



---

Russian Comitatives and the Ambiguity of Adjunction

Author(s): Bradley Larson

Source: *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, winter—spring 2014, Vol. 22, No. 1  
(winter—spring 2014), pp. 11-49

Published by: Slavica Publishers

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/24602166>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Slavica Publishers is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*

## ARTICLES

### Russian Comitatives and the Ambiguity of Adjunction\*

Bradley Larson

*Abstract:* There is a conundrum in the study of comitative constructions in Slavic. It has long been an assumption that the construction is best analyzed through two structurally distinct representations: noun modification by a comitative prepositional phrase and verb modification by a comitative prepositional phrase. Another analysis has been proposed that derives the distinctions in the construction not from differential attachment sites but rather via differential movement of comitative phrase and its host. In this view, the comitative phrase always adjoins to the host DP, but is sometimes stranded by movement. This paper presents empirical and theoretical arguments against these analyses using data from Russian. It is shown that both differential attachment site analyses and differential movement analyses cannot account for the construction. This conundrum is avoided by adopting a “decomposed Merge”-style analysis to derive structural ambiguity in the construction. Under this analysis the ambiguity is an effect of attachment type, not movement or attachment site. This analysis also provides a new avenue to capture the facts that pertain to plural pronoun comitatives. Russian is the test case here for the sake of concision; however the analysis should extend to the rest of the Slavic languages.

#### 1. Introduction

There is a problem facing the analysis of comitative constructions in Russian. The construction shows a split syntactic profile, but this dual nature cannot be fully captured by the current accounts. In this paper I present the conundrum and offer an alternative analysis that avoids it. In effect, I argue that the constellation of comitative-like constructions is in fact a unified construction.

To begin, there are two current accounts of the construction in (1):

---

\* I am much appreciative of the helpful comments, criticisms, and judgments that made this work much better than it would have been without them. In particular I would like to thank Norbert Hornstein, Howard Lasnik, Jeff Lidz, Tonia Bleam, Irina Agafonova, Ksenia Zanon, Anna Chrabaszcz, Lydia Grebenyova, Yakov Kronrod, and audiences at SLS 5 in Chicago and FASL 20 in Cambridge.

- (1) Maša s Dašej xodit/ xodjat v školu.  
 Masha with Dasha go<sub>SG</sub>/ go<sub>PL</sub> to school  
 ‘Masha goes to school with Dasha.’

Note the possibility for differing agreement. This difference in agreement correlates with a number of other syntactic and semantic dualities in the construction. The traditional account is that the construction is best analyzed through two structurally distinct representations: noun modification by a comitative prepositional phrase and verb modification by a comitative prepositional phrase (see, among others, Dylā 1988, Dylā and Feldman 2003, Feldman 2001, McNally 1993, Vassilieva 2000, Vassilieva and Larson 2001). With plural agreement this is due to noun modification; when singular agreement arises, it is due to the lack of noun modification. The difference stems from the choice of attachment site. In other words, the term “comitative” does not refer to a single construction, but rather a family of constructions with superficial similarities.

A newer analysis of the construction maintains that comitatives are derived via noun modification in every instance (Ionin and Matushansky 2002). Differential movement of either just the host NP or the NP along with the comitative accounts for the agreement options. When the NP moves to SpecTP without the modifying comitative phrase, singular agreement occurs; when both move en masse, plural agreement occurs. In this analysis, there is a single comitative construction that can be altered by an independent operation.

In this paper I show that neither movement nor differing attachment sites can account for the dual nature of Russian comitatives. This is problematic because capturing the dual nature of the construction requires that at some point in the derivation there be two distinct representations. Yet if we are not allowed to derive these distinct representations by movement or initial attachment site we are left with a paradox. We need two representations, but there is no way to derive them.

This paper presents empirical and theoretical arguments against these options and offers an alternative that avoids those shortcomings arguing that it is the *type* of attachment that determines the profile of the comitative. This analysis differs from the previous unification-style analysis in that it crucially does not rely on movement to derive the relevant structural ambiguity. The analysis differs from the variable

attachment site analysis in that the location of the attachment is uniform across comitative types. This is made possible by adopting a “decomposed Merge”-style analysis to derive a structural ambiguity, wherein the comitative phrase can attach to its host NP at a single site yet in two different ways.

This new analysis is based on the status of adjunction in the Bare Phrase Structure (BPS) of Chomsky 1995. Hornstein (2008) argues that current analyses of adjunction are not tenable in a BPS system and proposes a decomposition of the Merge operation to deal with this. In turn, theories of comitatives consider the construction to be derived via adjunction (or coordination qua adjunction as in Munn 1993) and as such, they too can be reanalyzed in terms of decomposed Merge. In this paper I show this to be not only advantageous theoretically but also more adequate descriptively. This analysis also provides a new avenue to capture facts that pertain to plural pronoun comitatives. Russian is the test case here for the sake of concision. However, the analysis should extend to the rest of the Slavic languages to the extent that they have been investigated in this regard.

In section 2, I discuss the basic empirical facts of the construction. Section 3 concerns the previous analyses as well as their problems, both theoretical and empirical. I offer a new analysis in section 4 and in section 5 I extend the analysis to plural pronoun comitatives. Following this is a short conclusion in section 6.

## 2. Basic Paradigm

Slavic comitatives come in two flavors. In (2) below is what is traditionally considered comitative VP-adjunction in Russian. This construction is distinguished by singular agreement on the verb.

- (2) Maša [VP s Dašej xodit v školu].  
 Masha with Dasha go<sub>SG</sub> to school  
 ‘Masha goes to school with Dasha.’ (Feldman 2001)

In (3) we find what is traditionally dubbed comitative coordination. The comitative phrase is analyzed as being attached to the subject to the exclusion of the verb and the construction is distinguished by plural agreement on the verb.



- (3) [DP Maša s Dašej] xodjat v školu.  
 Masha with Dasha go<sub>PL</sub> to school  
 'Masha and Dasha go to school.' (Feldman 2001)

The two types of comitative phrases exhibit quite different behaviors. In the subsections below, I rehearse a few of the canonical differences between these two ostensibly distinct types of comitatives (examples in this section are taken from Feldman 2001 unless otherwise noted). The list is by no means exhaustive, but the examples presented are interesting and representative of the types of distinctions that arise.

### 2.1. Extractability

As shown below, only comitatives accompanied by singular agreement can undergo *wh*-extraction. To be precise, it is not just the comitative phrase that can be extracted, as in (4a), but also the subject, as in (4b). When the verb shows plural agreement neither component of the comitative can be *wh*-extracted.

- (4) a. S kem Maša pošla/ \*pošli v kino?  
 with whom Masha went<sub>SG</sub>/ went<sub>PL</sub> to movie  
 'With whom did Masha go to the movies?'  
 b. Kto s Mašej pošel/ \*pošli v kino?  
 who with Masha went<sub>SG</sub>/ went<sub>PL</sub> to movie  
 'Who went to the movies with Masha?'

### 2.2. Adjacency

Similar to the extraction pattern found above, only comitatives that involve singular agreement permit the nominals in question to arise in non-adjacent locations in the sentence. With plural agreement, the nominals must only be separated by the comitative preposition. This is shown in (5a) and (5b) below.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It should also be noted that the default, unmarked order for the singular agreement is in fact that in which the nominals are separate as in (5b). For singular agreeing comitatives to arise in the order found in (5a), there needs to be some sort of focus on the rightmost nominal. This makes minimal pairs that differ only in verbal agreement

- (5) a. Maša s Dašej xodit/ xodjat v školu.  
 Masha with Dasha go<sub>SG</sub>/ go<sub>PL</sub> to school  
 'Masha goes to school with Dasha.'
- b. Maša xodit/ \*xodjat v školu s Dašej.  
 Masha go<sub>SG</sub>/ go<sub>PL</sub> to school with Dasha  
 'Masha goes to school with Dasha.'

