Russian Comitatives and the Ambiguity of Adjunction

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. Recently a new 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 advantages to challenging 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. 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.

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):

(1) Masha s Dashei xodit/xodjat v shkolu.

Masha with Dasha go.sg/go.pl 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, Dyła 1988, Dyła
Larson 2001). When plural agreement arises, 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 spec,TP to the exclusion of the modifying
comitative phrase, singular agreement is effected; when both move en masse, plural
agreement arises. 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. Capturing the
dual nature of the construction requires that there at some point in the derivation 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 advantages to supplanting these with
an analysis in which it the type of attachment 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.

The foundation of this new analysis is spurred by the status of adjunction in the Bare Phrase Structure (BPS) of Chomsky 1995. Hornstein (2009) 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 re-analyzed 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 1, I discuss the basic empirical facts of the construction. Section 2 concerns the previous analyses as well as their problems both theoretical and empirical. I offer a new analysis in section 3 and in section 4 I extend the analysis to plural pronoun comitatives. Following this is a short conclusion in section 5.
1 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)  Masha [VP s Dasheil xodit v shkolu].
      Masha with Dasha go.sg 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 Masha s Dasheil xodjat v shkolu.
      Masha with Dasha go.pl to school
      ‘Masha and Dasha go to school.’   (Feldman, 2001)

The two types of comitative phrase 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.
1.1 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, like in (4a), but also the subject, like in (4b). When the verb shows plural agreement neither component of the comitative can be wh-extracted.

(4)  a.  S  kem  Masha poshla/*poshli  v kino?
     with whom masha went.sg/went.pl  to movie
     ‘With whom did Masha go to the movies?’

     b.  Kto s  Mashei poshol/*poshli  v kino?
     who with Masha  went.sg/went.pl to movie
     ‘Who sent to the movies with Masha?’

1.2 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.¹

(5)  a.  Masha s  Dashei xodit/xodjat v shkolu.

¹ It should also be noted that the default, unmarked order for the singular agreement is in fact that in which the nominals are separate like in (5b). For singular agreeing comitatives to arise in the order found (5a) there needs to be some sort of focus on the right-most nominal. This makes minimal pairs that differ only in verbal agreement 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.
Masha with Dasha go.sg/go.pl to school

‘Masha goes to school with Dasha.’

b. Masha xodit/*xodiat v shkolu s Dashei.

Masha go.sg/go.pl to school with Dasha

‘Masha goes to school with Dasha.’

1.3 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) Masha s Dashei *lubit/ljubvat druga.

Masha with Dasha like.sg/like.pl each other

‘Masha and Dasha like each other.’

1.4 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 like in (8) corresponds to only the nominative agent controlling into the adjunct (examples from McNally 1993).²

² The use of the null anaphoric PRO here is not meant to be a theoretical statement but rather an agnostic stand-in for one.
(7) Prorabotav celyj den', Anna s Petej poshli domoj.
Having-worked whole day Anna with Peter went.pl home
‘[PROi Having worked all day], Anna and Peteri went home.’

(8) Prorabotav celyj den', Anna posla domoj s Petej.
Having-worked whole day Anna went.sg home with Peter
[PROi Having worked all day], Annai went home with Peteri.’

2 Previous Analyses

In the section above, I provided some of the evidence that spurred the traditional analysis which 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 argumentation to the effect that they are insufficient. I then argue that the other, more unified analysis of Ionin and Matushansky is similarly insufficient.

2.1 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). The differences between

---

3 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-adjunct and coordination in terms of attachment site.
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) \[\text{VP} [\text{DP} \text{ Masha} \text{ Dashei}] \text{ V} \ldots]\n
(10) \[\text{VP} \text{ [Masha DP]} [\text{V'} \text{ s Dashei} \text{ V} \ldots]]\n
The representations above straightforwardly account for the distinctions shown in the previous subsections. The representation in (9) functions akin to 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 as such we predict only singular agreement on the verb and only the nominative noun c-commands into the verb and can bind anaphora and be involved in control resolution.

### 2.2 Problem with 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 analyses that comes from 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.sg Cecilia with Annabella

   ‘I invited Cecilia and Annabella/*Cecilia with Annabella.’

