

HANNA JOKELA (Tartu), KIRSI-MARIA NUMMILA (Turku)

BECOME-CONSTRUCTIONS IN FINNISH AND ESTONIAN: DIACHRONIC AND CONTRASTIVE PERSPECTIVES

Abstract. We focus on so-called BECOME-constructions in Finnish and Estonian. There are many constructions expressing becoming and change. We examine three types of BECOME-construction based on the verbs *saada/saama* 'to get' and *tulla/tulema* 'to (be)come'. There are morphological differences between BECOME-constructions: they apply different cases in expressing the subject and/or the result of the change. The possible cases are the elative, the translative and the nominative. The choice of case depends on both the language and the period of time. The article focuses diachronically and contrastively on different resultative constructions in written Finnish and Estonian.

Keywords: Finnish, Estonian, resultative construction, elative, translative, verb *saada/saama*, verb *tulla/tulema*.

0. Introduction

In the Finnic languages, syntactic constructions expressing becoming or experiencing a change of state typically involve the verbs *tulla*¹ 'to come' or *saada* 'to get'. Our focus in this article is on three constructions² known in two closely related languages, Finnish and Estonian. Their use is to some extent language-specific, and both their use and their frequency clearly seem to be connected to a particular period of time; at different times different types are preferred. Temporal and local variation adds up to an interesting phenomenon. A contrastive study of written Finnish and written Estonian reveals that variation and use of different arguments in resulta-

¹ In Finnish, the A-infinitive (*saada*), also known as the first infinitive, is used as a basic form. Its Estonian equivalent is the *da*-infinitive (*saada*), but Estonian grammars and dictionaries refer to the *ma*-infinitive (*saama*). In this article we refer to the A-infinitive and the *da*-infinitive.

² Marja Pälsi (2000) has analyzed Finnish resultative clauses such as *Kimmo nuiji pihvin pehmeäksil* 'Kimmo pounded the steak [with a mallet] till it was soft', *Päivi hölkkäsi itsensä näännyksiin* 'Päivi jogged till she was exhausted'. These clauses clearly differ from the type we focus on here: the construction type is different, and clauses mentioned above do not involve any specific, fixed verb. Estonian resultative constructions are discussed by Mati Ereht (2005). Huno Rätsep (1978) has listed different verbs expressing change or result.

tive constructions have taken at least partly different paths in the two languages. Some of the differences found in Modern Finnish and Estonian may be due to certain differences in clause patterns in general.

This variation has been influenced by structures and models offered by the Indo-European languages. We discuss Finnish and Estonian BECOME-constructions from both a diachronic and a contrastive perspective. Among the features examined are case-marking, semantic restrictions, syntactic roles, and the influence of foreign (Germanic) languages. Our data, described below, cover a period of 450 years of written language.

1. Aim, background and data of the study

Before looking at each language, and the period of written language, in more detail, we briefly introduce all the BECOME-constructions dealt with in our study. In Finnish, the first of the three types (1a) is syntactically classified as a predicative clause;³ in the second type (1b) the result is expressed by a predicative adverbial in the translative case;⁴ in the third type (1c), as in the first, the result is represented by a nominative predicative. Notably, in type 1c, the predicative verb *tulla* typically appears in the past tense (imperfect). The difference between predicative clauses 1a and 1b is the syntactic role of the pre-verbal argument: in 1a it is an elative adverbial, in 1b a nominative subject (see e.g. ISK § 904). As examples 1a–1c demonstrate, in Finnish the verb *tulla* is the most typical choice in all BECOME-construction types. It should be noted that Finnish *tulla* — as well as Estonian *tulla* and *saada* — have a future implication when used in the present tense, and for example in English translations⁵ this may be explicated with an auxiliary *will*.

- (1a) *Poja-sta tulee iloinen / opettaja*
 boy-ELA come-3SG happy.NOM / teacher.NOM
 'The boy becomes ~ will be happy / a teacher'
- (1b) *Poika tulee iloise-ksi*
 boy.NOM become-3SG happy-TRAN
 'The boy becomes ~ will be happy'
- (1c) *Kastike tuli suolainen*
 Sauce.NOM become-PST.3SG salty.NOM
 'The sauce became salty'

Here we use the term *BECOME-construction* to refer to the constructions illustrated in the examples. When demonstrating differences between construction types, we also use more specific terms, such as translative/elative/nominative construction, depending on the arguments and their case of the particular construction under discussion.

³ Syntactic clause types differ to some extent in Finnish and Estonian. Syntactic roles in the resultative constructions, especially the matter of subject and predicative, are dealt differently in Finnish and Estonian grammar traditions. With respect to these current and past traditions, one of the most significant differences is arguably the perception of the post verbal noun/adjective: unlike Finnish, in Estonian it is not considered a predicative but rather a subject/object.

⁴ Our study does not include the construction type (with a past participle in the translative case) *työ tulee tehdyksi* 'work gets done'. These constructions in Old Literary Finnish legal translations are discussed by Merlijn de Smit (2006 : 109–111; see also Häkkinen 1994 : 468).

⁵ English may also use certain more specific resultative verb (*develop, turn out, grow into*).

Both Estonian grammars and previous studies describe two main types of BECOME-constructions. The third type, corresponding to the Finnish type 1c in the classification above, is seen as a subtype of the translative construction. Unlike Finnish, this construction is productive in Modern Estonian (this will be discussed further in the following sections). Similarly to Finnish, the two main constructions include either an elative argument as the experiencer of the change or a translative argument as the result of the change; the position of the subject depends on the construction type. In the translative construction the NP expressing the experiencer of change is in the nominative, while the post-verbal argument expressing the resulting state is in the translative (2b). In the elative construction, the noun expressing the experiencer is in the elative case (2a), while the noun expressing the resulting state is in the nominative (2c) (see Erelt 2005; Pajusalu, Tragel 2007; Tragel, Habicht 2012).

- (2a) *Poisi-st saa-b õpetaja*
 boy-ELA get-3SG teacher.NOM
 'The boy becomes a teacher'
- (2b) *Poiss saa-b suure-ks / õpetaja-ks*
 boy.NOM get-3SG big-TRAN / teacher-TRAN
 'The boy becomes big / a teacher'
- (2c) *Kaste saa-b ~ tuleb soolane*
 sauce.NOM get-3SG salty.NOM
 'The sauce becomes salty'

As these examples illustrate, there is variation in the use and frequency of the verbs *tulla* and *saada* in Finnish and Estonian BECOME-constructions; in Estonian *saada* is the dominant one.

BECOME-constructions expressing result and change are usually mentioned in descriptions of grammar and/or syntax. However, they are discussed relatively briefly in both Finnish and Estonian studies. In Finnish linguistics the constructions dealt with here have hardly been studied at all, and this applies to all stages of language history (e.g. ISK § 904; see also Kelomäki 1997 : 142–143; Herlin, Honkanen 2001 : 355–360; in Estonian, they have been discussed by Erelt 2005; Erelt, Metslang 2006; Tragel, Habicht 2012).

