

On collectives with numerals

Marcel den Dikken and Éva Dékány
HRCL and ELTE

Aims: This paper focuses on Hungarian comitative numeral collective expressions, aiming to give a syntactic explanation for why there is an apparent feature mismatch between the antecedent of the collective and the agreement on the numeral-collective itself. To the best of our knowledge, these data have not been investigated before.

Comitative collectives: In comitative numeral collectives the numeral is followed by a linking morpheme (LM), a 3SG possessive-like suffix and the comitative case.

- (1) a. mi négy-es-é-vel mentünk nyaralni
 we four-LM-3SG-COMIT went.1PL vacation.INF
 ‘we went on a holiday in a group of four’
 b. *mi négy-es-ünk-kel mentünk nyaralni
 we four-LM-1PL-COMIT went.1PL vacation.INF
 Intended: ‘we went on a holiday in a group of four’

This construction presents three puzzles. ① It employs what appears to be a possessive element that shows no person or number agreement with the subject, instead having the 3SG form. Agreement that matches the ϕ -features of the subject renders the collective ungrammatical. ② The comitative PP does not add to the total number of participants in the event (the *we plus four* reading is unavailable). ③ The role of the linking morpheme is unclear both from the syntactic and the semantic side.

Core proposal: We suggest that comitative numeral collectives are projected from a silent Kaynean GROUP noun. GROUP is predicated of a reflexive morpheme, which we indicate abstractly with SE. In Hungarian SE is silent, but in the Dutch equivalents of comitative numeral collectives it is spelled out overtly by *z*’.

- (2) we gingen met **z**’-n vier-en met vakantie
 we went with 3SG-M four-LM with vacation
 ‘we went on a holiday in a group of four’ Dutch

Following den Dikken (2006), we take predication relations to be syntactically asymmetrical. The predication is mediated by a functional head we call Relator (Rel), with the subject and the predicate occupying the specifier and the complement positions. We suggest that in the case of comitative numeral collectives, the possessive-like morpheme spells out the Rel head, the subject SE occupies spec, RelP, and the predicate GROUP forms the complement of the Relator.

- (3) [_{RelP} SE [Rel=*e* [GROUP]]]

The predication relation between GROUP and its subject is not possessive: the SE-phrase *is* the group. Due to the presence of SE, (3) is an unsaturated DP that can be predicated of a numeral. This predication relationship is again mediated by a Relator head, which is spelled out by the linking morpheme. (3) occupies the complement of Rel2, while the numeral is in its specifier.

- (4) [_{Rel2P} numeral [_{Rel2’} Rel2=*es* [_{RelP} SE [Rel=*e* [GROUP]]]]]

The structure in (4) is embedded by a DP and a PP, with the P head spelled out by the comitative case (5). The comitative PP in (5) is predicated, as a depictive, of a PRO controlled by the plural subject: [_{RelP} PRO [_{Rel’} Rel [_{PP} ...]].

- (5) [_{PP} [_{DP} D [_{Rel2P} numeral [_{Rel2’} Rel2=*es* [_{RelP} SE [Rel=*e* [GROUP]]]]]]] P=*vel*]

The puzzles untangled: Our proposal accounts for the three puzzles in the following way. ① The possessive-looking element shows no person or number agreement with the subject (1PL) because its local subject is the 3SG reflexive. The mismatch in ϕ -features is thus only apparent. ② The numeral serves as the antecedent of SE, and (3) expresses and indentify/equative relationship between SE and the GROUP. Hence, the numeral indicates the total number of the group. Since the PP is a depictive of the clausal subject, it indicates the total number of participants. Adding participants to an event (i.e. *we plus four* rather than *we four*) requires a configuration where the PP is a simple adjunct to the subject rather than a depictive with an internal PRO subject. ③ The role of the linking morpheme is to mediate the higher predication relationship.

Collectives with a locative: In addition to comitative numeral collectives, Hungarian also has locative numeral collectives. These comprise a numeral, a linking morpheme and the inessive case suffix (6). Conspicuously, the possessive-like morpheme (-e, which lengthens to -é when followed by a case suffix) is obligatorily missing here (7).

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| (6) | négy-es-ben
four-LM-INE
'in/with a group of four' | (7) | *négy-es-é-ben
four-LM-3SG-INE
'in/with a group of four' |
|-----|---|-----|--|

We suggested that -é is the exponent of the Relator of the predication relation between GROUP and reflexive SE. Its absence in (6) means that this collective does not involve the lower predication layer of (4): GROUP is directly predicated of the numeral. As before, the predication between the numeral and the complement of the Relator is mediated by the linking morpheme. Embedding this predication under an inessive P yields an interpretation that says that the event denoted by the VP was performed *in* a group consisting of *n* number of participants.

- (8) [PP [DP D ... [RelP numeral [Rel' Rel=LM=es [GROUP]]]] P=*ben*]

It should be noted that the inessive in (6) cannot be swapped for the comitative ending.

- (9) *négy-es-sel
four-LM-COM
Intended: 'in/with a group of four'

In other words, choosing the comitative as the outer P leads to the presence of SE, while selection of the inessive does not. This is related to the fact that Hungarian has a so-called inclusory comitative construction, where the referent of the comitative PP is included in the referent of a pronoun (*we went to the movies with my father* can involve just two movie-goers). Inside an inclusory comitative PP, there is always an anaphoric element, which is bound by the external plural pronoun and thus matches its reference set. The anaphoric element is SE; therefore SE and the comitative are intimately related. The presence of SE, in turn, requires a Relator to connect it to a predicate, so the possessive-like morpheme, which spells out this Relator, is also required with the comitative.

In closing: The analysis emphasizes the importance of predication in the complex NP, as well as the role played by silent phrasal material (a silent noun GROUP, responsible for the collective reading, and a silent reflexive) within the syntax of noun phrases.

Selected references: Dikken, Marcel den. 2006. *Relators and linkers*. Cambridge: MIT press. • Kayne, Richard. 2004. *Here and there*. In C. Leclère et. al. (eds.). *Lexique, syntaxe et lexique-grammaire*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.