

MATI ERELT (Tartu)

CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP  
OF THE COMITATIVE CONSTRUCTION  
TO THE COORDINATING CONSTRUCTION  
IN ESTONIAN\*

**Abstract.** In many languages the comitative construction expressing the relation of accompaniment has developed or is developing into the coordinating construction. In Estonian the accompaniment comitative occurs as a verbal adjunct, e.g. *Jüri läks (k o o s) M a r e g a kinno* 'Jüri went to the cinema with Mare'. However, the beginnings of coordination are evident in those constructions where a comitative-marked NP precedes the verb, immediately following the primary NP (i.e. the constituent that occupies a higher position in the hierarchy of grammatical relations than the comitative-marked NP), e.g. *Peaminister NN (k o o s) a b i k a a s a g a jõuab tagasi visiidilt Soome* 'Prime Minister NN with his spouse returns from a visit to Finland'. At first the contact position highlights relatedness and is highly natural where phrases denote internally closely related concepts – semantically or culturally. At this initial stage of coordination the number of the verb still reflects the number of the nominative NP, but occasional examples of a plural verb with the contact comitative indicate that coordination could develop further. More syntactic and semantic properties of the coordinating construction are manifested in the inclusory comitative construction, that is, in the construction where the referent of a comitative-marked NP is among the referents of the primary constituent, e.g. *Meie s i n u g a (= mina ja sina) käisime maal* 'We with you (= me and you) visited the countryside'. At the same time the comitative constituent of the inclusory construction has in addition to the properties of the conjunct also some properties of the apposition (specifying the composition of the group) and the adjunct (can be placed after the verb). For this reason, this constituent cannot be classified in the traditional manner.

**Keywords:** Estonian, comitative construction, inclusory comitative construction, coordinating construction.

### Properties and types of the comitative construction

The comitative construction consists of two noun phrases, one of which stands in the comitative case. Usually comitative-marked NP modifies the verb and expresses accompaniment, as in examples (1)–(3).

\* The study was funded by the Estonian Science Foundation (grant No. 7006).

- (1) *Jüri läks (koos) Marega kinno*  
 Jüri went together Mare:COM to cinema  
 'Jüri went to the cinema (together) with Mare'
- (2) *Ma saatsin Jüri (koos) Marega kinno*  
 I sent Jüri together Mare:COM to cinema  
 'I sent Jüri (together) with Mare to the cinema'
- (3) *Jüri üüris auto koos järelhaagisega*  
 Jüri rented car together trailer:COM  
 'Jüri rented a car with a trailer'

The principal function has given rise to a number of other functions; for example, the comitative-marked constituent can express instrument (*kirjutab pliiatsiga* 'writes in pencil'), manner (*tuli suure kisa-ga* 'came with a lot of noise'), time (*tegi töö ära kahe tunniga* 'completed the job in two hours'), etc.<sup>1</sup> A comitative NP can also modify a noun (*sulega kübar* 'hat with a plume'). The relationship of the comitative construction to the coordinating construction is topical only for the principal type of the comitative construction, which is the focus of the present article.

The constituents of the comitative construction share the same semantic role with regard to the verb; for example, in sentence (1) both *Jüri* and *Mare* are agents, but in sentence (2) they are patients. However, both NPs have a different morphosyntactic and semantic status, and they function as the primary and the secondary constituent with regard to status. The primary constituent occupies a higher position in the hierarchy of grammatical relations than the co-member (subject > direct object > adverbial complement > adjunct).<sup>2</sup> Usually the primary constituent functions as the subject, but it could also be the object, as in sentence (2); the secondary constituent, however, can only be an adjunct. There is no agreement among typologists with regard to the difference in status. Some researchers, for example, Thomas Stolz (Stolz, Stroh, Urdze 2006) take the view a sentence with the comitative construction consists of two predications — primary and secondary. Primary predication is the relation between the verb and the NPs, and it is true that in this case both NPs perform the same semantic role. It coincides with the constituents of the *ja/ning* 'and' construction. Secondary predication is an asymmetrical relation between two NPs, where this relation is expressed by the comitative marker. In the case of secondary predication one NP is the main constituent, and the other NP is the co-constituent. Other researchers, however, for example Aleksandr Archipov (Архипов 2005), see the asymmetry of the comitative construction in the communicative rather than in the semantic difference of the NPs. Assuming that in addition to the primary theme the rheme could include

<sup>1</sup> The Estonian inflectional comitative *-ga* has developed from the comitative postposition *kaa* < *kaas* (< *kansa* 'people'). Most functions of the modern comitative were present already at the postpositional stage of the development of the comitative marker (see Häbicht 2000).

