It is well known that comitative items may affect argument selection and agreement operations. For that reason, the status of comitative constructions has long been discussed in the bibliography, the following being the main proposals: (a) the comitative item is a preposition (Ionin & Matsushansky 2002); (b) it is the head of a boolean phrase (Lakoff & Peters’ 1969 seminal work, Kayne 1994); (c) it is a D head inside a complex DP (Feldman 2002); and (d) it is the head of an Applicative Phrase (Dourado 2002). The relationship between comitative constructions and coordination concerning plurality has been observed by many authors, and has given rise to Stassen’s (2000) typological approach. This author argues that languages are characterized by the strategy that is used to codify the participation of two individuals in an event (AND- languages and WITH-languages). Notwithstanding, as Stassen himself observes, several languages have a special strategy for cases in which one or both of the participants are represented by a pronoun. In this presentation, I focus on comitative constructions that trigger morphosyntactic effects concerning plurality, with special attention in the linguistic variation involved in this phenomenon.

**THE FACTS.** The comitative elements I consider are prepositions (English *with*, Spanish *con*), prefixes (Latin *con-vivo* ‘to live with’), case morphemes (Estonian *Balthasari-ga*, ‘with Baltasar’) or ‘hidden’ elements in Stolz et al.’s (2006) terminology (Mapudungun *ińché eymi ińchiu*, lit. ‘I you we’). The presence of these elements in the structure induces the following changes:

**Comitative agreement**

(1) **Con** Osvaldo nos casamos en junio. [Spanish]
   With Osvaldo *us marry.PRT.1PL in June. ‘Osvaldo and me married in June’

(2) **Nous** l’avons fait avec mon frère [French, Rigau 1990:366]
   We CL- have done with my brother
   ‘My brother and I did it

(3) Maša s Dašej xodjat v školu. [Russian, Feldman 2002: 39]
   Masha.NOM con Dasha.INST ir.PL a escuela.DEF
   ‘Masha and Dasha go to the school’

**Partial agreement**

(4) John is friends **with** Peter

**Reciprocal interpretation** (discontinuous reciprocity)

(5) Estela se abrazó con Guido.
   REFL.1SG hug.1SG with Guido
   ‘Estela and Guido hugged each other’

**Obligatory plural pronouns**

(6) ińché eymi ińchiu iyu [Mapudungun, Smeets 2008: 138]
   I you we.group eat.ind.1.dual
   ‘I eat with you’
As examples show, the presence of a comitative element is associated with plurality. However, the final configuration presents a context of interesting variation: plural pronoun constructions with an overt/covert comitative item, comitative coordination, prefixation, discontinuous reciprocity, and partial agreement.

**PROPOSAL.** The aim of this presentation is to account for linguistic variation in the comitative constructions presented above. I assume a Distributed Morphology model (Halle & Marantz 1993) and, following Svenonius’ (2007, 2008) approach to adpositions, I propose that the comitative item is merged with a relational element \( p \) that presents the feature \( \text{[GROUP]} \). The idea behind this feature originates in the interpretation of plural pronouns, noted by Benveniste (1966), among many others. Accordingly, Cysouw (2003: 72) points that “a much better approach for the analysis of pronominal paradigms is to talk about a group marking instead of plural marking” (see also Kratzer 2009). This semantic feature is independent of morphological plurality and, in general, is associated with the categorizer \( n \). We propose that in many languages a \( \text{pP}_{\text{[GROUP]}} \) merges as the specifier of a \( \text{nP} \), whose head is \( n_{\text{[GROUP]}} \). Variation arises when this kind of merger is not possible (e.g. some Spanish dialects); when \( \text{pro-drop/non pro-drop} \) properties are involved (e.g. French vs. Spanish); when the \( \text{pP}_{\text{[GROUP]}} \) can be prefixed (Latin); or when other features are included. Thus, I propose that the comitative item triggering agreement is an adposition that merges inside the DP, except when it is prefixed. In the latter case, the feature \( \text{[GROUP]} \) in the verbal structure induces changes in the base verb argument structure.
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