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Abstract. The present article studies the usage of the Estonian verb jääda and Livonian īedõ in various grammatical constructions. Although in both languages they can be attested to convey remain and change, there are differences in their use depending on the construction. Apart from Estonian, the Livonian īedõ is shown to function as a general change-of-state predicate. Whereas previously the Estonian jääda has been associated with negative change and continuation, this study demonstrates that, in more general terms, one could speak about unexpectedness or difference from the majority, and remaining in an activity or state for some time. The linguistic data originates from various corpora, in the case of Livonian also from collections of texts. In order to investigate the historical development, the Old Written Estonian data was also included in the study. We propose that originally the verb expressed ‘remain, stay behind’. The corresponding meaning is present in most of the constructions expressing location; in Old Written Estonian such instances constituted ¾ of all examples.
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1. Introduction

For the present article, we studied the semantic functions and syntactic behaviour of the Estonian verb jääda and its Livonian cognate īedõ. The Estonian jääda and Livonian īedõ have counterparts in all the Finnic languages, e.g. Finnish jäädä, Votic jäävvä, Olonets Karelian jiäjä, Veps jäда, and Ludic d’iädä. The Proto-Finnic root...
*jää- can be regarded as originating from the Proto-Indo-Iranian root ġeǵeḥē- (see ETY). Typically, the abovementioned Finnic verbs are attested to mean ‘remain, stay’, ‘remain, stay behind’ (example 1), or ‘become’ (2).

(1) a. Livonian (Kettunen 1925: 70)
   \[ perīmiez īend kuodāj \]
   master IÉ:APP at_home
   
   b. Estonian (p.k. – personal knowledge)
   \[ peremees jäänu koju \]
   master JĀA:APP at_home
   ‘The master stayed at home.’

(2) a. Livonian (Mägiste 1964: 14)
   \[ läpš īeb rujāks \]
   child IÉ:3SG ill:TRA
   
   b. Estonian (p.k.)
   \[ laps jääb haigeks \]
   child JĀA:3SG ill:TRA
   ‘The child will become ill.’

The Estonian jääda and Livonian īedõ have been previously studied, but their usage in the two cognate languages has not been compared systematically, and thus there is a need for clarifications and (further) discussion. Pajusalu and Tragel (2007) analysed change-of-state predicates in Estonian and argued that the Estonian jääda primarily conveys continuation (‘remain’) and change (‘become’), provided that the change is negative. They associated negativity with three domains: (i) a decrease in quantity; (ii) an activity or purpose that becomes more passive; (iii) the deterioration of a state (as judged by the the participant undergoing a change). The domains were shown to intertwine, e.g. falling ill (2) was associated with all three negative domains (for more detail, see Pajusalu and Tragel 2007: 306). In turn, positivity was seen as an increase in quantity, an activity that becomes more active, and the improvement of a state. Norvik (2014) discussed change-of-state expressions in Livonian and concluded that the Livonian īedõ functions as a general change-of-state predicate, and can be used to convey negative (2a) and positive (3) change. Apart from Livonian, the Estonian terveks jääda only expresses ‘remain healthy’ (4); the reading ‘get well’ (as in Livonian example 3) is not possible.
The main concepts discussed in this article are change and remain. Following Frawley (1992: 190), change can be defined as a transition from one state to another or crossing the boundary between two states. The main attention is given to the new state (Radden and Dirven 2007: 274), or as put by Creissels (2014: 610) “noun phrases in [a] transformative role refer to the final state of a participant undergoing a transformation”. For instance, in (2) the final state is predicted to be that of being ill, and in (3) and (4) being healthy. Creissels considers transformatives (X becomes Y) as contextual variants of the equatives (X is Y).

The concept remain is associated with instances where a particular situation continues to persist. Typically the subject remains in a certain location, situation, or state; see (1) and (4). Those instances of ‘remain’ that refer to a location (as in 1), especially enable a reading of ‘remain, stay behind’. Furthermore, the period of remaining in a state can be specified by temporal adverbs (one could add e.g. ‘for five minutes’, or ‘for a week’). However, ‘remain’ can also be connected to ‘become’. As illustrated by Huumo (2007: 87) using the Finnish jääda, instances such as (1) express fictive change: the entity remains in a certain location and thus rejects the alternative, which would be to leave the location (for a general background of fictive change, see Talmy 2000: 101). In the current paper, the corresponding cases are still referred to as remain to distinguish them from more clear-cut instances of change. As will be shown however, it is often the case that readings of ‘remain’ and ‘become’ are both relevant, because one can remain in a steady state after a change has occurred.
With some reservations, the Estonian *jääda* and Livonian *tėdō* are in the current paper associated with change, even if the participant does not undergo any change, but the circumstances surrounding them change. Example (5) is one such case: the size of the apartment does not actually change (although it is presented as such), rather the family has grown.

(5) Estonian (etTenTen [elamugrupp.ee])

\[
\text{et maja ostab reeglina suurem pere siis,}
\]
\[
kui korter on väikseks jäänud
\]

when apartment be.3SG small:TRA JÄÄ:APP

‘A bigger family usually buys an house when their old apartment has become small.’

As demonstrated in (1) through (5), usage of the Estonian *jääda* and Livonian *tėdō* can be associated with various meanings and constructional polysemy; (3) and (4) also point to differences between the uses of the Estonian *jääda* and Livonian *tėdō*. Regarding this, our aim was to compare these cognate verbs by discussing their various meanings and the similarities/differences in their use. For this purpose, we considered their syntactic behaviour and made use of the distinction between positivity and negativity situation, but we will show that the distinction between usual/expected and unusual/unexpected situation could be of primary importance. We also comment on the possible development of the various usages. Occasionally parallels will be drawn with the usage and development of the corresponding verb in Finnish and other Circum-Baltic contact languages (e.g. German, Latvian, Russian, and Swedish).

