Uralic Essive and the Expression of Impermanent State
(Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017, 555 pages)

Satu Manninen

This volume, edited by Casper de Groot, provides a typological survey of the essive case in Uralic languages. Several Uralic languages are thought to have a distinct essive case marker that is used to express impermanent states lasting for a limited period of time; see (1a). The essive can contrast with other cases, such as the nominative, which is used to express more permanent states (1b), and the translative, which is used to indicate a change of state (1c):

(1) a. *Mary is ill*-ESSIVE   Impermanent state
     b. *Mary is ill*-NOMINATIVE   Permanent state
     c. *Mary became ill*-TRANSLATIVE   Change of state

Although there is plenty of previous work on case in Uralic, no systematic description of the essive case marker exists. When the essive is discussed in the linguistic literature, reference is nearly always made to Finnish and/or to Hungarian where the marker is said to be associated with meanings such as '(be) as', '(be) in the capacity of' and 'while' (e.g., *I work as a teacher in Paris; While (I was) a teacher in Paris, I often visited the Eiffel Tower*). The same is true of many well-known linguistic dictionaries and glossaries; see e.g. Crystal, 2008; Essive, 2018).

In Finnish grammars, the essive is traditionally treated as an abstract locative case; see e.g. Hakulinen (1978), Vilkuna (1996), Hakulinen et al. (2004). It is argued to have developed from an originally more concrete locative case and be part of a case series, where the role of the essive was to express 'location' while the other two cases in the series – the partitive and the translative – expressed 'source' and 'goal/destination', respectively (Hakulinen, 1978:101-102, see also Koptjevskaja-Tamm, 2001:534). The present-day Finnish local or spatial case series are also often analyzed as having an 'essive' element in them, i.e. as being combinations of the two dimensions 'location' vs. 'source' vs. 'goal/destination' and 'in' vs. 'on' – see e.g. Hakulinen (1978:103-104):

	'in' / inner local case series	'on' / outer local case series
'location' 'static position'	Inessive *Talo-ssa* 'in the house'	Adessive *Lattia-lla* 'on the floor'
'source' 'motion from'	Elative *Talo-sta* 'from the house'	Ablative *Lattia-lta* 'from the floor'
'destination' 'motion to'	Illative *Talo-on* 'to the house'	Allative *Lattia-lle* 'to the floor'

Table 1: *Local / spatial case series in Finnish.*

In Hungarian, the local/spatial case series are also often assumed to contain an 'essive' element in them. Hungarian differs from Finnish in that it distinguishes between 'in' vs. 'on' vs. 'at' configurations and has therefore also a third set, containing the superessive, delative and sublative cases (Kiss 2002, Creissels 2008).

The purpose of this volume is to investigate if it is true that the essive is a common property of Uralic languages. It attempts to find out which contemporary Uralic languages have an essive case, and to see if it is possible to produce any unifying characterization of this case in Uralic (p. 2). The research has taken the morphological form as the starting point and attempted to provide a description of its function in as many Uralic languages as possible. If the language under investigation does not have a distinct essive case, then those forms or constructions have been described that are used in typically 'essive' functions in other Uralic languages.

Chapter 1 is an editorial introduction written by Casper de Groot. It gives the background of the Uralic essive project, states the aims, and presents the questionnaire that was used to collect the data from the different languages, with comments and illustrative examples. The questionnaire, without the comments and examples, is also available in the appendix. Chapters 2 through 20 discuss the distribution of the essive in 21 Uralic languages or major dialects, following the structure set up in the questionnaire (the back cover states that there are 19 languages but there are actually 21; two of the chapters discuss two languages each). Chapter 21, written by Casper de Groot, summarizes the discussion in a descriptive fashion and provides a linguistic typology of the essive, based on what has been said in the preceding chapters.

Looking at the questionnaire, one can only admire the devotion with which the authors have pursued their task. The questionnaire lists 10 main points or questions, all of which are divided further into sub-points or questions. Altogether, the authors have needed to take into consideration 71 or more sub-points or questions, when doing the background research, locating the relevant materials and data, choosing the examples, and writing the chapters. That each chapter has more or less the same structure and addresses the same points and data in more or less the same order helps the reader pay attention to the details without losing sight of the big picture. That the examples are glossed consistently using the same system helps facilitate comparisons between the languages. These are important qualities in a work of this kind.