<sup>2</sup> Hierarchy determines the syntactic behaviour of parts of the sentence, such as the ability to control verbal agreement and reflexivation, etc. One can find various hierarchies of the syntactic functions depending on the conception of syntax and specific languages (see Erelt 2002; 2004). The present study follows the Estonian syntactic tradition.

a secondary theme, Aleksandr Archipov claims that the comitative construction is characterized by joining NPs of different degrees of thematicity. In the prototypical case the comitative NP is thought to have a lower communicative status, but if the comitative constituent is topicalized, as in the Estonian sentence *Koos leivaga tõi ema kannutäie piima* 'Together with the bread mother brought a jug of milk', the primary constituent enjoys a lower status. However, the discussion on the communicative status of the constituents of the comitative construction has been too superficial and unconvincing to adopt it for the description of Estonian.

As noted, the comitative construction resembles the coordinating construction in that the constituents of the construction perform the same semantic function in the primary predication. However, the difference lies in the fact that the constituents of the *ja/ning*-construction reveal no difference in status. Unlike the comitative construction, the *ja/ning*-construction reveals a (rather) symmetrical relation between the NPs, and the coordinated constituents form a single constituent, which acts as a single whole both semantically and syntactically. According to Leon Stassen (2000; 2001), the coordinating construction and the comitative construction represent two different morphosyntactic strategies with the same semantic function to unite the NPs. Leon Stassen calls these strategies AND-strategy and WITH-strategy, respectively.

In Estonian the difference between the *ja/ning*-construction and the comitative construction is revealed more specifically in a number of syntactic and semantic properties.

1. Typically, in SVO languages the comitative-marked adjunct is separated from the subject by the verb and is positioned in a normal clause after the verb, as in example (1) *Jüri läks (k o o s) Marega kinno* 'Jüri went to the cinema (together) with Mare'. On the other hand, coordinated NPs are always positioned next to each other as members of one constituent as in example (4).

- (4) *Jüri ja Mare läksid kinno*  
Jüri and Mare went:PL to cinema  
'Jüri and Mare went to the cinema'

In the case of coordination both coordinated constituents act together as controllers of agreement in number in the verb, but in the case of the comitative only the primary constituent does so. For this reason, the predicate verb is in the plural in a coordinating construction with singular constituents, as in example (4), and in the case of the comitative construction it is in the singular, as in example (1).

2. A coordinated constituent cannot be questionized (5a, b) or relativized (6a, b),<sup>3</sup> but such changes are possible if the member of the comitative construction is a separate constituent (5c, d; 6c, d).

- (5) a. *\*Kes ja Mare läksid kinno?*  
who and Mare went to cinema  
'Who and Mare went to the cinema?'

<sup>3</sup> In theoretical syntax such a constraint has been called *Coordinate Structure Constraint* (Ross 1967).

- b. \**Jüri ja kes läksid kinno?*  
 Jüri and who went to cinema  
 'Jüri and who went to the cinema?'
  - c. *Kellega Jüri läks kinno?*  
 who:COM Jüri went to cinema  
 'With whom did Jüri go to the cinema?'
  - d. *Kes läks Marega kinno?*  
 who went Mare:COM to cinema  
 'Who went to the cinema with Mare?'
- (6) a. \**Ta kohtas Jürit, kes ja Mare läksid kinno*  
 s/he met Jüri who and Mare went to cinema  
 'S/he met Jüri who and Mare went to the cinema'
- b. \**Ta kohtas Maret, Jüri ja kes läksid kinno*  
 s/he met Mare Jüri and who went to cinema  
 'S/he met Mare, Jüri and who went to the cinema'
  - c. *Ta kohtas Jürit, kes läks Marega kinno*  
 s/he met Jüri who went Mare:COM to cinema  
 'S/he met Jüri who went to the cinema with Mare'
  - d. *Ta kohtas Maret, kellega Jüri kinno läks*  
 s/he met Mare who:COM Jüri to cinema went  
 'S/he met Mare with whom Jüri went to the cinema'