(12) Korol' otdal korolevstvo princu s Zolushkoj.

   king gave kingdom prince with Cinderella

   ‘The king gave the kingdom to the prince and Cinderella.’

(13) ?Dashin s Mashej portret nam ochen' ponravilsja.

   Dasha-poss with Masha-Instr 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-adjointed comitative related to the subject, direct object, or indirect object? Absent such a theory of differential VP-adjunction, there is little reason to suspect that VP-adjunction is involved in comitatives. There are other arguments against this analysis presented in Ionin and Matushansky’s paper. For the sake of concision I direct the reader to that paper instead of discussing the shortcomings further in this one.

2.3 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 Spec,TP 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 Spec,TP position. If the entirety of the complex subject comititave 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.

2.4 Problems with the Unified Analysis

In this section I address aspects of the above analyses that are inadequate in various ways. I present a theoretical argument as well as empirical arguments in doing so.

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 will spur a new analysis.

2.4.1 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 Spec,TP. This, they say, correlates with particular interpretation of the sub-parts of the DP.
The reliance on movement leads Ionin and Matushansky’s analysis to undergenerate relevant data concerning agreement and binding. The Spec,TP 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 Spec,TP whatsoever. It is possible for the differential agreement to arise when the subject is post-verbal as seen below:

(17) Kupil/kupili novyj divan Ivan s Vasej.
    bought.sg/bought.pl new sofa Ivan with Vasja
    'Ivan with Vasja bought a new sofa.'

(18) Bezhali/bezhal po ulice Ivan s Vasej.
    ran.pl/ran.sg on street Ivan with Vasja
    'Ivan with Vasja were running on the street.'

If the subject in the above sentences has not moved to spec,TP, 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 the Ionin and Matushanky’s account. It could be the case however that in the above sentences the subjects have indeed moved to spec,TP (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 to not involve movement (overt or covert) of the subject to the Spec,TP position (see Lavine and Freidin 2002, Perlmutter and Moore 2002, Bailyn 2004a, and Potsdam and Polinsky 2011 for various approaches to this idea). That is, for a sentence like in (19), it is argued that the subject is in a position below the T-head.  

(19) Vcher a vecherom v gorod priletel ochen’ vazhny j chinovnik.
    yesterday evening in town arrived very important official
    ‘A very important official arrived in town yesterday evening.’

Ionin and Matushanky’s analysis requires movement to the Spec,TP position and thus do not predict evidence of structural ambiguity in constructions like those above. Note that the nominative argument in structures like that above can license anaphora (20) as well as control PROs (21).

(20) Vchera vecherom v gorod priletel ochen’ vazhny j chinovnik na svoem:

---

4 This is not to say that linearly right-peripheral subjects are never in a spec,TP 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.
yesterday evening in town arrived very important official on his airplane.

‘A very important official arrived in town yesterday evening on his airplane.’

(21) ne PRO: predooprediv zarane, vchera vecherom v gorod priletel
not warning in.advance yesterday evening in town arrived
chinovnik
official

‘An official arrived in town yesterday evening without warning in advance.’

In comititative 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.⁵

(22) Vchera vecherom v gorod priletel vazhniy chinovnik so svoim sekretarem
yesterday evening in town arrived important official with his secretary
na svoem samolete.
on his airplane

‘A very important official arrived in town yesterday evening on his airplane with

---

⁵ A reviewer notes that the comitative agreement optionality arises in unaccusative constructions even when the subject appears pre-verbally:

(i) Vazhniy chinovnik s sekretarem vchera vecherom priletel/prileteli v gorod.
important official with secretary yesterday evening arrived.sg/arrived.pl in town

‘An important official with/and a secretary arrived in town last evening.’

However, as shown by Potsdam and Polinsky 2011 among other, 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 a sentence like in (i) it would have to be the case that the subject is in a sub-Spec,TP position and that the verb is either yet lower or some higher, yet rightward position.
The interpretation of the structures of coordination and comitatives has been argued not to involve any movement to Spec,TP. Thus there is no way to derive the movement-driven structural ambiguity that Ionin and Matushansky’s analysis requires. A new, non movement-dependent analysis is required and I present one in section 3.