In each individual chapter, section 1 is intended as a general introduction to the language under consideration. The authors identify the geographical area where the language is spoken and provide information about the number of speakers. They describe the data they have used for their investigation and motivate these choices; they provide general information about the case system of the language and comment on other grammatical properties that are of relevance; and they characterize the main uses of the essive (as opposed to the translative) case. Section 2 describes the distribution of the essive case in non-verbal main predications / copular constructions of the type *Mary is [a teacher/ill]*. The aim is to see if the language allows essive-marked predicative nominals and/or adjectives in such constructions, and if the essive is limited to any specific classes of nominals and/or adjectives. Another question often addressed in this section is if the essive can alternate with some other forms, such as the nominative case, to distinguish between impermanent or change-inclined states and permanent states. Section 3 focusses on the distribution of the essive form in optional secondary predications of the type *Mary ate the meat [naked/raw]*; an important issue is the relation between the essive-marked elements and depictives in the language. Section 4 looks at obligatory secondary predications / predicative complement constructions of the type *Mary considered the boys*

[fools/foolish], and the discussions often focus on the type of verbal predicates that allow essive and/or translative case-marked elements in such constructions. Section 5 discusses the distribution of the essive form in adverbials. One goal is to see if essive-marked elements can be used to express manner(-like) meanings, and if/how they can be separated from depictive essives (i.e., the equivalents of sentences such as *They recited the poem [happily/happy]*). Section 6 investigates possible temporal and/or locational readings of essive-marked elements in the language, i.e. if the essive form can be found in adverbial expressions such as *tomorrow, last Friday, this Easter, at home* and *far away.* This is an interesting question to ask, in view of the fact that the Uralic essive is originally a locative case. Section 7 investigates if the essive form can be found in comparative and simile expressions, i.e. in contexts such as *X is [bigger than Y]* and *X is [like/as Y]*. Section 8 returns to the distribution of the essive and the translative case, to see if these are two distinct forms with distinct functions in the language; if one of the forms is used for both of the functions; or if an entirely different element has become the marker of the 'essive', the 'translative' or both of the functions. In section 9, the authors discuss word order in the language, with special emphasis on whether there are any preferred positions for the essive-marked elements. Finally, in section 10, the authors have an opportunity to provide additional information that has not yet been covered in the previous sections of their chapter.

I will now review each of the individual chapters briefly, and conclude with comments on general issues. The first six chapters following the *Introduction* chapter investigate the distribution of the essive in languages belonging to the Finnic branch of the Finnic–Saami language group. It seems motivated to start with Finnic, because all these languages have an essive marker that is separate from the translative marker, and because they display the widest array of essive functions. In addition, because most previous accounts of the essive are based on Finnish, it is possible to build on what is already known. In chapter 2, Emmi Hynönen accounts for the distribution of the essive case in Finnish, a language with about 5 million speakers. She shows that the essive is allowed in non-verbal main predications (the *Mary is [a teacher/ill]*-type); in optional secondary predications (the *Mary ate the meat [naked/raw]*-type); and in obligatory secondary predications (the *Mary considered the boys [fools/foolish]*-type). When the essive can alternate with another form, such as the nominative case, its role is often to express a state that is impermanent or is likely to change. Although the nominative can also have impermanent readings, its main function is to denote properties and states that are viewed as being more permanent: while both (2a) and (2b) can mean that Maija is temporarily ill, only (2b) can mean that she is chronically ill:

(2)   a.   *Maija   on   sairaana.*
           Maija   is   ill.ESS
           'Maija is ill.'
      b.   *Maija   on   sairas.*
           Maija   is   ill.NOM
           'Maija is ill.'

Essive-marked elements are also shown to have adverbial interpretations of various kinds. In the section focusing on essive and translative case, Hynönen argues, in line with previous work, that these are two distinct forms in Finnish, with clearly distinct functions. The essive is used to express a (temporary) state, while the translative is used

to express "a state as a result of change" (p. 50). Essive- and translative-marked forms are also shown to occur in different contexts: essives are typically found with verbs referring to "stabile but changeable situations" (p. 50), translatives with "change-denoting" verbs (p. 50).

In chapter 3, Helle Metslang and Liina Lindström account for the distribution of the essive in Estonian, a language with approximately 1.1 million speakers. The authors show that the distribution of the essive differs in many ways from that in Finnish, partially because the essive was lost as a paradigmatic case during the formation of the Estonian language. Since its revival in the 19th and early 20th centuries, the essive has become productive in some of the functions that are of interest in the volume (e.g., in secondary predications of various kinds), but it remains almost absent in many of the older functions (e.g., in temporal and locational expressions). The essive also cannot be used to mark non-verbal main predicates in Estonian (i.e., the *Mary is [a teacher/ill]*-type). In such constructions, the translative case is used instead, to indicate that the state is viewed as "unstable, i.e. temporary or non-essential" (p. 66). The translative also contrasts with the nominative, which is viewed as the unmarked form. Although the translative is the more frequent case form in Estonian, having taken on many of the typically 'essive' functions, Metslang and Lindström argue that there is nevertheless a division of labour between these cases. The translative is used "mainly to mark the result of change, thus having a more dynamic meaning than the essive, which is used mainly for temporary or non-essential states without change" (p. 85).

