UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The typology of the essive in the Uralic languages

de Groot, C.

DOI

[10.1075/tsl.119](https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.119)

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Author accepted manuscript

Published in

Uralic Essive and the Expression of Impermanent State

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Groot, C. (2017). The typology of the essive in the Uralic languages. In C. de Groot (Ed.), *Uralic Essive and the Expression of Impermanent State* (pp. 497-552). (Typological Studies in Language; Vol. 119). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.119>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Chapter 21

The typology of the essive in the Uralic Languages

Casper de Groot

Summary

This chapter presents the typology of the essive in the Uralic languages. The input for the typology is the detailed information about the essive in nineteen Uralic languages presented in the former chapters of this volume. The chapter specifically investigates the distribution of the essives and also the opposition between permanent and impermanent state in non-verbal predication. The typological variation is discussed within the linguistic domains of non-verbal main predication, secondary predication, complementation, and manner, temporal, and circumstantial adverbial phrases. The use of the marker in the essive sense (associated with state) is contrasted with its use in expressing the translative sense (associated with change). The syntactic position of elements marked by the essive is discussed in relation to the position of focus constituents. The conclusions summarize the major findings of this volume.

Keywords: Linguistic typology, Uralic languages, essive case, translative case, depictive, impermanent state, non-verbal predication, focus.

1. Introduction

In several Uralic languages there are markers referred to as essive. The essive is considered a case marker and is used in phrases to indicate impermanent state or temporary state, often equivalent to English “as a (child)”. In contrast to the essive, several Uralic languages have the translative, a case marker to indicate change or result with the general sense of ‘become X’ or “change into X”. The following triplet illustrates the application of the two cases. If the essive is not used, the clause will denote permanent state.

(1)	a.	John is ill-NOM	permanent state
	b.	John is ill-ESS	impermanent state
	c.	John becomes ill-TRA	change

The distribution of the essive, translative or alternative forms in the Uralic languages as presented in the chapters 2 through 20 in this volume shows that this characterization is only partly correct and only holds for a few languages. The distribution of the markers, however, offers an interesting, wide variety of linguistic observations. This chapter aims to summarize the distribution in a descriptive fashion, but also in terms of linguistic typology.¹

2. Essive and translative: Form and function

The traditional terminology of the essive and translative in the Uralic languages is diffuse, because they are sometimes functionally but often also formally motivated. There are languages with a functionally motivated label essive or translative, such as Hungarian. There are other languages, such as the Finnic and Saamic languages, where the origin of the labels essive and translative are defined

¹ A remark on the use of slash in this chapter. A slash between two terms indicates that a marker is used for two functions, as in inessive/essive, i.e. there is just one marker (label) which is used for semantic ‘inessive’ and ‘essive’. Note that it does not indicate syncretism.

on the basis of the form *-na* for the essive and *-ks* for the translative. Inventories of cases in the latter type of Uralic languages may contain an essive and a translative or one of both, where they may have the specific functional relation to state or change, but they may also have another, even the opposite relation: essive used in the context of a change or the translative used in the context of a state. A third type of language, such as some Samoyedic languages, uses a form not related to the two forms mentioned in essive-like and translative-like expressions. In the sample of languages in this volume, the situation is as in Table 1.

Table 1. Essive, translative and essive/translative in the Uralic languages

- i. Languages which have two distinct forms labeled as essive and translative use these forms straightforwardly, the essive for state, and the translative for change. Marginal exceptions are found in Estonian and Karelian.

	essive	translative
• Finnish	-na	-ksi
• Estonian	-na	-ks (one systematic exceptional use of the translative)
• Votic	-n	-ssi
• Ingrian	-n	-kš
• Veps	-n	-ks
• Karelian	-na	-kši (one irregular exceptional use of the translative)
• Hungarian	-ként -ul/-ül -n/-an/-en	-vá/-vé
- ii. Languages which have just one form, either essive or translative, may use this single form in both contexts of state and change.

	essive [-na]	translative [-ks]
• Saami South	-ne	
• Saami North	-n	
• Saami Skolt	-n	
• South Veps		-ks
• Erzya		-ks
• Moksha		-ks
- iii. In the course of the research project, some investigators introduced the label ESSTR (a contractions of essive/translative) for some of the Samoyedic languages to indicate that one form occurs in both essive and translative constructions, as e.g. Siegl (2013: 166-167). This prompted other investigators to rename the traditional labels whether or not based on *-na* for essive or *-ks* for translative, which serve both purposes, essive and translative, as ESSTR, as in Mansi.

	essive/translative
• Khanty	-ka
• Mansi	-γ
• Selkup	-t-qo/-n-qo
• Enets (Forest)	-Vš
• Enets (Tundra)	-ae
• Nenets (Tundra)	-ŋæ
• Nganasan	is ^l a (free morpheme)

- iv. Languages of the Uralic family in this volume without an essive, translative, or essive/translative marker are the following:
- Mari
 - Komi
 - Udmurt
 - Kamas

A first result of this study is that essive and translative are clearly two distinct forms and functions in some languages, where other languages have just one form to serve the expression of the two functions.² The origin of this single form may be the essive, translative or some other element. In other words, the essive may expand to the translative, the translative may expand to the essive, or some other element may become the marker of both the essive and translative function or one of them. Essive and translative must then have a peculiar property in common, which makes unification of the two (as essive/translative) possible. A straightforward explanation is that both markers occur in non-verbal predicative constructions and are basically markers on non-verbal main or secondary predicates. Schematically:

- (2)
a.	Mary COP teacher-ESS	"Mary is a teacher."
b.	Marco works in Pisa doctor-ESS	"Marco works as a doctor in Pisa."
c.	Joan (semi-)COP teacher-TRA	"Joan becomes a teacher."
d.	John painted the door green-TRA	"John painted the door green."

A second result of this study is that the labels for Saami essive, and Erzya, Moksha, Khanty translative could (but not should) be renamed into essive/translative, or translative/essive, because they are employed to mark both state and change.³ This would lead to a greatly simplified classification: languages with two markers (Type 1), languages with one marker (Type 2), and languages with no marker (Type 3). Consider Table 2, where the form (marker) and function collapse in the notions essive, translative, and essive/translative.

Table 2. Essive, translative and essive/translative in the Uralic languages (revision)

Type 1			Type 2		Type 3
Two markers			One marker		No marker
Essive		Translative	Essive/translative		no function
Finnish	-na	-ksi	South Veps	-ks	Mari Komi Udmurt Kamas
Estonian	-na	-ks	South Saami	-ne	
Votic	-n	-ssi	North Saami	-n	
Ingrian	-n	-kš	Skolt Saami	-n	
Veps	-n	-ks	Erzya	-ks	
Karelian	-na	-kši	Moksha	-ks	
Hungarian	-ként -ul/-ül	-vá/-vé	Khanty	-ka	
			Mansi	-γ	

² It seems that Estonian and Veps behave for certain linguistic domains as a Type 1 language with two markers and in others as a Type 2 language with one marker. In Veps far more than in Estonian, the translative often applies where one should expect the essive. See section 3 of this chapter.

³ One can question the practicality of the lumping of essive and translative, because verbal semantics plays a decisive role and the constructional characteristics get lost when lumping. The form *-na* in Saami is more essive than translative, whereas the form *-ka* in Eastern Khanty is more translative than essive.

	-n/-an/-en		Enets Forest Enets Tundra Nenets Selkup Nganasan	-Vš -ae -ŋæ -t-qo/-n-qo isʲa	
--	------------	--	--	--	--

Note that Table 2 presents an overview of markers in the realm of state and change in the various Uralic languages. However, it does not imply that the markers within one column equally apply in the different languages. The individual chapters on the languages in this volume present detailed descriptions of the form and use of the markers. A discussion of the differences in the distribution of the markers will follow later in this chapter.

A third result concerning these markers is that the essive, translative, and essive/translative can hardly be considered case markers. They are mainly found on non-verbal (main and secondary) predicates. In his chapter on the terminology of case, Haspelmath (2009) renders essive and translative under abstract cases together with nominative, accusative, and dative, which are typical grammatical cases, markers of arguments of verbal predicates, whereas essive and translative are definitely not.⁴ They do not belong to the class of concrete non-spatial or spatial labels either. Haspelmath (2009: 514) refers to the essive and translative as special cases for predicative nominals. The essive and translative apply to predicative adjectives too, as e.g. (2b) and (2d). Predicative markers as labels for the essive and translative, thus, seem more appropriate. However, the central function of the essive (but not the translative) is to mark a non-verbal predicate as stage-level predicates, i.e. time instable, temporary, impermanent. In this respect, they show properties of derivational morphology as it shows relative stable form–meaning mapping.

3. Impermanent versus permanent state

3.1. Differential marking

One of the central questions of this volume concerns the relation between the use of the essive and the expression of impermanent state. One way to show the existence of this relation is in contrast with alternative expressions without the essive as in the following pairs in Finnish:

- (3) Finnish (Hynönen, ch. 2, this volume)
- a. Anna o-n opettaja-na ~ sairaa-na.
Anna COP-3SG teacher-ESS ~ ill-ESS
‘Anna is (working as) a teacher ~ (temporarily) ill.’
- b. Anna o-n opettaja ~ sairas.
Anna COP-3SG teacher.NOM ~ ill.NOM
‘Anna is a teacher (by profession) ~ (chronically) ill.’

