; cf. *k-nisŭwí-yeq* (2-be.married-2PL) ‘your (sg.) spouse’, where the prefix *k-* indicates a second person possessor even though *-yeq* is the verbal ending indicating a second person plural subject.

[9] Passamaquoddy names are conventionally paired with English names, but the associations do not always correspond to the etymological sources of the names. Thus *Téles* is derived from French *Thérèse* ‘Theresa’, but is conventionally associated with English *Alice*.

[10] The verb here is intransitive: *ítŏmuk* ‘they say’ takes *keqsèy* ‘what’ as an oblique complement, not as an object; see note 5.

[11] The verb is interpreted as dual here because it does not include a multi-plural suffix; see note 3.

[12] The secondary object is not indexed in inflection in conjunct modes, which are primarily used in subordinate clauses, nor in imperative forms. Participles, i.e., relative clause forms, are an exception to this statement: the participle ending indexes the relativized constituent, which may happen to be a secondary object. If the argument of this paper is correct, this is the proper analysis of the obviative singular suffix -il in (13b) above.

[13] The root /yoh-/ 'tell' appears as /-iy-/ in prefixed forms.

[14] Inflection for secondary object appears to be optional for TA+O verbs as well, at least under some circumstances, as illustrated in (i) and (ii) below: the verb in (i) has (null) agreement with the secondary object kèq 'something' (note the presence of the suffix -N); the verb in (ii) lacks secondary object agreement (and is inflected like an ordinary TA form instead, agreeing only with the goal and not the theme).

(i) *Mihtáqs-ol*   *mecimí=te*   *kèq*   *mil-ku-n.*

    (3)-father-OBV.SG always=EMPH something (3)-give-INV-N

    'His father always gives him something.'

= (ii) *Mihtáqs-ol*   *mecimí=te*   *kèq*   *mil-ku-l.*

    (3)-father-OBV.SG always=EMPH something (3)-give-INV-OBV.SG

[15] The range of use of the forms lacking object agreement has yet to be determined. In attested examples, the verb is always used with an overt object.

[16] The obviative form *ksinúhkĭ-yil* (be.sick-(3)-OBV.SG) 'he (obv.) is sick' is also possible in this example.

[17] The forms *totŏli* and *toli* 'ongoing', seen in (31a, b), are in free variation.

References

Bruening, Benjamin. 2004. Split coordination in Passamaquoddy. Unpublished MS, Department
        of Linguistics and Cognitive Science, University of Delaware.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2006. Discrepancies between projection and selection: Split coordination

and raising to object in Passamaquoddy. Unpublished MS, Department of Linguistics and

Cognitive Science, University of Delaware.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. *The view from Building 20:*

Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel J.

Keyser, pp. 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. *Step by step: Essays on minimalist*

syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka,

pp. 89–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Francis, David A., and Robert M. Leavitt. 2008. *Peskotomuhkati wolastoqewi latuwewakon / A*
        Passamaquoddy-Maliseet dictionary. Orono, Me.: University of Maine Press.

Goddard, Ives. 1974. Remarks on the Algonquian independent indicative. *International Journal*
        of American Linguistics 40:317–27.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2006. Severing the external argument from its verb. *Phrase structure and*

the lexicon, ed. by Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, pp. 109–37. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

LeSourd, Philip S. 2006. Problems for the pronominal argument hypothesis in Maliseet-
Passamaquoddy. *Language* 82:486–514.

Ross, John Robert. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute
of Technology.