### 2.3. Reciprocals

Furthermore, it is only so-called comitative coordination (concomitant with plural agreement) that can license reciprocal binding, not comitative VP-adjunction (singular agreement). In (6), the reciprocal *drug druga* is only licensed when there is plural agreement.

- (6) Maša s Dašej \*ljubit/ ljubjat drug druga.  
 Masha with Dasha like<sub>SG</sub>/ like<sub>PL</sub> each other  
 'Masha and Dasha like each other.'

### 2.4. Control

It is also the case that the two types of comitatives show differential ability to control into adjuncts. The plural agreement found in (7) corresponds with the fact that both the nominative agent and the instrumental agent control into the adjunct phrase. Singular agreement as in (8) corresponds to only the nominative agent controlling into the adjunct (examples from McNally 1993).<sup>2</sup>

- (7) Prorabotav celyj den', Anna s Petej pošli domoj.  
 having-worked whole day Anna with Peter went<sub>PL</sub> home  
 '[PRO]<sub>i,j</sub> Having worked all day], Anna<sub>i</sub> and Peter<sub>j</sub> went home.'

essentially impossible. I opt to abstract away from the focus distinction in this paper so as to maintain pairs of sentences that do not differ in word order.

<sup>2</sup> The use of the null anaphoric PRO here is not meant to be a theoretical statement but rather an agnostic stand-in for one.

- (8) Prorabotav celyj den', Anna pošla domoj s Petej.  
 having-worked whole day Anna went<sub>SG</sub> home with Peter  
 '[PRO<sub>i</sub> Having worked all day], Anna<sub>i</sub> went home with Peter<sub>j</sub>.'

### 3. Previous Analyses

In the section above I provided some of the evidence that supported the traditional analysis that reasonably suggests that the comitative construction be seen as actually two different constructions. In this section I sketch the differential attachment site analysis of these ostensibly distinct constructions and present arguments to the effect that they are insufficient. I then argue that the other, more unified analysis of Ionin and Matushansky is similarly insufficient.

#### 3.1. Traditional Analyses

Given the differences noted above and others, many have argued that plural agreement examples function more like coordination while the singular agreement examples involve adjunction of a PP to the VP (Dyła 1988, Dyła and Feldman 2003, Feldman 2001, McNally 1993, Vassilieva 2000, Vassilieva and Larson 2001).<sup>3</sup> The differences between the types of comitatives are roughly schematized in (9) and (10) below. The structure in (9) represents the plural-agreement-inducing, comitative coordination, while the structure in (10) represents the singular agreement-inducing, comitative VP-adjunction.

- (9) [VP [DP [DP Maša] s Dašej] V ...]

- (10) [VP [DP Maša] [V' s Dašej V ...]]

These representations straightforwardly account for the distinctions shown in the previous subsections. The representation in (9)

---

<sup>3</sup> The exact mechanism by which the comitative phrase is combined with the subject in comitative coordination differs from analysis to analysis. The relation has been claimed to be any of adjunction, complementation, or coordination. The particulars of these analyses are not relevant to this paper. What is of relevance is that the previous analyses claim a distinction between comitative VP-adjunction and coordination in terms of attachment site.

functions like any other coordinated subject and as such is predicted to license plural agreement, reciprocal binding, and plural interpretations of adjunct control. The representation in (10) also straightforwardly accounts for the singular agreement facts: There is only one singular subject and therefore we predict only singular agreement on the verb, and only the nominative noun c-commands into the verb, can bind anaphora, and be involved in control resolution.

### 3.2. Problem with the Traditional Analysis

There are serious problems for the dichotomous approach presented above. Although the facts are easily explainable under such a view, there are arguments that comitatives in Slavic do not adjoin to VPs. For instance, Ionin and Matushansky (2002) present a strong argument against the two-part analysis based on the fact that the comitative phrase need not necessarily be associated with the subject. In their examples below, the comitative phrase is shown to be associated with direct objects, indirect objects, and possessives, respectively.

- (11) Ja priglasila Ceciliju s Annabelloj.  
 I invited<sub>SG</sub> Cecilia with Annabella  
 'I invited Cecilia and Annabella/<sup>2</sup>Cecilia with Annabella.'
- (12) Korol' otdal korolevstvo princu s Zoluškoj.  
 king gave kingdom prince with Cinderella  
 'The king gave the kingdom to the prince and Cinderella.'
- (13) <sup>?</sup>Dašin s Mašej portret nam očēn' ponravilsja.  
 Dasha<sub>POSS</sub> with Masha<sub>INST</sub> portrait us very appealed  
 'We liked Dasha and Masha's portrait a lot.'


Ionin and Matushansky correctly point out that if comitative phrases are to be adjoined to the VP when associated with the subject of the sentence, there needs to be a finely articulated theory as to the particular site of this adjunction that prohibits the association with any other argument. That is, how would it be possible to determine whether a VP-adjoined comitative related to the subject, direct object, or indirect object? Absent such a theory of differential VP-adjunction,


there is little reason to suppose that VP-adjunction is involved in comitatives. There are other arguments against this analysis presented in Ionin and Matushanky's paper, and I direct the reader to that paper instead of discussing the shortcomings further.

### 3.3. A Unification Approach

Instead of the two-part traditional approach, Ionin and Matushansky propose a collapse of the two types of comitatives into a single type. Their position is essentially that the comitative PP always adjoins to the host DP. The construction displays the two-way split based on whether the host DP moves to SpecTP on its own or whether it moves there with the adjoined comitative PP. In other words, in lieu of the two trees we saw above in (9) and (10), we have instead two derivational histories of the same base-generated representation. The analogues of (9) and (10) are shown below as (14) and (15), respectively. This approach captures the above facts in a more parsimonious manner.

They claim that agreement, reciprocal binding, and control take place from the SpecTP position. If the entirety of the complex subject comitative phrase moves to that position (as in (14)) then we expect plural agreement, licensing of reciprocals, and a plural interpretation of the relevant PRO positions. If, however, only the adjoined-to DP moves to that position, we expect only it to play a role in agreement, anaphora binding, and control.





### 3.4. Problems with the Unified Analysis

In this section I address aspects of the above analysis that are inadequate in various ways, presenting a theoretical argument as well as empirical arguments.

Given the aforementioned difficulties of the traditional analysis, the shortcomings discussed here are particularly vexing. There is an undisputed dichotomy in the profile of Russian comitatives, but two well-understood syntactic means of accounting for such differences (differential attachment sites above; differential movement here) are insufficient. This spurs a new analysis.

#### 3.4.1. Empirical problems

One significant empirical problem with Ionin and Matushansky's approach is that for the plural agreement split (and the subsequent split in PRO and reciprocal licensing), they require differential movement of DP to SpecTP. This, they say, correlates with particular interpretation of the sub-parts of the DP in (14) above.

The reliance on movement leads Ionin and Matushansky to under-generate relevant data concerning agreement and binding. The SpecTP position is specially endowed with the capacity to determine agreement, anaphor licensing, and control interpretations. However, we still find the need for this structural ambiguity when there has been no movement to SpecTP whatsoever. It is possible for the differential agreement to arise when the subject is post-verbal, as seen below:

- (16) Kupil/ kupili novyj divan Ivan s Vasej.  
 bought<sub>SG</sub>/ bought<sub>PL</sub> new sofa Ivan with Vasja  
 'Ivan with Vasja bought a new sofa.'

- (17) Bežali/ bežal po ulice Ivan s Vasej.  
 ran<sub>PL</sub>/ ran<sub>SG</sub> along street Ivan with Vasja  
 'Ivan with Vasja were running down the street.'