These famous pairs of examples from Finnish are always presented in the contrastive way, where (3a) expresses impermanent state and (3b) permanent state, as indicated by the glosses. It seems to be correct to posit that the essive marks the impermanent reading, but it is questionable whether the nominative, a zero marker, could be considered the marker of the permanent state. The expression with the nominative could by default get the interpretation of permanent state. Unfortunately there are no other instances in Finnish where the bare form of the noun or adjective is used predicatively, as in (3). Secondary non-verbal predicates such as depictives in Finnish always take the essive. Differential marking of the secondary predicate essive/nominative does not occur,

⁴ This is argued for Forest Enets by Siegl (2013: 166; 185-186) and for Tundra Nenets by Nikolaeva (2014: 39).

hence the opposition between impermanent and permanent state does not play a role in this domain.⁵ The nominative is excluded in the non-verbal secondary predications, as shown in (4).

(4) Finnish (Hynönen, ch. 2, this volume)

a.	Sano-n	tämä-n	sinu-lle ystävä-nä	~	* ystävä
	say-1SG	this-GEN	you-ILL friend-ESS		friend.NOM
	'I am saying this to you as a friend.'				
b.	Juo-n	kahvi-n	kylmä-nä	~	* kylmä
	drink-1SG	coffee-GEN	cold-ESS		cold.NOM
	'I drink my coffee cold.'				

As a matter of fact, in the Uralic languages the opposition impermanent vs. permanent state only plays a role in the domain of non-verbal main predication. The only exception is found in Hungarian, which does not have differential marking in non-verbal main predications on the basis of the opposition nominative vs. essive but does have differential marking in one type of secondary predication, namely, in a class of depictives. The choice is between the essive *-ként* and the preposition *mint*. Using the nominative is no option. Consider:

(5) Hungarian (de Groot, ch. 14, this volume)

Mari	tanár-ként	~ mint	tanár	dolgozik	Budapest-en
PN	teacher-ESS	~ as	teacher	work.PRS.3SG	Budapest-SUPES
'Mari is working in Budapest as a teacher (impermanent ~ permanent).'					

The discussion of impermanent vs. permanent state in relation to differential marking will consequently be confined to the domain of non-verbal main predication in the remainder of this section.

The same distribution of the essive vs. nominative opposition as in Finnish (3) denoting impermanent vs. permanent state is found in Karelian, South Saami, North Saami and Skolt Saami, as shown in (6). However, Ylikoski (this volume) mentions that the application of the essive is not rigid, i.e. there are examples where the bare nominal form denotes an impermanent state.

(6) a. Karelian, Olonec (Koivisto, ch. 7, this volume)

tuatto	on	voimattoma-nnu	~ voimattoma.
father	COP.PRS.3SG	powerless-ESS	~ powerless.NOM
'Father is sick/weak (at the moment)/(chronically).'			

b. South Saami (Siegl, ch. 8, this volume)

Aanta	lea	lohkehtäjine	~ lohkehtäija.
PN	COP.3SG	teacher.woman.ESS	~ teacher.women.NOM
'Aanta is currently a teacher. ~ Aanta is a teacher.'			

c. North Saami (Ylikoski, ch. 9, this volume)

Son	lea	oahpaheaddjin	~ oahpaheaddji
3SG	COP.3SG	teacher.ESS	~ teacher.NOM
'S/he is teaching (temporarily). ~ S/he is a teacher (his/her profession).'			

d. Skolt Saami (Feist, ch. 10, this volume)

liâskkân	~ liâskk	lij	leäm	kaammgaž
widow.ESS	~ widow.NOM	COP.PRS.3SG	COP.PST.PTCP	Little.Bear.SG.NOM
'Little Bear was currently a widow. ~ Little Bear was a widow.'				

⁵ Differential marking within the domain of secondary predication in Finnish does marginally occur, however, other than essive vs. nominative. See Hynönen, this volume.

Estonian shows a similar pattern, however, it employs the translative instead of the essive. The use of the translative could be considered a structural inconsistency as a result of a historical development. The old essive case in Estonian was almost completely lost, when in the 19th century the essive was reintroduced into written Estonian but did not reach all domains for which the essive was meant to operate (see Metslang and Lindtröm, this volume, for detailed information). Given the typology in Table 2, it could be argued that Estonian developed from a type 1 language into a type 2, where the translative took over functions of the essive. The reintroduction in the 19th century of the essive triggered the reverse development from type 2 to type 1. The use of the translative in main non-verbal predications in present-day Estonian remained as a relic from the old type 2 stage.

Erelt and Metslang (2003:167) argue that the nominative is the unmarked form, containing no information about the state's relative time stability; the translative marking indicates that the state is unstable, i.e. temporary or non-essential.

(7) Estonian (Metslang and Lindtröm, ch. 3, this volume)

Kaja	on	Eesti	suursaadiku-ks	~ suursaadik	Ingismaal.
PN	be.3	Estonia.GEN	ambassador-TRA	~ ambassador-NOM	England.ADE

'Kaja is (currently ~ more permanently) the Estonian ambassador to Great Britain.'

In contrast to Standard Estonian, the South Estonian dialects often use the inessive/essive to mark the predicate in non-verbal predications. The inessive/essive expresses impermanent state. The use of the inessive/essive is, however, not obligatory.

(8) Mulgi (Estonian) (Metslang and Lindtröm, ch. 3, this volume)

siin	ol'li	tüdrukku-n
here	COP:PST.1SG	maid-INE/ESS

'Here I was a maid.'

Also different from the essive–nominative alternation is the use of the inessive versus the nominative in some dialects of Mari and Komi. The class of nouns used in the inessive in non-verbal predications is limited to those denoting a temporary function or profession in the Mari dialects. Interestingly, standard Mari and Komi do not distinguish an essive or a translative. Consider the examples in (9).

(9) a. Eastern colloquial Mari (Saarinen, ch. 11, this volume)

Tudo	kütüčə-štö	~ kütüčə
he	shepherd-INE	~ shepherd.NOM

'S/He is (working as) a shepherd, currently ~ more permanently.'

b. Komi dialects (Leinonen and Nekrasova, ch. 12, this volume)

Ivan öni	göryś-yn	~ göryś
Ivan now	ploughman-INE	~ ploughman.NOM

'Ivan is (now ~) a ploughman.'

Another example of differential marking in non-verbal predications yielding an impermanent–permanent distinction comes from Tundra Nenets. Jalava (this volume) argues that the bare nominal construction has a permanent reading, whereas the construction with a semi-copula and the essive/translative marker on the nominal predicate has an impermanent reading. The difference between (10a) and (10b) can be compared to the nominative versus essive marking of the non-verbal predicate in Finnic languages.

- (10) Tundra Nenets (Jalava, ch. 17, this volume)
- a. mən toxolkoda-dm?
I teacher-1SG
'I am a teacher.'
- b. mən toxolkoda-ŋæ tara-m?
I teacher-ESSTR be.necessary-1SG
'I am (as) a teacher.'

Again another type of differential marking in non-verbal predication is found in Komi, a language without an essive or translativ. Non-verbal predication in Komi employs nominative, instrumental, and locative case forms. The instrumental is common with non-present tenses, while the nominative is (almost) the rule with present tense zero-copula. Indicating a stage level, or impermanent state, the predicate may trigger the instrumental, but not obligatorily. The instrumental can be used for both permanent and temporary properties. The nominative is used mainly to express permanent properties or those that last for a longer time (Leinonen and Nekrasova, ch. 12, this volume).

- (11) Komi (Leinonen and Nekrasova, ch. 12, this volume).
- a. sijö völ-i zev na tom-ön.
s/he COP-PST.3SG very still young-INS
'S/he was still very young.' (impermanent)
- b. Leena velödc-öm šerti-ys čužan kyv velödyš
Leena study-NMZ by-3POSS mother-tongue teacher.NOM
'Leena is a mother tongue teacher by training.' (permanent)

There are other languages which also allow the differential marking of main non-verbal predicate by the essive or nominative, which, however, cannot be associated with the impermanent vs. permanent distinction. There seems to be free variation in the use of the essive and nominative in Votic and Ingrian, since a semantic difference cannot be attested. Speakers of Votic and Ingrian do not recognize a difference in the use of the essive and nominative in the following examples (see Markus and Rozhanskiy, this volume).

- (12) a. Votic (Markus and Rozhanskiy, ch. 4, this volume)
tämä	el-i	ivo	täte-n	~ tättä
3SG	COP-PST.3SG	Ivo.GEN	father-ESS	~ father.NOM
- 'He was Ivo's father.'
- b. Ingrian (Markus and Rozhanskiy, ch. 5, this volume)
peř'tā	ol-i	ivoi-n	poičkā-n	~ poiga
Petya	COP-PST.3SG	Ivoi-GEN	son-ESS	~ son.NOM
- 'Petya was Ivoi's son.'

Similar to Votic and Ingrian, Mansi shows differential marking essive/translative vs. nominative in non-verbal predications without any indication of semantic or pragmatic differences (Sipőcz, this volume). If the essive/translative is used in the present tense, the overt expression of the copula is required (13b), which does not hold for the nominative (13c). According to the findings reported in Pustet (2003), zero copula constructions with bare predicates count as time stable (permanent) and copula constructions with a marker on the predicate as less time stable, which then does not hold for Mansi. Other counter-examples are given in section 3.2.2.