The linguistic material analysed in this article originates from: (i) the etTenTen corpus –which includes contemporary Estonian; (ii) the Corpus of Old Written Estonian (COWE) – mainly representative of 17th century Estonian; (iii) various sources of Livonian – in general the sources represent 20th century language. Old Written Estonian was included in the study so that the historical development of *jääda* could be investigated. As Estonian and Livonian are closely related languages, the Old Written Estonian data was assumed to show us something about the development of the Livonian *tėdō*. 
2. Verbs expressing change and remain in a broader context

2.1. Semantic counterparts in the neighbouring Circum-Baltic languages

In other Circum-Baltic languages one also finds examples of verbs expressing both ‘remain’ and ‘become’, e.g. the German bleiben (see examples 6a and 6b, respectively), Latvian palikt (see 7a and 7b, respectively), Russian ostat’sja, Polish zostać, and Swedish bli. However, depending on the language, there are various restrictions on their use. For instance, use of the Latvian palikt to mean ‘become’ is common in spoken Latvian; see example (7b) that originates from a witness report in a newspaper. In literary Latvian, it is advised to use the verb klūt ‘become’ instead; and the verb palikt only to mean ‘remain’. For comparison, a German would use the future copula/auxiliary werden to express a change in such cases as in (7b) (for more information, see Schlücker 2004).

(6) German (Schlücker 2004: 260–261)

a. Alle setzen sich hin,
   nur Peter blieb stehen.
   only Peter remain.pst.3sg stand:inf
   ‘Everybody sat down but Peter remained standing.’

b. Plötzlich blieb Peter stehen.
   suddenly remain.pst.3sg Peter stand:inf
   ‘Suddenly Peter stopped.’

(7) Latvian (Zvejnieks 2016)

a. Kaut arī kūrorta ēka bija netīra,
   ūdens ap to tomēr palika tīrs.
   water.m around this.acc still remain:pst.3sg clean.m
   ‘Although the building was dirty, the water surrounding it remained clean.’

b. “Pēc raksta avīzē pagāja divas vai trīs dienas,
   un pagalms palika tīrs”, apliecīna ... 
   and yard.m remain:pst.3sg clean.m confirm:pst.3sg

   “‘After the article appeared in the newspaper, two or three days passed and the yard was clean (lit. ‘the yard became clean’)’, confirmed … .’
The etymological dictionaries of the Germanic languages usually give ‘remain’, ‘stick’, and ‘cling to something’ as the original meanings of bleiben, bli, and related verbs (see HKW, EWN); the meaning ‘become’ is regarded as a later development (e.g. see Hellquist 1993 for the Swedish bli). However, as mentioned earlier (see Section 1) instances of remain could be associated with fictive change, which means that the meaning ‘become’ was probably already present originally. As Schlücker (2004) pointed out, the Gothic *leiben and *bileiben also originally meant ‘remain, stay behind’ and thus could be associated with change-of-state rather than a steady state. As she puts it, “if somebody or something remains behind this presupposes that there are other entities which in contrast do not take part in the state asserted but which realise a state contrary to that state” (Schlücker 2004: 261). That the German bleiben is used with sein (not haben) as an auxiliary is further evidence of the veracity of this claim: i.e. in German, sein is used with intransitive eventive verbs, whereas haben is used with verbs denoting a state or process (ibid.). The meanings ‘remain’ and ‘become’ have also been shown to be historically connected in the case of other Indo-European languages, e.g. for the Polish zostać, see Wiemer (2004: 298–299). In this article, it will be argued that the meaning ‘remain, stay behind’, which in essence is connected to change, could also be the original meaning of the Estonian jääda and Livonian īedō.

2.2. Syntactic behaviour

The underlying constructions in various Circum-Baltic languages reveal differences in the marking of their constituents. For example:

i. Whereas the Estonian and Livonian examples (2) to (5) contain the predicative adjective in the translative case, the Latvian examples (7a) and (7b) are in the nominative case.

ii. In Latvian, for expressing a profession the adpositional construction with par is used (8) (Kalnača 2013: 638), in Swedish, the predicative nominal constituent remains in the nominative case (9). (The Estonian and Livonian counterparts are discussed in Section 3.2.3)

iii. The Russian verb ostat’sja can take the instrumental form with predicative adjectives and predicative nominals; see examples (10a) and (10b), respectively.
In Russian, the instrumental case is associated with expressing temporary and non-inherent states (e.g. professions, periods of one’s lifetime); it is often used to express a change-of-state. The nominative case in Russian, is typically used for permanent and inherent states (e.g. BEING, IDENTITY). However, there is some variation in the use of the instrumental and nominative cases conveying future time reference (Clancy 2010: 19, 98–99). Whereas Stassen (2001) also applied the distinction between permanent, inherent states (expressed by the nominative) and temporary, non-inherent states (expressed by the translative case) on Estonian, Erelt and Metslang (2003: 167) maintained that in Estonian one could speak about “a more general opposition – prototypical vs. non-prototypical encoding of non-verbal predication”. For instance, they presented examples (11a) and (11b) to claim that although both are possible, the nominative case in (11b) can be regarded as the non-marked option and the translative as its marked counterpart. As in Russian, the prototypical function of the translative (similar to the instrumental case) is to express the result of change (ibid.).
Ajanki (2014) states that the Finno-Ugric translative suffix *kse originally functioned as a functive, i.e. conveyed the meaning that a participant appears as someone or something, and its use to express change was a later development. The Erzya Mordvin examples in (12) illustrate both usages (Creissels 2014: 624). Regarding instances of remain in Estonian (4) and Livonian, but also the Russian examples in (10), one could ask whether the use of the translative case (or in Russian, the instrumental case) could be also associated with a functive reading\(^2\). Although this could be possible, it is more plausible that the presence of fictive change determines the choice of translative/instrumental.

As follows, the aim is to study the semantic functions and syntactic behaviour of the Estonian jääda and Livonian īedõ. Occasionally parallels will be drawn with the usage of corresponding verbs in the Circum-Baltic languages mentioned above.

---

\(^2\) Although a functive reading could also be associated with the essive case (see Ajanki 2014), uses of the essive are not discussed in the current paper, as neither the Estonian jääda nor the Livonian īedõ can be combined with it. For use of the essive in Livonian, see Viitso (2016); for use of the essive in Estonian, see Metslang and Lindström (2017).
3. The Estonian *jääda* and Livonian *īedõ*: similarities and differences in their semantics and syntax

3.1. Overview of the data sets

Data sets were compiled separately for contemporary Estonian, Old Written Estonian, and Livonian.