If the subject in the above sentences has not moved to SpecTP, the Ionin and Matushansky approach has no way of capturing the agreement patterns. Movement to that position is necessary for the differential agreement, but we still see this paradigm without that movement. This is *prima facie* evidence against Ionin and Matushansky's account. It could be the case, however, that in the above sentences the subjects have indeed moved to SpecTP (either *en masse* or to the exclusion of the comitative) and that the verb moves to an even higher position. Admitting this as a logical possibility begs for a clearer case.

Unaccusative subjects in Russian have been argued not to involve movement (overt or covert) of the subject to the SpecTP position (see Lavine and Freidin 2002, Perlmutter and Moore 2002, Bailyn 2004a, and Potsdam and Polinsky 2011 for various approaches to this idea).<sup>4</sup> That is, for a sentence like in (18), it is argued that the subject is not occupying the SpecTP position but rather a lower one.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> It is important to note that the empirical basis of the Russian unaccusative has recently be questioned. A reviewer notes that that traditional diagnostics for unaccusativity have found counterexamples in such works as Kuznetsova 2005. Whether or not the effects of unaccusativity in Russian are currently explicable, the evidence offered by the researchers cited here still holds as empirical facts that cast doubt on the movement of the relevant subjects to the SpecTP position. As such, I will refer to unaccusativity, but this should be construed as referring to the empirical effects of unaccusativity, whatever their source may be.

<sup>5</sup> This is not to say that linearly right-peripheral subjects are never in a SpecTP position, but rather that unaccusative subjects never are. Any transitive or unergative subject may find itself in that linear position after having been crossed over by structurally lower elements, and the Ionin and Matushansky account would suffice to account for their properties. Further, even if it were the case that pre-verbal nominals in unaccusative sentences were in SpecTP, the lack of availability of covert movement in the post-verbal instances remains problematic for Ionin and Matushansky's theory.

- (18) Včera večerom v gorod priletel očen' važnyj  
 yesterday evening in town arrived very important  
 činovnik.  
 official

'A very important official arrived in town yesterday evening.'

Ionin and Matushanky's analysis requires movement to the SpecTP position and thus does not predict evidence of structural ambiguity in constructions like those above. Movement to SpecTP is critical for their approach, and if this position is not reached the differences found in comitatives should not arise. This means that movement of unaccusative subjects to positions beyond SpecTP (like to Spec,CP in the case of overt or covert wh-movement or QR) is not sufficient. Note that the nominative argument in structures like that above can license anaphora, as in (19), as well as control PROs, as in (20).

- (19) Včera večerom v gorod priletel očen' važnyj  
 yesterday evening in town arrived very important  
 činovnik<sub>i</sub> na svoem<sub>i</sub> samolete.  
 official<sub>i</sub> on his<sub>i</sub> airplane

'A very important official arrived in town yesterday evening on his own airplane.'

- (20) Ne PRO<sub>i</sub> preduprediv zaranee, včera večerom v  
 not warning in.advance yesterday evening in  
 gorod priletel činovnik<sub>i</sub>  
 town arrived official

'An official arrived in town yesterday evening without warning in advance.'

In comitative constructions, the same facts are to be found. The host DP can bind a reflexive and control PRO to the exclusion of the comitative PP.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> A reviewer notes that the comitative agreement optionality arises in unaccusative constructions even when the subject appears pre-verbally:



- (21) Včera večerom v gorod priletel važnyj činovnik<sub>i</sub>  
 yesterday evening in town arrived important official  
 so svoim<sub>i</sub> sekretarem na svoem<sub>i</sub> samolete.  
 with his secretary on his<sub>i</sub> airplane  
 'A very important official arrived in town yesterday evening on  
 his own airplane with his secretary.'
- (22) Ne PRO<sub>i</sub> preduprediv zaranee, včera večerom v  
 not warning in.advance yesterday evening in  
 gorod priletel važnyj činovnik<sub>i</sub> so svoim<sub>i</sub> sekretarem.  
 town arrived important official with his secretary  
 'A very important official arrived in town yesterday evening  
 with his secretary without warning in advance.'

These unaccusative constructions have been argued not to involve any movement to SpecTP. Thus there is no way to derive the movement-driven structural ambiguity that Ionin and Matushanky's analysis requires. A new, non-movement-dependent analysis is required, and I present one in section 4.



### 3.4.2. Structural Differences from Traditional Coordination

Though some comitatives are essentially indistinguishable from coordination, there are clear differences between them. Ionin and Matushanky's account does not structurally distinguish coordination and comitative constructions despite their differences. A relatively ano-

- 
- (i) Važnyj činovnik s sekretarem včera večerom priletel/  
 important official with secretary yesterday evening arrived<sub>SG</sub>/  
 prileteli v gorod.  
 arrived<sub>PL</sub> in town  
 'An important official with/and a secretary arrived in town last evening.'

However, as shown by Potsdam and Polinsky (2011) among others, looks can be deceiving when it comes to Russian unaccusatives. The surface string order of the subject preceding the verb masks the fact that the subject is in a position as structurally high as TP. For (i) it would have to be the case that the subject is in a sub-SpecTP position and that the verb is either lower yet or somewhere higher, but in rightward position.

dyne interpretation of the structures of coordination and comitatives would be as in (23) and (24).



That this unified analysis makes no structural distinctions between comitatives and coordination is problematic. It is of course possible to adopt Ionin and Matushansky's approach to comitatives with an analysis of coordination that sufficiently distinguishes it from comitatives. As such, the concerns raised below will only be of interest to the extent they support a broader point. I offer an approach to comitatives that extends to nominal coordination and vice versa, while accounting for their differences. The structural ambiguities possible in comitatives also arise in nominal coordination and are explained by the same mechanism. But adopting a distinct analysis of coordination while adopting Ionin and Matushansky's approach to comitatives precludes such a unified analysis.

The most striking difference between comitative coordination and traditional coordination is the fact that the former cannot iterate while the latter can. So, as shown below, where there is more than one comitative phrase, the interpretation can only be of a hierarchical, nested sort; not a flat listing of participants like with traditional coordination (noted by McNally 1993).

- (25) Daša i Maša i Saša  
 Dasha and Masha and Sasha  
 'Dasha and [Masha and Sasha]' or 'Dasha, Masha, and Sasha'

- (26) Daša s Mašej s Sašej  
 Dasha with Masha with Sasha  
 'Dasha and [Masha with Sasha]' but not 'Dasha, Masha, and Sasha'

To show that there is no flat reading of iterated comitatives, it is necessary to set up a scenario in which to test them. Consider the scene in (27):

- (27) There is a party and Dasha arrives, followed by Masha, and subsequently followed by Sasha. They did not arrive in a group of three or any group of two.

Against this backdrop, it is possible to say (28), accurately reporting what happened using iterative coordination. The same cannot be said of iterated comitatives in (29). This sentence can only have a reading in which there is a sub-group pair that arrived together (either Dasha and Masha or Masha and Sasha).

- (28) Daša i Maša i Saša prišli.  
 Dasha and Masha and Sasha arrived<sub>PL</sub>  
 'Dasha, Masha, and Sasha arrived.'
- (29) Daša s Mašej s Sašej prišli.  
 Dasha with Masha with Sasha arrived<sub>PL</sub>  
 'Dasha and Masha with Sasha arrived.'

Structurally, neither previous approach can in any obvious way account for this distinction. In fact, the Ionin and Matushansky approach seems to predict that if the entirety of (24) were to move to SpecTP then, being equal participants in the event, the flat reading should be the only reading possible. This is not the case. We require some additional difference between the two in terms of interpretation.