All the construction types of our study are more or less connected and intertwined, but as already noted their variation at different times is considerable, both language-specifically and cross-linguistically. Our aim is to shed some light on BECOME-constructions, and to provide an overview on their historical variation in Finnish and Estonian.

Our data consist of three subsets of data, each representing a different period of written Finnish and each comprising eighty BECOME-constructions with the verb *tulla*. In collecting the data, possible BECOME-constructions with the verb *saada* were also searched for, but this type seems to be completely unknown in Finnish databases. The oldest subset in our data consists of *tulla*-resultatives in Mikael Agricola's translation of the New Testament (1548), collected from the morpho-syntactically coded database of Agricola's texts (http://www.utu.fi/fi/yksikot/hum/yksikot/suomi-sgr/tutkimus/tutkimushankkeet/agricolan_tietokanta/Sivut/home.aspx). The second subset is based on the works of Christfrid Ganander (1763–1788). The third subset consists of the two volumes of the newspaper "Suometar"

(1847–1848).⁶ Our data for the 18th and 19th century were derived from the corpora of Old Literary Finnish (http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/vks/meta/vks_coll_rdf.xml) and Early Modern Finnish (http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/1800/meta/1800_coll_rdf.xml). We did not establish separate Estonian data for this study, as the main features of Estonian resultative constructions are already available.

In the following sections, we analyze Finnish texts from both a diachronic and a contrastive perspective. We compare our data subsets to each other and to Modern Standard Finnish, and to both modern and early Estonian texts. Our purpose is to draw attention to similarities and differences between the languages and periods mentioned.

2. BECOME-constructions in Finnish and Estonian

2.1. BECOME-constructions in Modern Finnish and Modern Estonian

2.1.1. BECOME-constructions in Modern Finnish

In Modern Finnish, a typical BECOME-construction consists of a nominative subject NP, the verb *tulla*, and a translative AP (*Poika* [boy.NOM] *tuli iloise-ksi* [happy-TRAN] 'The boy became happy'). There are certain semantic restrictions concerning this particular BECOME-construction (for more on restrictions see section 2.4.). In Finnish grammar, the post-verbal argument has been considered a predicative adverbial, because of the translative case-marking (e.g. ISK § 904; see also Vilkuna 2000 : 186).

The second type of the three BECOME-constructions discussed here is semantically close to the first one, but differs clearly from it at the level of syntax. This second type too is a BECOME-construction based on the verb *tulla*, but it is more multifunctional than the first type, due to the fewer restrictions affecting the noun class of the argument. The object of the change, the first argument of the construction, is an elative NP, while the post-verbal argument expressing the result is predicative in either the nominative or the partitive case (*Pojasta* [boy-ELA] *tuli opettaja / iloinen* [teacher.NOM / happy.NOM] 'The boy became a teacher / happy'). As in Finnish copula clauses typically, the predicative following the verb can be either a substantive or an adjective. This BECOME-construction is seen as subjectless, and the pre-verbal argument it contains is an elative adverbial (ISK § 904). In the discussion, we refer to this type as an 'elative construction'.

The third BECOME-construction bears structural similarities to the first two. Both noun arguments in this construction are in a grammatical case (nominative or partitive): *Kastike* [sauce.NOM] *tuli suolainen* [salty.NOM] 'The

⁶ Mikael Agricola (circa 1510–1557) was the author of the first printed publications in the Finnish language. The most significant of these is the first Finnish translation of The New Testament (1548), on which the oldest part of our data is also based. Christfrid Ganander (1741–1790) was one of the most important writers and publishers of the 18th century. Our 18th-century material is based on his diverse production (1766–1788), including Finnish poems (1766), riddles (1783), fairy tales (1784), and the first medical books in Finnish ("Eläinten tauti-kirja and Maan-Miehen Huoneja Koti-Aptheeki" (1788)). The 19th-century data are based on an early Finnish newspaper "Suometar" (1847–1848), founded by four central figures in Finnish linguistics and literary history: August Ahlqvist, Daniel Europæus, Paavo Tikkanen and Antero Warelius (for more detail see e.g. Häkkinen 1994).

sauce became salty'. It resembles the translative construction in having a nominative subject NP, and the elative construction in using the nominative in the post-verbal argument. The post-verbal argument is interpreted as a predicative. This BECOME-construction cannot be viewed as conventional or neutral in Modern Finnish, and is considered to be an archaic type (e.g. Ikola 2001 : 148; ISK § 904).

2.1.2. BECOME-constructions in Modern Estonian

Pajusalu and Tragel discuss change-of-state constructions; according to them (2007 : 293), the two main constructions are the change construction with the nominative and the verbs *saada* or *tulla*, and the change construction with the elative (see also Pajusalu, Tragel, Veismann, Vija 2004). Erelt (2005) labels the resultative clause *goal-marking* or *source-marking resultative clauses*, depending on the types of argument occurring with the verb expressing result and change, and on their syntactic roles. Goal-marking resultative refers to what we call the translative construction (*Poiss* [boy.NOM] *saab mehe-ks* [man-TRANS] 'A boy becomes a man'), while 'source-marking resultative' refers to the elative construction (*Poisi-st* [boy-ELA] *saab mees* [man.NOM], with the same meaning).

In Estonian the elative construction is described as a marginal type of the resultative clause, and the translative construction is regarded as the main type (Erelt, Metslang 2004 : 260–261); here, however, this refers more widely to all resultative constructions, not only BECOME-constructions with the verb *saada* or *tulla*. The predicate verb of the elative construction in Finnish and Estonian has different features. Interestingly, unlike Finnish, in Estonian a plural NP triggers agreement in the predicate verb (Erelt, Metslang 2004 : 261): *Pois-te-st* [boy-PL-ELA] *sa-i-d* [get-PST-PL] *mehed* [man.NOM.PL] 'Boys became men' (in Finnish *Pojista* [boy-PL-ELA] *tuli* [come-PST.3SG] *miehiä* [man-PART.PL]). It should be noted that Estonian also has more agreement in other clause types with a non-typical subject, such as existential clauses.

In the Finnish elative construction, the post-verbal noun in the nominative is syntactically seen as a predicative. In Estonian, there is no tradition of regarding post-verbal NPs in resultative clauses as predicatives (Erelt, Metslang 2004 : 261). According to Erelt and Metslang (2004 : 261), the post-verbal NP has some object properties, such as negation triggering the partitive case (*Poisi-st* [boy-ELA] *ei saanud* [get-NEG-3SG] *meest* [man.PART] 'A boy did not become a man'). In Estonian studies in general, this NP following the verb has been regarded as either a subject (intransitive clause) or an object (transitive clause) (Erelt 2005 : 26). Erelt concludes that "the resultative subject is a typological peculiarity of Estonian" (2005 : 28).

In Estonian, an adjective as a post-verbal argument in the elative construction — in Finnish terms, a predicative — is not acceptable (Erelt 2005 : 22, 26; Pajusalu, Tragel 2007 : 301). However, post-verbal adjectives do occur in (intranslative) clauses expressing the result state of the subject noun (3a). This type is also possible in the passive voice (3b) (Erelt 2005 : 23).