- (13) Mansi (Sipőcz, ch. 16, this volume)

- a. Xōtal rēḡəŋ ~ rēḡəŋ-iḡ ōl-əs.
 day warm.NOM ~ warm-ESSTR COP-PST.SG
 'It was a warm day.'
- b. Am lōmwoj-iḡ ōl-ēḡəm.
 I mosquito-ESSTR COP-SG1
 'I am a mosquito.'
- c. Am mań
 I small
 'I am young.'

Finally, the differential marking of the non-verbal predicate in the Finnic languages is sometimes blurred due to the fact that (speakers of) some languages or language varieties dislike bare nominal predicates. Although bare nominal predicates do not count as ungrammatical in those languages, it seems as if the nominal predicates should be marked in one way or another. That is why one also finds next to the essive, the translative in Veps and Karelian, or the partitive in Estonian and Karelian.

3.2. Restrictions

3.2.1. Nominal and adjectival predicates

The data on differential marking related to impermanent vs. permanent state in the Uralic languages reveal two conclusions as for nominal and adjectival predicates. The first conclusion is that nominal predicates are prime candidates for differential marking, and that adjectival predicates come second. This can be seen e.g. in Estonian and South Saami, which have differential marking on nominal predicates but not on adjective predicates. A second conclusion is that adjectival predicates allow the same number or fewer markers (essive, translative, partitive etc.) than nominal predicates. Adjectival predicates often only allow the nominative. This also holds for languages with differential marking where permanent vs. impermanent state does not play a role, such as Votic, Ingrian, Veps, and Erzya. These conclusions could be formalized in the following implicational hierarchies.

(14) Differential marking in Uralic

- a. Noun > Adjective
 b. Number of markers for Noun > same number of markers or fewer for Adjective

(14a) predicts that if a language has differential marking in adjectival predication, it will also have the same for nominal predication. (14b) predicts that adjectival predicates have the same set or less markers available than nominal predicates, as for instance in Karelian where the nominal predicate takes the nominative, essive, partitive, and translative, whereas the adjectival predicate takes only the nominative and essive. Table 3 in section 3.2.4 below contains information which supports the hierarchies in (14).

3.2.2. Tense

Tense plays a marginal role in the differential marking of non-verbal predication. The present tense seems to be less hospitable to take the nominative vs. essive distinction than the past tense. The combination of copula, essive or translative and present tense yield a future interpretation in some languages, such as Erzya. Several Uralic languages do not require a copula in present tense non-verbal predication, third person (singular) subject, indicative mood. If these languages allow the essive, translative or essive/translative, the non-verbal predication requires a copula, such as Tundra Nenets and Enets (see section 4.2 below). One exception to this general rule is found in Southern Veps, where the non-verbal predicate can be marked by the translative to indicate impermanent state without an overt copula.

- (15) Southern Veps (Grünthal, ch. 6, this volume)
 Vas'ka se tobne-mba-ks kaike-lemeide-n pravlendja-le
 Vas'ka FOC big-CMPR-TRA all-ALL our-GEN leadership-GEN
 'Vasiliy is the biggest boss among our leadership.'

Even with an overt copula in the present tense, Skolt Saami highly disfavors the application of the essive. Temporary states in the present tense are generally but not always expressed in the nominative case, as exemplified in (16).

- (16) Skolt Saami (Feist, ch. 10, this volume)
 ton leäk muu kaa'f-č'i'tti
 2SG.NOM COP.PRS.2SG 1SG.GEN coffee.SG.NOM-cook.NMLZ.SG.NOM
 'You are my coffee maker.'

3.2.3. Other

There is no indication that definiteness plays a role in the distribution of the essive in non-verbal predications. Although none of the Uralic languages with differential marking in this domain have articles, the possessive counts as definite and possessives do occur in non-verbal predications, as in the examples (12) in Votic and Ingrian above. However, the possessive declension in languages such as Enets and Nenets does not allow the essive/translative, because the order of suffixes person marker then case marker is ruled out.

Restrictions in the field of animacy and person are not attested. For the investigators, it was often very difficult or impossible to find relevant data to substantiate possible restrictions. The same holds for distinctions in the field of Aktionsart, aspect and modality.

3.2.4. Conclusions of this section

A major conclusion of this section is that the linguistic domain in which the differential marking of non-verbal predicates correlates with temporal distinctions is basically that of non-verbal main predications. There is just one exception to this conclusion, the specific sub-class of depictives in Hungarian.

Languages in the sample which do not have differential marking in non-verbal main predications are the following: Mari, Udmurt, Hungarian, Khanty, Enets, Nganasan, Selkup, and Kamas. In these languages the non-verbal predicate always takes the nominative in non-relational predications, i.e. locative or existential predications. The expressions are neutral as to the interpretation of permanent versus impermanent state. The semantics of the predicate, individual level or stage level, temporal modifiers or the context in which the utterance is used, may specify the interpretation, whether impermanent or permanent.

All other languages in the sample have differential marking of non-verbal predicates, either on the nominal and adjectival predicate, or just alone on the nominal predicate and not on the adjectival predicate. Differential marking is a condition for the distinction between permanent and impermanent state to occur but is not a necessary entailment. The data reveals that there is no one to one relation between the use of the essive, translative, or essive/translative and the impermanent state interpretation. Three types of correlations can be distinguished in the use of the differential markers and the differential temporal interpretations: strong, weak, and no correlation.

In languages which have a strong correlation between the differential marking and the permanent or impermanent reading, the impermanent state almost always requires the essive or translative on the non-verbal predicate or the other way around, the occurrence of the essive or translative on the non-verbal predicate almost always entails the impermanent state. In this type of languages the use of the essive (impermanent) on an individual level predicate (permanent) is ruled out. However, if it

does occur, as in Finnish (Hynönen, this volume), it forces a reinterpretation of the semantics of the predicate. In languages which have a weak relation, it seems as if the use of the differential markers is less rigid, that the semantics of impermanent and permanent state is more vague or less well experienced by the speakers. Finally, in the third type of language, there seems to be free variation between the markers. The use of the markers is optional, there is no correlation with the impermanent or permanent interpretation. It must be noted that it is extremely difficult to elicit minimal pairs which support the very subtle correlation between the use of the essive or translative and the temporal distinctions. The fieldworkers on Votic, Ingrian and Veps did their utmost to elicit the data, but the correlation could not be attested.

The results of the correlation between the use of differential markers and the impermanent vs. permanent distinction are summarized in Table 3. It should be mentioned that in addition to the differential marking of the non-verbal predicate, Tundra Nenets uses a semi-copula in the impermanent predications and a zero-copula in the permanent predications. The two types of predications thus differ on two points: semi-copula + essive/translative (impermanent) versus zero-copula + nominative (permanent).

Table 3. Differential marking and permanent vs. impermanent state in Uralic

		Differential marking of permanent vs. impermanent state	
		Non-verbal main predication	
Correlation	Language	Noun	Adjective
Strong	Finnish Karelian North Saami Skolt Saami Tundra Nenets South Saami Estonian	nom-ess nom-ess-par-tra nom-ess nom-ess nom-esstr nom-ess nom-ess nom-tra	nom-ess nom-ess nom-ess nom-ess nom-esstr nom-esstr
Weak	Estonian dialect Komi Komi dialect Mari dialect	nom-ine/ess nom-ins nom-ine nom-ine	nom-ine/ess
None	Mansi Votic Ingrian Veps Erzya	nom-esstr nom-ess nom-ess nom-ess-tra nom-tra	nom-esstr
		Secondary predication - depictive	
		Noun	Adjective
Weak	Hungarian	ess-preposition	

The Uralic languages in the sample in this volume which have just one type of marking, the nominative, in non-verbal main predications are Mari, Udmurt, Hungarian, Enets, Nganasan, Selkup, and Kamas.

4. Copula, semi-copula, essive, and translative

Section 3 already touched upon the use of a copula in non-verbal main clauses with an essive or translative marker. This section summarizes the use of copulas and semi-copulas in non-verbal predications relevant to the use of the essive, translative, or essive/translative.

4.1. Copula

The semantic relation between non-verbal predicates and their subjects can be given on the basis of the categorical status of the non-verbal predicate and the specification of subject. Non-verbal predicates may consist of an adjective or bare noun, but also of an (in)definite term, or a relational term such as location. The subject may be (in)definite or (non)specific. The possible combinations of types of non-verbal predicates and subjects yield a typology of semantic relations, such as property assignment, class inclusions, class membership, location, or existence (Dik 1980). A typology based on the different predicates is as in (17).⁶

- (17)
- i. Adjectival predicate (Mary is *clever*)
 - ii. Bare nominal predicate (Kate is *doctor*)
 - iii. Indefinite term predicate (Susan is *a good musician*)
 - iv. Definite term predicate (Sophie is *the best candidate*)
 - v. Possessive predicate (The office is *Marian's*)
 - vi. Adpositional (pre- or postpositional) predicate (Clair is *in the garden*)
 - vii. Existential predicate (*There* is beer)

Type of predicate	Semantic relation
Adjectival / bare nominal	Property assignment
Indefinite term	Class inclusion
Definite term	Identification
Possessor term	Possession
Locative term	Location / Existence
Unspecified locative term	Existence

Non-verbal predications may employ a copula, a semantic empty element which basically serves as a base for grammatical specifications to apply to, such as person and TAM distinctions. This holds for many languages in the world including most Uralic languages.⁷ Third person singular, present tense non-verbal predications generally count as the unmarked form, which often does not require a copula. The prime candidate for expressions with a zero copula is the predication with the semantic relation of property assignment, and the last candidate is the one with the semantic relation of existence. Implicational hierarchies of copula support claimed to be cross-linguistically relevant to non-verbal predications are the following.⁸

- (18) Hierarchies relevant to copula support
- a. adjective, bare noun > indefinite term > definite term > possessor > location
 - b. third person > non-third person
 - c. present > past

⁶ It is not necessary to include different types of subjects for a discussion of non-verbal predication and the use of the essive in the Uralic languages.

