

The clash of reciprocity and accompaniment in Russian

One way to explore the semantics of a given domain is to investigate domains it interacts with. This delineates the semantic space of the domain and the dimensions along which it can vary. The domains reciprocity and accompaniment intersect; e.g. they both are pluractional (Cusic 1981), require plural entities and involve temporal/spatial overlap (Lasersohn 1995, Kratzer 2003 re. accompaniment, Majid et al. 2011 re. reciprocity). We might expect the domains to co-occur, e.g. for an accompaniment phrase (AP) (headed by a preposition such as *with* or *s* in Russian) to co-occur with a reciprocal construction. Such co-occurrence is impossible in Russian, however:

- (1) Ivan i Marija posli v kino (#drug s drugom.)
Ivan.NOM and Marija.NOM go.PST to movies.ACC (each with other.INST)
'Ivan and Marija went to the movies (with each other).'

In Russian, an AP is a prepositional phrase headed by the accompaniment preposition *s*. My data suggest that *drug druga* cannot be realized as the object of the accompaniment *s*, and I argue the restriction is semantic and not syntactic as the AP requires its object to have secondary participation in the event.

Adapting a diagnostic for APs suggested by McKercher (2001), I propose that predicates compatible with the adverb *vmeste* can co-occur with APs, while predicates incompatible with *vmeste* cannot co-occur with APs. Using this diagnostic, I show that VPs compatible with APs do not acceptably co-occur with the phrase *drug s drugom* 'with each other'. For example, the predicate in (2), the same as in (1), is compatible with *vmeste* but not *drug s drugom*. Conversely, the predicate in (3) is incompatible with *vmeste* but compatible with *drug s drugom*:

- (2) Ivan i Marija posli v kino vmeste.
Ivan.NOM and Marija.NOM go.PST to movies.ACC together
'Ivan and Marija went to the movies together.'
- (3) Ivan i Marija pocelovalis' drug s drugom /#vmeste
Ivan.NOM and Marija.NOM kiss.PST each with other.INST/together
'Ivan and Marija kissed with each other /together.'

I conclude that *drug s drugom* cannot be used as an AP.

The restriction is semantic rather than syntactic as the anaphoric pronoun *sebjja* 'oneself' is compatible with accompaniment *s*:

- (4) ... odnogo-dvux čelovek oni ... unesut vmeste s soboj ...
... one-two.ACC person.ACC they.NOM take.NPST.3PL together with self.INST to
'... one to two people they will take together with themselves...'

(Russian National Corpus)

I suggest that the semantic restriction is due to a selection violation. Lasersohn (1995) argues that for an accompaniment reading referents must be "party" to an event, while Stolz et al. (2006) write that the referent "participates only via its association" with another entity. I propose that *s* assigns a lexical entailment (Dowty 1991) to its object, so that the object has only secondary participation in the event.

Drug druga cannot be assigned this property because it refers to all entities denoted by the subject. If *drug druga* had this property, a contradiction would arise as the subject would be assigned both a primary (from the verb) and secondary (from *s*) role.

My analysis suggests that accompaniment requires one entity to play a primary role in the event and one to play a secondary role, and that a semantic difference exists between the two. Furthermore, it suggests that reciprocity requires the entities involved in an event to have identical participation. While the analysis is limited to Russian data, it is expected to have cross-linguistic validity, thus informing our understanding of both reciprocity and accompaniment.