- (3a) *See raamat tuli hea*
 this.NOM book.NOM get-PST.3SG good.NOM
 'This book became good'

- (3b) *See raamat tehti hea*
this.NOM book.NOM make-PST.PASS good.NOM
'This book was made good'

Erelt and Metslang (2004 : 261) note that in the translative construction (*Poiss* [boy.NOM] *saab mehe-ks / suure-ks* [man-TRAN / big-TRAN] 'A boy becomes man / big'), the resultative state can also be expressed by an adjective in post-verbal position. Their observations indicate that in the case of adjectives this construction type is more common in Estonian than in Finnish. The translative construction bears a clear semantic restriction: its use is restricted if the change which has taken place cannot be interpreted as the result of an intentional, purposeful and goal-oriented action. Thus for example *Poiss sai kurjategija-ks* [criminal-TRAN] 'A boy became criminal' is rather questionable (Pajusalu, Tragel, Veismann, Vija 2004 : 47; Pajusalu, Tragel 2007 : 301).

In Estonian, the verbs *saada* and *tulla* can both be used in all resultative constructions; however, they are not synonymous, and they involve different semantic restrictions. Of the two, *saada* has become the more frequent verb in clauses expressing result; again, unlike Finnish, *tulla* rarely has this meaning (Erelt 2005 : 23). The meaning and interpretation of *saada* and *tulla* in BECOME-resultatives are discussed by Pajusalu and Tragel (2007). They conclude that *saada* typically expresses a positive change; a negative change is typically expressed with the verb *jääda* 'remain, stay', while *tulla* retains its meaning of motion (Pajusalu, Tragel 2007 : 306). In Modern Estonian the primary meaning of the verb *tulla* is modal, and in certain texts it is one of the most frequent modal verbs, even if the modal meaning does not occur in older Estonian texts (Penjam 2006). The verb used in future constructions is mainly *saada*. Using *tulla* as a future auxiliary is regarded as a matter of Finnish influence, and the language-planning authorities recommend avoiding it (Penjam 2006 : 37). Interestingly, expressing the future and change (including its results) are often intertwined.

2.2. BECOME-constructions in Old Literary Finnish and Old Literary Estonian

2.2.1. BECOME-constructions in Old Literary Finnish

The frequency of the clause types expressing becoming and changing differs greatly in Old Literary (i.e. written) Finnish and Modern Finnish. In Old written Finnish, the translative construction (*Poika tuli papi-ksi* 'The boy become a priest') is clearly the dominant type. As described above, in Modern Finnish grammars and descriptions these constructions with a substantive predicative are seen as highly unusual if not unacceptable.⁷ The relative construction (*Poja-sta tuli pappi* 'The boy become a priest') is also known in Old Literary Finnish, but compared to the translative construction it is extremely rare. For the seventeenth century, there is only one example: *t ä s t ä L a p s e s t a*

⁷ It is noteworthy that a BECOME-construction type exists where a substantive predicative is acceptable even in modern Finnish: *Matti tuli papiksi pitäjään* 'Matti came to the parish to become a priest', *Matti tuli pitäjän papiksi vuonna 1950* 'Matti became a priest of the parish in 1950', *Helena tuli piiksi taloon* 'Helena came to the house to be a maid'. This construction type always includes an element expressing location or possession. The subject changes his/her location or status, but the focus is not on the change (alone). This construction type differs semantically from the type focused on here.

piti Parembi Pilti Caswaman ('This baby was supposed to become/grow into a better child') (Andreae 1654; Forsman Svensson 2011). This difference in their distribution during different periods of the development of written Finnish appears drastic, but it has rarely been noted in earlier studies (Häkkinen 1994 : 330; Forsman Svensson 2011), and there have been no studies focusing specifically on this issue. Herlin and Honkanen (2001), in their study dealing with allative constructions, discuss the BECOME-construction as one clause type in the *Biblia* (1642); their focus, however, is on a narrow group of BECOME-constructions meeting specific conditions.

Forsman Svensson (2011) provides the following examples (4a–4d) representing translative constructions from the seventeenth century:

- (4a) *ia tuli niijn ihminen eläväise-ksi sielu-ksi* [soul-TRAN]
'And so a human being became a living soul'
- (4b) *Cuinga Leipä ia wijna tulewat*
Sacramendi-xi [sacrament-TRAN]
'How bread and wine became a sacrament'
- (4c) *sinä olet lain rikkoja-xi* [lawbreaker-TRAN] *tullut*
'You have become a lawbreaker'
- (4d) *nijn cuin David tuli maanculki-a-xi* [vagabond-TRAN]
'Like David became a vagabond'

In all the above examples (4a–4d), the post-verbal NP is a substantive. In Modern Finnish, all of these would be expressed using the relative construction (5a–5d):

- (5a) *Ihmise-stä* [human-ELA] *tuli eläväinen sielu*
- (5b) *kuinka leivä-stä ja viina-sta* [bread-ELA and wine-ELA] *tuli sakramentti*
- (5c) *sinu-sta* [you-ELA] *on tullut lain rikkoja*
- (5d) *Davidi-sta* [David-ELA] *tuli maankulkija*

If it is interesting to examine more closely the insights offered by a diachronic perspective into Finnish BECOME-constructions, it is at least equally interesting to compare the practices of Old Literary Finnish to those of Old Literary Estonian.

2.2.2. BECOME-constructions in Old Literary Estonian

Based on earlier studies of Estonian, it can be concluded that a change occurs in the frequency of the relative construction type. Trigel and Habicht survey the history and usage of the Estonian verb *saada*, and give examples of the grammaticalization process of *saada* throughout the different periods of Old Literary Estonian (Trigel, Habicht 2012; Habicht, Trigel 2014). They also discuss the influence of German on the lexical meanings of the verb *saada*: as a result of language contact, the German verb *werden* influenced the Estonian verb *saada* and its usage and meaning in different constructions. Their survey also offers an adequate summary of resultative constructions and their variation at different times. Habicht and Trigel (2012 : 1386) claim that no examples of the relative construction can be found in old written Estonian, and argue that the first examples of the relative construction appear in the middle of the nineteenth century (6a). They see this as an evidence

of the later development of the elative construction, while the translative construction is frequent in old written Estonian.

- (6a) *agga temma-st peab mees s a - m a!*
but he-ELA must-3sg man get-INF2
'but he must become a man!'

Erelt and Metslang (2004 : 261) point out that the elative construction cannot yet be found in — typically German-influenced — 1890s Estonian. On the other hand, they continue, it was common in the 1930s, when Estonian language development followed the model of Finnish. According to Erelt and Metslang (2004 : 261–262), at an earlier stage the elative construction was used mainly to denote changes in people, but later its usage expanded. Present-day usage includes changes in inanimate objects, events, actions, and abstract concepts. Notably, all the examples given by Erelt and Metslang have the verb *saada* as their predicate.

The translative construction occurs frequently in old written Estonian. Tragel and Habicht (2012 : 1387) point out that the change denoted may concern mental and physical states, and that due to the religious content of the texts these usually involve abstract, mental changes of state, such as *õndsa-ks* [blissful-TRAN] *saa-ma* [get-INF2] 'become blissful'.