The linguistic data on contemporary Estonian mainly originated from the etTenTen corpus. To estimate the frequencies of constructions containing *jääda*, we took a random sample consisting of 500 sentences and calculated 95% confidence intervals for the observed frequencies. For analysing semantic functions, we searched for additional examples in the corpora, as otherwise there was not enough data to describe some less frequent constructions and their usages.

The data on Old Written Estonian (OWE) came from the Corpus of Old Written Estonian (COWE) and more precisely from the following sources of Old Written Northern Estonian: Wanradt-Koell’s catechism (1535); Georg Müller’s sermons (1600–1608); Heinrich Stahl’s Hand- und Hausbuch (1632–1638); and Leyen Spiegel (1641–1649). In these sources, the verb *jääda* occurs a total of 415 times. More recent sources were considered only when a particular construction was not present in these sources. The frequencies of OWE constructions are given in percentages, as the example sentences collected did not constitute a random sample. Moreover, it is important to note that the authors of these sources were Germans whose level of Estonian varied. For instance, Müller’s knowledge of Estonian is generally considered better than that of his contemporaries (see Prillop 2009). Nonetheless, the authors are discussed separately only if there are important statistical differences.

The Livonian examples are from various sources of written and spoken language (e.g. AEDKL, Kettunen 1925, Mägiste 1964, and Setälä 1953). In total, the data set consisted of 273 sentences that contained *īedõ*. The earliest examples date back to 1888, and the latest ones to 2010. In the case of Livonian, only percentages were calculated.

---

3 AEDKL stands for the Archives of Estonian Dialects and Kindred Languages of the University of Tartu; the archives also contain recordings of Livonian (the earliest recording of Livonian originates from 1968).
Table 1. Data sets of jääda verb constructions in contemporary Estonian (Est.) and Old Written Estonian (OWE), and īedõ verb constructions in Livonian (Liv.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Est.</th>
<th>OWE</th>
<th>Liv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tokens</td>
<td>% (95% confidence interval)</td>
<td>Tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ V LOC/ADV</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>31.0–39.6</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ V (LOC) mINF</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.9–17.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ V AdjPtra/NPtra</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>25.4–33.6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPela V (LOC) SUBJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0–3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LOC) V SUBJ and (NPdat/ade) V SUBJ</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.3–10.1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ V AdjPnom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3–2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ V mINFabe and SUBJ V tINF</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.5–14.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. The semantic functions of different constructions

3.2.1. SUBJ V LOC/ADV

In contemporary Estonian, the construction SUBJ V LOC/ADV constituted 31.0–39.6% of all examples, which made it the most frequently occurring jääda-construction. In Old Written Estonian, it constituted most (75.4%) of all examples. In Livonian, the corresponding construction was the second most frequent construction (31.1% of all uses) after the translative construction (see Subsection 3.2.3).

LOC in the construction SUBJ V LOC stands for NPloc or AdpP expressing a concrete location (examples 13 and 14), or an abstract location and a physical state (15 and 16). The latter instances can be easily linked with instances of the SUBJ V ADV (see 17 to 20).

(13) Estonian (etTenTen [naistekas.delfi.ee])

aga mis koju jää, oli tungraud

but what at_home JÄÄ:3SG be:PST.3SG lifting_jack

‘But [one thing] that stayed behind (lit. ‘remained at home’), was the lifting_jack.’
(14) Estonian (etTenTen [sport.postimees.ee])

14. katse järgsel ülesõidul
jää tee äärde
JÄÄ:PST.3SG road:GEN side:ILL
neljandat kohta hoidnud Breen

‘After the 14th stage, during the transport phase, the 4th placed driver Breen retired from the race.’

(15) OWE usu sisse (belief:GEN into) jääda ‘start believing’ (lit. ‘remain into belief’)

(16) Est. mõttesse (thought:ILL) jääda ‘start thinking’ (lit. ‘remain into thought’)

Whereas in example (13) the preceding and current situations did not differ (the lifting jack was at home and remained at home), in (14) the context enables one to conclude that the car stopped and thus a change occurred. However, the main emphasis is on the final result, i.e. a car remaining somewhere (as opposed to others that are still in the competition). The instances presented in (15) and (16) also seem to emphasise remaining in a mental state as a result of change.

Examples (13) and (14) can be also associated with the meaning ‘remain, stay behind’, which tended to be present in most of the cases where location was expressed (regardless of the corpus). As such a reading also appeared to be the most typical in the case of OWE examples of SUBJ V LOC/ADV, and the frequency of the construction in OWE was the highest (75.4%), we suggest this to be the original meaning of the verb jääda. This is in line with the proposed meaning of the German bleiben as well (see Subsection 2.1; but also see examples (23) and (24)).

Examples (17) through (20) are instances of SUBJ V ADV that contain an adverb in the post-verbal position. In relation to the preceding situation, (17) expresses REMAIN and examples (18) through (20) convey CHANGE. Whereas (18) and (19) contain jääda and īedõ to convey negative and passive change respectively, the Livonian example (20) is an instance of increased agitation, which in Estonian would be expressed using the verb minna ‘go’ (see also Subsection 3.2.3).
Although in the case of Estonian the notions *passivity* and *negativity* often explain the choice of *jääda* (see 17 and 18), one also finds cases that cannot be explained using these notions, e.g. (21). Furthermore, negativity does not presuppose change as a negative situation can also continue (17), and the result of change can also be neutral (21) or positive. The data especially showed that examples containing phrasal verbs (combinations of a main verb and an adverb particle) tended to express positive rather than negative change; see (22).
(22) Estonian (etTenTen [toompark.pri.ee])

Sega niikaua,
kuni hakklihasegu jääb kokku
until minced_meat JÄÄ:3SG together
üheks palliks.
one:TRA ball:TRA

‘Mix until the mixture of minced meat sticks as one ball.’

There were also usages such as (23a) that conveyed permanent location and can be regarded as close to meaning ‘be situated’. Although there were no instances in Livonian, the usage of the Latvian palikt ‘remain’ (23b) suggests that it could be possible in Livonian. Such instances fall under the MOVING-EGO METAPHOR (for more detail, see Lakoff 1993: 218), where the observer or so-called ego moves in space and time. The German example (24) reveals that the same metaphor bleiben was also used in 19th century texts; however, in contemporary German one would use a compound verb: liegen bleiben or zurück bleiben ‘stay behind’. In any case, such usages can be associated with the proposed original meaning of ‘remain, stay behind’.