In chapter 4, Elena Markus and Fedor Rozhanskiy discuss Votic, a language that is closely related to Estonian. Votic is on the verge of extinction, with less than five elderly speakers at the time of writing the chapter. Votic is reported to have a productive essive case that can be used in non-verbal main predications and in both optional and obligatory secondary predications. Essive forms can also be found in adverbial expressions of various kinds. In some contexts, the authors observe, the essive even appears to serve as a translation equivalent of the Russian instrumental case. Unlike in the other Finnic languages, as Markus and Rozhanskiy observe, the Votic essive is not associated with the impermanent vs. permanent state distinction, which means that the essive and the nominative sometimes seem to be in almost free variation (p. 97). As the authors note, the essive and the translative can also be used interchangeably in many contexts, although the translative is at the same time said to have retained its typical 'translative' function of indicating change of/in state (p. 110).

In chapter 5, the same authors Elena Markus and Fedor Rozhanskiy discuss Ingrian, which is spoken by about 50 elderly speakers. Ingrian is most closely related to Finnish and Karelian. Ingrian has a productive essive case – as the authors observe, it is the only Finnic language in which all the three cases from the original essive-translative-excessive series are still productive (p. 117). The essive can be found in non-verbal main predications, in optional secondary predications, and in obligatory secondary predications. To a limited extent, the essive can also be found in adverbial expressions of various kinds. Like the Votic essive, the Ingrian essive also seems in some contexts to serve as a translation equivalent to the Russian instrumental case. The Ingrian essive can contrast with the nominative, to distinguish between impermanent and permanent state readings. There are, however, contexts where the choice between the essive and the nominative is less clear (p. 120). Ingrian, as already noted, has separate forms for the essive and the translative case, and the authors argue that these forms are associated with clearly separate functions: the essive occurs in static contexts and has static readings,

while the translative is found in dynamic contexts and expresses properties or states that have resulted from a change (p. 127).

In chapter 6, Rino Grünthal investigates the distribution of the essive in Veps, the easternmost variant of Finnic with about 3.500 speakers. The essive, Grünthal argues, is a very marginal and unproductive case in Veps that has only a limited number of functions. This may partly be the result of the essive being identical in form with the genitive singular. The essive is most typically found in secondary predications in Veps, where it can alternate with a number of other case forms. The essive can also be used to express temporal and locational meanings. Overall, the occurrence of the essive, Grünthal observes, is in many cases "lexically ruled" (p. 152). The translative, on the other hand, is not limited in this way and displays a wider array of functions. The translative also seems to have taken on some of the 'essive' functions in Veps; for example, it can occur in both stative and dynamic contexts.

In chapter 7, Vesa Koivisto discusses the essive in Karelian, a language that is most closely related to Finnish and has approximately 50.000 speakers. Not surprisingly, Karelian shows a number of similarities to Finnish in its distribution of the essive case. The essive can be found in non-verbal main predications, in optional secondary predications, and in obligatory secondary predications. It can also be used to encode adverbial meanings of various types. The essive can alternate with the nominative to indicate impermanent and permanent properties and states, and the essive and translative case forms have their separate functions and contexts of use (state vs change of a state), the same way they do in Finnish.

The next three chapters in the volume discuss the distribution of the essive case form in the Saami branch of the Finnic-Saami language group. Three different Saami languages – South Saami, North Saami and Skolt Saami – are included. An important property of Saamic that sets it apart from Finnic is that it lacks a translative case form; another difference is that the essive is the only case category that does not make a formal distinction between singular and plural number. First, in chapter 8, Florian Siegl discusses the essive in South Saami, a language with an estimated 700 speakers. The author shows that essive-marked elements can be found in non-verbal main predications as well as in both optional and obligatory secondary predications. Alternation between the essive and the nominative can be associated with impermanent vs. permanent state readings. Essive forms are not able to receive adverbial interpretations in South Saami. As the language lacks a distinct translative case form, the question that arises is whether the essive has taken on some of the typical 'translative' functions. Siegl suggests that this is indeed what has happened: the essive can be used as a marker of impermanent states in South Saami, but it can also be a marker of more permanent states. In the latter function, it can be associated with 'translative' change of state semantics (p. 203).