In older written Estonian, the verb *saada* is mainly used in resultative constructions and future constructions, which can be regarded as the result of German influence; later its use expands to other construction types as well (Habicht, Tragel 2014 : 841). Despite the dominance of *saada* in Estonian elative constructions, *tulla* occurs already in old written Estonian: *kurbdussest rõõm jälle tulleb* 'misery becomes joy again', 'after misery comes joy again' (P 1739 : 569) (Erelt 2005 : 24⁸). It should be noted that in this example from 1739 the verb *tulla* appears, somewhat controversially, in the elative construction, which was not supposed to occur until the early twentieth century (see above).

2.3. General features of the BECOME-construction

Different BECOME-constructions are connected to different periods of time, but it is difficult to track the more precise timing of the changes that have taken place, within languages and cross-linguistically. Nevertheless, the constructions discussed here have recognizable syntactic and structural counterparts in the Indo-European languages. German in particular has provided interesting examples from both the Finnish and the Estonian perspective. BECOME-resultatives have traditionally been expressed in German by a *werden*-construction (*der Winter wird kalt*). The morphosyntactic structure of the Finnish and Estonian BECOME-construction is clearly recognizable: the pre-verbal argument illustrates the starting point, and is followed by a verb indicating resultativity. The third argument, positioned after a verb, indicates the result. Even if Finnish and Estonian resultative constructions are at least partly adopted from other languages, however, they also include obvious non-loan features: the relations between the elements are indicated by case-marking.

The nominative construction known both in Finnish and Estonian (*Kastike tuli suolainen* 'The sauce became salty') is an exception to the complex system of case variation in BECOME-constructions. This nominative construc-

⁸ Mati Erelt; personal communication from Pille Penjam.

tion fully corresponds to the resultative constructions of German and other Indo-European languages (as for example in the English variant above). This is not unexpected, as German in particular has influenced Finnish and Estonian syntactic structures (see e.g. Itkonen 1966; for old written Finnish see Häkkinen 1994 : 473; for old written Estonian, see Trigel, Habicht 2012 on parallels between Estonian case-marking and German resultatives). On the other hand, German has also strongly influenced Swedish (e.g. Pettersson 2005 : 136, 139). There have been no significant studies of the correspondences of the clause types and constructions discussed here between the Germanic languages and Finnish or Estonian.

Based on a very few reports in earlier studies, the translative construction is known in both Old Literary Finnish and Old Literary Estonian since the very beginnings of the written language; these earlier studies have not estimated the more specific age of either the translative or the elative construction. Ereht (2005) notes that the elative construction appears only late. In the light of our data, it is interesting to view the development of the BECOME-constructions from the Finnish perspective. The choice of the construction is also dependent at least in part on semantic restrictions, which are discussed in the following section.

The BECOME-construction, and the resultative clause type as its context, require certain verbs. In Finnish BECOME-constructions we find only the verb *tulla*. In collecting our data we searched for the verb *saada* in BECOME-constructions in the text data from the 16th to 19th century, but did not find any. This total absence of *saada* in Finnish BECOME-constructions is an interesting feature. From the perspective of the present-day language, the verbs *tulla* and *saada* have different and specific meanings. In Finnish too, however, we can find cases in which these two verbs are very close in meaning (*aamu saa ~ aamu tulee* 'the morning arrives ~ comes'; for the similarities of *tulla* and *saada* in certain participial constructions see Ikola, Palomäki, Koitto 1989 : 454–466; for verbs used in resultative clauses in other Finnic languages see Norvik 2013). The verb *tulla* seems to be construction-specific in Finnish; in Estonian, *tulla* and *saada* can occur more freely in similar contexts and constructions. In Finnish, *tulla* can be used to express positive, negative or neutral changes, while Estonian *tulla* and *saada* have more specific restrictions (see section 2.4 below).

2.4. Semantic restrictions

Vilkuna (2000 : 158) characterizes the contrast between the Finnish elative and translative constructions as interesting (*Koira-sta tuli vihainen — Koira tuli vihaise-ksi* 'The dog became angry'). According to Vilkuna, despite their closeness these constructions have slightly different meanings; however, she does not give any further explanation. Likewise the "Iso suomen kielioppi" (ISK), the latest and most extensive descriptive grammar of Finnish, notes certain semantic aspects of these constructions. According to the ISK, the elative construction expresses the emergence of a new entity or class, rather than a change in an already existing one. A predicative is possible only in cases where a referent does not change but rather develops into something (*Leivonnaisi-sta tuli suussa sulavia, *Leivonnaiset tulivat suussa sulavi-ksi* 'The cakes became delicious') (ISK § 904). In an earlier descriptive grammar,

Hakulinen and Karlsson (1979 : 98) label this kind of case as ungrammatical: **Kakku tuli likilaskuise-ksi* 'The cake became flat'; **Tämä tulee hyvä-ksi kirja-ksi* 'This will become a good book'. The semantic difference between the grammatical elative construction and the ungrammatical translative one becomes obvious when they describe time-consuming processes: *Avioliitto-sta tuli pitkä*, **Avioliitto tuli pitkä-ksi* 'The marriage became long'; *Kokoukse-sta tuli vaikea*, **Kokous tuli vaikeaksi* 'The meeting became difficult' (ISK § 904).

The difference between the elative and translative construction can be seen at the level of the noun class: a substantive predicative clearly favors the elative construction (*Hänestä tulee laulaja*) (ISK § 904). In Modern Finnish, clauses such as **Hän tulee laulaja-ksi* 'S/he will become a singer' or **Poika ei tullut opettaja-ksi* 'The boy did not become a teacher' seem awkward (except for the construction type mentioned in footnote 6). This construction seems acceptable in Modern Finnish only when the post-verbal argument is an adjective, but there is another restriction: the subject NP cannot represent the result. Compare **Kakku tuli likilaskuise-ksi* 'The cake became flat'; **Kirja ei tule hyväksi* 'The book does not become good'. The result, however, can be coded as a subject if the meaning of the adjective allows it: for example, clauses such as *Kakku / talo / palapeli tuli valmiiksi / kootuksi* 'The cake / house / puzzle became ready / finished' are entirely normal (cf. the adverbial in *Kakku / talo / palapeli tuli kuntoon*).

The translative construction implies that the result will be temporary, non-permanent. This also restricts the meaning of the adjective, in other words the permanence of the result expressed by the adjective. Therefore, *Poika tulee iloiseksi* 'The boy becomes happy' is fully grammatical, whereas **Poika tulee iso-ksi* 'The boy becomes big' would not be acceptable in Modern Finnish. When referring to a permanent change, the elative construction is chosen: *Poja-sta tulee / on tullut iso* 'The boy will become / has become big'; *Poja-sta tuli vahva* 'The boy became strong'.

