

## ON THE SYNTAX OF COMITATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS: THE CASE OF FINNISH *MUKANA*, *MUKAAN* ‘WITH, ALONG’

**Krista Ojutkangas**

*University of Turku*

**Abstract.** The topic of this article is the syntax of Finnish comitative markers *mukana* and *mukaan* ‘with, along’. Comitative markers express accompaniment relations, which are typically conceived of being asymmetrical: the accompanee is the predominant participant, while the companion is involved in the situation only via the accompanee (Stolz *et al.* 2006: 26–27). However, markers such as *mukana* and *mukaan* are used in several syntactic constructions where the grammatical roles of expressions of the accompanees vary from subject to adverbial, that is, from syntactic core to periphery. Five syntactic construction types were analyzed from a corpus data showing three genres. On the basis of this study, it is shown that syntactic variation has an effect on the conceived asymmetry between the accompanee and the companion, and that syntax makes an important contribution to the semantics of comitative constructions. In strongly asymmetric accompaniment relations, a human accompanee is expressed by a possessive suffix affixed to the comitative marker, or by a clause-initial adverbial. The question of asymmetry contracts to the background when the accompanee is expressed by a non-clause-initial adverbial and when the accompanee is implicit, without overt marking altogether.

**Keywords:** adpositions, grams, accompaniment relation, comitative, grammatical roles, syntax, Finnish

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2017.8.2.09>

### 1. Introduction

In Finnish, there are several constructions which express accompaniment: for instance the conventionalized comitative case (*ystäv-ine-en* [friend-COM-3POSS] ‘with her/his friend(s)’), the grammaticalizing postposition/case *kanssa*, *kaa*, *-kaa* (*ystävä-n kanssa*, *ystävä-n kaa* [friend-GEN with], *ystävä-n-kaa* [friend-GEN-COM] ‘with a friend’), and grams (i.e., postpositions/adverbs; see Section 1) *mukana*, *mukaan* ‘with, along’, *myötä* ‘with, along with’ and *ohessa* ‘alongside, along with’. The relationship between the first two aforementioned expressions was

studied by Sirola-Belliard (2011, 2016), and the semantic and functional relationship between all three constructions would be an interesting research question. This study, however, focuses on the grams *mukana* and *mukaan*, as in *Hänellä on aina koira mukana*. ‘He brings his dog **with him** everywhere.’ and *Saanko tulla mukaan?* ‘Can I come **with you?**’ (examples taken from the MOT English dictionary; for glossed examples, see below).

Typically, accompaniment relations include at least one human participant. In addition, the relationship between these participants is not symmetrical; instead the less prominent one (the *companion*) is only involved in the situation indirectly, via the presence and action of the more prominent participant (the *accompanee*; Stolz *et al.* 2006: 26–27, Sirola-Belliard 2011: 135, 146, and Stolz *et al.* 2012 [2008]: section 41.1.1). In the framework of cognitive linguistics, the participants on which the language users focus their primary and secondary attention are called the *trajector* (or the *figure*) and the *landmark* (or the *ground*) respectively (e.g. Langacker 2008: 71–72). Both sets of terms will be used in this paper: the accompanee/companion emphasizes the semantic viewpoint, while the trajector/landmark covers both the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the grams. In combining these two, the concept of *reference point* will be utilized (Langacker 2000: 173–182).

The term *gram* (Svorou 1993: 31) is used to cover the different syntactic usages which elements such as *mukana* and *mukaan* have in Finnish: they typically function as both adpositions (in the case of *mukana* and *mukaan*, as postpositions) and adverbs. The difference between the two lies in the types of constructions the gram is used in, and more specifically, whether the landmark (LM) of the relationship is overtly expressed or not, and in those cases it is, how it is expressed. This is cross-linguistically typical for grams (see e.g. Hagège 2010: 51–57, 255–256, Libert 2013: 89–100). In Finnish, there are four possibilities, illustrated by the following examples<sup>1</sup>: with postpositions, the landmark is expressed with a noun or a pronoun in the genitive case positioned before the adposition (example 1a) or with a possessive suffix affixed to the gram (1b), while with adverbs, the landmark is expressed with a noun or a pronoun in a local case (1c) or it is implicit, without an overt expression altogether (1d).

1 For the sake of clarity and readability, these examples are simplified reformulations of real corpus occurrences.

- (1) a. LM: pronoun in the genitive case  
*Nuorena kuljin niitten mukana.*  
 young.ESS go.around.PST.1SG **they.PL.GEN** **with.ESS**  
 ‘When I was young, I wandered around with them.’
- b. LM: possessive suffix on the gram  
*Hän toi mukanaan outoja tavaroita.*  
 s/he bring.PST.SG3 **with.ESS.3POSS** strange.PL.PRT thing.PL.PRT  
 ‘S/he brought strange things with her/him.’
- c. LM: noun in a local case<sup>2</sup>  
*Lapsilla oli luistimet mukana.*  
**child.PL.ADE** be.PST.3SG skate.PL **with.ESS**  
 ‘The children had skates with them.’
- d. LM: no overt expression  
*Lääkäri antoi lääkettä mukaana.*  
 doctor give.PST.3SG medicine.PRT **with.ILL**  
 ‘The doctor gave some medicine (for the patient) to take along.’

The aim of this paper is to propose that the facts presented in the previous two paragraphs are intertwined: the syntactic status of the landmark expression varies across constructions, and so does the (a)symmetry between the participants of the accompaniment relation. It has been shown that different comitative markers in a language may express different kinds of accompaniment relations when it comes to the (a)symmetry of prominence among the participants (Stolz *et al.* 2006: 38–40, Sirola-Belliard 2011: 144). In the present study, the focus is on different constructions of one gram. The landmark (accompanee) expression is the stable member of the construction, and it is possible to define the type of the construction on the basis of this expression. The trajector (companion) expression, on the other hand, is not equally pivotal in the syntax of grams. This is why the landmark expression type in the comitative construction is crucial when the (a)symmetry of the accompaniment relation is analyzed.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, the grams *mukana* and *mukaan*, as well as some theoretical viewpoints, the data and the method used in the study, will be presented in more detail. Section 3 will concentrate on the main research question: what is the

2 This type will be divided into two separate types on the basis of word order in Section 3.

contribution of the syntactic construction to the conceived (a)symmetry between the participants of an accompaniment relation? Section 4 will summarize the main findings of the study.

