**Adjunct control in Ch'ol (Mayan) comitatives**

This paper proposes an analysis for a possessor prefix agreement alternation in comitatives in Ch'ol. Prefixal agreement on the comitative adjunct may index the predicate's subject, exhibit third person agreement, or agree with a discourse salient entity. I argue that this alternation is predicted under an account where the comitative is an alternating obligatory/non-obligatory control adjunct, as per Landau 2021, governed by the attachment site of the comitative. The account correctly predicts that when the adjunct is part of an obligatory control chain, established via Agree, subextraction is possible under an account where Agree can unlock a nominal for subextraction, adding data from non-argumental constituents for Agree as an unlocking mechanism.

**Data** Ch'ol is a Mayan language spoken in southern Mexico and diaspora communities across North America by a quarter of a million people. I focus my study on *ik'oty*, translated as 'with' or 'and'. The data in this paper are from texts, spontaneous/naturalistic speech, and context based elicitation. Uncited data is from original fieldwork of the author. The comitative has the structure in (1), analyzed as a relational noun, as per Vázquez Álvarez 2011, Mora-Marín 2021, where it is obligatorily possessed. Set A markers index possessive arguments and any set B (absolutive) markers index a complement. I concentrate my discussion on accounting for Set A agreement on *ik'oty*.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $[_{DP}$ | A- | *ik'oty* | -B ] |
| (1) | | poss. prefix | with | abs. suffix |

*Ik'oty* has comitative (2a)-(2c) and instrumental uses (2d).

(2) a. Tsajñi-yoñ k-ik'oty-ety / *aw-ik'oty-oñ.
leave.PFV-B1 A1-with-B2 A2-with-B1
'I went there 'me with you'.

b. Tsajñi-yety aw-ik'oty-oñ / *k-ik'oty-ety.
leave.PFV-B1 A2-with-B1 A1-with-B2
'You went there 'you with me'.

c. Tsajñi xWañ k-ik'oty / y-ik'oty-oñ.
leave.PFV-B1 Juan A1-with A3-with-B1
'Juan went there 'him-with-me'/'me-with-him.'

d. Ta' k-tsepe jiñi tye' y-ik'oty machity.
PFV A1-cut DET tree A3-with machete
'I cut the tree with a machete.' (Instrumental)

Setting aside its use as an instrumental, which always display third person agreement, I concentrate on *ik'oty*'s comitative meaning. In its comitative use, agreement prefixes can index the person features of the predicate subject. In (2a) and (2b), the agreement prefixes track the subject of the predicate when the subject is first or second person and its comitative complement is also first or second person. In (2c), when the subject of the predicate is third person and the comitative object is first (shown) or second person, there is optionality regarding whether the subject's features are realized as a prefix or suffix. The set A possessive prefix may also index third person features, as in (3), when the predicate subject is first or second person. (Similar patterns have been reported in Vazquez Alvarez 2011: 149.)

(3) a. Tsajñi-yety y-ik'oty xWañ.
go.PFV-B2 A3-with Juan
'You left with Juan.'

b. Tsajñi-yoñ y-ik'oty-ety.
go.PFV-B1 A3-with-B2
'I left with you.'

**Adjunct control** I propose that *ik'oty* is a so-called alternating Obligatory Control/Non-Obligatory Control Adjunct, as described most thoroughly in Landau 2021. Initial evidence for *ik'oty*'s alternating status comes from the fact that the possessive prefix may or may not be controlled by the predicate subject, as per (2a) where the predicate's subject controls set A agreement, versus (3b) where the predicate's subject does not control set A agreement. Further evidence comes from the fact that *ik'oty* can attach to many different verb types such as unaccusative predicates, above, as well as unergative and transitive predicates in (4). Alternating adjuncts are expected to be non-selective and modify many different types of clauses (Landau 2021).

(4) a. Ta' k-tsepe tye' [ k-ik'oty-ety ].
PFV A1-cut tree A1-with-B2
'I cut a tree with you.' Transitive

b. Ta' i-cha'le soñ [ y-ik'oty-oñ ].
PFV A3-do dance A3-with-B1
'She danced with me.' Unergative

I propose the following structure for *ik'oty*, in (6) where *ik'oty* heads a DP. The PRO in the DP accounts for the fact that *ik'oty* is obligatorily possessed. (I place PRO in a right-side specifier as overt possessors in Ch'ol appear on the right.) The sentence in (5) is analyzed as in (6), where PRO gets its $\phi$ features from the predicate's subject: its controller. (See also the control analysis for embedded PROs in Ch'ol nominalized complement clauses in Coon (2013).)