3. In the case of coordination the coordinated NPs serve jointly as the controller for equi-deletion (7a) and pronominalization (7b). It is also possible to pronominalize together the constituents of the comitative construction (7d); zero anaphora (7c) would be unacceptable for some language users. Unlike the coordinating construction, both constituents of the comitative construction allow functioning as a controller for deletion and pronominalization also separately. Zero anaphora can be used to refer to the primary constituent (7e); it is possible to pronominalize both constituents (7f, g). At this the pronoun corresponding to the primary constituent occupies a higher position in the hierarchy of pronominalization than that of the secondary constituent. For example,

- (7) a. *Jüri<sub>i</sub> ja Mare<sub>j</sub> läksid koju ja <sub>-i,j</sub> helistasid Jaanile*  
 Jüri and Mare went home and called to Jaan  
 'Jüri and Mare went home and called Jaan'
- b. *Jüri<sub>i</sub> ja Mare<sub>j</sub> läksid koju ja nad<sub>i,j</sub> helistasid Jaanile*  
 Jüri and Mare went home and they called Jaan'
  - c. ? \**Jüri<sub>i</sub> läks Marega<sub>j</sub> koju ja <sub>-i,j</sub> helistasid Jaanile*  
 Jüri went Mare:COM home and called Jaan
  - d. *Jüri<sub>i</sub> läks Marega<sub>j</sub> koju ja nad<sub>i,j</sub> helistasid Jaanile*  
 Jüri went Mare:COM home and they called Jaan  
 'Jüri went home with Mare, and they called Jaan'
  - e. *Jüri<sub>i</sub> läks Marega<sub>j</sub> koju ja <sub>-i</sub> helistas Jaanile*  
 Jüri went Mare:COM home and called Jaan  
 'Jüri went home with Mare and called Jaan'
  - f. *Jüri<sub>i</sub> läks Marega<sub>j</sub> koju ja ta<sub>i</sub> helistas Jaanile*  
 Jüri went Mare:COM home and he called Jaan  
 'Jüri went home with Mare, and he called Jaan'

- g. *Jüri<sub>i</sub> läks Marega<sub>j</sub> koju ja see<sub>j</sub> helistas Jaanile*  
 Jüri went Mare:COM home and this called Jaan  
 'Jüri went home with Mare, and she called Jaan'

4. While the co-reference of the attribute of the conjunct with another conjunct is expressed by means of the pronouns *tema/see* 'he/she/this' (8a), the co-reference of the attribute of the comitative adjunct with the primary constituent is expressed by the possessive reflexive pronoun *oma* 'one's own'(8b).

- (8) a. *Jüri<sub>i</sub> ja tema<sub>i</sub>/\*oma<sub>i</sub> naine sõitsid Võrumaale*  
 Jüri and his /own wife travelled to Võrumaa  
 'Jüri and his wife travelled to Võrumaa'  
 b. *Jüri<sub>i</sub> sõitis oma<sub>i</sub>/\*tema<sub>i</sub> naisega Võrumaale*  
 Jüri travelled own/his wife to Võrumaa  
 'Jüri travelled with (his) own wife to Võrumaa'

5. While the coordinating construction allows both the distributive and collective readings the comitative allows only the collective interpretation. For this reason, the comitative adjunct cannot occur with those verbs that exclude a collective interpretation, such as cognition verbs. Cognition is an individual-centred rather than a collective process, cf.