## 2. Background to this study: grams, data, method, and theoretical viewpoints

The words *mukana* and *mukaan* are typical Finnish grams, morphologically, syntactically, and semantically. First of all, they are complex words, consisting of a stem and a local case suffix. The gram *muka|na* is in the essive case: essive is a historical local case with the static meaning of ‘in’ or ‘at’. In contemporary Finnish, the essive has a more abstract function as a role marker (e.g. *opettaja|na* ‘as a teacher’). On the other hand, *muka|an* is in the illative case, which is a productive directional local case meaning ‘to’ or ‘towards’. In addition, the inessive form *mua|ssa*, especially in 19th-century data, is used as a variant for the essive form – the inessive case is the static ‘in’ counterpart of the illative. With these grams, it is thus possible to express the accompaniment relation as static or dynamic, and the choice of the gram form depends on the semantics of the verb in the construction. (On the Finnish system of local cases and adpositions in general, see Huumo and Ojutkangas 2006.) Syntactically, *mukana* and *mukaan* are multifunctional elements, and this was illustrated in examples 1a through d above. A small minority of Finnish grams has a limited syntactic repertoire, but, for example, another comitative marker *kanssa* ‘with’ is used as a postposition only, that is, in similar constructions as in examples 1a and b, and the spatial grams *ulkoa* ‘from out(side)’, *ulkona* ‘out(side)’, *ulos* ‘to out(side)’ function solely as an adverb (c.f. examples 1c and d; on *ulko* grams, see Ojutkangas 2012).

It is semantically typical of grams to be polysemous elements since more abstract functions often emerge from more concrete, for example spatial, ones. For example, it is assumed that *kanssa* ‘with’ was grammaticalized from the inessive (‘in’) case form *kansa|ssa* from the word *kansa* ‘people’. In this case, the meaning of accompaniment thus originates from the meaning ‘in (a group of) people’. (Häkkinen 2004 s.v. *kanssa*.) Typologically, the origin of comitative markers typically lie in nouns meaning ‘comrade, fellow’ or ‘hand’, or in verbs expressing ‘to follow’, ‘to use’, ‘to take’, ‘to meet’, ‘to join’, among others (Hagège 1993: 211, 2010: 153, Heine and Kuteva 2002: 329, 2007: 66, and Heine

2012 [2008]: 461, 463). According to Stolz *et al.* (2006: 361), relative (spatial, social) closeness of participants is common to the whole range of typical lexical sources. On the other hand, comitative markers often also function as instrumental, possessive, and locative markers as well as coordinating conjunctions ('and') in the languages of the world (Stolz *et al.* 2006: 118, Heine and Kuteva 2002: 79–90). In the gram form *mukana*, the meaning of accompaniment is strong. However, it does have a link to a possessive meaning, as it explicitly expresses temporary possession as in *Minulla on kirja mukana* [I.ADE be.3SG book with.ESS] 'I have a book on me' – not necessarily a book of the person marked as a possessor in this sentence, but as well a book s/he is going to return to the owner (c.f. the standard possessive construction *Minulla on kirja* [I.ADE be.3SG book] 'I have a book'). The illative form *mukaan* has, however, several extended functions, some of which are illustrated by examples 2a (as an expression of following a model or a guideline) and 2b (as a kind of evidential marker, expressing a source of information).

- (2) a. *Miksi Tikkurilassa ei ole toimittu tämän*  
 why Tikkurila.INE NEG be.CONNEG act.PTCP this.GEN

*ohjeen mukaan?*  
 guideline.GEN with.ILL

'Why did no one follow these instructions in Tikkurila?'

- b. *Mikolan mukaan matkustajat ovat tyytyväisiä*  
 Mikola.GEN with.ILL passenger.PL be.3PL satisfied.PL.PRT

*juniin.*  
 train.PL.ILL

'According to Mikola, the passengers are satisfied with the trains.'

Analyses of these usages, their interrelations and the development from one another can be found in other studies, as well as the lexical origin of *mukana* and *mukaan*, which is not as clear as that of *kanssa* (Ojutkangas, forthcoming)<sup>3</sup>. The present study is thus part of a larger project concerning the grams *mukana* and *mukaan*. The research is usage-based, and the data consists of three subcorpora presenting different genres: contemporary literary Finnish (from the Finnish

3 The proposed stem of these grams, *muka*, was grammaticalized to the stance adverbial 'as if, supposedly, allegedly'. This has been studied by Nordlund (2011) and Nordlund and Pekkarinen (2014).

Language Bank), 19th-century literary Finnish<sup>4</sup> (from the Kaino corpora), and recorded Finnish dialect samples (the Syntax Archives). The material in these studies covers approximately 2,000 occurrences of *mukana* or *mukaan* altogether, in sentential context. Of these occurrences, 725 cases of *mukana* or *mukaan* express an accompaniment relation and the rest represent grammaticalized usages of *mukaan*, as illustrated in (2a and b). The essive and inessive forms *mukana* and *muassa* in the function of comitative markers are far more common than the illative form *mukaan* (548, or 76% in the essive/inessive vs. 177, or 24% in the illative). Nevertheless, *mukaan* is used in four out of five construction types, and it can thus be concluded that the forms behave in a similar manner as expressions of an accompaniment relation.

The examples used for illustration in the present study are mainly simplified reformulations of real corpus occurrences; only a few unedited corpus examples will be used, as the main focus is on the syntactic alternation of the grams and the consequences the alternation has on the conceived (a)symmetry between the participants<sup>5</sup>. The results, however, are based on syntactic and semantic analysis of the material: In what kinds of constructions are *mukana* and *mukaan* used (at different times)? What kinds of verbs are utilized in the constructions? What are the semantic types of landmarks/accompanees and the trajectors/companions of the accompaniment relations? What kind of overt expression is used for the landmark, if any? In the present context, the last question is the most important.

The starting point for this study is typological since the main research question is based on what has been proposed as typical for the semantics of comitative constructions in the languages of the world: the asymmetry between the participants of the accompaniment relation (Stolz *et al.* 2006, 2012 [2008]). This study is conducted in the spirit of cognitive linguistics. The most important tools adopted from cognitive framework are the *trajector/landmark alignment* and the concept of *reference point*. The trajector/landmark alignment is based on language users' ability to direct their attention on varying intensities to different participants of the relationship they are describing. This alignment is clearly reflected on different levels of language structure. For example, on the clause level, the subject is the trajector and the object is the landmark. In adposition phrases, on the other hand, the complement of the adposition

4 This is the first century when Finnish was widely used as a literary language in numerous genres.

5 A more detailed analysis of the data is available in Ojutkangas 2017.

is the landmark and the entity whose spatial or temporal location is being described, for example, is the trajector (e.g. *the edge* [trajector] *of the lawn* [landmark]). (E.g. Langacker 2000: 34, 74–75, 2008: 57–60, 70–73.) The reference point is an entity which enables language users to establish mental contact with another entity. For example, a part term, such as *door* or *finger*, is conceived of in connection to the whole (house or room; hand), which is then the reference point for understanding the part term. (Langacker 2000: 173, 177.) The role of the reference point is central in combining the trajector/landmark alignment and the idea of asymmetry between the accompanee and the companion. This will be discussed in the next section. In this study, the accompanee, landmark, and reference point (as well as the companion and the trajector) refer to the same entity from different viewpoints, semantic, syntactic, and conceptual, respectively.