(23) Estonian (etTenTen [issuu.com])

a. Suurem osa pealinna randu
   jääb mere äärde
   remain:3SG sea.GEN side:ILL

b. Latvian (p.k.)
   paliek pie jāras
   remain.3SG by sea.GEN

‘Most of the beaches of the capital are located by the seaside.’

(24) German (Neigebaur 1842: 438)

das Dorf bleibt Rechts
DEF.ART village remain:3SG right

‘The village is located on the right.’

The Livonian data set also contained examples of jääda to convey the emergence of something, as in (25). In Estonian, the verbs tekkida ‘emerge’ or ilmuda ‘appear’ would be used instead (for more about ‘appear’ and ‘emerge’, see Subsection 3.2.4).
(25) Livonian (Mägiste 1964: 40)
\[ rő’ ūeb mõ pûlõ \]
money JÄÄ:3SG earth:GEN on:ALL
‘The money emerges on the ground.’

**3.2.2. ** **SUBJ** V **(LOC)** mINF

Examples with the structure SUBJ V (LOC) mINF in contemporary Estonian constituted 10.9–17.1% of the usages of the *jääda*-verb. In OWE, the percentage of these constructions was less than 3%. In the Livonian data set, the construction constituted 10.3% of all cases.

The construction SUBJ V (LOC) mINF differs from the construction SUBJ V LOC/ADV (discussed in Section 3.2.1) only by involving one further constituent: the M-infinitive that expresses an activity (state or process). According to Erelt (2014: 188), the primary reading of *jääda* + M-infinitive should be that of ‘remaining in an activity’ or ‘beginning an activity’. Pajusalu and Orav (2008: 109, 117), coded instances of *jääda* + M-infinitive as primarily expressing ‘remaining’ and **LOCATION**, while maintaining that another option would be to code them as expressing the semantic domain **GOAL**.

In the current study, the main distinction was again made between instances of **REMAIN** and **CHANGE**. The Estonian and Livonian data sets contained examples that conveyed (i) continuation of an earlier situation (26); and (ii) entering into a new state, with the main emphasis on that new state (27). As with the examples of SUBJ V LOC/ADV, it was also the case that SUBJ V (LOC) mINF context (i.e. an earlier situation) enabled one to differentiate between the two readings. For instance, without context *ūeb paikõl istām* and *jäid pingi juurde seisma* could either be associated with **REMAIN** or **CHANGE**. Moreover, as with SUBJ V LOC/ADV, reading SUBJ V (LOC) mINF as the persistence/continuation of an earlier situation was preferred when remaining was somehow different from the general situation, e.g. by expressing ‘staying, remaining behind’ or the non-occurrence of an expected change (26). In (28), it is also explicitly said with respect to whom the situation is different (i.e. *Kaidist* ‘from Kaidi’).

(26) Livonian (AEDKL[F0447-01])
\[ ä’b lä ūeb paikõl istām \]
NEG go.CNG TĒ:3SG place:ILL sit:MINF
‘[s/he] does not leave, remains seated.’
Milvi ja Marika astusid roosipõõsaste vahelt välja ja jäid pingi juurde seisma.

‘Milvi and Maarika stepped out from the rose bushes and stopped by the bench.’

Ma olen nüüd 2 hommikut järjest Kaidist koju magama jäänud.

‘Two straight mornings I have stayed at home in bed sleeping, while Kaidi left.’

For comparison, Pajusalu and Tragel (2007: 298) associated the constructions with M-infinitive that express a state or passive activity (e.g. seista ‘stand’, or istuda ‘sit’) either with remain (see examples 26 and 28) or change (27), whereas in the case of active verbs (e.g. tantsida ‘dance’), the only possible interpretation was claimed to be ‘remain’ and to imply change-of-state, the verb hakata ‘begin’ has to be used. However, the data set contained examples such as (29) that expressed change, i.e. that a situation is different from the previous one (listening to speeches). The emphasis was again on remaining in an activity for some time and that the activity is somehow different or unexpected compared to others (see also (14) and (27)).

Lõppesid viimased kõned, /…/ venelased läksid laiali, mugrlilased jäid palee-esisele väljakule tantsima.

‘The last speeches were over, /…/ the Russians dispersed, whereas the Finno-Ugric people stayed and danced on the square in front of the palace.’

The OWE examples were mainly from 17th century texts, which contained 10 examples of the SUBJ V (LOC) mINF. Still, one cannot extrapolate as much in one’s conclusions, as in three examples the distinction between remain and change was not clear-cut; the remaining
seven examples were instances of seisma jääda ‘stop’. With regard to the expression of CHANGE by means of seisma jääda, one can draw parallels with German. Namely, the corresponding construction blieb stehen can also be used to convey ‘stop’ (7). For comparison, in Latvian and Russian a synthetic form is preferred to convey CHANGE, e.g. a Latvian would use apstāties and a Russian ostanavlivat’sja to translate seisma jääda ‘stop’.

3.2.3. SUBJ V AdjPtra/NPtra

The construction SUBJ V AdjP-tra/NP-tra containing jääda constituted 25.4% to 33.6% in the contemporary Estonian, which makes it the second most frequent jääda -construction after SUBJ V LOC/ADV (see subsection 3.2.1). In Livonian, the corresponding construction even proved to be the most frequent: 50.5%. In Old Written Estonian, such constructions formed only 9.2% of all instances.

In the data sets, the construction SUBJ V AdjP-tra was used to express CHANGE (30 and 31) and REMAIN (32 and 33).

(30) Estonian (etTenTen[alkeemia.ee])
   ühel päeval Anne jää rasedaks
   one day Anne JÄÄ:PST.3SG preagnant:TRA
   ‘One day Anne became pregnant.’

(31) Livonian (Mägiste 1964: 23)
   se neist um ėend murgalizōks
   this girl be.3SG ĪE:APP sad:TRA
   ‘The girl became sad.’