Semantic restrictions on resultative constructions in Estonian are discussed by Ereht (2005). Ereht (2005 : 23) analyzes elative constructions (*Rehepapi-st sai / tuli hea raamat* 'Rehepapp became a good book') and the intranslative clauses mentioned above (*See raamat tuli hea* 'This book became good'), and concludes that they share certain central features: they both imply that the referent has emerged as the final result of the process. Trägel and Habicht (2012; 2014) also pay attention to the semantic restrictions on the use of translative resultative constructions. Trägel and Habicht (2012 : 1386) point out that even if the translative construction in general is the most productive resultative construction, there are nevertheless restrictions on its use: it is normally not used in cases in which the change cannot be considered the result of an intentional action on the part of the change experiencer (**Poiss a-i kurjategija-ks* 'The boy became a criminal'), nor can it be used with processes intended as neutral (**Puu-d s a-i-d sügise-l värvilise-ks* 'In fall the trees became colorful').

The use of the verb *saada* in BECOME-constructions is strongly influenced by the meaning: Trägel and Habicht (2012) point out that the use of *saada* is connected in particular to a sense of success. Basically, it is acceptable in changes "where the experiencer of change intentionally and consciously desires the change, i.e., the action must be successful, the state resulting from the change is normally desired and under the control of the experiencer."

Thus falling ill and getting well cannot be expressed by identical constructions with regard to either the verb or the argument, as their examples demonstrate: *Ma saa-n terve-ks* [I get-1SG well-TRAN] 'I will get well', but not **Ma saa-n haige-ks* [I get-1SG ill-TRAN] 'I will get ill'. A different verb is applied when expressing unsuccessful or undesired change, such as getting sick, where the verb normally used in the same construction the verb *jääma* 'to stay, to remain' would be chosen instead (Tragel, Habicht 2012 : 1383).

Overall, the nature of the change influences possibilities and restrictions in choosing the BECOME-construction. Whether the change leading to the result is gradual or sudden, and whether the change is permanent or temporal, seem to be some of the factors. In Estonian, the choice of verb is guided by the positivity, neutrality and/or negativity of the change.

3. BECOME-constructions of the study from the diachronic and the contrastive viewpoint

3.1. Individual overview of each BECOME-construction

3.1.1. Translative construction

In our Finnish data for sixteenth-century written language, the clearly dominant BECOME-construction is the one in which a typical pre-verbal argument is a nominative subject and the argument following the verb *tulla* is a predicative adverbial in the translative case (*Poika* [boy.NOM] *tuli opettaja-ksi* [teacher-TRAN] / *iloise-ksi* [happy-TRAN] 'The boy became a teacher / happy'). This type is still a clause type in Modern Finnish, but an adjective is now the only possible post-verbal argument; thus **Poika tuli opettaja-ksi* 'The boy became a teacher' is today unconventional or even ungrammatical, whereas *Poika tuli iloise-ksi* 'The boy became happy' is not only correct but also the primary option.

Unlike Modern Finnish, in Old Literary Finnish and early Modern Finnish we find translative constructions with substantives as post-verbal arguments expressing the result, but there are fewer translative constructions than elative ones during the earlier period as well. Out of 240 BECOME-resultatives in the data for 1548–1848, fewer than forty are translative constructions (with a substantive as the translative argument). We can thus assume that the frequency of the translative construction does not vary notably from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century (each of the three data subsets contains 12–13 cases out of eighty). From the perspective of Modern Finnish, all occurrences of translative + substantive are odd; examples are given in (8a–d) below. However, these translative constructions have recognizable features of biblical language and of religious texts in general, and are therefore somewhat familiar even today (9). They all concern transformation into a concrete material.

- (8a) *Ja me toimelisexi ihmisi-xi* [people-TRANS] *tulema*
 'We become active people'
 (8b) *Sine olet opettaja-x* [teacher-TRANS] *tullut*
 'You have become a teacher'
 (8c) *mies tuli kälmi-ksi* [rogue-TRANS]
 'a man became a rogue'

- (8d) *Yxi susi tuli munki-ksi* [monk-TRANS]
 'One wolf become a monk'
 (9a) *Ja se sana tuli liha-xi* [flesh-TRANS]
 'And the word was made flesh'
 (9b) *ia ne caxi tuleuat yhdeksi liha-xi* [flesh-TRANS]
 'and those two become one flesh'
 (9c) *nemet kiuet leiu-xi* [bread-TRANS] *tulisit*
 'these stones become bread'

The examples in (8a–8d) could be modernized by replacing the translativ constructions with elative ones and using the predicative instead (e.g. *Me tulemme toiminnallisi-ksi ihmisi-ksi* > *Mei-stä tulee toimellisi-a ihmisi-ä* 'We become active people', *Sinä olet opettaja-ksi tullut* > *Sinu-sta on tullut opettaja* 'You have become a teacher'. The examples in (9a–9c) could be adjusted by changing the verb: *Sana tuli lihaksi* > *Sana muuttu liha-ksi* 'A word changed into meat'.

Most of the BECOME-constructions with the verb *tulla* are ones where the result is coded as a (adjectival) predicative adverbial. Unlike the examples in (8a–8d) and (9a–9c), those in (10a–10d) are in accordance with Modern Finnish. In contrast to Finnish, Estonian translativ arguments are more flexible, even though certain specific restrictions apply (see above).

- (10a) *se waimo tuli terve-xi* [healthy-TRANS]
 'that wife became healthy'
 (10b) *tulee se punaise-ksi* [red-TRANS] *kuin veri*
 'it becomes red like blood'
 (10c) *tulee niitten suu kipiä-xi* [sore-TRANS]
 'their mouth(s) become sore'
 (10d) *se oikein täydellise-ksi ja hyvältä maistuva-ksi*
 [perfect-TRANS and goodtasting-TRANS] *tulee*
 'it becomes really full and delicious'

3.1.2. Elative construction

In the oldest data subset, that for sixteenth-century written Finnish, there are no BECOME-constructions with a pre-verbal elative argument followed by the verb *tulla* and a predicative in nominative (*Poja-sta tulee opettaja / iloinen* 'The boy will become a teacher / happy'). This construction has been assumed to be rare in old written Finnish, and the assumption is thus confirmed: in the light of our data, the construction was entirely unknown in sixteenth-century literary Finnish (the oldest form of written Finnish). It is interesting to note that in Modern Finnish this particular construction type is extremely frequent.