Additionally, Bošković 2010 shows that coordinated subjects in Russian can affect agreement similarly to comitatively modified subjects. That is, it is possible for coordinated subjects to have either plural agreement, as in (30), or singular agreement with the first conjunct, as in (31):

- (30) Byli razrušeny odna derevnja i odno selenie.  
 were destroyed<sub>PL</sub> one village<sub>F</sub> and one settlement<sub>N</sub>
- (31) Byla razrušena odna derevnja i odno selenie.  
 was<sub>F</sub> destroyed<sub>SG,F</sub> one village<sub>F</sub> and one settlement<sub>N</sub>  
 'One village and one settlement were destroyed.'

But with pre-verbal coordination, it is not possible for the verb to agree solely with the first coordinand like it does in (31). This is shown in (32), where the verb cannot agree with the feminine 'village':

- (32) \*Odna derevnja i odno selenie byla razrušena.  
 one village<sub>F</sub> and one settlement<sub>N</sub> was<sub>F</sub> destroyed<sub>SG,F</sub>  
 'One village and one settlement were destroyed.'

The example in (32) is modified from Bošković 2010. In the original sentence, the agreement on the verb is with the second, neuter conjunct and is reported as acceptable. As a reviewer points out, this is not a clear case of closest conjunct agreement. It could be the case that the agreement on the verb is a default form expressed as the neuter singular. This is very plausibly the case. The reviewer notes that neuter agreement is preferable to feminine agreement independent of the order of the conjuncts. Whatever the case turns out to be for coordination, it sharply differs from comitatives, where this potential default neuter agreement does not arise and where it is possible for the verb in question to agree with the leftmost nominal. This is shown in (33), where agreement with the noun closest to the verb is impossible, although it is possible with the leftmost one, as seen in (34).



- (33) Anna s Ivanom byla zamečena.  
 Anna with Ivan was<sub>F</sub> seen<sub>F</sub>  
 'Anna was seen with Ivan.'
- (34) \*Anna s Ivanom byl zamečen.  
 Anna with Ivan was<sub>M</sub> seen<sub>M</sub>  
 'Anna was seen with Ivan.'

Ionin and Matushansky's analysis makes comitatives and traditional coordination too similar to account for these differences structurally. Below I propose a clear distinction between coordination and comitatives.

### 3.4.3. Theoretical Problem

Ionin and Matushansky's proposed structural analysis of comitatives is sketched below. First note the traditional bipartite analysis of comitatives in (35) and (36). Ionin and Matushansky propose that comitatives have the unified analysis in (35) prior to any movement.


There is a major problem with the above representations. In Bare Phrase Structure (BPS) (Chomsky 1995), X-bar terms are relational, not static. As such (since there is only one projection of a head that does not project further), there can only be one maximal projection per head. In other words, we are required by BPS to portray the above trees like the example below in (35) instead like the tree in (36).<sup>7</sup>



<sup>7</sup> In BPS, nodes labeled, for example, “vP” are non-entities. I employ them here simply to draw attention to them as maximal projections.

As is apparent, the trees in (35) and (36) are essentially the same except that there are no longer multiple maximal projections per head.<sup>8</sup> Where we once had a rigid skeleton of minimal, intermediate, and maximal projections, we now have only “bare” labels. These slight differences will turn out to be pivotal. Importantly, the erstwhile DP dominating *Maša* in (35) is now a non-maximal D and the lower *vP* in (36) is now also a non-maximal projection.

This creates a problem. Following Muysken (1982), intermediate nodes are not targetable for grammatical operations, yet we sometimes desperately need to be able to target them. For example, in the BPS tree below, the intermediate, non-maximal V can be targeted for deletion.



We can of course target the topmost VP in a sentence like (38). What BPS, as presented here, does not predict is that we are able to target a non-maximal V projection for deletion, like in (39).<sup>9</sup>

(38) Ivan ate apples in the fall, and Igor did [~~VP eat apples in the fall~~] too.


(39) Ivan ate apples in the fall, and Igor did [~~VP [V eat apples V] in the spring~~].

<sup>8</sup> If there were a more complex nominal in the position of *Maša* in (36) it too would be considered a D by the syntax. This is not to say that this more complex nominal is monomorphemic or simplex, but rather that in Bare Phrase Structure anything but the highest projection is not considered a maximal projection.

<sup>9</sup> Chomsky's precise formulation of the nodes produced via adjunction differs from this, though see Hornstein 2008 for an argument against this formulation.

Given BPS, the Ionin and Matushansky approach is not tenable. A tree like (36), although forced upon us by BPS, is not adequate for the unified analysis. In (36) there is no maximal projection dominating *Maša* to the exclusion of the comitative phrase. As such, it alone cannot be targeted for the movement necessary to distinguish the two types of comitatives, as in (40). It is non-maximal and is not able to move as a phrase.

In sum, the traditional analysis cannot in principal maintain the dependence on VP-adjunction, and the unified analysis cannot maintain the dependence on DP-adjunction. In the following section I present empirical arguments concerning the inadequacies of the analyses in question.



### 3.5. Summary

There are clear empirical problems with the previous accounts of comitatives. They cannot adequately distinguish comitatives from traditional coordination and, in Ionin and Matushansky's case, they do not correctly correlate (plural or singular) agreement with syntactic and semantic facts.

Also, there are theoretical reasons to believe that the fundamental representations of comitatives are no longer tenable. In the following sections I posit a solution to the theoretical problem and, following that, argue that this new approach more accurately handles the data.

What is required is a way to derive structural ambiguity that avoids two things: (i) differing attachment sites and (ii) differential

movement of the host DP. In section 4 I offer an analysis that avoids both of these.

#### 4. Solution to the Theoretical Problem

To handle the differential behavior of adjuncts, Hornstein (2008) proposes the decomposition of Merge into two suboperations: Concatenate and Label. In (41) below the traditional conception of Merge from Chomsky (1995) is presented. Hornstein's decomposed Merge account breaks that operation down into (42a) and (42b).

(41) Merge( $x, y$ )  $\rightarrow$   $\{x, \{x, y\}\}$

(42) a. Concatenate( $x, y$ )  $\rightarrow$   $\{x, y\}$

b. Label( $x, y, x$ )  $\rightarrow$   $\{x, \{x, y\}\}$

In other words, traditional Merge takes two elements and combines them to make a unit with one of the elements serving as the label of that unit. Under decomposed Merge, the operation Concatenate makes a unit of the two elements and the operation Label causes one of the subunits to act as the label of the unit.


This decomposition allows for an elegant account of the different behavior of adverbial modification. When an adverb Concatenates with a verb and labeling does not occur, as shown in (43), the adverb is, in Hornstein's words, "invisible" to operations targeting the verb. So when an operation like VP-deletion targets a VP with a merely concatenated adverb, the VP deletes and the adverb will be left unaffected, as in (44). Were Label to have applied, as in (45), the adverb would be included in the ellipsis, as in (46).

(43)

VP	A
run	quickly

(44) Ivan ran slowly and Ivy did so [vp ~~run~~] quickly.





(46) Ivan ran quickly and Ivy did so [<sub>VP</sub> ~~run quickly~~] too.

In the following section I show how this conception of Merge can be applied to comitative constructions in Russian.