(32) Estonian (etTenTen[www.poogen.ee])
   Ta küüris kõvasti,
   kuid pesu jää määrdunuks.
   but laundry JÄÄ:PST.3SG dirty:TRA
   ‘S/he scrubbed hard but the laundry remained dirty.’
Pajusalu and Tragel (2007: 297) as well as Erelt (2013: 217) made use of the notion of *unexpectedness* when explaining the reading ‘remain’ (in a particular situation). For example, it can be perceived as unexpected that the laundry remains dirty after one has scrubbed it (32) and that a person does not get injured in an accident (33). Still, in the present article we argue that the usage of *jääda* in both cases (remain as well as change) can be explained by the situation being somehow exceptional/unusual/unexpected. For instance, becoming pregnant (30) in a way also means becoming different from the majority and remaining in that state for a while. Furthermore, although the situation that is unexpected/unusual/different is often negative, especially in the cases of change (31), there are instances that cannot be regarded as negative (30) (see also discussion in 3.2.1).

In Estonian, the verb *jääda* can be found with the meaning ‘become’ in cases where “things happen”, e.g. in (34) no effort is made to make the place free. For an occupied country to become free, in turn, a purposeful action is needed. This is why a different verb (*saada*) has to be used in Estonian to convey change-of-state (*jää vabaks* in (35a) can only mean ‘remained free’). Pajusalu and Tragel (2007: 302) define the corresponding usage of the Estonian *saada* as follows: “(of animate reference) positive change resulting from purposeful human action” (35b).
(35) Estonian (p.k.)
   a. Eesti jää vabaks.
      Estonia JÄÄ:PST.3SG free:TRA
      ‘Estonia remained free.’
   b. Eesti sai vabaks.
      Estonia become:PST.3SG free:TRA
      ‘Estonia became free.’

Apart from Estonian, in Livonian there does not seem to be any semantic restrictions on the use of the verb īedõ for REMAIN and CHANGE. For instance, in (36) the Livonian īedõ is used to convey a positive result of human action. In Latvian, as well, the verb palikt can be used to express purposeful human action (cf. example 7b in Section 2.1). Moreover, the verb īedõ also occurs in cases that in Estonian are covered by the scope of other verbs, e.g. minna ‘go’, saada ‘get; become’, e.g. in cases such as (37) that express the so called increased agitation (see Pajusalu and Tragel 2007: 299; cf. also example 20 in Section 3.2.1).

(36) Livonian (Mägiste 1964: 32)
   na’ggõrd īebõd pū’dõks un sieldõks
      turnip:PL Ī:E:PST.3SG clean:TRA and clear:TRA
      ‘Turnips will become clean and clear.’

(37) Livonian (Kettunen 1925: 114)
   si’z ēbrikš īend kõžīžõks,
      then spider Ī:APP angry:TRA
   irgõnd pū’gõ (kärmõst) i’lzõ
      ‘Then the spider became angry and started to hang the fly by the neck.’

Additionally, there are cases that involve change in some surrounding circumstances; see (38). Namely, the dress is still the same size, but the one who wears it has gained or lost weight (cf. also example 5 in Section 1).

(38) Estonian (p.k.)
   kleit jää suureks
      dress JÄÄ:PST.3SG big:TRA
      ‘The dress became big.’
The following examples illustrate the functions of the construction SUBJ V NP_{tra}. In Estonian the corresponding construction tended to occur with the meaning ‘remain’; see (39) and (40). Even in cases such as (41), where the resulting state is clearly different from the previous state (holding the position of a general practitioner vs. being a doctor’s assistant), the focus is on remaining in the resulting state rather than on the change-of-state. Furthermore, it seems that it is also associated with location (the position can change, but not the location).

(39) Estonian (p. k.)
poisid jäävad poisteks
boy:PL JÄÄ:3PL boy:PL:TRA
‘Boys will be (lit. ‘remain’) boys.’

(40) Estonian (etTenTen[www.rada7.ee])
aga jäägu see siinkohal üllatuseks
but JÄÄ:JUSS.3SG this here surprise:TRA
‘… but let it be a surprise in this case.’

(41) Estonian (etTenTen[www.med24.ee])
Andke praksis ära ja
jääge oma kolleegile abiarstiks.
JÄÄ:IMP.2PL own:GEN colleague:ALL doctor’s_assistant:TRA
‘Give up your medical practice and continue (lit. remain) as a doctor’s assistant.’

In Livonian, the construction SUBJ V NP_{tra} could be found with the meaning ‘remain’ (42) as well as ‘become’ (43). Furthermore, cases such as (43) clearly express the change-of-state (i.e. becoming an hawk) rather than remaining in the resulting state (cf. Estonian example 41).

(42) Livonian (Kettunen 1925: 71)
vöidag īeb pa vöidagōks
butter ÌE:3SG PP butter:TRA
‘Butter remains butter.’
Examples (42) and (43) also contain the preposition *pa*. Its occurrence is explained with the influence of the Latvian *par* -construction (cf. example 8), which is used to convey the meaning ‘become’ in connection with professions and states (Grünthal 2003: 190, 192). Thus, in Livonian, the expression of *change-of-state* gets double-marked as the translative case occurs as well (see 42 and 43). Whereas previously no clear pattern for occurrence of *pa* has been presented (see e.g. Grünthal 2003), the Livonian data set collected for the purposes of the present study demonstrates that *pa* is used in the construction SUBJ V NP<sub>tra</sub>. This reveals a clear parallel between Latvian and Livonian as, for instance, the marking of the construction SUBJ V AdjP does not tend to contain *pa*/par in Latvian (see Livonian examples 31, 36, 37 and Latvian example 7). The Livonian data set contained only one example of SUBJ V AdjP<sub>tra</sub> with *pa*, whereas there were 41 examples of SUBJ V NP<sub>tra</sub> containing *pa* and only four corresponding examples that did not contain *pa*.