### 3. Syntax and semantics intertwined

In an accompaniment relation, the accompanee is the semantically more prominent participant, while the companion is included in the relationship via the accompanee only (Stolz *et al.* 2006: 26–27). As such, an accompaniment relationship is like any association of two entities occurring together, and the factor that creates its asymmetry is that the accompanee is not just one of two equal entities but the reference point which introduces the target, that is, the companion. The basic semantic property of accompaniment relations, the asymmetry, is thus due to the fact that it is a reference point relationship (c.f. Langacker 2000: 175–176, Jaakola 2004: 34). Conceiving situations and their participants as asymmetric is characteristic of humans. It enables us to structure our experiences and describe them to each other linguistically. There is fundamental asymmetry in information structure: we need given information to connect with new information (i.e. activation cost; Chafe 1994: 71–81). Furthermore, reference point relationships are inherently dynamic in a way similar to the alternation of given and new information, because when the function of the reference point is fulfilled, it can fade to the background, giving way to the target (Langacker 2000: 174, Jaakola 2004: 39). It is clear that these two phenomena, activation cost and reference point organization, are interconnected (c.f. Langacker 2000: 202), but the details of the relationship between them will be outside the scope of this paper (however, see Jaakola 2004: 38–70 on the Finnish genitive case from this perspective).

In previous research, syntax has not always been taken into account in detail. For example, Stolz *et al.* (2012 [2008]: Section 41.1.1) note that asymmetry is often reflected by grammar. In their extensive study on comitatives from a typological perspective, however, they explicitly omit syntactically alternating constructions (e.g. German *mit* as a verbal prefix) and concentrate on “examples of complete patterns,” that is, on constructions where the accompanee, the companion, and a comitative marker are linguistically present (Stolz *et al.* 2006: 19). My aim is not to deny the fact that an accompaniment relation is asymmetrical by nature, but to shed light on the role syntax has on the semantics of comitative constructions.

Sirola-Belliard (2011: 144–145, 2016: 314) has shown that the Finnish comitative case (with the suffix *-ine*) expresses an accompaniment relation where the participants are conceived as being asymmetrical. On the other hand, the comitative postposition *kanssa* can also express accompaniment in a reciprocal action where the participants must be even. In line with the comitative case, *mukana* and *mukaan* express an accompaniment relation that is asymmetric. However, the exact nature of the asymmetry depends on how the landmark is expressed in the construction, and this is the question we will turn to next.

First, certain grammatical roles are conceived as being more prominent than others; thus, certain expression types make the landmark/accompanee more prominent in comparison to the trajector/companion. In Finnish, three grammatical roles are of interest: the subject, an adverbial in the theme position (henceforth, T-adverbial), and other adverbials (or non-T-adverbial). The prominent status of subject is obvious: it is the starting point of the description made by the clause, it is typically the theme (i.e. what the clause is about), and its referent is typically human (e.g. Givón 1984: 135–140, Chafe 1994: 82–83, Langacker 2000: 36–37). In word order, it is typically located in the theme position, which is generally the first position of the clause, and it is normally followed by a finite verb (Vilkuna 1989: 37–43, ISK: §1369). Finnish word order is characterized as grammatically free, and the concept of *theme position* allows one to draw parallels between different grammatical roles of different clause types; the theme position is prominent as such, regardless of the grammatical role of the NP in it. Because of their clause-initial position, T-adverbials are thus more prominent than other adverbials; they share many semantic and discourse properties with subjects (Vilkuna 1989: 44–50; Huumo and Helasvuo 2015). A typical



construction with a T-adverbial is the Finnish possessive construction with an initial NP in the adessive case: *Marialla on kirja* [Maria.ADE be.3SG book] ‘Maria has a book’.

Secondly, we should remember that the landmark in Finnish gram constructions can morphosyntactically be expressed with a noun or pronoun in the genitive case found before the adposition, with a possessive suffix affixed to the gram, or with a noun or a pronoun in a local case which can occur in either the theme or non-theme position. The fifth option is that the landmark is left implicit without an overt expression. Table 1 shows how the landmark expression types are combined with the three grammatical roles as shown above.

**Table 1.** Morphosyntactic patterns of landmark expressions.

LANDMARK EXPRESSIONS OF <i>MUKANA/MUKAAN</i>	
EXPRESSION TYPE	GRAMMATICAL ROLE
NOUN/PRONOUN IN THE GENITIVE CASE	ADVERBIAL IN THE NON-THEME POSITION
POSSESSIVE SUFFIX	CO-REFERENTIAL WITH THE SUBJECT
NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 1	ADVERBIAL IN THE THEME POSITION
NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 2	ADVERBIAL IN THE NON-THEME POSITION
IMPLICIT	NONE

Before proceeding to discussion on the combinations of landmark expression types and their grammatical roles, a closer look at the research data is needed. As previously noted, this study is based on approximately 2,000 occurrences of *mukana* and *mukaan*. Of these, *mukana* and *mukaan* are used as expressions of accompaniment in 725 occurrences. Table 2 below shows how different landmark expression types are represented in the research data. The results are given separately for each sub-corpus, contemporary literary Finnish, 19th-century literary Finnish, and Finnish dialect samples recorded in the mid-20th century.

**Table 2.** Landmark expression types in comitative constructions of the three sub-corpora.

LANDMARK EXPRESSION		CONTEMPORARY FINNISH (N = 229)	19TH- CENTURY FINNISH (N = 390)	DIALECT SAMPLES (N = 106)	TOTAL 725
EXPRESSION TYPE	GRAMMATICAL ROLE				
NOUN/PRONOUN IN THE GENITIVE CASE	ADVERBIAL IN THE NON- THEME POSI- TION	12 (5.2 %)	105 (27.0%)	13 (12.3%)	130 (17.9%)
POSSESSIVE SUFFIX	SUBJECT	14 (6.1%)	147 (37.7%)	14 (13.2%)	175 (24.1%)
NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 1	ADVERBIAL IN THE THEME POSITION	38 (16.6%)	45 (11.5%)	14 (13.2%)	97 (13.4%)
NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 2	ADVERBIAL IN NON-THEME POSITION	85 (37.1%)	28 (7.2%)	17 (16.0%)	130 (17.9%)
IMPLICIT	NONE	80 (35.0%)	65 (16.6%)	48 (45.3%)	193 (26.6%)

Following the example of Stolz *et al.* (2006: 19), the postposition construction will be taken as a starting point and as a standard case to which other construction types will be compared. However, it should be noted that the postposition construction is not especially common in any of the three sub-corpora, as seen in Table 2. Instead, the dominating landmark expression types include possessive suffixes (in the 19th-century data), local cases in non-theme positions (contemporary language data), and implicit landmarks (dialect samples and contemporary language data). Next, each construction type will be discussed separately. English translations of schematic examples will be used as section headers for the discussion of each construction, and applicable lines from Table 2 will be repeated at the beginning of each one.