2.4.2 Structural differences from traditional coordination

Though the interpretation of some comitatives is essentially indistinguishable from the interpretation of coordination, there are clear differences between them. Ionin and Matushansky’s account does not structurally distinguish coordination and comitative constructions despite their differences. Let us take a relatively anodyne interpretation of the structures of coordination and comitatives like in (24) and (25).

(24) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} & \text{DP} \\
\& & \text{&P} \\
\& & \text{DP}
\end{array}
\]
The extent to which the unified analysis makes no structural distinctions between comitatives and coordination is the extent to which the following distinctions are problematic.

The most striking difference between comitative coordination and traditional coordination is found in the fact that the former cannot iterate while the latter can. So, as shown below, when 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).

(26) Dasha i Masha i Sasha
    Dasha and Masha and Sasha
    ‘Dasha and [Masha and Sasha]’ or ‘Dasha, Masha, and Sasha’

(27) Dasha s Mashei s Sashei
    Dasha with Mashe with Sasha
    ‘Dasha and [Masha with Sasha]’ but not ‘Dasha, Masha, and Sasha’

To show that there is not ‘flat’ reading of iterated comitatives, it is necessary to set up a scenario against which to test them. Take a scene like in (28):
(28) 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 the backdrop of (28), it is possible to say (29) to accurately report what happened by using iterative coordination. The same cannot be said of iterated comitatives in (30). 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).

(29) Dasha i Masha i Sasha prishli
    Dasha and Masha and Sasha arrived.pl
    ‘Dasha, Masha, and Sasha arrived’

(30) Dasha s Mashei s Sashei prishli
    Dasha with Masha with Sasha arrived.pl
    ‘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 (27) were to move to spec,TP 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 spur either plural agreement (31), or singular agreement with the first conjunct (32):

(31) Byli razrušeny odna derevnja i odno selenije
were destroyed.pl one village.F and one settlement.N

(32) Byla razrušena odna derevnja i odno selenije
was.F destroyed.sg.F one village.F and one settlement.N
‘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 (32). This is shown in (33) below, where the verb cannot agree with the feminine ‘village’:

(33) *Odna derevnja i odno selenije byla razrušena
one village.F and one settlement.N was.F destroyed.sg.F
‘One village and one settlement were destroyed.’

The example in (33) 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 (and roughly a third of my informants agree) that neuter agreement is preferable to feminine agreement independent of the 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 left-most nominal. This is shown in (34) where it is impossible to agree with the noun closest to the verb but is possible with the left-most one as seen in (35).

(34) Ana s Ivanom byla zamechena
Ana with Ivan was.F seen.F

(35) *Ana s Ivanom byl zamechen
Ana with Ivan was.M seen.M

‘Ana was seen with Ivan’

Ionin and Matushansky’s analysis requires that comitatives and traditional coordination be too similar to account for these differences structurally. Later, I propose a clear distinction between coordination and comitatives.

2.4.3 Theoretical Problem

Ionin and Matushansky’s proposed structural analyses of comitatives are sketched below.

In (36) and (37) we see the traditional bipartite analysis of comitatives. The unified analysis prior to movement is identical to that in (36).

(36)

Diagram: vP
      /   
v    /
   / 
  /  
 DP  DP
    /  
   /   
  /    
 DP  PP
   /  
 /   v
 PP  DP
 /  
 /  /
 P  s
   /  
   /   
   /    
   Masha Dashei
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 (the analogue for (38)).

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{(37)} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Masha} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{s} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Dashei} \\
\end{array} \]

In BPS, nodes labeled, for example, ‘vP’ are non-entities. I employ them here simply to draw attention to them as maximal projections.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{(38)} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{Masha} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{s} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Dashei} \\
\end{array} \]
As is apparent, the trees in (36) and (38) are essentially the same except that there are no longer multiple maximal projections per head. 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 *Masha* in (36) is now a non-maximal D and the lower vP in (38) is now also a non-maximal projections.

This creates a problem. Following Muysken (1982) intermediate notes 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.