#### 4.1. Application to Comitatives


The solution to the adjunct conundrum presented above can straightforwardly be applied to comitatives. Following Ionin and Matushansky, I'll assume here that the comitative adjoins to a host DP, but this time there will be an initial structural ambiguity between the comitative phrase being Concatenated and Labeled with the subject, shown in (47a), and being merely Concatenated, shown in (47b). There is no more particular motivation for Labeling to occur or not than there was for the comitative phrase to adjoin to the DP or VP in the previous accounts or for a certain portion of the comitative phrase to move to SpecTP in the unified analysis. So long as the result is licit with respect to the rest of the sentence, the sentence will be grammatical; if the Labeling choice does not comport with the rest of the sentence, the result will be bad.<sup>10</sup>

An important question arises here as to what sort of entity the DP+PP Concatenation is. What does the dashed line above signify and how does that differ from traditional Merge? Under the system that Hornstein proposes, the DP+PP concatenation is not a syntactic con-

<sup>10</sup> For example, if an unLabeled subject is something inanimate that cannot generally be assisted in doing something, the result will be unacceptable, as in (i). But inanimate subjects can freely be interpreted as coordinated with other things, and as such plural agreement should be acceptable. In (i) below, there is nothing syntactic that forces the Labeling, it is simply the case that failing to do so leads to a noncoordinated interpretation and thus an unacceptable sentence given these lexical items. That is, notebooks cannot lie with the assistance of textbooks, but they can lie in addition to textbooks.

(i) Tetrad' s učebnikom ležali/ \*ležala na stole.  
 notebook with textbook lie<sub>PL</sub>/ lie<sub>SG</sub> on table  
 'The notebook and the textbook were on the table.'

stituent and is thus not targetable by grammatical operations as a unit.<sup>11</sup>



This does not mean that there is no semantic or syntactic relation between the two. Hornstein argues that featural relations are mediated by Concatenate and the adjoined element is thus interpreted as modifying the host. Because of this, the comitative PP and the host DP can be interpreted as related without being a targetable syntactic constituent. The particular meaning induced by this relation is not the coordinated one, but rather the traditional comitative one. Concatenation simply relates the PP with the DP rather than another constituent. La-

<sup>11</sup> Also, there is no c-command relation between the DP and the PP as there is no branching node dominating DP that dominates PP. This means that any condition requiring c-command cannot be satisfied by a structure like in (47b). If we assume the LCA (Kayne 1994), then at the PF-interface structures like (47b) will need to have been labeled in order to be interpreted (the LCA demands c-command). One has to allow some sort of late-labeling that has been argued for in Larson 2013. It is argued there that late-labeling is an option and this interface condition can be met.

belonging is a more powerful operation that introduces the 'is-a' relation to the two Concatenated objects in the sense of Chomsky 1955 (see Hornstein and Pietroski 2009 for more discussion). If Labeling applies, the DP+PP group is closed off and treated as a syntactic unit with the label DP. This new DP is now a unit that can be input to further operations. The comitative PP along with the host DP are now a closed-off unit, and I posit that the coordinated reading is hereby effected. In short, the meaning difference that Ionin and Matushansky derive via movement is here derived via differential Labeling.

Now we have a theoretically sound way in which to target either the string *Maša s Dašej* in its entirety or just *Maša* to the exclusion of *s Dašej*. Labeling is in free variation with mere Concatenation. The host DP can move without the comitative phrase qua DP. As such, we can account for at least the same range of data that Ionin and Matushansky do through their account: Where Ionin and Matushansky want the whole phrase to move, we can target the DP in (47a); where Ionin and Matushansky want just the initial noun to move, we can target the DP in (47b). The advantage is that we can do so in a more theoretically tenable fashion. Furthermore, movement is no longer strictly necessary for deriving the structural ambiguity. The ambiguity stems from whether Label has occurred or not. Both options are equally available but they result in different syntactic and semantic representations.

#### 4.2. The Rarity of Comitative Coordination

An important question is left unanswered in Ionin and Matushansky's account and is as yet unanswered in this one. If comitative coordination arises simply from adjoining the relevant type of preposition to a DP, why does this type of comitative not arise more commonly? That is, why is the English equivalent of (1) illicit?

(48) \*John with Mary go/goes to school.

Furthermore, prepositional phrases are generally taken to attach to NP when attaching to nominals, but this is not the case here. I think this is not due to chance but rather a constellation of factors that conspire to make 'with' PP adjunction to DP possible. A confluence of three factors is necessary for the Russian type of comitative. First, the comitative morpheme must be different from the instrumental mor-

pheme. In other words, the language must be what Stolz (1996) and Stolz, Stroh, and Urdze (2006) would deem an A-type language. Second, it must be the case that coordination (as opposed to a comitative strategy) is the default option for expressing two nominals as having the same thematic role. This is what Stassen (2000) calls an AND-type language. Finally, it must be the case that the comitative morpheme be the head of the relevant phrase instead of the nominal. In this section I show how these three criteria work together to allow the Russian type of comitative.

Stolz, Stroh, and Urdze 2006 investigates (and notes previous discussion of) the inherent similarities between instrumentals and comitatives, both in terms of surface distribution and in terms of more abstract notions of meaning. It is very often the case that a language will use the same morpheme for both comitative purposes and instrumental ones. English is a straightforward example of this with *with* serving both purposes:

- (49) a. Ivy went to school with Dana.  
b. Ivy cut the carrot with the knife.

Russian on the other hand is a language in which these two roles are expressed with different morphemes. The comitative is expressed with *s* whereas the instrumental is expressed with suffixal case morphology.

In order for the comitative to be ambiguous with coordination in the Russian sense and in turn adjoin to DP, it cannot additionally be the case that the comitative morpheme is used in an instrumental sense. The sole meaning (in a sufficiently abstract sense) of the comitative morpheme should be that of accompaniment, so that it is essentially redundant with coordination. This in turn depends on how coordination broadly speaking is expressed.

Stassen (2000) explores different strategies for expressing two nominals in the same thematic role with respect to a given predicate. He notes that languages generally either opt for an AND-strategy and use coordination (with the occasional comitative construction) or they opt for a WITH-strategy and solely use comitative constructions. Russian is an AND-type language in his terminology.

Because Russian typically expresses role-sharing nominals via coordination and because it has a single-use comitative morpheme that

redundantly expresses the same concept, it is all the more likely to be used after a fashion like the coordinator.<sup>12</sup>

Languages that are both A-type languages and AND-type languages face an inherent redundancy. Comitative morphemes in these languages are distinct from instrumental morphemes and thus only serve to indicate accompaniment in the same way that the coordination of nominals does. The close affinity between comitatives and coordination allows them to function similarly and opens the possibility that they are treated the same in terms of attachment site. That is, if the lexical semantics of coordination and comitatives are to such a degree similar, they should be interchangeable compositionally. When the comitative phrase (*s Ivanom*) is headed by the comitative morpheme it is possible for it to compose with the DP. We thus expect the Russian type of comitative to arise in such languages as Polish (Trawinski 2005 and Dylą 1988), Czech (Skrabalova 2003), and Paiwan (Tang 2011), where this is the case. Yet if the comitative morpheme does not head the comitative phrase but is merely an affix, it should not be possible to compose with the DP without causing problems with canonical coordination. This will be explained in the section below. This correctly predicts that languages with comitative suffixes like Basque and Finnish will not behave like Russian.<sup>13</sup>

This is not intended as a strict entailment of these properties nor a functionalist analysis of either coordination or comitatives. Rather, what is intended is a typologically plausible attempt to explain the relative rarity of the Russian type of comitative despite the apparent generalizability of the specific analysis presented here. The compositional effects, both semantic and syntactic, of the comitative phrase must be similar enough to coordination so as to be able to attach where coordination phrases do, namely to DP.

<sup>12</sup> Arkhipov (2009: 234) notes Russian as an example of the result of this sort of AND-drift.

<sup>13</sup> The standard modern Finnish comitative morpheme (*kanssa*) was once a post-position but has been reanalyzed as a clitic or case suffix (see Campbell 1988 for discussion).