- (9) a. *Jüri ja Mare armastasid isamaad*  
 Jüri and Mare loved native country  
 'Jüri and Mari loved their native country'  
 b. *Jüri ja Mare uskusid helgesse tulevikku*  
 Jüri and Mare believed bright future  
 'Jüri and Mari believed in a bright future'  
 c. *\*Jüri armastas koos Marega isamaad*  
 Jüri loved together Mare:COM native country  
 'Jüri with Mare loved their native country'  
 d. *\*Jüri uskus koos Marega helgesse tulevikku*  
 Jüri believed together Mare:COM bright future  
 'Jüri with Mare believed in a bright future'

Typological studies on the comitative (see especially Stassen 2000; 2001) have shown that the comitative construction reveals a tendency to develop into the coordinating construction. Because the development is gradual rather than abrupt, one can find comitative constructions with varying degrees of coordination. In some languages one can speak about the coordinating comitative construction. The Slavic languages serve as examples here. For example, there is no doubt that sentence (10c) in Russian represents first and foremost the coordinating construction because despite the singular NPs the verb is in the plural, that is, both NPs jointly determine the form of the verb. At the same time the construction remains comitative in the sense that the syntactic function of the construction as a whole (in this sentence the function of subject) is marked not in both but only in one constituent. Many languages have comitative constructions that are associated with coordinated constructions only by the contact position of the NPs before the verb. The verb is in the singular and not in the plural

as in the case of the coordinating construction. The contact comitative construction can be exemplified by sentence (10b) in Russian (e.g. see also Vassilieva 2001; Vassilieva, Larson 2005).

- (10) a. *Даша пошла с Машей в кино* (prototypical comitative construction)  
 Dasha went with Masha:INSTR to cinema  
 'Dasha went to the cinema with Masha'
- b. *Даша с Машей пошла в кино* (contact comitative construction)  
 Dasha with Masha:INSTR went to cinema  
 'Dasha with Masha went to the cinema'
- c. *Даша с Машей пошли в кино* (coordinating comitative construction)  
 Dasha with Masha:INSTR went:PL to cinema  
 'Dasha with Masha went to the cinema'
- d. *Даша и Маша пошли в кино* (coordinating construction)  
 Dasha and Masha went:PL to cinema  
 'Dash and Masha went to the cinema'

Thus, Russian reveals both degrees of coordination of the comitative construction.

In Estonian the prototypical comitative construction is the most common type of the comitative construction. However, the contact comitative construction can be found, too. The contact position marks close relatedness of the members of the pair. The contact position is especially natural where the phrases denote internally — semantically or culturally — closely associated concepts, such as *isa poja ga* 'father with son', *president/peaminister abikaasa ga* 'president / prime minister with his spouse' as in (11a), but relatedness could result from a shared situation, as in (11b).

- (11) a. *Peaminister Tiit Vähi koos abikaasaga jõuab tagasi  
 visiidilt Soome*  
 from visit to Finland  
 'Prime Minister Tiit Vähi with his spouse returns from a visit to Finland' (NEWS)<sup>4</sup>
- b. *Tiger oma meestega võttis kohad sisse juhtimiskeskuses*  
 Tiger own men:COM took positions up in command centre  
 'Tiger with his men took up their positions in the command centre' (FICT)

The relatedness criterion has been applied first and foremost to explain syntactic differences in the coordinating constructions. Bernard Wälchli (2005) showed in many languages that the number of the adjectival attribute of a coordinating construction with singular constituents depends on whether one is dealing with natural or accidental coordination. In the former case the attribute is in the plural; in the latter case it is in the singular. Such a distinction is made, for example, in Finnish, cf. (12a and b) (examples of Dalrymple, Nikolajeva 2006).

<sup>4</sup> The examples marked as NEWS and FICT come from the 1990s subcorpus of the Tartu University Corpus of Standard Estonian; they denote journalistic and fiction texts, respectively.

- (12) a. *Hoiiset mies ja poika lähtivät yhdessä käsi kädessä*  
 happy:PL man and boy walked together hand in hand  
 'The happy man and son walked hand in hand'
- b. *Hän osti uuden /\*uudet talon ja auton*  
 s/he bought new:SG /\*new:PL house and car  
 'S/he bought a new house and a car'

The plural form of the attribute results from the circumstance that in the case of natural coordination the coordinating construction usually provides a collective reading, and accidental coordination is often interpreted distributively. Because the comitative construction has a collective reading, the natural coordinating construction happens to be the construction that undergoes the coordination of the comitative construction first. Thus, in Estonian the coordination of the comitative construction is at the initial stage, but occasional examples (13) of the plural form in the case of the contact comitative show that coordination could develop further.