(39)

```
(39)    VP
       /  \
      /    \n    V     PP
   /  \
  /    \nV eats NP P NP
   apples in Fall
```

We can of course target the topmost VP in a sentence like (40). What BPS, as presented here does not predict is that we are able to target a non-maximal V projection for deletion like in (41).

(40) Ivan ate apples in Fall, and Igor did [eat apples in the Fall VP] too.

---

8 If there were a more complex nominal in the position of *Masha* above in (38) it too would be considered a D by the syntax. This is not to say that this more complex nominal is mono-morphemic or simplex, but rather that in Bare Phrase Structure anything but the highest projection is not considered a maximal projection.

9 Chomsky precise formulation of the nodes produced via adjunction differs from this, though see Hornstein, 2008 for argument against this formulation.
Given BPS, the Ionin and Matushansky approach is not tenable. A tree like (38), essentially though forced upon us by BPS, is not adequate for the unified analysis. In (38) there is no maximal projection dominating Masha 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 (42). It is non-maximal and is not able to move as a phrase.

In sum, the traditional analysis cannot principally 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.

2.5 Summary

In sum, 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: 1) differing attachment sites and 2) differential movement of the host DP. In section 3 I offer an analysis that avoids both of these.

3 Solution to the theoretical problem

To handle the differential behavior of adjuncts, Hornstein (2008) proposes the decomposition of Merge into two sub-operations: Concatenate and Label. In (43) below the traditional conception of Merge from Chomsky 1995 is presented. Hornstein's decomposed merge account breaks that operation down into (44a) and (44b).

\[(43) \quad \text{Merge}(x, y) \rightarrow \{x, \{x, y\}\}\]

\[(44) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Concatenate}(x, y) \rightarrow \{x, y\} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Label}(x, y, x) \rightarrow \{x, \{x, y\}\}
\end{align*}\]

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 differential behavior of adverbia! modification. When an adverb Concatenates with a verb and Labeling does not occur (45), 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 will the adverb will be left unaffected (46). Were Label to have applied (47), the adverb would be included in the ellipsis (48).

(45) \[ \text{VP} \quad \text{A} \]
\[ \text{run} \quad \text{quickly} \]

(46) Ivan ran slowly and Ivy did so [run-VP] quickly.

(47) \[ \text{VP} \]
\[ \text{run} \quad \text{A} \]
\[ \text{quickly} \]

(48) Ivan ran quickly and Ivy did so [run-quickly-VP] too.

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

3.1 Application to Comitatives

The solution to the adjunct conundrum presented above can straightforwardly be applied to comitatives. Due to the arguments of 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 (49a) and being merely Concatenated (49b). 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 spec,TP 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.10

(49) a. 

```
   vP
  /   \
DP   v
 /     \
DP     v
 |      |
 D     VP
|      |
Masha P
|      |
 PP     DP
|      |   \
 s     Dashei
```

b. 

```
   vP
  /   \
DP   v
 /     \
DP     v
 |      |
 D     VP
|      |
Masha P
|      |
 PP     DP
|      |   \
 s     Dashei
```

10 For example, if an unLabeled subject is something inanimate that cannot generally be assisted in doing something, the result will be unacceptable (i). But inanimate subjects can freely be interpreted as coordinated with other things, 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 a non-coordinated 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 ucebnikom lezali/ lezala na stole. 
"The notebook and the textbook were on the table."
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 constituent and is thus not targetable by grammatical operations as a unit.\(^{11}\)

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 as opposed to another constituent. Labeling is a more powerful operation introducing 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 in their analysis is here derived via differential Labeling.

Now we have a theoretically sound way in which to target either the string *Masha s*

---

\(^{11}\) 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 (49b). If we assume the LCA (Kayne 1994), then at the PF-interface structures like (49b) 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 forthcoming. It is argued there that late-labeling is an option and this interface condition can be met.
Dashei in its entirety or just Masha to the exclusion of s Dashei. Labeling is in free variation with mere Concatenation. The host DP can move to the exclusion of 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 (49a); where Ionin and Matushansky want just the initial noun to move, we can target the DP in (49b). The advantage is that we can do so in a more theoretically tenable fashion. Furthermore, movement is no longer strictly necessary to derive the structure 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.

