

DPS WITH A TWIST: A UNIFIED ANALYSIS OF RUSSIAN COMITATIVES

Russian comitatives: comitatives in Russian appear in three flavors (Dalrymple et al. 1998, Vassilieva 2001, Vassilieva & Larson 2001, Feldman 2001, a.o.), which we will refer to as the **plural comitative**, the **singular comitative**, and the **plural pronoun comitative**, all exemplified in (1). These constructions have standardly been considered to be syntactically (and semantically) different.

Singular/plural: In (1a & c) the *with*-phrase triggers **plural marking** on the verb and implies that Boris took **equal part** in the action, which is not true for (1b). Neither in plural comitatives nor in plural pronoun comitatives can the Nominative DP by itself **bind a reflexive** (McNally 1993), as (2a, c) show, and certain **non-agentive predicates** such as *know* allow a plural comitative or a plural pronoun one, as in (3a, c), while disallowing singular comitatives (Vassilieva 2001). Finally, neither the plural comitative in (4a) nor the plural pronoun comitative in (4c) allows **(wh)-extraction** of the Comp (McNally 1993).

Due to these differences plural comitatives have been frequently analyzed as conjunctions, as opposed to singular comitatives, treated as VP-adjunctions (Camacho 1996, 2000, McNally 1988, 1993, Progovac 1997, Vassilieva 2001, a.o.). However, singular comitatives can modify direct and indirect objects (ex. (5)), which raises new questions about their adjunction site. Furthermore, adjuncts ought to be optional, but this is not always the case with singular comitatives, as previously unnoticed cases like (6) show (note the singular pronoun, only possible in singular comitatives).

Pronominal comitatives: Further problems for the DP-conjunction vs. VP-adjunction analysis of plural vs. singular comitatives come from pronouns. When one of the comitative conjuncts is a pronoun and the agreement is plural, as in (7), plural pronoun use is obligatory. Plural pronoun comitatives **share certain properties** with plural comitatives with respect to **equal participation, agreement, binding, agentivity** and **wh-extraction** (see (1-4), exx. (c)), but also show such idiosyncrasies as **pronoun hierarchy** and **stranding** (Vassilieva 2001). Vassilieva & Larson's 2001 analysis of plural pronoun comitatives as DP-complementation requires additional assumptions about their relation to plural comitatives. All analyses cited above leave unexplained the fact that singular and plural comitatives share the same semantics.

Proposal: We will argue that *with*-phrases are always base-generated as adjuncts to an argument DP, as in [_{DP} DP₁ [_{Comp} with DP₂]]. If the *with*-phrase is focalized, it must be right-extraposed – as is usual with foci in Russian. In this case it doesn't appear in [Spec, TP] and cannot participate in **subject-verb agreement**. Because **Russian reflexives are subject-oriented**, a *with*-phrase that hasn't raised to [Spec, TP] can't bind a reflexive, as in (2b). We will connect the behavior of singular comitatives with **non-agentives**, as in (3b), to pragmatic infelicity of focusing (and thus extraposing) the *with*-phrase with such verbs.

Such a unified analysis permits us to extend to both plural and singular comitatives the semantics of coordination (cf. Dalrymple et al. 1998, for plural comitatives only). It also explains why plural and singular comitatives are possible in all argument positions, with the same properties, and explains the argument structure of cases like (6) by the fact that all verbs that appear to require a *with*-phrase are also grammatical with plural arguments, as in "Nina introduced them". Further support for our theory comes from cases like (8), where the focused *with*-phrase, though adjacent to the subject, doesn't trigger plural agreement. If focused *with*-phrases must be extraposed (though in (8) the movement is string-vacuous), they never raise to [Spec, TP] and can't bind a reflexive, as in (9).

We can now explain the differences between English and Russian comitatives: because English requires *with*-phrases to extrapose, examples (10) are ungrammatical. We will link this difference to the so-called *recursion restriction*, which disallows right complementation/adjunction in the left branch in English.