Chapter 9, written by Jussi Ylikoski, provides an account of the essive in North Saami. This is the most widely spoken language in the Saami group, with some 15.000–20.000 speakers. North Saami allows essive-marked elements in non-verbal main predications, in optional secondary predications, and in obligatory secondary predications. North Saami uses the essive to mark impermanent properties and states, while the nominative is used, much in the same way as in many Finnic languages, to mark either impermanent or permanent properties and states (p. 220). The essive form is also found in adverbial expressions, especially in those with temporal and locational interpretations. As North Saami lacks a distinct translative case form, the question that arises is, again, whether the essive displays any of the typically 'translative case' functions.

Ylikoski notes that the North Saami essive "has been described as having also 'translative' functions ever since the advent of the Saami grammatical tradition" and that the essive "does cover most of the 'translative' functions of the Finnic and Mordvin cases labeled as translatives by earlier scholars and authors of the present volume" (p. 236). To what extent these descriptions have been influenced by the "Finnic (Finnish) grammatical tradition that for centuries has served as a model for the description of Uralic minority languages" (p. 218) is left as an open question. Whatever the answer may be, Ylikoski provides examples of sentences where the element marked with the essive expresses a change of state.

In chapter 10, Timothy Feist provides an account of the essive in Skolt Saami. Unlike South and North Saami, Skolt Saami belongs to the eastern branch of the Saami languages. Like the other eastern Saami languages Inari, Akkala, Ter and Kildin Saami, Skolt Saami is a small language with about 300 speakers. The essive case is frequently found in non-verbal main predications, in optional secondary predications, and in obligatory secondary predications. The essive can contrast with the nominative, to distinguish between impermanent and permanent state readings. Essive-marked elements can also have adverbial readings of various kinds. Like in South and North Saami, the essive in Skolt Saami can be used to express a change of/in state, i.e. it can have functions that in Finnic are seen as typical 'translative' functions.

In chapter 11, written by Sirkka Saarinen, the attention shifts to Mari, which, like Finnic-Saamic, is a sub-branch of the Finno-Volgaic language group. Mari is spoken by an estimated 388.000 people. Although Mari is a language that lacks both an essive and a translative case form, it is included in the volume, because one of the aims is to find out how the 'essive' and 'translative' functions are expressed in those Uralic languages that have no essive and/or translative forms. The author shows that in non-verbal main predications, the nominative case can express both impermanent and permanent state readings. In some sentences, even the inessive and dative cases can have impermanent state readings (p. 276). In secondary predications, Mari allows the use of the nominative, inessive, dative, genitive and accusative cases as well as some postpositional phrases. In secondary predications, it is also possible to use an adjective with what the author calls an "unproductive essive" affix (p. 271). She notes, though, that there is little difference in meaning between the unproductive essive affix and the more frequently used nominative and accusative case forms (p. 272). The same affix can also be found in a handful of temporal adverbials; yet, even these are argued to be rare in present-day Mari (p. 277). As there is no translative case in Mari, the typical 'translative' functions need to be expressed in other ways: the dative, the illative and the lative cases can be combined with the appropriate verbal predicates to produce change of state interpretations. In some contexts, even the nominative case is said to be possible.

Chapters 12 and 13 focus on the Permic languages Komi and Udmurt. Permic languages, like the Finno-Volgaic language group, form a sub-branch of the Finno-Permic languages. Both Komi and Udmurt are similar to Mari in that they lack both an essive and a translative case marker, and the typical 'essive' and 'translative' functions are expressed by various other means. Chapter 12, written by Marja Leinonen and Galina Nekrasova, provides an overview of Komi, a language with some 210.000 speakers (Komi Zyryan and Komi Permyak combined). It is shown that predicative nominals and adjectives can occur in the nominative, instrumental and locative case forms. The nominative is mainly used to express permanent properties and states, while the instrumental is used to express both impermanent and permanent properties and states (p. 287). In optional secondary predications, the nominative and the instrumental, and in

some contexts also the inessive, can be used. In obligatory secondary predications, Komi makes use of the instrumental and the illative case forms, as well as of various postpositional phrases. The instrumental is becoming the preferred way of expressing impermanent and/or "actively emphasized" states, the authors argue, while the nominative is used to express permanent or "passive" quality (p. 295). Verbs indicating movement or change are said to prefer the illative-case-marked elements. Komi uses the instrumental case even for adverbial elements of various kinds, i.e. for expressions that in e.g. Finnish would typically be marked with the essive. The instrumental usage in Komi, the authors observe, covers "all of the essive functions in Finnish" and some of the "translative functions" as well (p. 305). The instrumental also has other functions that correspond to the functions of the Russian instrumental case.