As mentioned above, in OWE, constructions SUBJ V AdjP<sub>tra</sub>/NP<sub>tra</sub> that contain the verb *jääda* constituted less than 10% of the examples. Moreover, into this type we also subsumed the instances that contained the NP or AdjP in the nominative case instead of the translative, probably as a result of German influence. The fact that we are dealing with German influence could be supported by the fact that in Stahl’s texts there were 14 instances (out of 18) that contained the nominative instead of the translative (see example 45), but in Müller’s texts – that were written in somewhat better Estonian – there were only five such cases (out of 20). Furthermore, the incorrect forms

---

4 The written standard uses the preposition *par* in constructions expressing change (see example 44). In the Talman dialects of Latvia, i.e. in the so-called Livonian dialects, the form *pa* is used, which also explains the use of *pa* in Livonian (Grünthal 2003: 192).
appeared in Müller’s earlier sermons, when his language skills were less developed. Thus, Müller’s texts seem to suggest that the nominative is a mistake and the jääda-constructions containing translative existed in the 17th century Estonian, although the construction itself was relatively infrequent.

(45) Old Written Estonian (COWE[Stahl_LSI, 354])

sihs ollet sinna Jummalast /
 ninck jehit temma Laps
and JÄÄ:2SG he:GEN child

‘You are from God and you will remain his child.’

It is possible that development of the verb jääda as a change-of-state predicate and the increase in the frequency of the construction are connected. Namely, in the 17th century texts there are not many cases of jääda clearly expressing CHANGE. As shown in subsection 2.1, there is evidence also in other languages that the reading ‘become’ could be of later development although originally the verb expressed at least fictive change. Besides, in OWE, instead of haigeks jääma ‘fall ill’ one finds usages such as haigus tuleb meie peale ‘lit. the sickness comes on us’, nad langevad tõve sisse ‘lit. they fall into sickness’, ta saab haigeks ‘lit. s/he gets ill’; instead of magama jääma ‘fall asleep’ the synthetic form uinuma is used. Still, as pointed out above, for some reason, SUBJ V NP_{tra} in Estonian does not express CHANGE but REMAIN (example 45 offers further proof for that).

3.2.4. NP_{ela} V (LOC) SUBJ

In contemporary Estonian, the construction NP_{ela} V (LOC) SUBJ containing jääda appeared to be relatively rare: it constituted 1.0% to 3.6% of all instances in the etTenTen corpus. The Livonian data set contained one example, whereas the Old Written Estonian data set did not contain any examples.

The corresponding examples explicitly reveal the source (an object, creature, situation), which brings about a result (see examples 46 and 47) or states the existence of a greater entity from which a part is left or removed (48). The final result is typically characterised by an adjective (see piisasuurused ‘droplet-sized’ in (46)). Whereas an attribute can be missing, there are no cases that would contain AdjP_{nom} in the subject position.
(46) Estonian (EnTenTen[reisijakiri.goamaailm.ee])

\[
\textit{vihmast} \quad \textit{jäävad} \quad \textit{meie} \quad \textit{riiete} \\
\textit{rain:ELA} \quad \text{remain:3PL} \quad \textit{ou:GEN} \quad \textit{clothes:PL:ALL}
\]

\[
\textit{piisasuurused} \quad \textit{hallid} \quad \textit{plekid} \\
\textit{droplet_size:PL} \quad \text{gray:PL} \quad \textit{stain:PL}
\]

‘Rain will leave droplet-sized grey stains on our clothes.’

(47) Livonian (Kettunen 1925: 28)

\[
\textit{sēpierāst} \quad \textit{ku} \quad \textit{amstō}, \quad \textit{mis} \quad \text{ta} \quad \textit{vō} \quad \textit{jārā} \quad \textit{rikkōn} \\
\textit{tām’} \quad \textit{sidāmō} \quad \textit{vō’l} \quad \textit{ēnd} \quad \text{mingi} \quad \textit{tē’d} \\
\textit{s/he:GEN} \quad \textit{heart:ILL} \quad \textit{be:PST.3SG} \quad \text{Ī:E:APP} \quad \textit{some} \quad \textit{star}
\]

‘From everything that s/he broke down, a star had remained in his/her heart.’

(48) Estonian (etTenTen[www.naisteleht.ee])

\[
\textit{majast} \quad \textit{jääd} \quad \textit{mustad} \quad \textit{seinad} \\
\textit{house:ELA} \quad \text{remain:PST:3PL} \quad \text{black:PL} \quad \textit{wall:3PL}
\]

‘Only the walls were left from the house.’

As examples (46) to (48) reveal, the construction NP\textsubscript{ELA} \text{V (LOC)} \text{SUBJ} containing the verb \textit{jääda} is not a change-of-state construction: in (46), \textit{vihm} ‘rain’ does not develop a new quality, but it causes something to happen; in (48) a house does not transform into walls, but the walls are what are left. For comparison, the Estonian \textit{saada} and Livonian \textit{sōdō} in the corresponding construction reveal change-like cases; see (49) and (50). Still, as maintained in ISK (2004), the elative construction is used to convey the development of some new quality rather than a true change-of-state.

(49) Estonian (p.k.)

\[
\textit{Temast} \quad \textit{sai} \quad \textit{kirjanik}.
\]

\[
\textit{s/he:ELA} \quad \text{become:PST.3SG} \quad \textit{writer}
\]

‘S/he became a writer.’

(50) Livonian (Stalte 2011: 63)

\[
\textit{Pōisōst} \quad \textit{sōb} \quad \textit{vist} \quad \textit{miermīez}.
\]

\[
\textit{boy:ELA} \quad \text{become:3SG} \quad \text{maybe} \quad \text{seaman}
\]

‘The boy will probably become a seaman.’
The OWE data set that mainly covered the 16th and 17th century did not reveal any occurrences with jääda in the elative construction. The elative construction was present, but it contained the verb saada ‘get; become’. It is only at the end of the 18th century / beginning of the 19th century that the first examples containing jääda appear. The expression of change-of-state by means of the elative construction (as in 49) is claimed to be of later development than the translative construction, both in the case of Estonian (see Tragel and Habicht 2012: 1386) as well as Finnish (Jokela and Nummila 2015: 92). However, whereas the data set collected by Tragel and Habicht allowed them to date the saada-construction to the 19th century, our data also revealed example (51) that originates from the 17th century.

(51) Old Written Estonian (COWE[1637-Stahl_HHII, 36])

\[
\text{üx nair sest surmast on sahnut–} \\
\text{one laugh this:ELA death:ELA be.3SG become:APP}
\]

‘Death has become a mockery.’