3.2 The site of attachment

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?

(50) *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 posit that 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 comitative. First,
the comitative morpheme must be different from the instrumental morpheme. In other words, the language must be what Stolz (1996) and Stolz et al. (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 et al. (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 as well as instrumental ones. English is a straightforward example of this with *with* serving both purposes:

(51) 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 used as 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 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 to express two nominals sharing thematic roles. 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.\(^\text{12}\)

Languages that are both an A-type languages and an 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 tight affinity between comitatives and coordination allows them to function similarly and opens the possibility that they be treated the same in terms of attachment site. That is, if the lexical semantics of coordination and comitatives are similar to such a degree 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 like Polish (Trawinski 2005 and Dyla 1988), Czech (Skrabalova 2003), and Paiwan (Teng 2011) where this is the case. Yet if the comitative morpheme does not head the comitative phrase but is merely an affix, it

\(^{12}\) Arkhipov (2009:234) notes Russian as example of the result of this sort of AND-drift.
should not be possible to compose with the DP without causing problems with canonical coordination as will be explained in the section below. This thus correctly predicts that languages with comitative suffixes like Basque and Finnish will not behave like Russian.\textsuperscript{13}

This is not intended as a strict entailment of these properties nor a functionalist analysis of either coordination or comitatives. Rather, this section is intended as 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. It must be the case that the compositional effects both semantic and syntactic of the comitative phrase are similar enough to coordination so as to be able to attach where coordination phrases do, namely to DP.

### 3.3 Empirical consequences

We can now avoid the problems that the unaccusative constructions raised. Comitatives that are represented like (49b) are only going to 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 to this approach.

Exactly how this works in the unaccusative case requires more explication. We have seen that putative spec,TP effects (agreement, PRO and anaphora licensing, etc.) arise when the subject is not found in that position. It thus cannot be the case that spec,TP

\textsuperscript{13} The standard modern Finnish comitative morpheme (\textit{kanssa}) was once a postposition but has been reanalyzed as a clitic or case suffix (see Campbell 1988 for discussion)
is uniquely endowed with properties that lead to those effects. It is possible that both spec,TP and the base position of the unaccusative subject are imbued with these properties and that the spec,TP effects will arise in both positions.¹⁴ That is to say, in the same way that Ionin and Matushanksy stipulate the spec,TP position as having these properties, so too would it be possible 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 posit 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 spec,TP position is due to a lack of an EPP feature—namely a feature that prompts movement independent of the relation the effects agreement. For unaccusative subjects, there is no motivation to move to the spec,TP 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, 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

¹⁴ 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.
structural consideration: structurally highest argument. In short, the unaccusative subject, while not in spec, TP 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 as 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 as 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 (52).

(52) *Kto s Mashei poshli v kino?
who with Masha went.pl to movie
‘Who went to the movies with Masha?’

The same reasoning accounts for the traditional distinctions presented above, but without necessary 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.

3.4 Differences between comitatives and coordination

It was shown above that current theories of comitatives render them essentially the same

---

15 This is not a complete explanation as to the actual licensing mechanisms for these subject oriented anaphors. This 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.
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. Larson 2010 argues that coordination is derived via iterative Concatenation of like categories with optional Labeling. That is, the phrase in (53) can be derived in (at least) two ways. This is to work in English just as in any other language.

(53) Mary and Ivan and Ivy

The derivation relies on the notion of decomposed merge discussed earlier. For the flat, non-hierarchical reading of the phrase above (‘Mary, Ivan, and Ivy’), the derivation proceeds as follows. First, concatenate Mary and Ivan (54), then Concatenate Ivy into the result (55). Lasnik 2011 also notes the need for ‘flat’ coordination like this.

(54) Concatenate(Mary,Ivan) → {Mary,Ivan}
(55) 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 posit that after Mary and Ivan were concatenated, but before Ivy is, Labeling occurs. Instead the derivation proceeds as follows:

---

16 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.
The consequence of this approach is that there are structural correlates to particular interpretations of coordination phrases. The result of the first derivation is a flat structure like in (59) and has essentially a distributive reading. The result of the second derivation is hierarchical like in (60) and has a collective or cumulative reading.