## 3.1. ‘I wandered around with them.’

LANDMARK EXPRESSION		CONTEMPORARY FINNISH (N = 229)	19TH-CENTURY FINNISH (N = 390)	DIALECT SAMPLES (N = 106)	TOTAL 725
EXPRESSION TYPE	GRAMMATICAL ROLE				
NOUN/PRO- NOUN IN THE GENITIVE CASE	ADVERBIAL IN THE NON-THEME POSITION	12 (5.2%)	105 (27.0%)	13 (12.3%)	130 (17.9%)

In the postposition construction, the landmark is expressed by a noun or a pronoun in the genitive case. In example 3a, the accompanee/landmark “other people” (to which the pronoun *ne*, ‘they’ in the genitive plural, refers), lead the wandering, and the accompanee/landmark ‘guest’ in 3b is the initiative maker for leaving. In both, the companion/trajector (the speaker in 3a and Jussi in 3b) follows the motion. Syntactically, the postposition phrases *niitten mukana* and *vieraan mukaan* are non-T-adverbials, which means that in the light of syntactic structure, they have no special prominence as compared to the other elements of the construction.

- (3) a. LM: pronoun in the genitive case  
 syntactically part of a non-T-adverbial  
*Nuorena kuljin niitten mukana.*  
 young.ESS go.around.PST.1SG they.PL.GEN with.ESS  
 ‘When I was young, I wandered around with them.’
- b. LM: noun in the genitive case  
 syntactically part of a non-T-adverbial  
*Jussi oli lähtenyt vieraan mukaan.*  
 person.name be.PST.3SG leave.PTCP guest.GEN with.ILL  
 ‘Jussi had left with his guest.’

Examples 3a and b are instances of a “complete pattern”, the only construction type Stolz *et al.* (2006, 2012 [2008]) take into account in their studies, and the one they consider prototypical. As for the syntactic structure, we can thus consider it to be a neutral construction type where the asymmetry between the accompanee and the companion is based on the semantics of the comitative marker *mukana* or *mukaan*. We should remember that the landmark functions as a reference point in

the construction: it allows for access to the trajector (Langacker 2000: 173). This function gives the landmark initial prominence in comparison to the trajector and can be seen as the source of the asymmetry in the semantics of the postposition construction (cf. Jaakola 2004: 34 on the schematic meaning of the Finnish genitive).

According to Stolz *et al.* (2006: 26), both participants are human in a prototypical accompaniment relation. However, there is no dominating pattern in the semantic types of participants in Finnish postposition constructions with *mukana* or *mukaan*, but concrete items/substances and human beings are equally typical as both the accompanee and the companion (ranging from 31 to 41%). Another prototypical feature of comitative constructions proposed by Stolz *et al.* (2006: 26–27) is that they contain an intransitive motion verb. The present research data show a connection between these features: the semantic type of the verb in each occurrence was analyzed, and one-third (40/130, or 34%) of the postposition constructions were used with a motion verb. This may not seem to be a radical percentage, but the rest of the occurrences were quite scattered among different verb types, with the verb *olla* ‘to be’ being the next in frequency with postposition constructions (25/130, or 20%). From another point of view, of all constructions with a motion verb, 40% (44/107) of the cases show a postposition construction. It can thus be concluded that motion verbs are central in Finnish comitative constructions with *mukana/mukaan* if one considers adposition constructions only. When we take the range of syntactic constructions into account, other verb types will also turn out to be frequent, as will be shown later.

### 3.2. ‘S/he brought strange things with her/him.’

LANDMARK EXPRESSION		CONTEMPORARY FINNISH (N = 229)	19TH- CENTURY FINNISH (N = 390)	DIALECT SAMPLES (N = 106)	TOTAL 725
EXPRESSION TYPE	GRAM- MATICAL ROLE				
POSSESSIVE SUFFIX	SUBJECT	14 (6.1%)	147 (37.7%)	14 (13.2%)	175 (24.1%)

As previously noted, the postposition construction is not an especially common type in the data. We can nevertheless take it as a standard case to which other construction types will be compared to illustrate the

varying differences in prominence between the participants in an accompaniment relation. There are two construction types in which syntax increases the asymmetry between the participants of an accompaniment relation because the grammatical role of the landmark expression is prominent. As reference point constructions, the landmark/accompanee in these two construction types is apparently still needed as an information bridge to the trajector/companion (cf. Langacker 2000: 174).

First, possessive suffixes are a noteworthy expression type for the landmark. Human participants, and especially human landmarks, are typical for accompaniment relations, and possessive suffixes nearly always have a human referent. However, the most important aspect of this construction type is that the possessive suffix and the subject of the clause, as found in the data, refer to the same entity. Consider examples 4a and b:

- (4) a. LM: possessive suffix on the gram  
 syntactically co-referential with the subject  
*Hän toi mukanaan outoja tavaroita.*  
 s/he bring.PST.3SG with.ESS.3POSS strange.PL.PRT thing.PL.PRT  
 ‘S/he brought strange things with her/him.’
- (b) LM: possessive suffix on the gram  
 syntactically co-referential with the subject  
*Hän sai talosta eväät mukaansa.*  
 s/he get.PST.3SG house.ELA food.PL with.ILL.3POSS  
 ‘S/he got food from the house and took it along with her/him.’

The subject is the most prominent grammatical role of the clause, and in this construction type, the subject role is taken by the landmark/accompanee expression. The landmark thus is as prominent as it can syntactically get, and the asymmetry between the accompanee and the companion can be considered to be at its greatest. The dominating verb groups in this construction type are transitive verbs of caused motion (4a) and acquisition (4b; 137/175, or 78% of the occurrences). The trajector/companion is syntactically the object and semantically most often a concrete item or substance (94/175, or 54%).

The construction with a possessive suffix as a landmark expression has a central role in the 19th-century language data. The explanation for this is the semantic type of the landmark: as can be seen in Table 3, the majority of landmarks in this subcorpus are human (229/390, or nearly

60%), and almost half of them (46%) are expressed by a possessive suffix. Human landmarks dominate in the dialect samples as well, but they are quite marginal in the contemporary language data. I will return to these differences later.