- (13) *Riias toimusid Läti Vabariigi 75. aastapäeva pidustused, millest võtsid [attended:PL] osa ka Eesti president Lennart Meri koos abikaasaga, osaledes õhtul veel pidulikul vastuvõtul Läti presidendi Guntis Ulmanise ja tema abikaasa Aino Ulmanise juures*  
 'Riga witnessed the celebrations of the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Republic Latvia that was attended also by Lennart Meri, the Estonian president, with his spouse; he also attended a festive reception given by the Latvian president Guntis Ulmanis and his spouse' (NEWS)

This is what has already happened in the Võru dialect because the questioning of informants showed that the plural verb is common in such cases, e.g. *Juhan Jaagupigaq lätsiq* [went:PL] *minema* 'Juhan together with Jaagup left'.

### Inclusory comitative construction

In the previously discussed comitative constructions the primary constituent and the secondary constituent have different referents. In addition to such a construction, Estonian reveals also some comitative constructions where the referent of the comitative secondary constituent is among the referents of the primary constituent. Because of this property such constructions have been called inclusory comitative constructions in typological literature (see e.g. Haspelmath 2007). For example, in examples (14) and (15) one of two possible readings (b) is inclusory; in example (16), however, which reveals the contact comitative, it is the only possible interpretation.

- (14) *Me käisime isaga maal*  
 we went:1PL dad:COM countryside (a. we + dad; b. I + dad)  
 'We visited the countryside with dad'
- (15) *Käisime isaga maal*  
 went:1PL dad:COM countryside  
 'We visited the countryside with dad' (a. we + dad; b. I + dad)

- (16) *Meie isaga käisime maal*  
 we dad:COM went:1PL countryside (I + dad)  
 'We visited the countryside with dad'

The primary constituent of the inclusory construction is a plural personal pronoun. It could also remain implicit, in which case its role is performed by the personal marker of the verb, as in example (15). The comitative constituent can also be a personal pronoun or a noun phrase. A personal pronoun always occupies a lower position in the person hierarchy (first person > second person > third person) than the primary constituent. In the case of exclusory reading there is no such constraint (18).

- (17) *Me käisime sinuga maal*  
 we went:1PL you:COM countryside (a. we + you (SG); b. I + you (SG))  
 'We visited the countryside with you'

- (18) *Te käisite minuga maal*  
 you went:2PL I:COM countryside (you (PL) + I)  
 'You visited the countryside with me'

- (19) *Meie sinuga käisime maal*  
 we you:COM went:1PL countryside (I + you (SG))  
 'We visited the countryside with you'

- (20) *\*Teie minuga käisite maal*  
 you I:COM went:2PL countryside (you (PL) + I)  
 'You with me visited the countryside'

Also, the frequency of occurrence follows the person hierarchy. Corpus evidence shows that the first person is by far more frequent in inclusory use, either explicit or implicit. Apparently, it could partly explained by the fact that the construction *meie sinuga* 'we with you' is a manifestation of the so-called positive politeness strategy. Below are some additional examples of the inclusory comitative.

- (21) *Raspel vastas seepeale: "Meie sinuga [we you:COM] oleme mõlemad rauast tehtud, kuidas ma siis omade vastu..."*

'Raspel then responded, "Both of us were made from the same iron, how could I then go against our own..."' (FICT)

- (22) *Tookord tänaval kiirendas Laurent sammu ja sosistas mulle järele jõudes (mina olin omakorda Carl Frederickist maha jäänud): "Kas sa ei leia, et meie sinuga [we you:COM] oleme nagu vennad?"*

'Then in the street Laurent quickened his pace and whispered to me when catching up (I had in turn fallen behind Carl Frederick), "Don't you think that we with you are like brothers?"' (FICT)

- (23) *Meie sinuga [we you:COM] teineteisele seda ei teeks*  
 'You and me wouldn't do it to each other' (FICT)

- (24) *Meie Helmiga [we Helmi:COM] kavatseme kahasse kirjutada ühe uurimusliku artikli ESA 53 jaoks, aga pealkiri pole veel välja mõeldud*

'Helmi and me intend to write jointly a research article for ESA 53, but we haven't come up with a title as yet' (e-mail)