Comitatives, as we have seen, are also structurally ambiguous. But as is obvious below, they are not ambiguous between structured, hierarchical representations and flat, non-hierarchical 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 and the entirely flat representation in (59) is not possible. The difference in interpretation then is not going to amount to a difference between cumulatively and distributivity. Instead we have the dichotomy standardly discussed in the comitative literature: it will reduce to an ‘and’ reading and a ‘with’ reading.
Comitatives, as we have seen, are also structurally ambiguous. But as is obvious from the examples, the 'with' reading is not going to reduce to cumulatively versus distributivity. Instead we have the dichotomy standardly interpreted only in ways that hierarchical coordination can be.

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 is 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 re-analysis of a typological generalization. In defending the notion of “comitative” as a distinct category of construction, Arkhipov (2009) develops criteria. To be considered what Arkhipov deems a “genuine” comitative construction it must be the case that for a given construction that expressing a non-obligatory participant there be: only one overt instantiation of the predicate, separate expression of the non-obligatory participant, and differing structural rank between the non-obligatory participant and its counterpart.

Arkhipov distinguishes comitative coordination from genuine comitatives. He does

(61) ‘with’ comitative: 
\[ \text{DP} \quad \text{PP} \]
\[ \quad \text{P} \quad \text{DP} \]

(62) ‘and’ comitative: 
\[ \text{DP} \]
\[ \quad \text{D} \quad \text{PP} \]
\[ \quad \text{P} \quad \text{DP} \]
this by referring to the criterion 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.

3.5 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? 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 (53). Thus, the fact follows that multiple comitative coordination phrases cannot have iterative readings like in (63) like we saw earlier.

(63) Dasha s Mashei s Sashei

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 (64) below, the sentence can have either a collective reading in which a total of 1000 rubles were won by the group of Anna and Masha or the reading in which both women won 1000 rubles each.

(64) Anna i Masha vyigrali 1000 rublej.
    Anna and Masha won.pl 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 (65) 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 is readily explainable based on the syntactic structure of the comitative.\(^{17}\)

(65) Anna s Mashei vyigrali 1000 rublej.
    Anna with Masha won.pl 1000 rubles
    ‘Anna and Masha won 1000 rubles in total.’ but not
    ‘Anna won 1000 rubles and Masha won 1000 rubles.’

\(^{17}\) Additionally, it is the case that the Russian distributive particle po seems to make available both interpretations when inserted in (65). 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 over-ride the interpretive constraint that the comitative correlates with otherwise. I do not have an answer as to which choice is the correct one.
It has been noted by my informants and a reviewer that the distributive reading is only slightly more available for the coordination example, but following McNally 1993 I contend that the distinction is real and that it correlates in 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.

3.6 Summary
As we have seen, the proposed decomposed merge approach to comitatives provides a theoretically sound avenue to account for the data concerning what has traditionally been seen at least two separate constructions. This analysis allows us to eschew that bipartite approach without loosing any ground empirically as well as 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.

4 Plural Pronoun Comitatives
In addition to the ostensible two different types of comitatives discussed above, there is in the literature a third version of comitative in Russian that has be analyzed a 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 comitative and
the result can be interpreted in three ways.

(66) My s̆ Petej pojdem domoj .

We with Peter go-Fut home

‘We will go home with Peter.’ or

‘Peter and I will go home.’ or

‘We and Peter will go home.’ (Vassilieva and Larson 2001)

The fact that there are only three potential interpretations of the above sentences 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 alternate between plural and singular readings, we expect a Cartesian product of possibilities: 4. Why do we not get a reading in which (66) 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.

4.1 Hypothesis

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

Assuming that the (de)composition shown in (67) can be coded in the syntax we can make a hypothesis about how plural pronouns function with comitatives.
(67) a. \( \text{we} = I + \Delta \)

b. \( \text{you(pl)} = \text{you(sg)} + \Delta \)

c. \( \text{they} = \text{he/she/it} + \Delta \)

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, like in (68). This is plausible in the sense that ‘we’ is essentially identical to ‘I and discourse referent’

(68) \( \text{Merge(1st person singular,}[\text{discourse referent } \Delta)] \rightarrow 1\text{st person plural (we)} \)

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.