In chapter 13, Svetlana Edygarova discusses the essive case and its functional counterparts in Udmurt, a language spoken by some 324.000 people. Udmurt shares many properties with its closest relative Komi. This means, among other things, that typical 'essive' functions are expressed by the nominative, instrumental and inessive cases, as well as by some other grammatical means. In many contexts, case alone cannot reveal whether the state or property in question should be viewed as impermanent or permanent. Instead, the intended interpretation needs to be signaled by the use of appropriate adverbs. In the same way, the intended state vs change of/in state readings need to be specified by an appropriate verb in combination with the nominative, instrumental, inessive, illative or elative case, where the last two forms are only found with verbal predicates that have dynamic meanings. Typical 'translative' functions, the author argues, can even be expressed by using the dative case (p. 321). As in Komi, adverbial functions of various kinds are typically expressed with instrumental case marked elements. The instrumental case also has uses that correspond to the uses it has in Russian.

In chapters 14 through 16, the attention shifts from the Finno-Permic branch to the Ugric branch of Finno-Ugric languages. The first Ugric language discussed is Hungarian, a language with approximately 14 million speakers. Chapter 14, written by Casper de Groot, is titled *The essives in Hungarian* and as the title suggests, Hungarian has "several forms traditionally labeled as essive, and, additionally, there are other forms which also have properties of the essive" (p. 325). One goal in the chapter is to determine if the "traditional essives" are essives in the sense that they can be captured by the Uralic essive questionnaire, or if they are some other type of markers. The author proposes that Hungarian has three affixes, *-ként, -ul/-ül* and *-n/-an-/-en*, that can be viewed as productive essive case markers. Essive(-like) functions, he further proposes, can also be signaled by various other forms, such as adpositional phrases. The essive forms can sometimes alternate with adpositional phrases, to distinguish between impermanent and permanent state readings. Unlike Finnic and Saami, Hungarian does not allow essive-marked elements in non-verbal main predications (the *Mary is [a teacher/ill]*-type). The essive form is, on the other hand, frequently found in optional secondary predications (the *Mary ate the meat [naked/raw]*-type), where the essive-marked elements are primarily depictives expressing property, function and similarity (p. 332). Essive forms can also be used to mark predicative complements in Hungarian (the *Mary considered the boys [fools/foolish]*-type), alongside with some other case forms, such as the dative. Essive elements can also receive adverbial(-like) interpretations, although it is not always clear, the author notes, if these elements are really adverbials or if they are depictive essives (p. 341). Hungarian is shown to have a distinct translative case form,

although the distribution of this form is limited to a small class of verbs that denote change. Even so, there seems to be a division of labour in Hungarian such that the essive forms are used in stative, and the translative forms in dynamic expressions.

In chapter 15, Andrey Filchenco discusses what he labels the 'essive' in Eastern Khanty. Both Khanty and Mansi are languages belonging to the Ob-Ugric branch of the Ugric language group. Khanty, a language spoken by an estimated 9.500 people, is traditionally divided further into the western (northern) and the eastern dialectal groups. Variation between these groups is said to be so significant that the variants are mutually incomprehensible. The author of this chapter focuses on Eastern Khanty. He starts by observing that Eastern Khanty does not have a distinct essive case form – hence the quotation marks – but that some of the typical 'essive' functions are expressed by the use of the translative case as well as by some other means (p. 356f; 372). In non-verbal main predications, predicative nouns and adjectives are not marked for case in Eastern Khanty; these constructions also do not differentiate between impermanent vs permanent state readings. In optional secondary predications, Eastern Khanty makes use of converbial and participial constructions (i.e. a morpheme that occurs with a verb). As in many other Uralic languages, it is not always clear if, and how, these constructions are distinct from adverbials. If the secondary predicate is inflected for case in Eastern Khanty, the most typical cases used are the locative ones (e.g. the illative and the ablative/prolative). In obligatory secondary predications, the complements of especially dynamic verbs can be marked for translative case. Overall, as the author argues, "the most frequent Eastern Khanty formal means of encoding the essive-like meanings is the use of the translative case" (p. 373). The translative form is thus associated with both 'real translative' functions which mostly arise in dynamic contexts and imply permanent transformation or change of state, and with 'essive' functions which arise in stative contexts and imply impermanent properties or states. The chapter finishes with an informative table where the author summarizes all the possible uses of the translative in contexts that are typically associated with 'essive' functions / meanings.