⁷ There are also other strategies which are, however, not relevant to the present discussion.

⁸ Pustet (2003: 34-39) discusses examples of 'copula dropping' which supports the hierarchies in (18).

d. indicative > non-indicative

The hierarchies in (18) entail that if a language uses a copula with indefinite term predicates, it will also use a copula with definite term, possessor and locational predicates. If used in the present, then also in the past, etc.

When we have a look at the use of a copula in the Uralic languages which have deferential marking of the non-verbal predicates, we get the following picture. For Finnish, Estonian, Votic, Ingrian, Veps,⁹ Karelian, North Saami, and Skolt Saami, there is a copula in all types of non-verbal predication. South Saami is different. Siegl (this volume) argues that no overt copula is required in South Saami in the present tense. This holds for all person distinctions and for both permanent and impermanent expressions, where the nominal predicate is alternatively marked by the nominative or the essive. Due to pragmatic factors, South Saami may, however, use a copula in both types of non-verbal predication. In Erzya and in dialects of Mari, the differential marked non-verbal predication, nominative vs. translative resp. nominative vs. inessive, do not require a copula in the present tense. Komi strongly prefers the combination of zero copula, present tense, predicate marked by the nominative, versus overt copula, past tense, predicate marked by the instrumental. Finally, Mansi and Tundra Nenets do not require a copula in present tense predication where the predicate is marked by the nominative ([Mary ill-NOM], Peter teacher-NOM]), whereas it requires a (semi-)copula if the predicate is marked by the essive/translative. All these observations are in line with the hierarchies of (18). A different cut-off point in hierarchy (ii) holds for South Saami, which does not make a distinction for person in non-verbal predication.

Table 4. The use of a copula in non-verbal predication in Uralic languages with differential marking of the predicate.

	All predication	Present tense		Past tense
		nominative	essive/translative	
Finnish	yes			yes
Estonian	yes			yes
Estonian dialects	yes			yes
Votic	yes			yes
Ingrian	yes			yes
Veps	yes			yes
Karelian	yes			yes
South Saami		no	no	yes
North Saami	yes			yes
Skolt Saami	yes			yes
Erzya		no	no	yes
Mari dialects		no	no	yes
Mansi		no	yes	yes
Nenets		no	yes	yes

With the exception of Mansi and Tundra Nenets, it holds for all Uralic languages with differential marking of the non-verbal predicate that copula support equally applies to both forms. This would in itself count as a strong indication that the two alternative predication are based on

⁹ In Veps vernacular speech the copula is often not used (Grünthal, this volume).

the same type of non-verbal predication, as indicated in (17). One could, however, mitigate this conclusion, because most of these languages, basically Finnic and Saamic, have overt copulas in all types of non-verbal predication. When we disregard these languages, there remain South Saami, Erzya and dialects of Mari. In these three languages or dialects the two types the alternative forms pattern along in using a zero copula. This counts as evidence that the two alternative non-verbal predication are based on one and the same semantic type. Mansi and Tundra Nenets, however, show the opposite, the differential marking goes hand in hand with differential use of a copula: nominative and zero copula versus essive/translative and overt copula (Mansi) or semi-copula (Tundra Nenets). Note that out of these five languages and dialects, only in South Saami is there a correspondence between differential marking and the permanent vs. impermanent state distinction. Why is all this relevant? A possible hypothesis for the differential marking could be that permanent state is associated with property assignment, whereas impermanent state is associated with a relational predicate, a term with a temporal semantic function. Schematically in (19), where the predicates are between braces {} and the arguments in brackets (), (19a) represents a nominal or adjectival predicate as in (17i, and 17ii), and (19b) represents a relational predicate as in (17vi).

- (19) a. {Nominal/Adjectival Predicate} (Argument) (permanent by implication/optional)
 {teacher} (Peter)
 'Peter is a teacher-NOM'
 b. {Temporal Predicate} (Argument) (impermanent)
 {temporary teacher} (Peter)
 'Peter is (currently) a teacher-ESS.'

If (19) presents the correct analysis of the underlying structures of the two alternative expressions, it could be argued that on the basis of implicational hierarchy (18a) structure (19a) is on the left side of the hierarchy, whereas (19b) is on the right side of the hierarchy. If the cut-off point for copula support would be halfway through the hierarchy, (19a) would have no copula whereas (19b) would have one. Unfortunately, the data from the Uralic languages does not clearly support this hypothesis. (19) would account for the differential marking in the use of the nominative versus essive, but it does not account for the distribution of the copula in the various languages. It would only do that for Mansi and Tundra Nenets, where equivalents of (19a) have a zero copula and those of (19b) have an overt copula. Note, however, that the differential marking in Mansi and Tundra Nenets does not entail the permanent vs. impermanent state opposition. For present-day Mansi and Tundra Nenets, hypothesis (19) must then also be rejected.

Now that hypothesis (19) must be rejected for an account of the differential marking of non-verbal predication in Uralic, it can be concluded that the temporal distinction of impermanent state is part of the semantics of the nominal or adjectival predicate. Instead of postulating a relational predicate, the nominal or adjectival predicate should be specified with a feature 'temporal state', or 'stage level'. A derivational rule could account for this in the following way.

- (20) Stage level predicate formation
 Input: Pred-N/A
 Output: [+ stage level] Pred-N/A
 Meaning: Pred-N/A denotes impermanent state

A derivational rule as (20) seems attractive to account for the different use of predicates denoting permanent or impermanent state. If individual level is taken to be the default feature of predicates, rule (20) specifically assigns the feature of stage level, which corresponds to a formal element in actual speech: the essive. Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005: 34) refer to Stump (1985), who expresses the view that in English the marker *as* serves to convert individual level predicates into

stage level predicates. The marker *as* could, however, been seen as the formal expression of the conversion or derivation similar to the essive in (20).

4.2. Semi-copula

In the former section we have seen that non-verbal predications in many Uralic languages take a copula. This also holds for the languages with differential marking of the predicate; they usually have an overt copula in their expressions. In addition to the stative copula constructions, all Uralic languages have some other verbal element, a semi-copula, which is specifically used in non-verbal predications denoting a change. Interestingly, given the background that many Uralic languages have both the essive and the translative as markers in their inventories of cases, stative non-verbal predications use a copula other than dynamic non-verbal predications. One could imagine that the following three types of expressions would be possible side by side, indicating a permanent state in (21a), an impermanent state in (21b), and a change in (21c).

(21)	a.	Kati COP teacher-NOM	[Kati is a teacher (permanent)]
	b.	Kati COP teacher-ESS	[Kati is a teacher (temporary)]
	c.	Kati COP teacher-TRA	[Kati becomes a teacher]

(21a) and (21b) neatly account for the permanent and impermanent state construction, whereas (21c) would account for the change construction. The Uralic languages do, however, not follow strategy (21c) to express a change in the sense of ‘become something.’ It marginally occurs that the stative copula combines with the translative. One example is from Finnish, where the translative in the copula construction entails future, not change.

- (22) Finnish (Hynönen, ch. 2, this volume)
Lounaa-na	~ Lounaa-ksi	o-n	pitsa-a.
lunch-ESS	~ lunch-TRA	COP-3SG	pizza-PAR
- ‘There is ~ will be pizza for lunch.’ (lit. ‘as lunch’ vs. ‘for lunch’)

Uralic languages use a semi-copula of the type ‘become’ in non-verbal predications to indicate a change. Languages such as Finnish, Estonian, Ingrain, Veps, and Karelian, but not Hungarian, which has a distinct translative marker, use the translative in combination with the semi-copula. Votic, in which the distinction between nominative, essive, and translative is blurred, uses all three markers in non-verbal change predications. According to Markus and Rozhanskiy (this volume), this has to do with the semantic, meaningful aspect of the semi-copula, which already reveals that a change is involved. The quality of the marker is not significant then. The Saami languages in our sample have just one marker, traditionally referred to as essive (see section 2 above), which is often also used to mark a change. These markers also occur in combination with the semi-copula indicating change. Udmurt, which does not have an essive or translative, usually uses bare nominal or adjectival predicates, although the instrumental case is also found on the predicate in combination with the semi-copula of the type ‘become’ (Edygarova, this volume). The same holds for Mansi and Selkup, which have one marker, the essive/translative serving two functions. Khanty, with a straightforward translative marker which is basically used for change but also in the realm of the essive, uses the translative in combination with a semi-copula of ‘change’. Hungarian behaves differently: it does not have a semi-copula of the type ‘become’, instead, the future form of the copula is used with the nominative and not the translative.

The conclusion of this section is overwhelming, Uralic languages use two different copulas, one in stative non-verbal constructions and the other in dynamic non-verbal constructions. The former occurs in constructions with the nominative or alternative marker and the latter with the translative or alternative marker. The semantics of state versus change is primarily expressed by the

choice of copula. The use of nominative, essive or translativ is dependent. The basic pattern found in non-verbal predications in Uralic is then as in (23). Many examples supporting (23a) can be found in section 3.1. Many Finnic languages, but particularly also Khanty greatly support (23b).