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

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.\(^{18}\) This essentially ad hoc component of the hypothesis allows for a simple interpretation of the PPC facts. This is shown in the following section.

---

\(^{18}\) It is not intended in either Vassilieva and Larson (2001) or the present paper that this is the only means for first person singular pronouns to enter a derivation. It must be possible for such an entity to arise in similar constructions in its singular form \(\text{ja i Ivan or ja s Ivanom}\). Following the approach of Vassilieva and Larson, I assume that the nominative singular can first merge with discourse referent that refers to the empty set. This will effect the singular morphology and allow the pronoun to undergo further Merge operations in that guise.
4.2 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 (70). This creates a ‘we and DP’ reading. The pronoun can Merge directly with a discourse element and then Concatenate with a comitative (71). This creates a ‘we with DP’ reading. The pronoun can first Merge with a comitative phrase (72). This creates an ‘I and DP’ reading. The pronoun can also merely Concatenate with a comitative (73). This also creates an ‘I and DP’ reading.
Now if merging something indirectly with the incipient plural pronoun causes an ‘and’ interpretation, we predict an utter lack of PPCs being interpreted as ‘I with Ivan’. This essentially ad hoc component of the hypothesis allows for a simpler interpretation of the PPC facts. In the following section we will see how.

Given our 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 (75). The pronoun can merge directly with a discourse element and then concatenate with a comitative (76). The pronoun can first merge with a comitative phrase (77). The pronoun can merely concatenate with a comitative (78).

The most immediate consequence is that given (73) it is predicted that movement of the pronoun to the exclusion of the comitative should be possible while still retaining an ‘and’ interpretation. In (73) ‘we’ is merely concatenated and can thus be targeted for movement independently of the comitative PP. This is not possible with non-pronominal ‘and’ interpretations as we see in (74). Here, the ‘and’ interpretation is not possible to maintain.

(74) *Pelagija znali s Mitrofanijem, kto prestupnik.

Pelagia knew-pl with Mitrofanij who criminal

‘Pelagia and Mitrofanij knew who was the criminal.’

(Ionin and Matushansky 2002)

Given the typology above in (70-73) only (71) and (73) should be able to undergo this separation. This is to say, that it is predicted that all the readings in (70-73) should be possible with the exception of (70) whose pronoun cannot be moved to the exclusion of the comitative. And this is exactly what we find in (75). The sentence can have the interpretations in (76a) and (76b), but not (76c). The reading in (76a) can be derived by
extracting the pronoun to the exclusion of the PP, like in (73). The reading in (76b) can be derived by extracting the pronoun-delta constituent, like in (71). The reading in (76c) cannot be derived because the pronoun-delta constituent cannot be extracted to the exclusion of the PP, like in (70).

(75) My pojdem zavtra s Ivanom v magazin i vse kupim.
we go tomorrow with Ivan to store and all buy
‘Ivan and I will go to the store tomorrow and get all (we need).’

(76) 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.

Arkhipov (2009) defines genuine comitatives so as to exclude PPCs (what he deems “inclusory constructions”). To be a genuine comitative it must be the case that the relevant participants are expressed separately. This is not the case with PPCs as multiple participants are expressed as a single word. However, given 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 and that differences arise due to lexical idiosyncracies of the nominals involved.19

---

19 This is not to say that inclusory constructions are necessarily sub-types of comitatives. Arkhipov (2009) notes that similar constructions arise without that aid of comitative morphemes.
Despite the superficial descriptive differences between canonical comitatives and PPCs, they form a single theoretical construction.

5 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, it also better accounts for the empirical terrain. It 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 either succumb to the problems of posited multiple attachment sites or the reliance on movement to derive structural ambiguity. The analysis here captures the empirical landscape while avoiding those pitfalls by adopting the notion of decomposed Merge. Such an analysis can be shown to further provide a possible explanation for the further complications found in plural pronoun comitatives.
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