### 4.3. Empirical Consequences

We can now avoid the problems that the unaccusative constructions raised. Comitatives that are represented like (47b) will only show the syntactic effects of the host DP. The comitative PPs in these constructions are invisible to the rest of the construction and as such will not be able to effect agreement, binding, or control. The fact that the necessary structural ambiguity can be derived without movement and without differential attachment sites is the main advantage of this approach.

Exactly how this works in the unaccusative case requires more explication. We have seen that putative SpecTP effects (agreement, PRO and anaphora licensing, etc.) arise when the subject is not found in that position. It thus cannot be the case that SpecTP is uniquely endowed with properties that lead to those effects. It is possible that both SpecTP and the base position of the unaccusative subject are imbued with these properties and that the SpecTP effects will arise in both positions.<sup>14</sup> That is to say, in the same way that Ionin and Matushanksy stipulate the SpecTP position as having these properties, so too would it be possible to make a similar stipulation for the unaccusative subject's base position. Though a logically possible option, this is not a very explanatory one. Instead I propose that these effects are the result of a disparate constellation of factors.

For one, Potsdam and Polinsky (2011) suggest that the failure of unaccusative subjects to move to the SpecTP position is due to a lack of an EPP feature, namely, a feature that prompts movement independently of the relation that effects agreement. For unaccusative subjects there is no motivation to move to the SpecTP position, but the agreement relation that holds between the T head and the subject nevertheless holds. If the comitative subject undergoes Label, this agreement relation will result in plural marking on the verb. Singular agreement stems from a lack of Label

The reason that the T head agrees with the unaccusative subject in its base position is not due to anything inherent to either element. Rather, the unaccusative subject is the structurally highest nominal and the agreement operation will hit upon it first following Chomsky 2000

<sup>14</sup> I take this base position to be the specifier of a ResultP (directly below *vP*) following Alexiadou and Schäfer 2011. Base generation in the position allows the unaccusative subject to license PRO in VP adjuncts via c-command.

and 2001. The other effects of subjecthood, including subject-oriented anaphora and PRO licensing, stem from the same consideration. That is, the relevant anaphors are not concerned with some primitive notion of “subject,” but rather with a structural consideration: the structurally highest argument.<sup>15</sup> In short, the unaccusative subject, while not in SpecTP, is still the highest argument and will in turn pattern with the structurally highest nominals in other constructions.

The initial empirical distinctions are captured in exactly the same way. For example when Labeling occurs, plural agreement is effected, since the subject is a complex entity functioning like coordination, but when Labeling does not occur, it is only possible for the host noun to be agreed with because the comitative phrase is not fully integrated into the structure. Further, when Labeling occurs and effects plural agreement it is also no longer possible to target just the host NP for wh-extraction because the host NP alone is not a maximal projection, as in (50).

- (50) \*Kto s Mašej pošli v kino?  
       who with Masha went<sub>PL</sub> to movie  
       ‘Who went to the movies with Masha?’

The same reasoning accounts for the traditional distinctions presented above but without recourse to movement or differential attachment sites. The paradox is thus avoided. Through adjunction, we are allowed sufficient structural ambiguity to handle the split personality of Russian comitatives.

#### 4.4. Differences between Comitatives and Coordination

It was shown above that current theories of comitatives render them essentially the same as coordination, despite their differences. In this subsection I will explore a means to distinguish the two, relying heavily on the account of comitatives I propose here.

---

<sup>15</sup> This is not a complete explanation of the actual licensing mechanisms for these subject-oriented anaphors. It is still an open issue in generative theories of Russian subject-oriented anaphors (see among others Hestvik 1992 and Avrutin 1994), but the work done by Bailyn (2003, 2004a, b) supports this generalization.

Larson 2010 argues that coordination is derived via iterative Concatenation of like categories with optional Labeling.<sup>16</sup> That is, the phrase in (51) can be derived in (at least) two ways. This is to work in English just as in any other language.

(51) Mary and Ivan and Ivy

The derivation relies on the notion of decomposed Merge discussed earlier. For the flat, nonhierarchical reading of (51), the derivation proceeds as follows. First, concatenate *Mary* and *Ivan* in (52), then Concatenate *Ivy* into the result in (53). Lasnik (2011) also notes the need for “flat” coordination like this.

(52) Concatenate(Mary,Ivan) → {Mary,Ivan}

(53) Concatenate({Mary,Ivan},Ivy) → {Mary,Ivan,Ivy} =  
“Mary (and) Ivan and Ivy”

There is however (at least) another reading to this phrase, one in which there are internal groupings of people (say, ‘Mary and [Ivan and Ivy]’). To derive this, I propose that after Mary and Ivan are concatenated, but before Ivy is, Labeling occurs. Instead the derivation proceeds as follows:

(54) Concatenate(Ivan,Ivy) → {Ivan,Ivy}

(55) Label(Ivan,{Ivan,Ivy}) → {Ivan,{Ivan,Ivy}}

(56) Concatenate(Mary,{Ivan,{Ivan,Ivy}}) → {Mary,{Ivan,{Ivan,Ivy}}}  
= “Mary and [Ivan and Ivy]”


The consequence of this approach is that there are structural correlates to particular interpretations of coordination phrases. The result

<sup>16</sup> The lexical item ‘and’ is a late-inserted grammatical primitive under this view. This precludes comitative coordination when the comitative morpheme does not head the phrase. When it is a suffixal, it does not alter the category of its host DP. Composing DP and DP leads to coordination, which cannot arise with the comitative marker.




of the first derivation is a flat structure as in (57) and has essentially a distributive reading. The result of the second derivation is hierarchical as in (58) and has a collective or cumulative reading.

(57) flat coordination:




(58) hierarchical coordination:




Comitatives, as we have seen, are also structurally ambiguous. But as is obvious in (59), they are not ambiguous between structured, hierarchical representations and flat, nonhierarchical ones. There is still a hierarchical distinction between the DPs in both trees below. Prepositions must both Concatenate with their internal argument and undergo Label. The entirely flat representation in (57) is not possible. The difference in interpretation then will not amount to a difference between cumulativity and distributivity. Instead we have the dichotomy standardly discussed in the comitative literature: it will reduce to an 'and' reading or a 'with' reading.

(59) 'with' comitative:



(60) 'and' comitative:



This distinction also accounts for the lack of closest conjunct agreement in comitatives noted above. In comitatives that do not undergo Labeling, there is a noun that enjoys a structural promotion with respect to the other noun within the PP, and this promoted noun is

what the verb always agrees with. Were coordinated subjects not to undergo Labeling, there would be no clear way to distinguish which conjunct should agree with the verb. As such, it may be the case that this is what allows closest conjunct agreement: lack of any strictly structural distinction between the conjuncts. That this distinction arises with comitatives and not with coordination can account for the distinction in agreement possibilities.

The result of this section suggests a reanalysis of a typological generalization. In defending the notion of “comitative” as a distinct category of construction, Arkhipov (2009) develops criteria. Arkhipov states that “genuine” comitatives must meet certain criteria. The relevant criterion for the current discussion is that the nonobligatory participant differ in structural rank from its obligatory counterpart.

Arkhipov distinguishes comitative coordination from genuine comitatives. He does this by requiring that the expressions must be of differing structural rank. I have argued above that, at least for Russian, this is not the actual distinction. All comitatives in Russian involve such a discrepancy, and the differences between comitative coordination and “genuine” comitatives arises due to differences in Labeling, not hierarchy. That is, comitative coordination should also be considered an instance of a “genuine” comitative as far as theory (and not description) is concerned despite its superficial differences from comitative non-coordination.

#### 4.5. Empirical Consequences

Note that the minimal amount of structure necessary for the ‘and’ interpretation of comitatives mirrors that of the hierarchical coordination above. This being the case, we would expect comitative coordination to be interpreted only in ways that hierarchical coordination can be.