- (25) *Millegipärast ei tsiteerita aga kunagi poja vastust isale, mis kõlas umbes nii, et t e i e e m a g a* [you:PL mother:COM] *olete küll tööd teinud ja vaeva näinud, aga armastust pole Vargamäel tänapäevani*  
 'For some reason, the son's reply to his father is never quoted, which sounded something like this that although mother and you have worked hard, Vargamäe has not seen love to this day' (FICT)
- (26) *Ja siinpool n e m a d e m a g a* [they mother:COM] *kahekesi*  
 'And here are them with mother' (FICT)

The inclusory comitative is highly common in the Slavic languages, including Russian (see Vassilieva, Larson 2005), and it could well be that Russian may have contributed to its spread in Estonian. At the same time one can find examples of the inclusory comitative in many other languages (see e.g. Haspelmath 2007 : 33–35), even in spoken Finnish, e.g. *Me ote-  
 taa M a k k o s e n k a n s v a s i k k a a* 'We shall have beef with Makkonen' (Hakulinen, Viikuna, Korhonen, Koivisto, Heinonen, Alho 2004 : 706). Here one is dealing with the special case of a phrase specifying the composition of the group.

Again, the constructions with the contact comitative are most interesting also from the perspective of comparing the inclusory comitative construction and the coordinating construction. The previous discussion of the non-inclusory comitative showed that the contact position as a feature of coordination occurs (at first) only in the case of those pairs that belong together. Because indication of belonging to the same group implies a clear emphasis on togetherness, the contact position is much more common in the case of the inclusory comitative than in the case of the non-inclusory comitative.

The inclusory comitative with the contact position is accompanied by some other properties of the coordinating construction: impossibility of the possessive reflexive pronoun *oma* 'one's own' to mark the coreference of the attribute of the comitative constituent with the primary constituent (27), impossibility of the separate pronominalization of the comitative constituent (28), possibility to use cognitive verbs (29). Among the properties of the (prototypical) comitative construction the inclusory contact comitative retains the impossibility to questionize and relativize the primary constituent (30) and (31).

- (27) *Meie oma pojaga käisime maal*  
 we own son:COM visited countryside  
 'We with our son visited the countryside' (only the exclusory reading is possible)
- (28) *Meie pojaga<sub>i</sub> läksime koju ja \*ta<sub>i</sub> hakkas autot parandama*  
 we son:COM went home and he started car to repair  
 'We with our son went home, and he started to repair the car'
- (29) *Meie sinuga teame, et nii need asjad ei käi*  
 we you:COM know that so these things don't work  
 'We with you know that things don't work like that'
- (30) *Meie<sub>i,j</sub> Mardiga<sub>j</sub> käisime Tartus. \*Kes<sub>i,j</sub> Mardiga Tartus käis?*  
 we Mart:COM visited Tartu who Mart:COM Tartu visited  
 'We visited Tartu with Mart' 'Who visited Tartu with Mart?'

- (31) *Meie<sub>i,j</sub> Mardiga<sub>j</sub> käisime Tartus. \*meie, kes (me)<sub>i,j</sub> Mardiga Tartus käisime*  
we Mart:COM visited Tartu we who we Mart:COM Tartu visited  
'We visited Tartu with Mart' 'We who we visited Tartu with Mart'

Agreement is not an indicator of coordination here because due to the plural form of the pronoun the predicate verb is always in the plural. However, it fits in well with coordination.

Thus, in the case of the inclusory contact comitative the properties of the coordinating construction are at the forefront. At the same time, the fact that the comitative NP specifies the composition of the group in the inclusory construction makes it closer to the apposition, and the circumstance that it is possible to place this NP after the verb (e.g. 14 and 17) makes it possible to treat it as a comitative adjunct modifying the verb. Thus, this phrase cannot be categorized in traditional terms.

## Conclusions

The development of the Estonian accompaniment comitative is in line with the universal tendency of the development of the comitative construction towards a coordinating construction. At present coordination is only at the initial stage and is manifested only in the pre-verb contact position of NPs. The comitative phrase is still functioning as an adjunct. Occasional uses of the plural verb in the case of the singular primary constituent indicate a possible development of the coordination tendency. Also, the use of the inclusory comitative is in line with the coordination tendency. In comparison with the other comitative constructions, the inclusory comitative constructions reveal more coordinating properties, and their classification is more difficult.