Written language evolved slowly during the Old Literary Finnish period. The BECOME-construction including a predicative appears in the written language in the seventeenth century, but its occurrence is sporadic. At turn of the eighteenth century this construction type seems to have become more frequent, but the number of cases is still rather insignificant. In the data for approximately the years 1750–1800, seven out of eighty BECOME-resultatives are elative constructions. It is interesting that in all cases the elative argument of the construction is a demonstrative (11a–11d):

- (11a) *s i j - t ä* [it-ELA] *tulee woide*
 'it will become a balm'
- (11b) *s i i - t ä* [it-ELA] *tulee salvu, jolla se kapinen hevonen wojellaan*
 'it will become an ointment, which the sick horse will be treated with'
- (11c) *s i i - t ä* [it-ELA] *tulee väkevä lipiä*
 'it will become strong lye'
- (11d) *s i i - t ä* [it-ELA] *tulee hyvä kana munimaan*
 'it will become a good hen for laying'

When we move on towards Modern Finnish, the number of cases of this type increases slightly. The data for nineteenth-century newspaper language contains nine elative constructions (again out of eighty), making the type still rare compared to its frequency today. In the nineteenth-century data, only four occurrences have a pronoun (demonstrative or relative) as the elative argument, which was the only possibility in the earlier era; in all other cases it is a substantive (12a–12d):

- (12a) *Mut ellei a s i a - s t a* [thing-ELA] *tule mitään*
 'But if the case is going nowhere'
- (12b) *Tulisi myös usioita jaloja kirjaintekijöitä koulujen*
o p e t t a j - i - s t a [teacher-PL.ELA]
 'The schoolteachers would become noble makers of books'
- (12c) *Kolmannesta p o j a - s t a* [son-ELA] *tuli voimallinen mies*
 'The third son became a strong man'

The examples from the eighteenth and nineteenth century (11–12) are fully acceptable in Modern Finnish (putting aside word order). Certainly in (11c) and (11d) the pronoun as the elative argument seems to be unnecessary: *s i i - t ä tulee väkevä lipiä* 'It will become strong lye' (seventeenth century) > *lipiä - s t ä tulee väkevä* 'The lye will become strong' (Modern Finnish). The arguments of the syntactic construction are reorganized. From a present-day perspective, all the examples in (11–12) feature a substantive predicative. Adjective predicatives common today (*Pojasta tuli iloinen* 'The boy became happy') are not found in the data for Old Written or Early Modern Finnish. We can conclude that both the elative construction and adjective predicatives have increased explosively during the twentieth century, if not earlier.

Tragel and Habicht (2012 : 1386) have shown that the elative construction, while it is the less common of the BECOME-constructions, does occur in Estonian dialects. Our Finnish data, however, indicate that this type is apparently very young in Finnish, and was probably not (at any rate widely) known in the spoken language before it appeared in written Finnish.

3.1.3. Nominative construction

The third BECOME-construction type in our study is the nominative construction, in which the verb in Finnish is again *tulla* (*Kastike tuli suolainen* 'The sauce became salty'); in Estonian both *tulla* and *saada* are acceptable, but due to some semantic restrictions they are not always interchangeable. In Finnish this construction has always been rare, nor is it neutral or common today either. Our Finnish data contain two such BECOME-constructions, in

which the pre-verbal argument expressing change and the post-verbal argument expressing the result are in grammatical cases: the pre-verbal subject in the nominative and the post-verbal predicative in either the nominative or the partitive. Both examples are from the nineteenth-century newspaper data (14a–14b):

- (14a) *Jotta usiampi paperi arki-sta tehdään, sitä s o u k e m p i* [thin-NOM. COMP] *tulee kirja*
'The more paper [i.e. pages] each sheet is turned into, the slimmer the book will be'
- (14b) *Ja erinomaista on että sama mies toimittaa usiaa työtä — ja k a i k k i* [all-NOM] *tulee hyvää*
'And it is excellent that the same man performs several tasks — and all becomes good'

Interestingly, this type is neutral and productive in Modern Estonian (*Nädalavahetus tuleb soe* 'The weekend will become warm'; *See plaad saab hea* 'This album becomes good').⁹ the nominative construction is a more direct loan from the Germanic languages, and Estonian has adopted this loan construction more fully. This construction type is interpreted as being more result-oriented than the relative construction. The nature of the changing process influences the choice between the verbs *tulla* and *saada*: *tulla* is used with changes implying that the result is known and recognized from the beginning, whereas *saada* refers to the process in the making. The post-verbal argument referring to the result is always an adjective.

3.2. BECOME-constructions in Agricola's New Testament compared to subsequent Finnish Bible translations and to Estonian ones

We compared our oldest data subset (Mikael Agricola's AUT 1548) to later Finnish Bible translations (B 1642; B 1776; R 1938; R 1992), as well as to Estonian translations from various times (PUT 1680–1705; PUT 1715; P 1739; P 1997). Our aim was to observe changes in BECOME-constructions: how long do the BECOME-constructions introduced by Agricola remain in the written language during later centuries? What trends can be observed? Do these comparisons reveal alternative expressions? In what ways do earlier Finnish translations correspond to Estonian ones, and how do they differ?

As noted above, translative constructions may have remained unchanged in set phrases in religious language from one translation to the next, until the time of Modern Finnish translations. This concerns in particular those instances in which the result argument is a substantive (15a–15b), but an adjective is possible as well (15c). These expressions have remained almost unchanged throughout different versions in Estonian as well (16a–16b).

- (15a) *ia caxi t u l e u a t* [become-3PL] *yhdeksi lihaksi* (AUT Mk 10:7)
Ja niin t u l e v a t [become-3PL] *kaksi yhdeksi lihaksi* (B 1776 Mk-10:8)
Ja ne kaksi t u l e v a t [become-3PL] *yhdeksi lihaksi* (R 1938 Mk 10:8)
niin että nämä kaksi t u l e v a t [become-3PL] *yhdeksi lihaksi* (R 1992 Mk 10:8)
'And they twain shall be one flesh'

⁹ Examples collected from Facebook, May 2014.

- (15b) *Ja se sana t u l i* [become-PST.3SG] *Lihaxi* (AUT Jh 1:14)
Ja Sana t u l i [become-PST.3SG] *lihaksi* (B 1776 Jh 1:14)
Ja Sana t u l i [become-PST.3SG] *lihaksi* (R 1938 Jh 1:14)
Sana t u l i [become-PST.3SG] *lihaksi* (R 1992 Jh 1:14)
 'And the Word was made flesh'
- (15c) *Nin viimeiset t u l e v a t* [become-3PL] *ensimeisix ia ensimeiset wime-*
six (AUT Mt 20:16)
Niin viimeiset t u l e v a t [become-3PL] *ensimmäisiksi ja viimeiset en-*
simmäisiksi (B 1776 Mt 20:16)
Näin viimeiset t u l e v a t [become-3PL] *ensimmäisiksi ja ensimmäiset*
viimeisiksi (R 1938 Mt 20:16)
Näin viimeiset t u l e v a t [become-3PL] *ensimmäisiksi ja ensimmäiset*
viimeisiksi (R 1992 Mt 20:16)
 'So the last shall be first, and the first last'

Fixed phrases and constructions form a rather narrow category of special cases. From a contrastive perspective, of particular interest are the adjectives in the translative construction, which in theory could have remained unchanged from the sixteenth century down to Modern Finnish. However, this has not happened, except for fixed expressions. The changes that have taken place in Agricola's translative constructions are diverse, as is their timing; typically the translative construction prevails down to the eighteenth-century translation, and changes in the one from 1938. A common change is replacement of the verb: *tulla* is replaced by another verb with resultative meaning, and at the same time by a more synthetic expression (e.g. *tulla mauttomaksi* 'become tasteless' > *menettää makunsa* 'to lose its taste'; *tulla eläväksi* 'become alive' > *virota* 'be revived'). A separate category consists of cases in which a former *tulla* + translative construction is replaced with a deverbal (*t*)*U*-derivative suffix (e.g. *tuli parannetuksi* 'became healed' > *oli parantunut* 'was healed'; *tulla vapaaksi / autuaaksi* 'become free / blessed' > *pelastua* 'be rescued / saved'; *tuli puhtaaksi* 'became pure' > *puhdistui* 'was purified').