**Table 3.** Expression types of the landmark in comitative constructions of the three sub-corpora: **human** landmarks.

LANDMARK EXPRESSION TYPE	CONTEMPORARY FINNISH (N = 24/229)	19TH-CENTURY FINNISH (N = 229/390)	DIALECT SAMPLES (N = 81/106)	TOTAL 334
NOUN/PRONOUN IN THE GENITIVE CASE	4 (16.7 %)	32 (14.0%)	6 (7.4%)	42 (12.6%)
POSSESSIVE SUFFIX	9 (37.5%)	106 (46.3%)	13 (16.0%)	128 (38.3%)
NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 1	0	42 (18.3%)	11 (13.6%)	53 (15.9%)
NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 2	2 (8.3%)	14 (6.1%)	11 (13.6%)	27 (8.1%)
IMPLICIT	9 (37.5%)	35 (15.3%)	40 (49.4%)	84 (25.1%)

Human landmarks also have a central role in the next construction type as well as in the construction type which will be discussed last. A common factor in these remaining construction types is the verb: the dominating verb in all three is *olla* ‘to be’.

### 3.3. ‘The children had skates with them.’

LANDMARK EXPRESSION		CONTEMPORARY FINNISH (N = 229)	19TH-CENTURY FINNISH (N = 390)	DIALECT SAMPLES (N = 106)	TOTAL 725
EXPRESSION TYPE	GRAMMATICAL ROLE				
NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 1	ADVERBIAL IN THE THEME POSITION	38 (16.6 %)	45 (11.5 %)	14 (13.2 %)	97 (13.4%)

In Finnish word order, the theme position is prominent regardless of the grammatical role of its occupant. Thus, the landmark in the second construction type, in which it becomes more prominent than one in

the postposition construction, is expressed by a T-adverbial, that is, a noun or a pronoun in a local case in the clause-initial position. This means that a T-adverbial is practically equal to a possessive suffix as an expression type for a highly prominent landmark, especially since a great majority of T-adverbials in the data refer to human participants. In a construction with a T-adverbial, clear asymmetry is thus created between the accompanee and the companion (example 5a). In addition, if the landmark is expressed by a possessive suffix which does not refer to the same referent as the subject, it then refers to the referent of the T-adverbial (5b).

- (5) a. LM: noun in a local case (type 1)  
syntactically a T-adverbial

*Lapsilla oli luistimet mukana.*  
child.PL.ADE be.PST.3SG skate.PL with.ESS  
'The children had skates with them.'

- b. LM: noun in a local case (type 1) + possessive suffix  
syntactically a T-adverbial

*Onko hänellä todistusta mukanaan?*<sup>6</sup>  
be.Q 3SG.ADE certificate.PRT with.ESS.3POSS  
'Does s/he have a certificate on him/her?'

This construction type is not especially common in any of the three sub-corpora, but it shows the semantic connection between accompaniment and possession nicely (cf. Stolz *et al.* 2006: 147–155, Sirola-Belliard 2016: 230–235): the prototypical Finnish possessive construction is comprised of a T-adverbial in the adessive case and *olla* 'to be', which is by far the most common verb (in 82/97, or 85%) with this landmark expression type in the data. The function of *mukana*<sup>7</sup> in a possessive construction is to express that the possessive relation is occasional or temporary: the skates in example (5a) may or may not be the children's own, and the certificate in (5b) may or may not pertain to the person carrying it. According to Stolz *et al.* (2006: 155), this is typical of possessive markers which have developed from comitative markers.

In this construction type, the landmark/accompanee is human in a just over half of the corpus occurrences (52/97, or 54%). For a possessive

6 Example (5b) is an instance of a construction where the theme position is preceded by a verb; this is a typical tag question construction

7 The illative form *mukaan* is not used in this construction type.

construction, one could expect a higher percentage than this. The explanation for this is that since the landmarks in contemporary Finnish are seldom human, the contemporary occurrences of this construction type (38/97, or 40%) are in fact different from the possessive construction-like cases of 19th-century literary Finnish and the dialect samples. They have more in common with the construction type that will be discussed in the next section.

### 3.4. ‘S/he was involved in establishing the party.’

LANDMARK EXPRESSION		CONTEMPORARY FINNISH (N = 229)	19TH- CENTURY FINNISH (N = 390)	DIALECT SAMPLES (N = 106)	TOTAL 725
EXPRESSION TYPE	GRAM- MATICAL ROLE				
NOUN/ PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 2	ADVER- BIAL IN THE NON-THEME POSITION	85 (37.1%)	28 (7.2%)	17 (16.0%)	130 (17.9%)

From a syntactic point of view, the asymmetry between the participants of the accompaniment relation diminishes when the landmark is expressed by a noun or pronoun in a local case not in the theme position. Syntactically, they are non-T-adverbials, which means that in the overall syntactic hierarchy, they are closer to the periphery than the core; they do not express an especially prominent participant. On the other hand, the most typical companion in this construction type is a human being or an institution (which consists of humans), and its expression may even be given the syntactically central status of the subject of the clause (6a). The most common verb in these constructions is *olla* ‘to be’ (88/130, or 68%; example 6a), but dynamic verbs are used as well (6b).

- (6) a. LM: noun in a local case (type 2)

syntactically non-T-adverbial

*Vuonna 1933 hän oli mukana perustamassa*  
year.ESS 1933 s/he be.PST.3SG with.ESS establish.INF.INE

*Chilen sosialistipuoluetta.*  
Chile.GEN socialist.party.PRT

‘In 1933, s/he was involved in establishing the Chilean Socialist Party.’



- b. LM: noun in a local case (type 2)

syntactically non-T-adverbial

*Olemme pyytäneet ihmisiä mukaan kampanjaan.*

be.1PL ask.PTCP.PL people.PL.PRT with.ILL campaign.ILL

‘We have asked people to join the campaign.’

It is important to note that in this construction type, the landmark expressed by a non-T-adverbial is in fact a *secondary* landmark. According to Talmy (2000: 203–214), situations are often structured with at least two landmarks. The states of affairs language users describe are complex enough to provide several options for dividing one’s attention, and the hierarchy between potential landmarks may have more than just two levels. This is exactly how these constructions can be described: the majority of secondary landmarks are semantically activities, and they function as frames for the accompaniment relation; at the same time, the accompanee(s) proper, the primary landmark(s), is (are) left implicit. Secondary landmarks also do not function as reference points; rather, they give additional information about a known trajector/companion. A majority of trajectors/companions in this construction type are human beings or institutions which consist of humans (73/130, or 56% of the occurrences), which make this type different from the three construction types as discussed above.