The remaining issue is **plural pronoun comitatives**. We will present an analysis arguing that the plural Nominative pronoun is semantically plural and that its reference is determined on the basis of the independently required **e-type pronominalization** (Evans 1980). We will show that this theory explains the **pronoun hierarchy** in (11) and correctly predicts that the Nominative pronoun in the plural pronoun comitative can be omitted. We will also show that plural pronoun comitatives behave as expected in **direct and indirect object** positions, and assimilate (non-focalized) cases of **comitative stranding** to **quantifier float** in English and French (Koopman and Sportiche 1987).

Examples:

- (1) a. Alexandra s Borisom tancevali plural comitative
 Alexandra-Nom with Boris-Instr danced-pl
Alexandra and Boris danced.
 b. Alexandra tancevala s Borisom singular comitative
 Alexandra-Nom danced-Fsg with Boris-Instr
Alexandra danced with Boris.
 c. My s Borisom tancevali plural pronoun comitative
 we-Nom with Boris-Instr danced-pl
I and Boris danced.
- (2) a. [Faina_i s Grigoriem_j]_[i+j] delali svoi_{i/*j/*[i+j]} uroki. plural
 Faina-Nom with Gregory-Instr did-pl self's homework-Acc
Faina and Gregory did their homework.
 b. Faina_i delala svoi_{i/*j/*[i+j]} uroki s Grigoriem_j singular
 Faina-Nom did -Fsg self's homework -Acc with Gregory-Instr
Faina did her homework with Gregory.
 c. [My_i s Grigoriem_j]_[i+j] delali svoi_{i/*j/*[i+j]} uroki. plural pronoun
 we-Nom with Gregory-Instr did -pl self's homework -Acc
Gregory and I did our homework.
- (3) a. Dasha s Elenoj znajut matematiku plural comitative
 Dasha-Nom with Elena-Instr know-3pl mathematics-Acc
Dasha and Elena know mathematics.
 b. *Dasha znaet matematiku s Elenoj singular comitative
 Dasha-Nom know-3sg mathematics-Acc with Elena-Instr
 c. My s Elenoj znaem matematiku plural pronoun comitative
 we-Nom with Elena-Instr know-1pl mathematics-Acc
Elena and I know mathematics.
- (4) a. *S kem Hana ne tancevali? plural comitative
 with who-Instr Hana not dance-pl
**Hana and who didn't dance?*
 b. S kem Hana ne tancevala? singular comitative
 with who-Instr Hana not dance-sg
With who didn't Hana dance?
 c. *S kem my ne tancevali? plural pronoun comitative
 with who-Instr we not dance-pl
**I and who didn't dance? (ok as With who didn't we dance?)*
- (5) Ja videla tebjja s JannoJ singular comitative (direct object)
 I-Nom saw-Fsg you-sg-Acc with Janna-Instr
I saw you with Janna.
- (6) Nina-Nom poznamomila ego *(s uchitelem). comitative argument
 Nina introduced-Fsg him-Acc with teacher
Nina introduced him to the teacher.
- (7) a. My s Irinoj tancevali. plural pronoun comitative
 we-Nom with Irene-Instr danced-pl
Irene and I danced.
 b. *Ja s Irinoj tancevali.
 I-Nom with Irene-Instr danced-pl
 c. *Irina so mnoj tancevali.
 Irina-Nom with me-Instr danced-pl
- (8) Katia s LEONIDOM *tancevali/✓tancevala.
 Katia-Nom with Leonid-Instr danced-pl/s
Katia danced with LEONID.
- (9) [Faina_i s GRIGORIEM_j]_[i+j] delala svoi_{i/*j/*[i+j]} uroki.
 Faina-Nom with Gregory-Instr did -Fsg self's homework-Acc
Faina did her homework with Gregory.
- (10) a. *Rosalind with Mark is/are speaking.
 b. *We with Mark is/are speaking.
- (11) a. my s toboj/nim 1st person > 2nd person > 3rd person
 we-Nom with you/him-Instr
 b. vy s nim/*mnoj 2nd person > 3rd person, * > 1st person
 you-pl-Nom with him/me-Instr
 c. *oni s toboj/mnoj 3rd person, * > 1st person, 2nd person
 they-Nom with you/me-Instr