When it comes to translative constructions with *tulla*, we find abundant variation over the centuries; what these have in common is that by the time of the 1992 translation those with an post-verbal adjective have been replaced and rephrased, except for fixed phases. It is noteworthy that the translative constructions used by Agricola were never replaced with the relative construction. This could be explained by semantic restrictions. How the choice of a particular BECOME-construction is affected by the context, and what type of context, are interesting questions, which require further research.

Early Finnish and Estonian Bible translations correspond to each other except for the choice of verb: in Finnish the verb is *tulla*, in Estonian it is *saada* (compare examples 15b–15c and 16a–16b). *Tulla* does not occur in these syntactic constructions in Estonian. In the earliest Estonian translation (16b), the construction is different (a more direct translation from the German *werden / waren sein*), but the verb *saada* is nevertheless used as a predicate verb. We also find *saada* + *olla* with a nominative predicative, with *is* a clear future implication.

- (16a) *Ning se Sonna s a i j e* [become-PST.3SG] *lehaks* (PUT 1686 Jh 1:14)
Ja se Sanna s a i [become-PST.3SG] *Lihhaks* (PUT 1715 Jh 1:14)

Ja se Sanna s a i [become-PST.3SG] *Lihhaks* (P 1739 Jh 1:14)

Ja Sõna s a i [become-PST.3SG] *lihaks* (P 1997 Jh 1:14)

'And the Word was made flesh'

(16b) *Nida s a h w a* [become-3PL] *ne wihtmässe eddimässe ollema* (PUT 1686 Mt 20:16)

Ninda s a w a d [become-3PL] *wiimsed esimesseks ja esimesed wiimseks* (PUT 1715 Mt 20:16)

Nenda s a w a d [become-3PL] *need viimsed esimeseks ja need esimesed wiimseks* (P 1739 Mt 20:16)

Nõnda s a a v a d [become-3PL] *viimased esimesteks ja esimesed jäävad viimasteks* (P 1997 Mt 20:16)

'So the last shall be first, and the first last'

Estonian Bible translations may also use other verbs, as shown in (17a). Occasionally in the early translations, the Estonian equivalents of the Finnish *tulla*-construction are verb chains, with either the predicate verb *peab* 'must' or *saab* 'will, can' and the infinitive *olema* 'be' (17b).

(17a) Finnish 1548: *ia Lepi tule pahema-xi* (AUT Mk 2:21)

ja se Auk l ä h h e b [get-3SG] *kurjama-ks* (PUT 1715 Mk 2:21)

ja auk l ä h h e b [get-3SG] *veel suuremaks* (P 1997 Mk 2:21)

'And the rent is made worse'

(17b) Finnish 1548: *hen tulepi swre-xi herran edhes* (AUT Lk 1:15)

Sest temma s a h p [get-3SG] *suhr o l l e m a* *Issanda ees* (PUT 1680 Lk 1:15)

Sest temma p e a b [must-3SG] *Issanda ees suur o l e m a* (PUT 1715 Lk 1:15)

sest ta s a a b [get-3SG] *suureks* *Issanda silmis* (P 1997 Lk 1:15)

'For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord'

In early German and Swedish Bible translations, the verbs corresponding to Finnish *tulla* and Estonian *saada* are connected to *werden* 'become' in Modern German (18a, 19a). It should be noted that in Swedish translations the verb *warda* (historically the same as German *werden*) is replaced with the verb *bliva* 'become' in the 1998 translation at the latest (18b—18d, 19b—19c).

(18a) *Und das Wort w a r d Fleisch* (DB 1545 Jh 1:14)

(18b) *och Ordet w a r d kött* (GVB 1541 Jh 1:14)

(18c) *Och Ordet v a r t kött* (SB 1917 Jh 1:14)

(18d) *Och Ordet b l e v kött* (SFB 1998 Jh 1:14)

'And the Word was made flesh'

(19a) *Also w a r d e n die Letzten die Ersten, und die Ersten die Letzten s e i n* (DB 1545 Mt 20:6)

(19b) *Altså w a r d a the ytterste the fremste, och the fremste the ytterste* (GVB 1541 Mt 20:6)

(19c) *Så skola de sista b l i v a de första, och de första b l i v a de sista* (SB 1917 Mt 20:6)

'So the last shall be first, and the first last'

4. Conclusions

Comparing on the one hand old written languages and modern ones, on the other Finnish and Estonian, gives us valuable insights into BECOME-constructions and their use and frequency patterns. The influence of Indo-European languages on both Finnish and Estonian is obvious. Semantic restrictions have played and continue to play an important role in the choice of constructions.

Our findings indicate that the BECOME-construction in old written Finnish corresponds to that in old written Estonian: the translative construction was the dominant type (*Poika tulee opettaja-ksi*), and the elative type has appeared relatively late in both languages. In Modern Finnish, the elative construction is the most common BECOME-construction (*Poja-sta tuli mies*). (In resultative constructions in general, as already noted in earlier studies, the elative construction is typical in Finnish and the translative in Estonian. However, when we take into account the semantic constraints on each type — particularly the nature of the change involved and the noun class of the arguments — the picture is far from clear. In Estonian the nominative construction can also be used, but in Modern Finnish the nominative construction is not available; grammars describe it as 'archaic'.

The result of a change can be expressed with three different BECOME-constructions, but they are by no means identical in their use. The choice of construction is constrained by semantic restrictions and by the word class of the potential arguments expressing the result, and the possibilities and restrictions are furthermore different in Finnish and Estonian. In the Finnish translative construction, a substantive is not a possible post-verbal argument, while an adjective is a typical argument. In Estonian, the same restrictions on noun class do not apply in the translative construction. In the elative construction, a post-verbal adjective referring to the result is possible only in Finnish but not in Estonian — in the nominative construction, on the other hand, an adjective is the only option (*See raamat t u l i hea*). Unlike Finnish, in Estonian elative constructions a plural NP triggers agreement (*Poistest said mehed*).

In the future, we hope to investigate when more precisely the elative construction made its breakthrough. This is particularly interesting in Finnish, as the switch from the translative to the elative has been quite dramatic. In Estonian, the change is considered to have taken place around the 1930s. The functions and meanings of the verbs *tulla* and *saada* are similar and yet not identical in Finnish and Estonian. More thorough cross-linguistic investigation of the relationship between *saada* and *tulla* is needed, not only in BECOME-constructions but in other construction and clause types as well.

Authors

Hanna Jokela
University of Tartu
E-mail: hanna.jokela@ut.ee

Kirsi-Maria Nummila
University of Turku
E-mail: kirsi-maria.nummila@utu.fi

Abbreviations

AP — adjective phrase, **ELA** — elative, **INF1** — A/DA-infinitive, **INF2** — MA-infinitive, **COMP** — comparative, **NEG** — negation, **NOM** — nominative, **NP** — nominal phrase, **PART** — partitive, **PASS** — passive, **PL** — plural, **PST** — past tense, **TRAN** — translative, **SG** — singular, **3SG** — 3rd person singular.