(5) Tsajñi-yoñ [ k-ik'oty xWañ ].
go-PFV-B1 A1-with Juan
'I left with Juan.'

(6) $[_{VP}$ tsajñi-yoñ$_i$ PRON.1$_i$ $[_{DP}$ $\boldsymbol{k}_i$- [ *ik'oty xWañ* ] **PRO**$_i$ ] ]

When *ik'oty* attaches higher, shown in (8), the predicate subject cannot control PRO. In (8), the comitative adjoins at the TP level, as per other types of alternating adjuncts in Landau 2021, though what is important is that *ik'oty* attaches above the predicate subject. In this case, the predicate's subject does *not* control PRO, thus the agreement prefix is the *y*-, third person. (See e.g., discussion in Aissen 1992, Henderson 2012 and Royer 2022 for evidence for right-side adjunction in Mayan languages.) I assume that the third person agreement is default agreement, indexing the underspecification of person features.

(7) Tsajñi-yoñ [ y-ik'oty xWañ ].
go-PFV-B1 A1-with Juan
'I left with Juan.'

(8) $[_{TP}$ $[_{VP}$ tsajñi-yoñ$_i$ PRON.1$_i$ ] $[_{DP}$ $\boldsymbol{y}_k$- [ *ik'oty xWañ* ] **PRO**$_k$ ] ]

When the adjunct attaches high, arbitrary PRO (PRO$_{arb}$) (or in earlier literature, PRO as a logophor à la Reinhart & Reuland 1993) can be controlled by a discourse-accessible participant, such as the speaker of (9).

(9) Tsajñi xWañ [ k-ik'oty ].
go-PFV-B1 Juan A1-with
'Juan left with me.'

(10) $[_{TP}$ $[_{VP}$ tsajñi xWañ ] $[_{DP}$ $\boldsymbol{k}_i$- [ *ik'oty* ] **PRO**$_{\mathbf{arb}i}$ ] ]

**Consequences of the analysis for subextraction** There are certain consequences for whether an obligatory control chain is established. In (3a), there is no control between the second person subject and the comitative. When questioned—*with who?*—the interrogative word must pied-pipe the comitative phrase, shown in (11a); (11b) shows that it is ungrammatical to subextract the interrogative *majki* without pied-piping. When a control chain is established, as in (12) where the set A prefix on the comitative is second person, subextraction of the interrogative *is* possible, as exhibited in (12b).

(11) a. [ Majki y-ik'oty ]$_i$ tsajñi-yety t$_i$?
who A3-with go.PFV.B2
'Who left with you?'

b. *Majki$_i$ tsajñi-yety [ y-ik'oty t$_i$ ]?
who go.PFV-B2 A3-with
'Who left with you?'

(12) a. [ Majki aw-ik'oty ] tsajñi-yety t$_i$?
who A2-with go.PFV.B2
'Who left with you?'

b. Majki$_i$ tsajñi-**yety** [ **aw-**ik'oty t$_i$ ]?
who go.PFV-B2 A2-with
'Who left with you?'

This is exactly what is expected (i) if control in low-adjoined adjuncts is governed by Agree (e.g., Adler 2006); and (ii) adopting an Agree-based model for extraction à la Rackowski & Richards 2005, Richard & van Urk 2015, Branan 2018 as well as what has been argued for Ch'ol before for subextraction (Little 2020). In (12b), an agreement chain is established, indicated by the second person prefix on the comitative, the same features as the subject's predicate, in an obligatory control configuration. This agreement subsequently unlocks the comitative phrase, making it possible for subextraction, adding data that non-argumental constituents can be unlocked via Agree for subextraction.

**Selected references** Adler, A. 2006. *Syntax and discourse in the acquisition of adjunct control.* || Aissen, J. 1992. Topic and focus in Mayan. *Language* || Coon, J. 2013. *Aspects of split ergativity* || Landau, I. 2021. *A selectional theory of adjunct control* || Little, C. R. 2020. Left branch extraction, object shift, and freezing effects in Tumbalá Ch'ol. *Glossa* || Rackowski, A., & Richards, N. 2005. Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. *Linguistic inquiry* || Vázquez Álvarez, J. J. 2011. *A grammar of Chol.*