What would happen if we tried to iterate comitative PPs? In order to be interpreted as coordination-like, the D would have to undergo Labeling. Labeling introduces hierarchical structure and precludes the flat reading we found in (51). Thus, the fact follows that multiple comitative coordination phrases cannot have iterative readings like in (61) as we saw earlier.

- (61) Daša s Mašej s Sašej  
 Dasha with Masha with Sasha  
 'Dasha and [Masha with/and Sasha]' but not 'Dasha, Masha,  
 and Sasha'

Another means to show this is as follows. In (62), the sentence can have either a collective reading, in which a total of 1000 rubles was won by the group of Anna and Masha, or the reading in which both women won 1000 rubles each.

- (62) Anna i Maša vyigrali 1000 rublej.  
 Anna and Masha won<sub>PL</sub> 1000 rubles  
 'Anna and Masha won 1000 rubles in total.' or  
 'Anna won 1000 rubles and Masha won 1000 rubles.'

This ambiguity is not found in comitative coordination. The sentence in (63) can only have the collective reading in which no more than 1000 rubles was won. As we have seen above, the minimum amount of structure for a coordination reading requires the collective reading, and thus the data below are readily explainable based on the syntactic structure of the comitative.<sup>17</sup>

- (63) Anna s Mašej vyigrali 1000 rublej.  
 Anna with Masha won<sub>PL</sub> 1000 rubles  
 'Anna and Masha won 1000 rubles in total.'  
 \*'Anna won 1000 rubles and Masha won 1000 rubles.'

It has been noted by my informants and a reviewer that the distributive reading is only slightly more available for the coordination

<sup>17</sup> Additionally, it is the case that the Russian distributive particle *po* seems to make available both interpretations when inserted in (63). It is not clear why this particle loosens the interpretive possibilities in this case. The same function is played by *each* in English in forcing the distributive reading:

(i) Ivy and Iris (each) won (each) 1000 rubles (each).

This requires that either this potential empirical repercussion be disavowed or that the distributive particle be able to override the interpretive constraint that the comitative correlates with otherwise. I do not have an answer as to which choice is correct.

example, but following McNally (1993) I contend that the distinction is real and that it correlates with the structural possibilities offered by this theory. It is likely that an interpretive distinction of this type may arise only indirectly from the syntactic structure and may be influenced by syntax-external forces of the semantic or pragmatic sort.

#### 4.6. Summary

As we have seen, the proposed decomposed Merge approach to comitatives provides a theoretically sound avenue to account for the data of what has traditionally been seen as at least two separate constructions. This analysis allows us to eschew that bipartite approach without losing any ground empirically. It also allows us to advance the unified account of Ionin and Matushansky while hewing to theoretical strictures and avoiding their reliance on movement-driven ambiguity.

In the following section plural pronoun comitatives will be addressed and shown to fit in well with the approach presented here.

#### 5. Plural Pronoun Comitatives

In addition to the ostensible two different types of comitatives discussed above, there is a third version of comitative in Russian that has been analyzed in the literature as yet another entirely different type. The construction in question is the Plural Pronoun Comitative (PPC). In the example below, a plural pronoun is affixed with a comitative and the result can be interpreted in three ways.

- (64) My s Petej pojdem domoj.  
 we with Peter go<sub>FUT</sub> home  
 'We will go home with Peter.' or  
 'Peter and I will go home.' or  
 'We and Peter will go home.'  
 \*I will go home with Peter. (Vassilieva and Larson 2001)

The fact that there are only three potential interpretations of the above sentence is unexpected under previous accounts. Given that comitatives in general can have either an 'and' reading or a 'with' reading and given that the plural pronouns here seem to be able to al-

ternate between plural and singular readings, we expect a Cartesian product of possibilities, namely, four. Why do we not get a reading in which (64) is interpreted as 'I will go home with Peter'? Analyzing this fact will lead to greater understanding of PPCs and allow for their easy assimilation into the decomposed Merge approach to comitatives at large.

### 5.1. Hypothesis

Following Vassilieva and Larson (2001), plural pronouns can themselves be decomposed into their singular version plus some discourse referent(s) (represented here as  $\otimes$ ).

Assuming that the (de)composition shown in (65) can be coded in the syntax, we can make a hypothesis about how plural pronouns function with comitatives.

- (65) a.  $\text{we} = \text{I} + \otimes$   
 b.  $\text{you(pl)} = \text{you(sg)} + \otimes$   
 c.  $\text{they} = \text{he/she/it} + \otimes$

Add to this a premise that if the delta value in the above examples is Merged (Concatenated and Labeled) directly with the pronoun, then the pronoun that it Merges with causes it to be interpreted as plural, as in (66). This is plausible in the sense that 'we' is essentially identical to 'I and discourse referent'

- (66)  $\text{Merge(1st person singular, [discourse referent } \otimes])} \rightarrow \text{1st person plural (we)}$



If however a contentful element is Merged (either merely Concatenated or also Labeled) directly (via a preposition) as the delta value, then the result is interpreted as '1st person singular and said contentful element' on analogy with the above case.



- (67)  $\text{Merge(1st person singular, [with Ivan])} \rightarrow \text{1st person singular (I) and Ivan}$

Now if Merging something contentful directly with the incipient plural pronoun necessarily causes an 'and' interpretation, an utter lack of PPCs being interpreted as 'I with Ivan' is predicted. This essentially ad hoc component of the hypothesis allows for a simple interpretation of the PPC facts. This is shown in the following section.

## 5.2. Consequences

Given the decomposed Merge means of structure building, there are four possible derivations for any given plural pronoun. The pronoun can first Merge directly with a discourse referent (covert here) and then Merge with a comitative phrase, as in (68). This creates a 'we and DP' reading. The pronoun can Merge directly with a discourse element and then Concatenate with a comitative, as in (69). This creates a 'we with DP' reading. The pronoun can first Merge with a comitative phrase, as in (70). This creates an 'I and DP' reading. The pronoun can also merely Concatenate with a comitative, as in (71). This also creates an 'I and DP' reading.





The most immediate consequence is that given (71) it is predicted that movement of the pronoun to the exclusion of the comitative should be possible while still retaining an 'and' interpretation. In (71) 'we' is merely concatenated and can thus be targeted for movement independently of the comitative PP. This is not possible with nonpronominal 'and' interpretations as we see in (72). Here, the 'and' interpretation cannot be maintained.

- (72) \*Pelagija znali s Mitrofaniem, kto prestupnik.  
 Pelagia knew<sub>PL</sub> with Mitrofanij who criminal  
 'Pelagija and Mitrofanij knew who the criminal was.'  
 (Ionin and Matushansky 2002)

Given the typology above in (68–71), only (69) and (71) should be able to undergo this separation. This is to say, it is predicted that all the readings in (68–71) should be possible with the exception of (68) whose pronoun cannot be moved to the exclusion of the comitative. And this is exactly what we find in (73). The sentence can have the interpretations in (74a) and (74b), but not (74c). The reading in (74a) can be derived by extracting the pronoun to the exclusion of the PP, like in (71). The reading in (74b) can be derived by extracting the pronoun-delta constituent, like in (69). The 'and' reading in (74c) cannot be derived because the pronoun-delta constituent cannot be extracted to the exclusion of the PP, like in (68).

- (73) My pojdem zavtra s Ivanom v magazin i vse  
 we go tomorrow with Ivan to store and all  
 kupim.  
 buy

‘Ivan and I will go to the store tomorrow and get all (we need).’

- (74) a. Ivan and I will go to the store tomorrow and get all (we  
 need).  
 b. We’ll go with Ivan to the store tomorrow and get all (we  
 need).  
 c. \*We and Ivan will go to the store tomorrow and get all (we  
 need).