The infrequent occurrence of the construction could also be explained by the general principle in languages according to which it is more common to mark goal than source (see e.g. Dirven and Verspoor 2004: 85). In Livonian for instance, the elative construction can be shown to be rare with the verb īedõ (47), but also sōdõ (50) and līdõ (future copula) (see more in Norvik 2014: 129–131).

### 3.2.5. (LOC) V SUBJ and (NP\_dat/ade) V SUBJ

The construction (LOC) V SUBJ expresses existential relations (52 and 53) and the construction (NP\_dat/ade) V SUBJ expresses possessive relations (54) (see also Huumo 2007). The confidence interval for the examples originating from the etTenTen corpus is 5.3% to 10.1%. In the OWE corpus, about 10.7% of all the examples could be associated with existential and possessive relations. The OWE examples stood out as the vast majority of cases only consisted of V and SUBJ, as in (53). In the Livonian data set, the corresponding constructions constituted 5.9% of all occurrences.
(52) Estonian (etTenTen[Ilukirjandus])

Pärast kirsika lahkumist jää
after Kirsika: GEN leaving:PRT JÄÄ:PST.3SG

suur tühjus.
big emptiness

‘After Kirsika left, I felt very empty (lit. ‘I remained with a big emptiness’).’

(53) Old Written Estonian (COWE[1601-Myller36,6])

Keick ieeb kui se enne on olnut
all JÄÄ:3SG as this before be.3SG be:APP

‘All will remain as it has always been.’

(54) Estonian (etTenTen[SLÕhtuleht_2009])

Kanadalased on väga tipus,
eksootilistele rahvastele jäävad tagumised kohad.

‘Canadians are on top; exotic nations are left with inferior standings.’

Examples (52) to (54) can be primarily associated with the meaning ‘remain’, i.e. something remains (from something else) somewhere (as a result of something) and continues to persist. The possessive relations, as in (54), include cases that (i) reveal a possessed entity that begins or continues to be possessed by the possessor, (ii) involve a possessor that leaves an entity for another person (Huumo 2007: 89–90). Example (54) is an instance of the first type, provided one regards it as an example of an abstract possession.

The Livonian data set also included instances that express an emergence of an entity, which did not exist before; see (55). In Estonian, the usage of the verb jääda in such cases would not express emergence, but only change in location (56). For translating (55) into Estonian, one would need to use a separate verb tekkida ‘appear, emerge’ (see similar example in 3.2.1).

(55) Livonian (Setälä 1953: 124)

sei tuoiz umārz jerā,
[S/he] ate the other apple and the second horn grew.'
(56) Estonian (p.k.)
Sõi teise õuna ära,
 jät
tei
ne sarv pähe (kinni).
JÄÄ: PST.3SG other horn head:ILL (fast)

'[S/he] ate the other apple and the second horn stuck fast to his/her head.'

In addition, the Livonian īedō is also used to express ‘beginning of a state’, as in (57). Whereas in spoken Latvian, one could use the corresponding verb palikt ‘remain, stay; become’ to denote change-of-state, in Estonian the verb hakata ‘begin’ would be used. Thus, the more general meaning of the Livonian īedō is proven once again.

(57) Livonian (Mägiste 1964: 24)
tä’mmõn um īend irm
s/he:DAT be.3SG JÄÄ:APP fear

‘s/he became afraid.’

### 3.2.6. SUBJ V AdjP_nom

This construction appeared to be rare in all three data sets: in the etTenTen corpus it constituted less than 2.3% of occurrences of jääda -verbs; in Livonian 1.5%; and, in Old Written Estonian there were no examples.

It can be asserted that the construction SUBJ V AdjP_nom is mainly used to describe the quality of the subject after it has emerged, see (58) and (59). For instance, the dough will be as thick as sour cream only when the necessary components are mixed together as only then there is something that can be called dough. The same construction containing a different verb (tulla ‘come’) has been analysed by Erelt (2005: 23), who explained that examples such as (60) stress the result. Thus, there is no transition from one state to another. The fact that the entity expressed by the subject did not exist beforehand makes the construction similar to the existential constructions discussed in subsection 3.2.5.

(58) Estonian (etTenTen[www.nami-nami.ee])
tainas jääb hapukoorepaksune
dough JÄÄ:3SG sour_cream_thick

‘The dough will be as thick as sour cream.’
(59) Livonian (AEDKL[F1035-01])

\[ \text{si'z ta \text{i}eb immõrgoutlimi} \]

then it ĪE:3SG round

‘Then it will be round.’

(60) Estonian (Erelt 2005: 23)

\[ \text{See raamat tuli hea.} \]

this book come:PST.3SG good

‘The book became good.’

As (61) reveals, it is also possible that the entity existed already beforehand. For instance, it may have had a different quality and that quality might also remain unspecified. As regards (61), one can conclude that there was some kind of a surface, but it was unenamelled.

(61) Estonian (etTenTen[ww.vivacolor.ee9])

\[ \text{lakitud pind jääb ühtlane} \]

enamelled surface JÄÄ:3SG even

‘The enamelled surface will be even.’

The construction SUBJ V AdjP_{nom} tends to contain Estonian jääda or Livonian īedõ in the present tense; see (58), (59) and (61). For comparison, the Swedish bli (originally ‘remain’) can be found in similar instances where it functions as a future copula, leaving the meaning ‘become’ in the background (see Dahl 2000). However, no such development can be posited to the Estonian jääda or Livonian īedõ. With regard to Livonian, the language contains a well-grammaticalised future copula līdõ (see Norvik 2015), which places a situation in the future. Furthermore, the usage of īedõ in (59) stresses the continuation of a state after it has been achieved rather than futurity. The same concerns Estonian examples (58) and (61). It can be argued that remaining in a permanent situation is additionally supported by the usage of the nominative case as the nominative predicative is usually associated with permanent characteristics, whereas the translatative case is more likely to stress the result of change (for details, see subsection 2.2).
3.2.7. **SUBJ V tINF or mINF\text{abe}**

All three data sets contained examples of SUBJ V mINF\text{abe} expressing a state which will not be achieved, or an activity that does not take place, see (62) to (64). Erelt (2013: 87) considers such instances as cases of retrospective; Pajusalu and Tragel (2007: 298–299) introduce them as instances that convey opposition “between a statement and an earlier assumption”. Again, the focus is on the remaining in a state. The etTenTen corpus contained 8.2 to 14.3% of such examples; the instances in the OWE data constituted 2.4% of all occurrences; and, in Livonian, there was only one example. The fact that the M-infinitive abessive form is rare in Livonian becomes apparent in the work by Ernštretits (2010) as well. He demonstrated that Livonian tends to use other constructions that involve the prefix \text{äb-} ‘not’. For comparison, all examples from OWE originate from Stahl and have an equivalent German (there are parallel texts) with the prefix \text{un-} ‘not’, e.g. \text{vngessen bleiben} ‘remain uneaten’.