In chapter 16, Katalin Sipőcz accounts for the distribution of the translative-essive in Mansi, the other language belonging to the Ob-Ugric branch of the Ugric language group. Mansi is spoken by less than 1.000 people. Like Eastern Khanty, Mansi does not have a distinct essive form. Instead, the translative can be used in both 'real translative' functions and in functions that are marked with the essive in some other Uralic languages (p. 382). The fact that one form has both functions has lead the author to re-name the form as *translative-essive*, instead of using the traditional label *translative* (p. 393). The author uses the label *translative-essive* consistently throughout the chapter, although the title actually reads *essive-translative*. In non-verbal main predications, Mansi allows both nominative and translative-essive marking on predicative nouns. The choice of case is not associated with semantic or pragmatic differences: in other words, it is not a way to distinguish between impermanent and permanent property or state readings (p. 384). In optional secondary predications, the translative-essive can be used, alongside some other cases such as the nominative and the instrumental. Secondary predicates can also take other forms, including adpositional phrases. The translative-essive, as the author observes, can be associated with impermanent readings in these constructions. As there is little previous work on obligatory secondary predications in Mansi, the author makes only passing remarks about the distribution of the translative-essive in such constructions. She notes that it seems to be possible to use the translative-essive in both stative and dynamic contexts. The translative-essive is also found in adverbial expressions of various kinds.

Chapters 17 through 20 of the volume focus on the Samoyedic branch of the Uralic language family. Six different Samoyedic languages are discussed. First, in chapter 17 Lotta Jalava accounts for the distribution of the essive-translative in Tundra Nenets, a language spoken by approximately 22.000 people. Tundra Nenets has not previously been analyzed as having an essive or a translative case, and the form that Jalava refers to as the essive-translative has been categorized in various other ways. Jalava proposes, however, that the form is a "minor case suffix that has two distinct functions, (i) to express a temporary state (essive interpretation […]) or (ii) a change in state (translative interpretation […])" (p. 398). In other words, with the appropriate copular verbs, elements marked with the essive-translative can be associated with either a stative (i.e., with a typically 'essive') or with a dynamic (i.e., with a typically 'translative' change of state) reading (p. 407ff). The essive-translative can also contrast with other forms, such as the bare nominal construction, to distinguish between impermanent and permanent properties and states (p. 405). The essive-translative form is also found in optional secondary predications, with primarily depictive, circumstantial, and resultative interpretations. With the appropriate verbs, elements marked with the essive-translative can also function as predicative complements. Adverbial functions like manner, temporality and location are not expressed using the essive-translative in Tundra Nenets.

In chapter 18, Florian Siegl discusses the distribution of the essive-translative in Forest Enets and Tundra Enets, both of which belong to the Northern Samoyedic branch of the Samoyedic language group. Both languages are critically endangered and have less than 40 speakers combined. The Enets languages have a specific affix that is associated with both impermanent and permanent states. This affix is not usually viewed as an essive or a translative case marker, and even Siegl admits that "it is certainly not a core case" (p. 432). However, as he observes, with the appropriate classes of verbs the affix is able to participate in what in other Uralic languages, most notably in Finnic, are considered typically 'essive' and/or 'translative' functions. In other words, the same form can have both (impermanent) state readings and change of state readings. Essive-translative elements are found in optional and obligatory secondary predications in the Enets languages. In non-verbal main predications or in adverbial expressions, these elements are not possible.

Chapter 19, written by Sándor Szeverényi and Beáta Wagner-Nagy, investigates the distribution of the essive-translative in Nganasan, another highly threatened language with no more than 125 speakers. Like Tundra Nenets and the Enets languages, even Nganasan is viewed as a language that has no distinct essive or translative case. Although Nganasan has a specific marker – which the authors label a converb/infinitive – that seems to cover many of the typically 'essive' and/or 'translative' functions in some other Uralic languages, there are also considerable differences. The overall conclusion is, however, that in the appropriate context the converb/infinitive is able to participate in producing both stative and change of state readings.

Chapter 20, written by Beáta Wagner-Nagy, discusses the essive-translative in Selkup and Kamas. Selkup has a few hundred elderly speakers, while Kamas is already extinct. Selkup has two forms that are traditionally labelled as 'translative'. One of these is originally of postpositional origin and contains even a genitive marker. The other one, according to the author, is a form that is also used as an essive marker, which is why she has chosen to re-label it as *essive-translative* in her chapter. Kamas has no essive or translative case forms, and the 'essive' and/or 'translative' case functions are instead expressed by using the nominative case. Both Selkup and Kamas also make use of

converb constructions (p. 482f). In Selkup, the essive-translative form be found in non-verbal main predications, to express both stative and change of state readings; it is used less frequently in secondary predications. The adverbial readings of essive-translative marked elements also seem rare, as the author observes, even though there are some lexicalized expressions of the type *in the morning* and *at night*.