(23)	a.	Kati BE teacher-NOM(-ESS)	state (permanent-impermanent)
	b.	Kati BECOME teacher-TRA	change

An interesting exception to (23) is Tundra Nenets. Jalava (this volume) convincingly argues that Tundra Nenets distinguishes one copula and two semi-copulas for the expression of non-verbal predications. The (zero-)copula is employed in (permanent) state expressions. The impermanent state expression requires semi-copula *tara-* ‘be necessary’, whereas the change expression requires the other semi-copula *xəja-* ‘leave’.¹⁰ In both semi-copula constructions the essive/translative marker is used.¹¹ Consider (24).

(24)	Tundra Nenets (Jalava, ch. 17, this volume)		
	a.	məń toxolkoda-dm?
I teacher-1SG
‘I am a teacher.’ (A61: 51)	permanent state
	b.	məń toxolkoda-ŋæ tara-m?
I teacher-ESSTR be.necessary-1SG
‘I am (as) a teacher.’	impermanent state
	c.	məń toxolkoda-ŋæ xəja-dm?
I teacher-ESSTR leave-1SG
‘I became a teacher.’	change

The basic reason for the introduction of a semi-copula in (24b-c) has to do with the morphological constraint that non-verbal predicates cannot be marked by cases when inflected for person. The semi-copulas offer a place for person markers and the non-verbal predicate is free to take the essive/translative.

Earlier, in section 3.1 above, we have seen that another morphological principle applies to some languages, such as Veps, Estonian and Karelian, where the use of bare nominal predicates is avoided by attaching a case. The case form can be essive, translative, partitive, or genitive without any semantic implications. See also section 4.4 below, where it is discussed that Votic and Ingrian do not allow bare nominals in complements of modal verbs. It is interesting to see which solutions languages take due to morphological constraints. Tundra Nenets introduces a semi-copula in impermanent state constructions, whereas Karelian almost randomly picks a case marker to avoid bare nominal predicates. These observations are relevant in analyzing the distribution of essive and translative in the Uralic languages: there is not always a direct mapping of forms onto functions and vice versa.

4.3. Converb of ‘be’

Nganasan, Tundra Nenets, Forest Enets, and Tundra Enets show another interesting aspect of the copula in the context of Uralic essive. The converbal form of the copula plays a role in the expression

¹⁰ The semi-copula derives from a perfective verb in the aorist tense. That is why (24c) is rendered into English in the past tense.

¹¹ Example (24b) is the Nenets innovation; Forest Nenets has this too. Example (24c) is attested in Enets, too (Florian Siegl p.c.).

of impermanent state. Szeverényi and Wagner-Nagy (this volume) show that the converb *i-s'ja* 'being' in Nganasan is an essive/translative marker, as in (25).

- (25) Nganasan (Szeverényi and Wagner-Nagy, ch. 19, this volume)
<i>mĩńsjiaraanə</i>	<i>əliɡaku</i>	<i>i-s'ja</i>	<i>taa</i>	<i>kođa-ʔa-m</i> .
although.I	small	COP-CVB (ESSTR)	deer	kill-COA-1SG
- 'Although I am small, I killed the reindeer.'

Note that the converb as the essive/translative marker in Nganasan is a free morpheme. The converbal form of the copula made it one step further in Tundra Nenets, Forest Enets, and Tundra Enets: it is in transition to becoming a bound morpheme. The origin of the essive/translative suffix in Tundra Nenets, but also in the two varieties of Enets, can be traced back to a process of grammaticalization that involves the converbal form of the basic copula being suffixed to a preceding noun (see Jalava, ch. 17, and Siegl, ch. 18, this volume). Finally, Edygarova (ch. 13, this volume) mentions that the converb of 'be' is gaining ground at the expense of the instrumental as the marker of nominal depictive in Udmurt (26). Different from the origin of the converbal essive/translative markers in Nganasan, Nentes, and Enets, Udmurt seems to copy this use from Russian.

- (26) Udmurt (Edygarova, ch. 13, this volume)
<i>końuh</i>	<i>luy-sa</i>	<i>daso</i>	<i>ar-jos</i>	<i>pala</i>	<i>uža</i>	<i>val</i>	<i>ińi</i>
hostler	COP-CVB	ten	year-PL	around	work.PRS.3SG	AUX.1PRT	already
- soku* *Lizka*.
that.time Liza
- 'Liza had been working as a hostler for approximately ten years at this time.'

The examples from Nganasan, Tundra Nenets, Enets, and Udmurt present clear evidence that essive markers may also originate from the converbal form of the copula 'be'. How close can the essive be.

4.4. Modal verbs

Markus and Rozhanskiy (ch. 4 and 5, this volume) argue for the distribution of the essive in Votic and Ingrian to also take modal verbs which have non-verbal complements into consideration. The nominal predicate in the non-finite complements of modal verbs must be marked by either the essive or the translative. This resembles data from Karelian and others, where bare nominals in main clauses are avoided and therefore often receive a case marker (see section 3.1 and 4.2). Example (27) presents ideal data from Votic, because the essive is used in a state and the translative in a change. The distribution of the essive and translative is, however, not as systematic as that. As in main predications there seems to be free variation in using the essive or translative in these languages.

- (27) Votic (Markus and Rozhanskiy, ch. 4, this volume)
a.	<i>miä</i>	<i>koko</i>	<i>ajka</i>	<i>tahto-zi-n</i>	<i>ел-лә</i>	<i>seppe-n</i>
	1SG	whole	time.PAR	want-PST-1SG	COP-INF	smith-ESS
- 'I always wanted to be a smith.'
b.	<i>tämä</i>	<i>taho-B</i>	<i>nejs-sə</i>	<i>sepä-ssi</i>
	3SG	want.PRS-3SG	become-INF	smith-TRA
- 'He wants to become a smith.'

4.5. Conclusions of this section

A first conclusion of this section is that almost all Uralic languages with differential marking of non-verbal predicates use a copula. A correlation according to Pustet (2003) between present tense zero-

copula constructions, non-marked predicates, and permanent state, versus present tense overt copula constructions, marked predicates and impermanent state is only found in Tundra Nenets but not in the thirteen other Uralic languages appearing in this volume with differential marking of the predicate.

A second conclusion is that the essive, translative or essive/translative on non-verbal predicates can synchronically be taken as (derivational) markers indicating the predicates as stage-level predicates. These predicates are not relational predicates.

A third conclusion is the use of semi-copulas in non-verbal predication indicating a change. The non-verbal predicates are always marked by the essive, translative, or essive/translative.

A fourth conclusion is that the converbal form of the copula 'be' may develop into an essive marker, as in Enets, Tundra Nenets, and Nganasan. The origin of the essive is thus not necessarily a case marker but may also be a converb.

On the basis of Votic and Ingrian, a fifth conclusion is that in addition to copula and semi-copula constructions, also constructions with modal verbs taking non-verbal complements should be taken into consideration.

5. The essive in secondary predication

In this section I will discuss the use of the essive or alternative forms in secondary predication. The permanent vs. impermanent distinction does not play a role in this linguistic domain, with the exception of Hungarian, which has differential marking of the depictive. I come back to Hungarian in section 5.1 below.

An important sub-class of secondary predication, the depictive, will receive full attention in section 5.1, because the essive turns out to be the major marker in the encoding of depictives. The discussion of other secondary predication follows in later sections: resultatives (section 5.1.3), predicative complements (section 6), oriented adjuncts (section 7), temporal adverbial phrases (section 7.2), and circumstantial adverbial phrases (section 7.3) are all overviewed.

5.1. Depictives

Depictives are optional secondary predicates such as *raw* in *Mary ate the fish raw*. Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt eds. (2005: 25) define depictive in the following fashion:

“A depictive proper (or depictive in the narrow sense) is a participant-oriented adjunct which is part of the focus domain of a sentence, i.e. which functions as focus exponents. Such adjuncts encode a state which contributes a significant characteristic to the main event – for example, leaving drunk or leaving outraged is different from simply leaving.”

Depictive secondary predication meets the following requirements:

- (28) i. There are two separate predicative elements. (*ate* and *raw*)
- ii. The depictive is obligatorily controlled. The controller is not expressed separately as an argument of the depictive. (*fish* is the controller of *raw* and is an argument of *ate*)
- iii. The depictive does not form a complex or periphrastic predicate with the main predicate. (there is no *raw-eat* as a complex or periphrastic verb)
- iv. The depictive is not an argument of the main verb. (*raw* is not an argument of *eat*)
- v. The depictive is not a modifier of the controller. (*raw* does not modify *ate*)
- vi. The depictive is non-finite. (*raw* does not combine with a finite verb form, i.e. *is*.)
- vii. The depictive is part of the same prosodic unit as the main predicate. (*Mary ate the fish raw* counts as one prosodic unit, there is no comma or full stop intonation between *fish* and *raw*)

The predicate functioning as a depictive may have the form of an adjective, noun, converb, or numeral, as in (29).

- (29) (Pseudo) English
i.	Noun	Peter worked in Amsterdam <i>as a gardener</i> .
ii.	Adjective	Mary ate the fish <i>raw</i> .
iii.	Converb	Charles walked home <i>drunken</i>
iv.	Numeral	They <i>two</i> went to the movie.