Research data: Agricola 1548 — Mikael Agricolan teosten kielen morfosyntaktinen tietokanta. Turun yliopisto. Kotimaisten kielten keskus. http://www.utu.fi/fi/yksikot/hum/yksikot/suomi-sgr/tutkimus/tutkimushankkeet/agricolan_tietokanta/Sivut/home.aspx; **AUT 1548** — Uus Testament 1548. Faksimile, Helsinki 1986 (Mikael Agricolan Teokset II); **B 1642** — Biblia, Se on: Coco Pyhä Ramattu, Suomexi, Stockholm 1642; **B 1776** — Biblia, se on: koko Pyhä Raamattu suomexi, Turku 1776; **DB 1545** — Die Deutsche Bibel 1545, Weimar [1929–1961] (D. Martin Luthers Werke); **Ganander 1763–1788** — Vanhan kirjasuomen korpus. Kotimaisten kielten keskus. http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/vks/meta/ganander/ganander_coll_rdf.xml; **GVB 1541** — Biblia, Thet är, All then Helgha Scrifft, på Swensk, Upsala 1541; **P 1739** — Piibli Raamat, Tallinn 1739; **P 1997** — Piibel 1997, Tallinn; **PUT 1680–1705** — Põhjaeestikeelsed Uue Testamendi tõlked 1680–1705 (Luuika evangeelium, Apostolide teod), Tallinn 2007; **PUT 1715** — Uus Testament 1715. Faksimile, Tallinn 2004; **R 1938** — Pyhä Raamattu. Uusi Testamentti, Pieksämäki 1938; **R 1992** — Pyhä Raamattu. Uusi Testamentti, Helsinki 1992; **SB 1917** — Svenska Bibeln, Stockholm 1917; **SFB 1998** — Svenska Folkbibeln, Stockholm 1998; **Suometar 1847–1848** — Varhaisnykysuomen korpus. Kotimaisten kielten keskus. http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/1800/meta/smtr/smtr_coll_rdf.xml.

ISK — A. Hakulinen, M. Vilkuna, R. Korhonen, V. Koivisto, T. R. Heinonen, I. Alho, Iso suomen kielioppi, Helsinki 2004.

LITERATURE

- Andraae, G. 1654, Christilinen Rwmis-Sarna, Turusa.
- de Smit, M. 2006, Language Contact and Structural Change. An Old Finnish Case Study, Stockholm (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis 228. Studia Fennica Stockholmiensia 9).
- Erelt, M. 2005, Source-Marking Resultatives in Estonian. — LU XLI, 20–29.
- Erelt, M., Metslang, H. 2006, Estonian Clause Patterns — from Finno-Ugric to Standard Average European. — LU XLII, 254–266.
- Forsman Svensson, P. 2011, Virtuaalinen vanha kirjasuomi. Sijamuotojen käytöstä (30.3.3). http://www.helsinki.fi/vvks/lauseoppi/sijamuotojen_kaytosta/index.html.
- Habicht, K., Tragel, I. 2014, Verbiga *saama* väljendatud leksikaalsed kategooriad ja konstruktsioonid. — KK, 826–843.
- Hakulinen, A., Karlsson, F. 1979, Nykysuomen lauseoppia, Helsinki.
- Herlin, I., Honkanen, S. 2001, Intransitiiviverbit. — Roolit ja rakenteet. Henkilöviitteinen allatiivi Biblian verbikonstruktioissa, Helsinki (SKST 813), 343–370.
- Häkkinen, K. 1994, Agricolasta nykysuomeen, Helsinki.
- Ikola, O. 2001, Nykysuomen opas, Turku (Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 65).
- Ikola, O., Palomäki U., Koitto A.-K. 1989, Suomen murteiden lauseoppia ja tekstikielioppia, Helsinki (SKST 511).
- Itkonen, E. 1966, Kieli ja sen tutkimus, Helsinki.
- Kelomäki, T. 1997, Ekvatiivilause, Helsinki.
- Norvik, M. 2013, Future Time Reference in the Finnic Language: LEE(NE)-Verbs. — JSFOU 94, 125–164.
- Pajusalu, R., Tragel, I. 2007, Word and Construction as Units of Categorization: the Case of Change Predicates in Estonian. — Mental States: Evolution, Function, Nature, Amsterdam, 289–310.
- Pajusalu, R., Tragel, I., Veismann, A., Vija, M. 2004, Tuumsõnade semantikat ja pragmatikat, Tartu (Tartu Ülikooli Üldkeeleteaduse Õppetooli Toimetised 5).

- Penjam, P. 2006, *Tulema*-verbi grammatilised funktsioonid eesti kirjakeeles. — КК, 33—41.
- Pettersson, G. 2005, *Svenska språket under sjuhundra år. En historia om svenskan och dess utforskande*, Lund.
- Pälsi, M. 2000, Finnish Resultative Sentences. — SKY Journal of Linguistics 13, Helsinki, 211—250.
- Rätsep, H. 1978, Eesti keele lihtlauseste tüübid, Tallinn (Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Emakeele Seltsi Toimetised 12).
- Tragel, I., Habicht, K. 2012, Grammaticalization of the Estonian *saama* 'to get'. — Linguistics 50, 1371—1412.
- Vilkuna, M. 2000, Suomen lauseopin perusteet, Helsinki.

ХАННА ЙОКЕЛА (Тарту), КИРСИ-МАРИЯ НУММИЛА (Турку)

**КОНСТРУКЦИИ С ГЛАГОЛАМИ 'СТАТЬ, СТАНОВИТЬСЯ'
В ФИНСКОМ И ЭСТОНСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ.
ДИАХРОНИЧЕСКИЙ И КОНТРАСТИВНЫЙ ПОДХОДЫ**

В финском и эстонском языках имеются различные синтаксические конструкции, выражающие становление или переход из одного состояния в другое. В состав таких конструкций входят глаголы *tulla/tulema* 'прийти, приходиться' и *saada/saama* 'получить, получать'. В статье рассматриваются три типа конструкций с *tulla* или с *saada*. Основное различие между ними в морфологическом плане заключается в вариации и в выборе употребляемых падежных форм (элатив, транслатив и номинатив). На выбор той или иной конструкции оказывали и оказывают влияние ограничения, обусловленные семантикой.

Особенности употребления и частотность этих конструкций предположительно связаны с определенным временем. В разные периоды предпочтение отдавалось тем или иным типам конструкций. Сравнение финского и эстонского литературных языков между собой позволяет предполагать, что варьирование в употреблении конструкций в них имеет, по крайней мере частично, разные источники. Расхождение обусловлено и тем, что финский и эстонский языки испытали влияние разных индоевропейских языков.

При описании рассматриваемых конструкций обращается особое внимание на их употребление в финском и эстонском письменных языках. Для более полного описания их сравнивается материал ранних и современных письменных языков, с одной стороны, и двух языков, эстонского и финского, с другой.