As already mentioned, chapter 21 by Casper de Groot summarizes the distribution of essive-marked elements in Uralic in a descriptive fashion and contains a typology of the essive, based on the information and data provided in the preceding chapters. For some readers, this may well be one of the most important chapters in the volume. The fact that the information is in most cases also given visually, in the form of tables, helps the reader get a good overview of each point and makes the reading relatively easy. The first conclusion drawn in this chapter is that the picture of the essive as a case marker that is used to express impermanent properties and states and which contrasts with other case markers, such as the nominative and the translative, is too simplistic and only holds for a limited number of languages (p. 498). The author notes that there are (i) languages (e.g., Finnic) that have two distinct forms labelled *essive* and *translative* and use these forms relatively straightforwardly to express impermanent states and changes of/in state; (ii) languages (e.g., Saamic, Mordvinic) that have a single form – either the essive or the translative – which use this single form in both 'essive' and 'translative' contexts; (iii) languages (e.g., the Ob-Ugric and many Samoyedic languages) that also have just a single form that can occur in both 'essive' and 'translative' constructions; and (iv) languages (e.g., the Permic languages) that have no essive, translative or essive/translative markers at all and make use of other constructions. Another conclusion drawn in this chapter is that the markers for the essive, the translative and/or for the essive/translative "can hardly be considered case markers" (p. 501). Instead, because they are most typically found on non-verbal main and secondary predicates, a better option might be to treat them as predicative markers.

Furthermore, although the use of the essive is in most previous accounts associated with the expression of impermanent state, the author observes that the picture is not as clear as examples like (1–2) above may lead us to believe. Even in Finnish, the language typically used to exemplify this point, the essive is able to contrast with another case, the nominative, in non-verbal main predications, but *not* in optional or obligatory secondary predictions. In other Uralic languages, if there is alternation between the essive and some other case form in non-verbal main predications, this alternation may or may not be associated with impermanent vs. permanent state interpretations. But like in Finnish, essive marking on a secondary predicate is *not* an indicator of impermanent state. In most Uralic languages there are also alternative ways to express impermanent vs. permanent state readings, and the markers used to express these readings can often be used to express other functions, too.

In a number of languages, the essive marker was found to be most common in secondary predications, and many languages that did not allow essive forms in non-verbal main predications allowed them in secondary predications of various kinds. The depictive was found to be an important sub-class of secondary predications in Uralic, so much so that Casper de Groot labels the essive as "the major marker in the encoding of depictives" (p. 518).

Yet another conclusion drawn in this chapter is that, although there are languages in which the essive can be used in adverbial expressions, the essive-marked elements are usually found on a limited set of temporal and locational expressions referring to "parts of the day, days of the week, yesterday, tomorrow, weeks, months, seasons, dates, years,

or festivals" (p. 538). Other types of temporal and locational expressions marked with the essive are not proper adverbials: they are depictives. For locational adverbial phrases in particular, the author states that "Uralic languages do not use essive-like forms to mark locations. None of the essive markers discussed in this volume are found as markers of location" (p. 537). A question that arises in this connection is the status of essive-marked adpositions: in chapter 7, Koivisto mentions that in Karelian, the essive can be found on adpositions expressing location. The same is true for Finnish, as observed e.g. in Hakulinen et al. (2004). Unfortunately, as Finnish examples like (3) are not discussed in the current volume at all, it remains unclear if the adpositions would qualify as "essive-like forms that are used to mark locations" or if these adpositional phrases would need to be (re-)analyzed in some other way:

(3) a. *Tapasimme*   [*puun*   *luona*].
         we.met   tree.GEN   by.ESS
         'We met by the tree.'
     b. *Puu on*   [*talon*   *takana*].
         tree is   house.GEN behind.ESS
         'The tree is behind the house.'