Depictives can be set apart from predicative complements, which are not optional (30a), and other optional secondary predication such as resultatives (30b), oriented adjuncts (30c) temporal (30d), and circumstantial adverbial phrases (30d).

(30)	a.	Susan considers her boyfriend <i>handsome</i> .	Complement
	b.	John painted the door <i>green</i> .	Resultative
	c.	Peter <i>stupidly</i> answered the question.	Oriented adjunct
	d.	<i>As a child</i> Andrew liked Brussels sprouts.	Temporal
	e.	<i>As a mother</i> , Kate inquired after what was happening.	Circumstantial

In (30a) the predicative element *handsome* cannot be omitted, hence it is an obligatory part of the predicate structure of the verb *consider*.

In (30b), *green* does not depict a state but a change, or a result of the action specified by the verb *paint*.

Oriented adverbs as in (30c) are more complicated, because they may be ambiguous between manner and depictive. Consider example (31) where the adverb *stupidly* is used as a manner: the stupidity is ascribed to the way Peter answers the question.

- (31) Peter answered the question stupidly.

The same set of words in a different order yield a different interpretation. The adverb *stupidly* in (32) is rather a participant-oriented adverb which syntactically still belongs to the sentence-level adverbs.

- (32) Peter stupidly answered the question.

Adverbs such as *stupidly* in (32) ascribe a certain characteristic to the agent on the basis of the event which it performs. The example can be paraphrased as “It was stupid of Peter to answer the question”, which clearly indicates that the form *stupidly* in (32), irrespective the fact that it takes the adverbial suffix *-ly*, (also) functions as a secondary predicate.

A similar situation may arise with concomitance (Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann 2004: 100). Comitative-marked noun phrases can be analysed as general adjunct constructions which may have a depictive or an adverbial reading. The question arises whether the same holds for abessive (*without*) phrases. This is of particular interest, since Uralic is rich in grammaticalized forms expressing lack, such as abessive case but also privative/caritive derivation and adpositions (Miestamo et al. 2015:24).

Temporal and circumstantial adverbial phrases (30d-e) can be clearly set apart from depictives by applying the negation test. Depictives are within the scope of negation, whereas temporal and circumstantial phrases are outside the scope of negation. Compare the following examples, where the square brackets indicate the scope of negation.

(33)	a.	Mary [did not eat the fish <i>raw</i>].	Depictive

- b. *As a child* Andrew [did not like Brussels sprouts]. Temporal
 e. *As a mother*, Kate [did not inquire after what was happening]. Circumstantial

This section is confined to discussing the depictive proper in the Uralic languages. The use of the essive or the translative in other secondary predications will be dealt with in sections below.

5.1.1. The marking of nominal and adjectival depictives in Uralic

As a major conclusion of the investigation of the marking of the depictive proper consisting of a noun or adjective in the Uralic languages is that the essive is the marker per excellence. The other two types of depictives based on a converb or numeral (cf. 29) behave differently. Converbs, i.e. adverbial participles, in Uralic do not take the essive or translative. Numerals as depictives take the essive or some other marker (see section 5.1.2 below). Again, the observations about the nominal and adjectival depictives lead to the conclusion that the essive is the principal marker of depictives in Uralic. There is no one-to-one relation between the essive and depictives, because (i) there are depictives which are not marked by the essive, and (ii) there are other secondary predicates than depictives which can be marked by the essive. The following examples of the Uralic languages give ample evidence of the essive being the major marker of nominal and adjectival depictives. I refer to section 3 of the individual chapters for more and detailed information and for more examples.

(34) Finnish (Hynönen, ch. 2, this volume)

- a. Sano-n tämä-n sinu-lle ystävä-nä.
 say-1SG this-GEN you-ILL friend-ESS
 'I am saying this to you as a friend.'
 b. Juo-n kahvi-n kylmä-nä.
 drink-1SG coffee-GEN cold-ESS
 'I drink my coffee cold.'

(35) Estonian (Metslang and Lindström, ch. 3, this volume)

- a. Nad tõusid ellu ning valitsesid kuninga-te-na
 they rise:PST:3PL life.ILL and rule:PST:3PL king-PL-ESS
 'They rose to life and ruled as kings.'
 b. paljud lahkusid tema juurest vihas-te-na.
 Many.PL leave:PST.3PL s/he.GEN from angry-PL-ESS
 'Many people left him/her angry.'

Note that Estonian uses the essive in depictives in contrast to main non-verbal predications, where the impermanent state is marked with the translative and not the essive.

(36) Votic (Markus and Rozhanskiy, ch. 4, this volume)

- a. ...kuza te-i-n tō-tā konteiš vōt-ta apinaizē-n
 where do-PST-1SG work-PAR thirteen year-PAR assistant-ESS
 '...where I worked as an assistant for thirteen years.' (Lensu 1930: 235)
 b. tämä tul-i kotto läsive-n
 3SG come-PST.3SG house.ILL ill-ESS
 'He came home ill.'

(37) Ingrian (Markus and Rozhanskiy, ch. 5, this volume)

- a. hā tekkō tō-dā prēttā-n kolhoži-ž
 3SG do.PRS.3SG work-PAR chairman-ESS collective.farm-INE
 'He works as a chairman in the collective farm.'
 b. hā šō-i šubi-n vaŗrī-n
 3SG eat-PST.3SG soup-GEN hot-ESS

‘He ate the soup hot.’

Where both Votic and Ingrian have differential marking of the predicate in main non-verbal predication, a choice between nominative and essive is excluded in depictives. The same holds for Karelian and for Veps, although the translative can be used in various other constructions in the latter. The chapter on Veps does not offer an example with a depictive based on an adjective. It does not, however, explicitly exclude the adjectival depictive.

(38) Veps (Grünthal, ch. 6, this volume)

a. Rado-i-n koruneca-n.
work-PST-1SG cow.minder-ESS
‘I worked as a cow minder.’

b. No example attested with an adjectival depictive in the corpus.

(39) Karelian (Koivisto, ch. 7, this volume)

a. Hiän ruata-u meijän kylä-ššä opaštaja-na.
s/he work-3SG we.GEN village-INE teacher-ESS
‘S/He works as a teacher in our village.’

b. soda-s peäz-i tervehe-nnä kod’i-h.
war-INE/ELA get away-PST.3SG healthy-ESS home-ILL
‘S/He got home safe and sound from the war.’

The essive does not combine with adjectives in South Saami. That is why there is no differential marking of adjectival predicates in main clauses, or adjectival depictives marked by the essive. North Saami and Skolt Saami do not have this restriction. A closed class of adjectives in North Saami has an alternative marker. See Ylikoski (this volume) for more information. Examples of nominal and adjectival depictives in North Saami are presented in (41) and in Skolt Saami in (42) below. See Feist (this volume) for a more detailed discussion of predicative-attributive adjectives as depictives and subtle differences in meaning.

(40) South Saami (Siegl, ch. 8, this volume)

Manne edtjem muahra-Mijan luvnie guessine minnedh.
1SG will.1SG aunt-Mija.GEN to.ILL guest.ESS go.INF
‘I will go to Aunt Mia as a guest.’

(41) North Saami (Ylikoski, ch. 9, this volume)

a. Soai bargaba málesteaddjin báikkálaš restoránŋas.
3DU work.3DU cook.ESS local restaurant.LOC
‘They work as cooks in a local restaurant.’

b. Lih[k]us láven morihit lihkolažžan.
luck.LOC use.to.1SG awake.INF happy.ESS
‘Fortunately, I used to wake up happy.’

(42) Skolt Saami (Feist, ch. 10, this volume)

a. bo’htter leäi ouddam heäppša vue’žžid
giant.NOM be.PST.3SG given.PST.PTCP horse.ILL meat.PL.ACC
porrmõššân
food.ESS

‘The giant had given meat to the horse as food.’

b. Son poori kue’l njuöckkân
3SG.NOM eat.PST.3SG fish.SG.ACC raw.ESS
‘he ate the fish raw’ = the fish was raw

Erzya behaves similar to South Saami in that it has one marker which serves to signal both state and change, and that the marker does not combine with adjectives. Note that the Erzya marker is based on the form *-ks* and is therefore labelled as translative, while the South Saami marker is based on the form *-na* and therefore labelled essive in (40).

(43) Erzya (Turunen 2013)

Tonavt'ń-an	ńej	koto-će	kurs-so	mehańike-ks
study-1SG	now	six-ORD	course-INE	mechanic-TRA

'I am taking now the sixth course as a mechanic.'

Standard Mari does not distinguish a marker similar to the essive. Depictives are in the nominative when coreferential with the subject or in the accusative when coreferential with the object. In dialectal Mari the nominal depictive may take up the inessive (44a). The adjectival depictive may be marked by the unproductive essive, which may be used as an alternative for the nominative or accusative. Saarinen (this volume) suggests that the unproductive essive could be taken to stress the meaning 'while still green', i.e. less stable in time in (44b).

(44) Literary Eastern Mari (Saarinen, ch. 11, this volume)

- a. Saltak-əšte kolə-š.
soldier-INE die-PST1.3SG
'He died (as) a soldier.'
- b. Kijar-əm užargə-ńek ~ užargə-m-ak kočk-ət.
cucumber-ACC green-ESS ~ green-ACC=CLT eat-PRS.3PL
'Cucumbers are eaten raw.'