(62) Estonian (etTenTen[postimesee.eu])

\text{Mõistagi jää seadus sellisena vastu võtmata.} of\textunderscore course JÄÄ:PST.3SG law like\textunderscore this AFADV take:mINF.ABE

‘Of course the law was not adopted as it was.’

(63) OWE (COWE[Stahl\_LSI, 340])

\text{sihs piddi se Rahwas söhmatta jehma} then must:PST.3SG this people eat:mINF.ABE JÄÄ: mINF.

‘Then, the people had to survive without food.’

(64) Livonian (Stalte 2011: 89)

\text{Vanād eit parāntōmōt.} old\textunderscore one:PL ḪE:PST.3PL fix:mINF.ABE

‘The old ones were not fixed.’

One can view the examples of SUBJ V mINF\text{abe} together with instances of SUBJ V tINF, e.g. Estonian \text{jääb teha} (JÄÄ:3SG do:tINF) ‘remains to be done’, see (65). Such examples add a modal meaning to the sentence, i.e. that the activity expressed by T-infinitive remains to be carried out (cf. Penjam 2008). No corresponding examples occurred in the OWE or Livonian data set. This would suggest that such a modal development is a later development.
4. Conclusions

The aim of the present article was to study the semantic functions and syntactic behaviour of the Estonian jääda and Livonian īedõ that, broadly speaking, could be found with the meanings ‘remain’ and ‘become’. In the case of Estonian, the linguistic material that was analysed mainly originated from the etTenTen corpus. In addition, sources of Old Written Estonian (from the 16th and 17th century) were included in order to consider the development of the verb jääda in various constructions. The Livonian data originated from the spoken and written sources covering the period from 1888 to 2010.

The Estonian jääda and Livonian īedõ were found in the following constructions: (i) SUBJ V LOC/ADV; (ii) SUBJ V (LOC) mINF; (iii) SUBJ V AdjP-tra/NP-tra; (iv) NPela V (LOC) SUBJ; (v) (LOC) V SUBJ and (NP_dat/ade) V SUBJ; (vi) SUBJ V AdjP_nom; and, (vii) SUBJ V mINF_abe and SUBJ V tINF (the SUBJ V tINF was attested only in contemporary Estonian). The analysis revealed that the constructions represented by the structures in (i) and (iii) are the most common in both languages (in Livonian the construction SUBJ V AdjP-tra/NP-tra even constituted 51%).

One of the central tasks, however, was to discuss the meanings that could be associated with the various constructions. With regard to the constructions in (i) to (iii), the readings ‘remain’ as well as ‘become’ turned out to be possible. It was shown that, in most cases, the broader context enables the determination of which meaning is primary. The other constructions primarily expressed the sense ‘remain’. The importance of the meaning of ‘remain’ was stressed in all cases as it was explained that the usage of the Estonian jääda and Livonian īedõ always involves the reading ‘continue to be in the state at least for some time’.

Although, in Estonian, the constructions SUBJ V AdjP-tra/NP-tra and SUBJ V LOC/ADV could be often associated with negativity, as shown previously, it was argued in the article that, in more general terms, one could speak about unexpectedness/difference from the majority. The
fact that if something is different from the norm it is often also negative was regarded to explain the negativity -reading. In the case of Livonian, the usage of īedõ could not be explained in terms of negativity as opposed to positivity. Furthermore, the examples occurring in the data revealed that the Livonian īedõ is relatively general in its meaning. Namely the Livonian verb īedõ was also used in cases that are covered by another change-of-state predicate in Estonian (e.g. minna ‘go’), or by a verb with a more specific meaning (e.g. tekkida ‘emerge’, ilmuda ‘appear’). Moreover, in Livonian, the construction SUBJ V NPtra was frequently attributed with the meaning ‘become’, whereas in Estonian the corresponding cases mostly conveyed ‘remain’.

Concerning the various constructions and the meanings that the Estonian jääda and Livonian īedõ could convey, it was argued that they could go back to the meaning ‘remain, stay behind’, ‘remain’ > ‘become’ being a later development. A similar development is also proposed for other languages, e.g. German. The ‘remain, stay behind’ meaning was shown to be present, particularly in cases identifying a specific location. At the same time, it was accepted that the occurrences of ‘remain, stay behind’ can be considered instances of fictive change: an entity does not change the location and thus rejects the alternative, which would be to leave the location. Thus, the expression of change is inherently connected with the verbs jääda and īedõ and the development into a general change-of-state predicate (as has happened in Livonian) could be expected.

The research also revealed areal contacts between Livonian and Latvian. In the case of spoken Latvian, the verb palikt with the meaning ‘remain; become’ was also shown to be in general usage (at least in the case of spoken language), as was the case with the Livonian īedõ. Furthermore, the occurrence of the preposition pa in the SUBJ V NPtra -construction in Livonian was shown to have an exact parallel in Latvian (the corresponding particle is par). In the case of SUBJ V AdjPtra, pa hardly ever occurred; nor does the corresponding construction contain par in Latvian. In the case of OWE, the usage of the nominative case instead of the transative case for the construction SUBJ V AdjP/NP was regarded as a German language influence.
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kogutud ka eesti vana kirjakeele korpusest. Ilmneb, et algelt on tegemist ‘maha jäämist’ tähistanud verbiga – nimetatud tähendus on ennekõike esil kohta väljendavates konstruktsoonides, mis näiteks vanas kirjakeeles moodustasid enamiku kasutusjuhtudest.

**Võtmesõnad:** muutus, püsimine, grammatilised konstruktsioonid, liivi keel, eesti keel, eesti vana kirjakeel