The volume is of interest to a wide readership, ranging from specialists in Uralic and/or linguistic typology to students and researchers of general and theoretical linguistics. It provides a comprehensive account of a relatively unknown marker in 21 different Uralic languages, describing the similarities and the differences in its distribution across these languages. The findings help us gain a better understanding not only of case but also of other "case-like" markers in Uralic and in other languages. Further, the volume makes available plenty of new data, comparisons, and descriptions of languages that have not previously been easily accessible to an international audience due to language barriers; a lot of the previous work on the 21 languages in the volume was written in Finnish, Russian, Hungarian or German. Especially, sections 1, 9 and 10 of each chapter contain information of a general nature that is interesting not only for readers who wish to learn more about the distribution of the essive case, but also for readers who wish to gain a brief introduction to the language, its history and its properties (e.g., the case system, agreement, and word order). The data, comparisons and descriptions provided in the volume offer a fruitful starting point for further analyses and discussions of both Uralic and other languages. Finally, the typological linguistic questionnaire compiled for the project serves as a helpful tool for students and researchers of other languages in the world. Overall, the chapters are well written and the fact that they are all structured following the typological linguistic questionnaire introduced in Chapter 1 makes it easy for the reader to compare information and data in the different chapters and helps them pay attention to the details without losing sight of the big picture.

At the same time, following the questionnaire is not a guarantee that the 'same' sub-points or questions would always be discussed in the same sections in all the chapters. Instead, different authors have interpreted the questionnaire in very different ways, and have made different decisions regarding what should be brought up where. This can make finding information about a specific topic a bit of a challenge. A reader who is interested in how the essive relates to the translative case in a language may go to the section titled *Essive versus translative,* as this seems like the most obvious place to look,

only to find that the relevant information and examples have already been provided in some earlier section (usually section 1, 2 and/or 4). And a reader who wishes to read about essive forms and temporal and/or locational interpretations may find the relevant information and examples in the introductory section, in the section on secondary predication, in the section on adverbials, or in all of these.

Although the volume claims to focus on "contemporary Uralic languages" the word *contemporary* needs to be interpreted liberally: one of the languages discussed – Kamas – is already extinct, and four others had, at the time of writing the chapters, less than 100 elderly speakers each. This is something that the reader needs to bear in mind also when reading the chapters and making comparisons between the languages. For a language like Hungarian that has 14 million speakers, the author has had access to several corpora and has been able to select the ones that are most suitable for his purposes (e.g., a corpus of 1.5 billion words). He has also been able to consult native speaker informants for ambiguous constructions. For a language like Nganasan, which at the time of writing the chapter had 125 elderly speakers, most of whom were also not monolingual speakers of the language, the authors had to rely on whatever data sources are available (e.g., a corpus of approximately 59.000 sentences), and they did not have unlimited access to native speaker informants. Having said that, all the individual authors are very careful to point out that the fact that there are no examples of some grammatical pattern in their data does not necessarily mean that the pattern is not possible in the language.

Another very minor criticism is that, although the Mordvinic languages Erzya and Moksha are not included in the volume, they are nevertheless part of the summarizing discussion in chapter 21. The languages are even listed in all of the tables in chapter 21. If a suitable author was not available to write a chapter about these languages, the editor could have provided a few general comments about matters such as the geographical area where the languages are spoken and the number of speakers. Now these two languages just emerge from nowhere, and the interested reader is forced to look elsewhere for more information.

Finally, in some of the chapters that are not about Finnish the authors have provided Finnish examples within the running text without glosses or translation. This is likely to be confusing for readers who are not familiar with Finnish. Relatedly, there is no consensus in the bibliographies to the chapters on whether to provide English translations of book titles in other languages; many of the authors provide the translations, but there are also bibliographies where none of the book titles have an English translation and most of them are written using the Cyrillic alphabet. Given the editor's observation that "due to language barriers most of the […] descriptions are not accessible to linguists in the world" (p. 10), one would have hoped the book titles to have been translated consistently into English, as this would have made them a bit more accessible to linguists in the world and allowed them to see at least what *type* of work has been done on the languages previously. Despite these minor shortcomings, the volume is truly an important contribution and a most valuable resource for both specialists in Uralic and/or linguistic typology and for students and researchers of general and theoretical linguistics.

References

Creissels, Denis. 2008. Spatial cases. In Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, 609−625. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, David. 2008. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th edition. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Essive. 2018. In *SIL Glossary of Linguistic Terms*. https://glossary.sil.org/term

Hakulinen, Auli, Vilkuna, Maria, Korhonen, Riitta, Koivisto, Vesa, Heinonen Tarja Riitta & Alho, Irja. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi* (A Descriptive Grammar of Finnish). Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Hakulinen, Lauri. 1978. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys* (The Structure and the Development of the Finnish Language). Helsinki: Otava.

Kiss, Katalin É. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2001. "A piece of cake" and "a cup of tea": Partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology ad Contact. Volume 2: Grammar and Typology,* 523−568. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vilkuna, Maria. 1996. *Suomen lauseopin perusteet* (The Foundations of Finnish Syntax*).* Helsinki: Edita.

Satu Manninen
Lund University
Satu.Manninen@englund.lu.se