Address:

Mati Erelt  
University of Tartu  
E-mail: mati.erelt@ut.ee

## REFERENCES

- Dalrymple, M., Nikolajeva, I. 2006, Syntax of Natural and Accidental Coordination. Evidence from Agreement. — *Language* 86, 824–849.
- Erelt, M. 2002, Hierarhiatest tüpoloogias. — *Teoreetiline keeleteadus Eestis, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli üldkeeleteaduse õppetooli toimetised 4)*, 34–40.
- 2004, Lauseliigendusprobleeme eesti grammatikas. — *Lauseliikmeist eesti keeles, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli preprintid 1)*, 7–15.
- Habicht, K. 2000, Grammaticalization of Adpositions in Old Literary Estonian. — *Estonian: Typological Studies IV, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli toimetised 14)*, 19–58.
- Hakulinen, A., Vilkuna, M., Korhonen, R., Koivisto, V., Heinonen, T. R., Alho, I. 2004, *Iso suomen kielioppi*, Helsinki (SKST 950).

- H a s p e l m a t h, M. 2007, Coordination. — Language Typology and Linguistic Description. Second edition. Volume II. Complex Constructions, Cambridge, 1—51.
- R o s s, J., R. 1967, Constraints on Variables in Syntax. Ph.D. Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- S t a s s e n, L. 2000, AND-languages and WITH-languages. — Linguistic Typology 1, 1—54.
- 2001, Noun Phrase Coordination. — Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook, Berlin, 1105—1111.
- S t o l z, T., S t r o h, C., U r d z e A. 2006, On Comitatives and Related Categories. A Typological Study with Special Focus on the Languages of Europe, Berlin (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 33).
- V a s s i l i e v a, M. 2001, On the Typology of Russian Comitative Constructions. — Proceedings of the Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Bloomington Meeting, 2000, Ann Arbor (Michigan Slavic Publications), 327—344.
- V a s s i l i e v a, M., L a r s o n R. K. 2005, The Semantics of the Plural Pronoun Construction. — Natural Language Semantics (2005) 13, 101—124.
- W ä l c h l i, B. 2005, Co-compounds and Natural Coordination, Oxford.
- А р х и п о в, А. 2005, Типология комитативных конструкций. Канд. дисс., Москва.

МАТИ ЭРЕЛТ (Тарту)

#### О СООТНОШЕНИИ КОМИТАТИВНОЙ И СОЧИНИТЕЛЬНОЙ КОНСТРУКЦИЙ

Во многих языках наблюдается тенденция перехода комитативной конструкции, выражающей сопровождение, в сочинительную конструкцию. В эстонском языке комитативный член конструкции обычно играет роль обстоятельства, подчиненного глаголу и следующего за ним, например, *Jüri läks (k o o s) M a r e g a kinno* 'Юри пошел (вместе) с Маре в кино'. О тенденции к сочинению свидетельствует наличие конструкций, в которых комитативная группа предшествует глаголу, занимая позицию после основной именной группы, например, *Peaminister Tiit Vähi koos abikaasaga jõuab tagasi viisidilt Soome* 'Премьер-министр Тийт Вяхи вместе с супругой возвращаются после визита в Финляндию'. Пока контактное расположение комитативной и основной групп маркирует их общность и в первую очередь, естественно, в том случае, если именные группы обозначают понятия, внутренне — семантически или узуально — тесно связанные. Отдельные примеры употребления глагола множественного числа при конструкции с контактным комитативом свидетельствуют о том, что процесс перехода комитативной конструкции в сочинительную может развиваться дальше. Многими синтаксическими и семантическими свойствами сочинительной конструкции обладает инклюзивная комитативная конструкция, в которой референт комитативной группы входит в число референтов основной группы, например, *Meie s i n u g a (= mina ja sina) käisime maal* 'Мы с тобой (= ты и я) были в деревне'. Но в то же время комитативная группа в инклюзивной конструкции имеет и некоторые свойства приложения (уточняет состав группы), а также обстоятельства (может находиться в позиции после глагола). Поэтому мы имеем дело с конструкцией, которая трудно поддается классификации.