Komi and Udmurt have neither an essive nor a translative. In many essive-like constructions the instrumental is used. Depictives in Komi are expressed by the nominative and the instrumental as in Russian. Object depictives may also take the accusative. In dialects of Komi and also in Komi-Permyak one may also find the inessive as the marker of depictives which are coreferential with the subject designating a profession or a duty (45). In Udmurt, the depictive is basically marked with the instrumental. The nominal depictive, however, may take the inessive (46), as in Komi dialects, but the adjectival depictive cannot.

(45) Komi, dialectal (Leinonen and Nekrasova, ch. 12, this volume)

Tuvsov göra-köža	dyrji	sijö	ńin	užal-i-s	brigad'ir-yn.
Spring field-work	during	s/he	already	work-PST-3SG	brigadir-INE

'During the spring field work s/he already worked as a head of a brigade.'

(46) Udmurt (Edygarova, ch. 13, this volume)

Gruzśik-yn	uža-j.
loader-INE	work-2PRT.1SG

'I worked as a loader.'

Hungarian distinguishes three essives. Two of them are found on nominal depictives, namely, the essive-formal *-ként* (47a) and the essive-modal *-ul/-ül* (47b). The third type, referred to as an adverbial marker *-n/-an/-en* is found on adjectival depictives (47c). The suffix is also found on oriented adjuncts, which are often ambiguous between manner and depictive. See de Groot (ch. 14, this volume) for a comprehensive description of the essives in Hungarian. Interestingly, the nominal depictive in Hungarian has differential marking corresponding to the permanent-impermanent distinction. There is a choice between the essive *-ként* and the preposition *mint*. The nominative cannot be used in depictives in Hungarian. Example (5) is here repeated as (47a).

(47) Hungarian (de Groot, ch. 14, this volume)

- a. Mari tanár-ként ~ mint tanár dolgozik Budapest-en
 PN teacher-ESS ~ as teacherwork.PRS.3SG Budapest-SUPES
 'Mari is working in Budapest as a teacher (impermanent ~ permanent).'
 b. Minket akar-t-atok főmunkatárs-ak-ul?
 1PL.ACC want-PST-2PL leading.contributor-PL-ESSM
 'Did you want (to have) us as leading contributors?'
 c. Kati nyers-en et-te meg a hal-at.
 Kate raw-ADV eat-PST.3SG.2f ASP the fish-ACC
 'Kate ate the fish raw.'

According to Filchenko (ch. 15, this volume), the most typical means for Eastern Khanty to express depictives are converbal and participial constructions. The language does, however, show examples of nominal depictives expressing a profession marked by the translative (48). Mansi employs the essive/translative in marking depictives, also particularly the nominal depictives of subjects denoting a profession, as in (49).

(48) Kanty (Filchenko, ch. 15, this volume)

- jüγ-ə we-γäl-il küťkül-tə qasi-γ wer-tä
 3SG-INS.O take-PST1-3SG hunt-IMPP man-TRA do-INF
 'S/He was hired (to work) as a hunter'

(49) Mansi (Sipőcz, ch. 16, this volume)

- a. Saw tal stroiřel-iy rupit-as.
 many year builder-ESSTR work-PST.SG3
 'S/He worked as a construction worker for years.'
 b. am aj-əs-ləm śaj-əm isəm-iy.
 I drink-PST-SG.1SG tea-1SG hot-ESSTR
 'I drank my tea hot.'

Tundra Nenets uses the essive/translative to mark secondary predicates, such as the nominal depictives, as in (50). An example of an adjectival depictive marked by the essive/translative is not attested in the corpus of Tundra Nenets. Note, however, that Tundra Nenets allows the combination of adjective + essive/translative with verbs of considering and in resultative constructions, as in (75) in section 5.1.3 below.

(50) Tundra Nenets (Jalava, ch. 17, this volume)

- sajnorma-[h] pūna jiri-wa? kolxoz-xəna śamant səwa
 war-GEN after grandfather-1PL.POSS kolkhoz-LOC of.all good
 ti pæart'a-ŋæ mæncəra-ś
 reindeer herder-ESSTR work.3SG-PRT
 'After the war, our grandfather worked in the kolkhoz as the best reindeer herder.'

The nominal depictives in Enets are marked with the essive/translative. The adjectival depictives do not take this marker.

(51) Enets (Siegl, ch. 18, this volume)

- a. Forest Enets
 Leonid te ponida-ś mosara-ś
 PN [reindeer herder]-ESSTR work-3SG.PST

- ‘Leonid worked as a reindeer herder.’
- b. Tundra Enets
kabu	nagođa-de	ti-ae	leei-gubi
aurora.borealis	be.red-PTCP.IPF	fire-ESSTR	shine-HAB.3SG
- ‘The northern lights shine like a red fire.’

Nganasan allows the free converbal form *i-s’a* as a marker of a nominal depictive. Szeverényi and Wagner-Nagy consider the optional phrase [d’ir suaru ‘hundred stocks’] as a depictive.

- (52) Nganasan (Szeverényi and Wagner-Nagy, ch. 19, this volume)
təniŋia-j-mu-ntu	kuntə d’ir	suaru	i-s’a	mi-ʔə-ti.
so-be-DER-GEN.3SG	during hundred	reserve.ACC	be-CVB do-EP-3SG.OBJ	
- ‘While he did so, he made a hundred stocks.’

According to Wagner-Nagy, depictives, both nominal and adjectival, are rare or even not existing in Selkup and Kamas. In Northern Selkup there is the following rather rare example.

- (53) Northern Selkup: Taz dialect (Wagner-Nagy, ch. 20, this volume)
lča	ɔɔm-tiʃ	qoo-tqo	ɔɔmta	qəættoo-qin
lcha	sit-PTCP.PRS	boss-ESSTR	sit.3SG	town-LOC
- ‘lcha is sitting in the town like a czar.’

5.1.2. The marking of numeral depictives in Uralic

Some of the Uralic languages have numeral depictives, i.e. depictives which are not based on a noun or an adjective but on a numeral. Numeral depictives are attested in Votic, Skolt Saami, Hungarian, Tundra Nenets, and Enets. Votic does not employ the essive, as for nominal and adjectival depictives, but the translative. Skolt Saami uses the essive on the numeral. Hungarian uses the adverbial marker as in (47c) for the adjectival depictive, which also counts as the marker of the third type of essive. Tundra Nenets and Enets use the essive/translative marker as on the nominal depictive.

- (54) Votic (Markus and Rozhanskiy, ch. 4, this volume)
mũ	mē-mmə	esimäjze-ssi	tũ	mē-ttə	tejze-ssi
1PL	go.PRS-1PL	first-TRA	2PL	go.PRS-2PL	second-TRA
- a nāmā men-nā keɹmɛtɛma-ssi
- and 3PL go-PRS.3PL third-TRA
- ‘We will go first, you will go second, and they will go third.’
- (55) Skolt Saami (Feist, ch. 10, this volume)
son	vuõ’ni	pukid	kue’htten
3SG.NOM	see.PST.3SG	all.PL.ACC	two.ESS
- ‘he saw everyone double (e.g. when drunk)’ (lit. ‘he saw everyone as two’)
- (56) Hungarian (de Groot, ch. 14, this volume)
Kett-en	men-t-ünk	haza.
two-ADV	go-PAST.1PL	home
- ‘The two of us went home.’
- (57) Tundra Nenets (Jalava, ch. 17, this volume)
ńaxər-ŋæ	ŋajəbar-manć	ŋamtid[ʔ]
three-ESSTR	eat.meat-PURP	sit.down.3PL.REFL
- ‘The three of them sat down to eat meat.’
- (58) Enets (Siegl, ch. 18, this volume)
- a. Forest Enets

	bud'i	šiđi-iš	ŋol'u	te	kađa-xi-č
	3DU	two-ESSTR	one	reindeer.ACC	kill-3DU-PST
	'They killed one reindeer.' (Lit. 'they as two')				
b.	Tundra Enets				
	šiđi-ae	moga-xiđo	kañi-xo'		
	two-ESSTR	forest-LAT.PL	go-3DU		
	'They, the two of them, went to the forests'				

5.1.3 Resultatives

In order to get a better understanding of the marking of depictives, it is also good to have a look at resultatives. Under the label resultative one finds a great variety of constructions including complements of verbs of change ('become', 'change'), accomplishments of the type 'Leo baked a cake.' or 'She combed her hair.' There is also a great variety in marking resultatives. For the comparison with depictives we look at resultatives of the type in *Peter painted the door green*, assuming that these two are quite good to compare: depictives and this type of resultative are both optional secondary predications. Moreover, depictives are clear stative secondary predications, whereas change is involved in resultatives. The following examples illustrate the occurrences of the essive and translative without claiming that other forms do not occur. The Finnic languages with two different markers, essive and translative, typically use the essive for depictives and the translative for resultatives. Hungarian, which also has essive and translative, uses still another marker for the resultatives, namely the sublative 'onto'. North Saami and Skolt Saami have just one marker, the essive, which is found on both depictives and resultatives. South Saami does not allow the essive on adjectives. Khanty uses the translative for depictives and resultatives. Tundra Enets has one marker, the essive/translative, which is used to mark both depictive and resultative. Nganasan employs the prolativ as marker of the resultative and not the converb *i-s'a* 'being' as the marker of depictives.