As Table 1 shows (and the part at the beginning of this section), this construction type strongly dominates in the contemporary literary Finnish data. The differences between the three subcorpora are remarkable, and we can conclude that there has been a clear change in how *mukana* and *mukaan* are used: from a description of a more prototypical accompaniment relation between two or more participants to a broader common activity of participants that are not fully specified. In the contemporary literary Finnish data, the asymmetry between the participants of an accompaniment relation seems to abandon the semantics of *mukana/mukaan* constructions, and it is the syntactic diversity of *mukana/mukaan* that has made this change possible. An implicit primary landmark can hardly be considered to be an especially prominent, and same is true of constructions with no expression for any landmark. This will be discussed in the next section.

### 3.5. ‘The doctor gave some medicine (for the patient) to take along.’

LANDMARK EXPRESSION		CONTEMPO- RARY FINNISH (N = 229)	19TH- CENTURY FINNISH (N = 390)	DIALECT SAMPLES (N = 106)	IN TOTAL 725
EXPRES- SION TYPE	GRAMMATI- CAL ROLE				
IMPLICIT	NONE	80 (35.0%)	65 (16.6%)	48 (45.3%)	193 (26.6%)

When the construction does not contain any linguistic landmark expression, the asymmetry between the participants becomes background information. However, being background information does not equate to being non-existent because the landmarks still remain conceptually present: the construction itself still contains information about the semantic and formal properties of the landmark. In the case of a comitative construction, one typically expects a human landmark, even though a backgrounded one. We should again remember that the landmark of the accompaniment relation is also a reference point, an element which enables access to the target, in this case, to the companion, and that reference points have an ability to fade into the background and to give way to the target, making the focus of attention shift dynamically (Langacker 2000: 174; Jaakola 2004: 39). Consider examples (7a and b):

- (7) a. LM: no overt expression

*Lääkäri antoi lääkettä mukaan.*  
 doctor give.PST.3SG medicine.PRT with.ILL

‘The doctor gave some medicine (for the patient) to take along.’

- b. LM: no overt expression

*Äiti oli töissä ja minä olin mukana.*  
 mother be.PST.3SG work.PL.INE and I be.PST.1SG with.ESS

‘My mother was at work, and I was with (her).’

It is clear that in the situation being described in (7a), there is a human being as a landmark in the double role of recipient and accompanee, even though the person is not explicitly expressed, but the focus is on the companion, in this case, the object of what is given (medicine). The case is even clearer in (7b) since the landmark/accompanee, the mother, is mentioned in the immediate context. One might be tempted to

say that cases such as this are simply elliptic, but in my view, it is more interesting to ask why such constructions are possible and necessary. After being mentioned at the beginning of the clause, the reference point (in example 7b the mother) has fulfilled its function in the flow of information, and the focus of attention can move on to the other participant (in (7b), the narrator her/himself). At the same time, the notion of asymmetry between the participants fades. In the corpus data, constructions of this kind often occur in contexts in which specific situations, often personal experiences, are described, and both participants of the accompaniment relation are human, as shown in (7b). In (7a), the companion is not human but a physical object (medicine), but the story that is being told is about a specific doctor. First-person pronouns, personal names and nouns that resemble personal names, such as ‘doctor’ and ‘mother’ in the previous examples, are common in these occurrences.

As Table 2 shows (and the part given at the beginning of this section), this construction type is especially common in the dialect sample data. Table 3 furthermore shows that the landmark is typically human in both in the dialect sample and the 19th-century Finnish data. However, the landmark in the latter is rather seldom implicit. These differences call for an explanation. What is the factor that increases the percentage of the constructions without an explicit landmark in the dialect samples? In the 19th-century Finnish data, a clear majority of occurrences without an explicit landmark represent the construction type illustrated in examples (7a and b), whereas, only half of these occurrences fit the same type in the dialect sample data. In the dialect samples, the other half of the occurrences thus represents a special group of constructions without an overt landmark expression, and the analysis of the data suggests that the genre of traditional dialect interviews triggers them. These interviews are typically more like monologues than conversations, and their main topic is agrarian life as experienced in the early 20th century. When the interviewees talk about their usual habits and methods of everyday tasks, it is often done by constructions which leave individualized actors, in this case, the accompanees, in the background. The companion element in these constructions is a physical object. The following are non-edited corpus examples (8a and b):

- (8) a. LM: no overt expression, passive construction

*Ei siin yötä oltu sil heinämaal,*  
 NEG there night.PRT be.PST.PTCP it.ADE hay.land.ADE

*kottii sielt ain iltasil tultii mut*  
 home.ILL there.ABL always evening.PL.ADE come.PASS.PST but

*päiväl piettii eväst mukana.*  
 day.ADE keep.PASS.PST food.PRT with.ESS

‘No one ever spent a night in the meadow, one always came home in the evening, but s/he took food along for the day.’

- b. LM: no overt expression, zero-person construction

*Mutta ko sillon tarttee ollap puukko mukana ko,*  
 but as then need.3SG be.INF knife with.ESS as

*sitä varten että jos putoo että saa jäähän*  
 it.PRT for that if fall.3SG that get.3SG ice.ILL

*kiip puukkon.*  
 fastened knife.ACC

‘But then one must have a knife with her/him, because if one falls [through the ice on the sea/lake], then one can stick the knife in the ice [to use to climb up from the water].’

In (8a), the construction used for the backgrounding of the accompanee/landmark is the passive, which promotes the object or some other non-subject element. In Finnish, the passive is possible for those verbs which express activities of a human actor; the transitivity of a verb is not a crucial factor for it. In addition, the Finnish passive implies a group of known actors. The description in (8a) is thus probably based on the personal experience of the interviewee, but s/he talks about it in a generalizing way, explaining that this is how they used to do it, this was the custom back then. (See Helasvuo 2006 on the Finnish passive.) On the other hand, there is the so called zero-person construction in example 8b, a third-person singular verb form without an overt subject. The zero-person construction expresses the activity or situation as generic, usual and/or necessary for human beings in general. It does not necessarily imply personal experience, even though it can be used in describing situations the hearers can relate to. Zero-person constructions typically contain modal elements that express obligation, need or ability, as example 8b shows; this is how everybody had to act in a certain situation. (On the zero-person in Finnish, see Laitinen 2006). In these

constructions, the landmark/accompanee is thus linguistically implicit but conceptually present through the semantics of the passive and zero-person constructions. The question of asymmetry between the participants of the accompaniment relation is superseded by textual factors. (See Sirola-Belliard 2016: 106–107 on the passive and zero-person with the Finnish comitative case and comitative marker *kanssa*.)

We will next turn to the final section of this paper, in which the findings will be summarized from the point of view of the constructions and their frequencies in the different subcorpora, the asymmetry between the participants, the role of reference point organization in the analysis, and the historical change in the use of *mukana* and *mukaan* as revealed in studying the three different genres. Finally, some future research questions will be raised.