Given the facts above, it has been shown that the present hypothesis coupled with a decomposed Merge analysis of comitatives in Slavic can account for a wide range of data, wider than the analyses previously presented for such constructions.

Arkipov (2009) defines genuine comitatives so as to exclude PPCs (what he deems “inclusory constructions”). To be a genuine comitative the relevant participants must be expressed separately. This is not the case with PPCs because multiple participants are expressed as a single word. However, on the basis of certain assumptions about the nature of pronoun composition, I have argued that these are genuine comitatives as well, in the sense that they are the result of the same structure as traditional comitatives with differences arising due to lexical idiosyncracies of the nominals involved.<sup>18</sup> Despite the superficial descriptive differences between canonical comitatives and PPCs, they form a single theoretical construction.

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that a decomposed Merge analysis of comitatives in Slavic is not only essentially forced upon us on theoretical grounds, but that it also better accounts for the empirical terrain. It

<sup>18</sup> This is not to say that inclusory constructions are necessarily subtypes of comitatives. Arkipov (2009) notes that similar constructions arise without that aid of comitative morphemes.



was argued that while the approach of Ionin and Matushansky is superior to traditional analyses, it undergenerates in a few crucial areas. Previous accounts were shown to succumb either to the problems of multiple attachment sites or to a reliance on movement to derive structural ambiguity. The analysis here by adopting the notion of decomposed Merge captures the empirical landscape while avoiding those pitfalls. Such an analysis can be shown to further provide a possible explanation for the complications found in plural pronoun comitatives.

## References

- Alexiadou, Artemis and Florian Schäfer. (2011) "An unaccusativity diagnostic at the Syntax-Semantics interface: *There*-insertion, indefinites, and restitutive *again*". Ingo Reich, ed. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 15*. Saarbrücken: Universaar—Saarland University Press, 101–15.
- Arhipov, Alexandre. (2009) "Comitative as a cross-linguistically valid category". Patience Epps and Alexandre Arhipov, eds. *New challenges in typology: Transcending the borders and refining the distinctions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 223–46.
- Avrutin, Sergey. (1994) "The structural position of bound variables in Russian". *Linguistic inquiry* 25(4): 709–27.
- Bailyn, John Frederick. (2003) "Does Russian scrambling exist?" Simin Karimi, ed. *Word order and scrambling*. Oxford: Blackwell, 156–76.
- . (2004a) "Generalized inversion". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 22: 1–49.
- . (2004b) "A (purely) derivational approach to Russian scrambling". Wayles Browne, Ji-Yung Kim, Barbara Partee, and Robert A. Rothstein, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Amherst meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 41–62.
- Bošković, Željko. (2010) "Conjunct-sensitive agreement: Serbo-Croatian vs. Russian". Gerhild Zybatow, Philip Dudchuk, Serge Minor, and Ekaterina Pshehotskaya, eds. *Proceedings of FDSL 7.5*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 31–48.
- Campbell, Lyle. (1988) "Syntactic change in Finnish dialects". Jacek Fisiak, ed. *Historical dialectology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 85–110.

- Chomsky, Noam. (1955/1975) *The logical structure of linguistic theory*. New York: Plenum.
- . (1995) *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . (2000) "Minimalist inquiries: The framework". Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, eds. *Step by step: In honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 89–155.
- . (2001) "Derivation by phase". Michael Kenstowicz, ed. *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.
- Dyła, Stefan. (1988) "Quasi-comitative coordination in Polish". *Linguistics* 26: 383–414.
- Dyła, Stefan and Anna Feldman. (2003) "On comitative constructions in Polish and Russian". Paper presented at the Fifth European Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages, Leipzig, November 26–28, 2003.
- Feldman, Anna. (2001) "Comitative and plural pronoun constructions". Yehuda N. Falk, ed. *Proceedings of the Israel Association of Theoretical Linguistics*. Online publication, available at <http://atar.mscc.huji.ac.il/english/IATL/17/>.
- Hestvik, Arild. 1992. "LF movement of pronouns and antisubject orientation". *Linguistic inquiry*, 23(4): 557–94.
- Hornstein, Norbert. (2008) *A theory of syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert and Paul Pietroski. (2009) "Basic operations: Minimal syntax-semantics". *Catalan journal of linguistics* 8: 113–39.
- Ionin, Tania and Ora Matushansky. (2002) "DPs with a twist: A unified analysis of Russian comitatives". Wayles Browne, Ji-Yung Kim, Barbara Partee, and Robert A. Rothstein, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Amherst meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 255–74.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1994) *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuznetsova, Julia. (2005) "Against the Russian distributive *po*-construction as a diagnostic for unaccusativity". Steven Franks, Frank Y. Gladney, and Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The South Carolina meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 170–80.
- Larson, Bradley. (2010) "Bare phrase coordination". Paper presented at GLOW 33, Wrocław, Poland, April 14–16, 2010.

- Larson, Bradley. (2013) "Arabic first conjunct agreement and primitive operations". *Linguistic inquiry* 44(4): 611–31.
- Lasnik, Howard. (2011) "What kind of computing device is the human language faculty?" Anna Maria Di Sciullo and Cedric Boeckx, eds. *The biolinguistic enterprise: New perspectives on the evolution and nature of the human language faculty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 354–65.
- Lavine, James E. and Robert Freidin. (2002) "The subject of defective T(ense) in Slavic". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 10(1–2): 251–87.
- McNally, Louise. (1993) "Comitative coordination: A case study in group formation". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 11(2): 347–79.
- Munn, Alan B. (1993) *Topics in the syntax and semantics of coordinate structures*. Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, College Park.
- Muysken, Pieter. (1982) "Parametrizing the notion 'head'". *Journal of linguistic research* 2(3): 57–75.
- Perlmutter, David M. and John Moore. (2002) "Language-internal explanation: The distribution of Russian impersonals". *Language* 78: 619–50.
- Potsdam, Eric and Maria Polinsky. (2011) "Against covert A-movement in Russian unaccusatives". *Linguistic inquiry* 42: 345–55.
- Skrabalova, Hana. 2003. "Comitative constructions in Czech". Peter Kosta, Joanna Błaszczak, Jens Frasek, Ljudmila Geist, and Marzena Żygis, eds. *Formal investigations into Slavic languages*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 685–96.
- Stassen, Leon. (2000) "AND-languages and WITH-languages". *Language typology* 4(1): 1–54.
- Stolz, Thomas. (1996) "Komitativ-Typologie: MIT- und OHNE-Relationen im crosslinguistischen Überblick". *Papiere zur Linguistik* 54(1): 3–65.
- Stolz, Thomas, Cornelia Stroh, and Aina Urdze. (2006) *On comitatives and related categories: A typological study with special focus on the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. [*Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*, 33.]
- Tang, Chih-Chen Jane. (2011) "Comitative vs. conjunctive constructions in Paiwan". *Language and linguistics* 12(1): 141–70.
- Trawinski, Beata. (2005) "Plural comitative constructions in Polish". Stefan Müller, ed. *The proceedings of the 12th International Conference*

- on *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, Department of Informatics, University of Lisbon. Stanford, CA: CLSI Publications, 375–95.
- Vassilieva, Masha. (2000) "On the typology of Russian comitatives". Steven Franks, Tracy Halloway-King, and Michael Yadroff, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Bloomington meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 327–44.
- Vassilieva, Masha and Richard K. Larson. (2001). "The semantics of the plural pronoun construction". Rachel Hastings, Brendan Jackson, and Zsolia Zvolenszky, eds. *Proceedings of the 23rd SALT Conference*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, 449–65.

Department of Linguistics  
Harvard University  
Boylston Hall, 3rd floor  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
blarson@fas.harvard.edu

Received: October 2012  
Revised: February 2013