#### 4. Conclusion

Three construction types were proved to be frequent in the data, and the expression types and the semantic types of the landmarks are quite neatly interconnected. The most typical landmark in the 19th-century Finnish and dialect sample data is human, and it is expressed by a possessive suffix (in the 19th-century Finnish data) or left implicit (in dialect samples). In the contemporary Finnish data, the most frequent semantic type of the landmark is activity, which is expressed by a noun/pronoun in a local case but not in the theme position. The postposition construction, often considered to be the basic case, is not among the frequent types. Moreover, nouns or pronouns in local cases in the theme position seem to be a minor expression type for the landmark. An explanation for the latter might be that this expression type is clause type specific: it is mainly used in possessive constructions with *mukana*, having a clause-initial adverbial in the adessive case.

In addition to both the expression and semantic types of landmarks, the semantic type of verb is important in these constructions. A postposition construction typically has an intransitive verb of motion which has been proposed to be the prototypical verb for a comitative construction (Stolz *et al.* 2006: 26–27). However, there is a much larger range of verb types when the variety of possible constructions is taken into account. In the data in this study, transitive verbs dominate in constructions having a possessive suffix as the landmark expression. The verb *olla* ‘to be’ is central in constructions where the landmark is expressed by a noun or pronoun in a local case, regardless of its position in the clause. These

are occurrences of possessive constructions and expressions of activities: both employ *olla* as a conventional part of the construction. The relationship between constructions with implicit landmarks and *olla*, on the other hand, is not equally straightforward. Coincidence can also play a role in the frequency of the verb. Table 4 below gives an overview of the findings of the corpus study from the viewpoints of landmarks, trajectors, and verb types.


**Table 4.** Typical landmarks, trajectors, and verb types across construction types.

LANDMARK EXPRESSION TYPE	GRAMMATICAL ROLE	ACCOMPANEE/LANDMARK	COMPANION/TRAJECTOR	VERB TYPE	IN WHICH SUB-CORPUS?
NOUN/ PRONOUN IN THE GENITIVE CASE	ADVERBIAL IN THE NON-THEME POSITION	thing/ substance, human	thing/ substance, human	motion verbs	
POSSESSIVE SUFFIX	SUBJECT	human	thing/ substance	verbs of acquisition and caused motion	19TH- CENTURY LITERARY FINNISH
NOUN/ PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 1	ADVERBIAL IN THE THEME POSITION	human	thing/ substance	<i>olla</i>	
NOUN/ PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE, TYPE 2	ADVERBIAL IN THE NON-THEME POSITION	activity	human/ institution	<i>olla</i>	CONTEMPORARY LITERARY FINNISH
IMPLICIT	NONE	human	human/ institution	<i>olla</i>	FINNISH DIALECT SAMPLES

When these findings are considered from the point of view of asymmetry between the participants, we can conclude that this asymmetry is strongest in the usage of *mukana* and *mukaan* in the 19th-century Finnish data where the landmark is typically expressed with a possessive suffix and is thus represented as the subject. In the contemporary Finnish data, on the other hand, the asymmetry is set aside, since the

whole accompaniment relation is conceived of in a new way, more as a common activity frame than a person-to-person relationship. And finally, in the dialect samples data, textual factors surpass the semantics of a prototypical comitative construction. The concept of reference point organization has proved to be useful in the analysis of asymmetry: as a reference point, the landmark/accompanee builds a mental bridge to the trajector/companion, which is thus both dependent on and less prominent than the landmark/accompanee. The dynamicity of reference point constructions allows for the alternation of the asymmetry between the participants, because when the function of the reference point is fulfilled, it can abandon the construction either partially, to a less prominent grammatical role, or totally, leading to a construction without an overt landmark/accompanee.

To conclude, Figure 1 shows how the expression types of the landmark and the grammatical roles of the expressions are interrelated. The postposition construction is considered to be the standard, as shown as being in the middle of the vertical double arrow which shows the effect of syntax on the strength of asymmetry. The asymmetry can thus increase and decrease, depending on the grammatical role of the landmark expression: subjects and T-adverbials are syntactically more prominent than other, that is, non-T-adverbials. This study shows that syntax is worthy of consideration in examining comitative constructions.

LANDMARK EXPRESSION TYPES	ASYMMETRY	GRAMMATICAL ROLES OF THE LANDMARK EXPRESSIONS
	INCREASES	
• POSSESSIVE SUFFIX		• SUBJECT
• NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE IN THE THEME POSITION		• T-ADVERBIAL
• NOUN/PRONOUN IN THE GENITIVE CASE		• NON-T-ADVERBIAL
• NOUN/PRONOUN IN A LOCAL CASE IS NOT IN THE THEME POSITION (SECONDARY LANDMARK)		• NON-T-ADVERBIAL
• IMPLICIT		• –
	DECREASES	

**Figure 1.** The interrelations between the expression types of the landmark and their grammatical roles: effect on the asymmetry between the participants of an accompaniment relation.

The corpus data used in this study shows that *mukana* and *mukaan* are used in rather different ways in the 19th-century data and dialect sample data than in the contemporary Finnish data, at least in literary Finnish<sup>8</sup>. In 19th-century Finnish and in dialect samples, *mukana* and *mukaan* express an accompaniment relation between two (of several) participants, whereas in contemporary literary Finnish, they express accompaniment through a common activity frame, without specifying the participants. This raises questions for future research: What is the semantic and functional relationship between different comitative grams like? Which gram is now responsible for the usages which *mukana* and *mukaan* no longer cover?

This study also raises a more general question on parts of speech in Finnish. Grams with a noun or pronoun in the genitive case or a possessive suffix as a landmark expression have traditionally been defined as postpositions. On the basis of the present study, however, there seems to be a remarkable syntactic difference between the two expression types. Is it then reasonable to consider them to be members of the same class? Answering this question requires a more extensive investigation on grams with human landmarks which can be expressed by possessive suffixes.

### Address

Krista Ojutkangas  
 Finnish Language and Finno-Ugric Languages  
 FI-20014 University of Turku  
 Finland  
 E-mail: krista.ojutkangas@utu.fi

### Abbreviations

1 – first person, 3 – third person, ACC – accusative, ADE – adessive (‘on, at’), COM – comitative, CONNEG – connegative, ELA – elative (‘from’), ESS – essive (‘as’), GEN – genitive, ILL – illative (‘to, towards’), INE – inessive (‘in’), INF – infinitive, NEG – negation, PASS – passive, PL – plural, POSS – possessive suffix, PST – past tense, PRT – partitive, PTCP – participle, Q – question marker, SG – singular

<sup>8</sup> Unfortunately, it was impossible to include contemporary colloquial Finnish in this research data. This remains a future task.



## Sources of the research data

- Finnish Language Bank*. (Hämeen Sanomat 2000. Finnish text collection.) CSC – IT Center for Science. Available online at <<https://www.kielipankki.fi/language-bank/>>. Accessed on 14.04.2015.
- Kaino corpora. Corpus of 19th-century literary Finnish*. Helsinki: Institute for the Languages of Finland. Available online at <[http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/1800/meta/1800\\_coll\\_rdf.xml](http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/1800/meta/1800_coll_rdf.xml)>. Accessed on 23.01.2015.
- Syntax Archives*. University of Turku. Available online at <<http://syntaxarchives.suo.utu.fi/>>. Accessed on 03.02.2015.

## References

- Chafe, Wallace (1994) *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Givón, Talmy (1984) *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hagège, Claude (1993) *Language builder: an essay on the human signature in linguistic morphogenesis*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hagège, Claude (2010) *Adpositions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Häkkinen, Kaisa (2004) *Nyky-suomen etymologinen sanakirja*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Heine, Bernd (2012 [2008]) “Grammaticalization of cases”. In Andrej L. Malchukov and Andrew Spencer, eds. *The Oxford handbook of case*, 458–469. Available online at <[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199206476.013.0030](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199206476.013.0030)>. Accessed on 7.04.2016.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva (2002) *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva (2007) *Genesis of grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Helasvuo, Marja-Liisa (2006) “Passive – personal or impersonal?” In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo and Lyle Campbell, eds. *Grammar from the human perspective: case, space and person in Finnish*, 233–255. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Huumo, Tuomas and Marja-Liisa Helasvuo (2015) “On the subject of subject in Finnish”. In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo and Tuomas Huumo, eds. *Subjects in constructions – canonical and non-canonical*, 13–42. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Huumo, Tuomas and Krista Ojutkangas (2006) “An introduction to Finnish spatial relations. Local cases and adpositions”. In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo and Lyle Campbell, eds. *Grammar from the human perspective: case, space and person in Finnish*, 11–20. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- ISK = Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, and Irja Alho (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Available online at <<http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>>. Accessed on 18.01.2016.

- Jaakola, Minna (2004) *Suomen genetiivi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Laitinen, Lea (2006) “Zero person in Finnish.” In Marja-Liisa Helasvuo and Lyle Campbell, eds. *Grammar from the human perspective: case, space and person in Finnish*, 209–231. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2000) *Grammar and conceptualization*. Berlin: Mouton the Gruyter.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (2008) *Cognitive grammar: a basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available online at <10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195331967.001.0001>. Accessed on 17.05.2016.
- Libert, Alan Reed (2013) *Adpositions and other parts of speech*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- MOT English dictionary*. Available online at <<https://mot-kielikone-fi.ezproxy.utu.fi/mot/turkuyo/netmot.exe>>. Accessed on 19.01.2016.
- Nordlund, Taru (2011) “Perustelevasta referoivaksi. Suomen partikkelin *muka* merkityksenmuutos 1800-luvun tekstiaineistojen valossa.” *Virittäjä* 115, 4, 484–514.
- Nordlund, Taru and Heli Pekkarinen (2014) “Grammaticalisation of the Finnish stance adverbial *muka*, ‘as if, supposedly, allegedly.’” In Irma Taavitsainen, Andreas H. Jucker, and Jukka Tuominen, eds. *Diachronic corpus pragmatics*, 53–76. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ojutkangas, Krista (2012) “Ikkuna *ulos*. Suomen *ulko*-grammit ja huomion ikkunoinen”. *Virittäjä* 116, 2, 169–197.
- Ojutkangas, Krista (2017) “Suomen *mukana* ja *mukaan* seuralaisuussuhteen ilmaisojoina: kiintopisteen ilmaisukeinot, konstruktiot ja osallistujien symmetriaero”. *Virittäjä* 121, 2, 176–212.
- Ojutkangas, Krista (forthcoming) “Suomen *mukaan*-sanan kieliopillistuminen: seuralaisuussuhteesta tiedon alkuperän ilmaisemiseen.” (Under review.)
- Sirola-Belliard, Maija (2011) “Is there a future for the Finnish comitative? Arguments against the putative synonymy of the comitative case *-ine* and the postposition *kanssa*”. In Seppo Kittilä, Katja Västi, and Jussi Ylikoski, eds. *Case, animacy and semantic roles*, 135–153. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sirola-Belliard, Maija (2016) *Suomen komitatiivi – -ine ja kanssa. Typologinen näkökulma*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- 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.
- Stolz, Thomas, Cornelia Stroh and Aina Urdze (2012 [2008]) “Varieties of comitative”. In Andrej L. Malchukov and Andrew Spencer, eds. *The Oxford handbook of case*, 601–608. Available online at <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199206476.013.0042>. Accessed on 16.02.2016.
- Svorou, Soteria (1993) *The grammar of space*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Talmy, Leonard (2000) *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Vilkuna, Maria (1989) *Free word order in Finnish. Its syntax and discourse functions*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

**Kokkuvõte. Krista Ojutkangas: Komitatiivkonstruktsioonide süntaksist: soome keele *mukana*, *mukaan* ‘kaasas, kaasa’.** Artiklis käsitletakse soome keele komitatiivsete markerite *mukana* ja *mukaan* ‘kaasas, kaasa’ süntaksi. Komitatiivsed markerid väljendavad kaasasolusuhteid, mida peetakse tüüpiliselt asümmeetrilisteks: kaasaja on peamine osaleja, samas kui kaaslane on situatsiooni haaratud ainult kaasaja kaudu (Stolz *et al.* 2006: 26–27). Markereid *mukana* ja *mukaan* kasutatakse mitmetes süntaktilistes konstruktsioonides, kus kaasaja grammatiline roll varieerub subjektist adverbiaalini. Artiklis käsitletakse viit konstruktsioonitüüpi kolmes erinevas korpus. Uurimus näitab, et süntaktiline varieerumine mõjutab tajutud asümmeetriat kaasaja ja kaaslane vahel ning süntaksi roll komitatiivsete konstruktsioonide semantikas on suur. Tugevalt asümmeetrilistes kaasasolusuhetes on inimesest kaasaja väljendatud possessiivsufiksiga, mis liitub komitatiivi markerile, või lausealgulise adverbiaaliga. Asümmeetria tõmbub taustale, kui kaasaja on väljendatud mittelauselalgulise adverbiaaliga või kui kaasaja on implitsiitne.

**Võtmesõnad:** kaassõnad, grammid, kaasasolusuhed, komitatiiv, grammatilised rollid, süntaks, soome keel