- (59) Finnish (Hynönen, p.c.)
 Petteri maala-si ove-n punaise-ksi
 Peter paint-PST.3SG door-GEN/ACC red-TRA
 'Peter painted the door red.'
- (60) Estonian (Metslang and Lindström, p.c.)
 John pühki-s laua kuiva-ks
 John wipe-PST.3SG table.SG.GEN dry-SG.TRA
 'John wiped the table dry.'
- (61) Votic (Ariste 1968: 31)
 лauta krāzga-tī musa-ssi
 table paint-IMPERS.PST black-TRA
 'The table was painted black.'
- (62) Ingrian (Markus and Rozhanskiy, p.c.)
 tama aida piittä krāže-da rohoižē-kš
 this fence have.to.PRS.3SG paint-INF green-TRA
 'This fence should be painted green.'
- (63) Veps
 No example attested.
- (64) Karelian
 No example attested.
- (65) South Saami
 No example attested.
- (66) North Saami (Ylikoski, ch. 9, this volume)
 Jus mun livččen seamma johtilit barberen

- if 1SG be.COND.1SG same quick.ADV shave.PST.PTCP
 de livččen nájadan iežan buot varran!
 then be.COND.1SG damage.by.cutting.PST.PTCP refl.GA.1SG all blood.ESS
 'If I had shaved as quickly [as he did], I would have slashed myself all bloody!'
- (67) Skolt Saami (Feist, ch. 10, this volume)
 åålm kálkkii pöört čappeen
 man.SG.NOM paint.PST.3SG house.SG.ACC black.ESS
 'the man painted the house black'
- (68) Erzya (Turunen 2013)
 meže l'ijado-kšno-ś ej-ste-d'e-nze tu-ś penge-ks
 what remain-FREQ-1PST-3SG PoP-ELA-ABL-3PL go-1PST.3SG firewood-TRA
 'What remained of it went as firewood.'
- (69) Mari (Saarinen, ch. 11, this volume)
 a. Eastern literary Mari
 Kem-əm šəgər-əm əšt-en.
 boot-ACC tight-ACC make-2PST.3SG
 'S/he made the boots (too) tight.'
 b. Western literary Mari
 Kem-əm tor-əm əšt-en.
 boot-ACC tight-ACC make-2PST.3SG
 'S/he made the boots (too) tight.'
- (70) Komi (Leinonen and Nekrasova p.c.)
 Petyr mavt-öma ödzös-sö görd-ön ~ görd-ö
 Petyr.NOM paint-2PST.3SG door-POSS3.ACC red-INS ~ red-ILL
 'Peter painted his door red.'
- (71) Udmurt (Edygarova, p.c.)
 Petyr ös-ez gord ~ gord-en buja-z.
 Peter door-ACC red.NOM ~ red-INSTR paint-1PRT.3SG
 'Peter painted the door red.'
- (72) Hungarian (de Groot, ch. 14, this volume)
 János rongyos-ra táncol-ta a cipő-jé-t.
 PN ragged-SUB dance-PST.3SG.2f the shoe-3SG.POS-ACC
 'John danced his shoes to pieces.'
- (73) Khanty (Filchenko, ch. 15, this volume)
 loʏtaŋ -qə jor-ɪ!
 loop-TRA tie-IMPER.3SG
 'Tie it into a loop!'
- (74) Mansi (Katalin Sipőcz, p.c.)
 xul kamińt-əʏ pajt-əs-ləm.
 fish soft-ESSTR cook-PST-SG.1SG
 'I cooked fish tender.'
- (75) Tundra Nenets (Lotta Jalava, p.c.)
 šit ńerrña paskoj-ŋæ padta-ŋku-dm?
 you.ACC first beautiful-ESSTR paint-FUT-1SG
 'First I will paint you beautiful.'
- (76) Forest Enets (Siegl, ch. 18, this volume)
 to-ʔ salba-š kodi-ubi-ńim
 lake-[NOM.PL] ice-ESSTR freeze-HAB-ASS.3PL
 'The lakes freeze to ice.'
- (77) Nganasan (Szeverény and Wagner-Nagy, ch. 19, this volume)

- siti hiñəl'ükü-məni ɣəmsu-mtu d'etad'i-ʔə
s/he small-PRO meat-ACC.3SG cut-COA.3SG
'S/He cut the meat into small pieces.'
- (78) Selkup (Wagner-Nagy, p.c.)
Mat midit-pa-m kətə-m padəl-xə
I paint-PST.NAR-1SG fence-ACC yellow-TRA
'I painted the fence yellow.'
- (79) Kamas (Wagner-Nagy, p.c.)
No example attested.

When we compare the marking of resultatives with depictives, there is a clear preference for the use of the translative and not the essive. Most but not all languages with just one marker for state and change do employ the marker for both depictive and resultative. Other markers are found, such as sublative and prolative.

5.1.4. Conclusions of this section

Sections 5.1 shows in a overwhelming way that the essive, translative or essive/translative is the marker of nominal depictives. All languages from our sample which distinguish an essive(-like) marker use this form on nominal depictives. Even languages or varieties which do not have an essive, such as Udmurt and dialects of Mari and Komi, may use the locative inessive marker instead of the instrumental, or the unproductive essive in Mari dialects. Many – although significantly fewer – languages allow the essive or its alternatives on adjectival depictives. Languages such as South Saami, Enets, or Erzya which do not allow the essive or translative on adjectival main predicates do the same for adjectival secondary predicates. The fact that, like in main predications, the adjective is less hospitable for essive/translative markers may then have to do with a morphological constraint and not with the semantics of the adjectival predicate. The hierarchy given in (14a) – Noun > Adjective – also applies to the nominal and adjectival predicates in secondary predicates, the depictives.

Table 5. The marking of optional depictives and resultatives in Uralic

	Depictive			Resultative
	nominal	adjectival	numeral	
Two markers				
Finnish	Essive	Essive		Translative
Estonian	Essive	Essive		Translative
Votic	Essive	Essive	Translative	Translative
Ingrian	Essive	Essive		Translative
Veps	Essive	Essive		
Karelian	Essive	Essive		
Hungarian	Essive 1 and 2	Essive 3	Essive 3	Sublative
One marker				
South Saami	Essive			
North Saami	Essive	Essive		Essive
Skolt Saami	Essive	Essive		Essive
Erzya	Translative			
Mansi	Essive/translative			
Khanty	Translative			Translative
Tundra Nenets	Essive/translative		Essive/translative	Essive/translative
Enets	Essive/translative		Essive/translative	Essive/translative

Nganasan	Essive/translative			Prolative
Selkup (Taz)	Essive/translative			Translative
No marker				
Mari				
Mari - dialect	Inessive	Unproductive essive		Accusative
Komi - dialect	Inessive			Instrument / Illative
Udmurt	Inessive			Nominative / Instrument

The data from section 5.1 also shows that depictives marked by the essive or alternative forms preferably contain nominals denoting a function or profession (Nichols 1978; Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt 2005: 34). It is even claimed for Mansi and Khanty that the nouns available for depictives are restricted to the class of functions and professions. This observation supports the view that the nominal depictives are basically stage level secondary predications. Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt (2005:2) state that depictive secondary predicates provide a major diagnostic for the stage level vs. individual level distinction. Consequently, the use of the essive as the marker of the nominal depictives reinforces the idea that the essive is the marker of impermanent state, because depictives are basically stage level predications. This is, however, not entirely correct, because individual level predicates do incidentally occur as depictives without conversion into a stage level predicates, e.g. in examples of the type 'I accompanied the children as an adult to the zoo.'

We may thus conclude that the association of Uralic essive with impermanent state basically derives from the use of the essive on nominal depictives and only marginally from the differential marking of non-verbal main predicates.

6. Predicative complements

There are classes of verbs which take secondary predicates as complements. In contrast to depictives and resultatives as discussed in section 5 above, the secondary predicates are obligatory, not optional. There are basically two classes which can be referred to as the verbs of considering versus the verbs of appointing. The former class consists of verbs such as *consider*, *see*, *keep*, *use*, and *accept*, whereas the latter has verbs such as *name*, *call*, *take*, and *divide*. The verbs are typically three place predicates where the third argument predicates over the second. The predicative relation in the verbs of considering is static, while in the verbs of appointing it is dynamic. Consider (80).

- (80) a. Mary considers her boyfriend handsome. [boyfriend is handsome]
b. John appointed his fiancée chair person. [fiancée becomes chair person]

Given the distinction between essive and translative in stative and dynamic non-verbal predications, one may wonder which markers the Uralic languages use on the secondary predicates in the two classes of verbs. It will not come as a surprise that the Finnic languages which have an essive and a translative basically use the essive with the verbs of considering and the translative with the verbs of appointing. The argument structure of the two classes of verbs is given in (81). The representation of the third argument shows a non-verbal predicate which applies to (x2) to indicate the relation between the third and second argument of the verbs.

- (81) a. considerV (x1) (x2) (x3: Pred-N/A (x2))ESS
b. appointV (x1) (x2) (x3: Pred-N (x2))TRA

The essive and translative, as indicated in (81), do, however, not apply consistently within the two classes of verbs. There is quite some variation in the marking of predicative complements within and between languages. Consider Finnish (82), which shows the distribution as in (81).

(82) Finnish (de Groot, ch. 1, this volume)

- a. Pidä-n hän-tä tyhmä-nä.
hold-PRES.1SG he-PAR stupid-ESS
'I consider him stupid.'
- b. Tiedekuntaneuvosto nimittää hän-et dosenti-ksi.
faculty.council name.PRES.3SG he-ACC docent-TRA
'The faculty council names him docent.'

A similar distribution of markers is found in Votic, Ingrian, Veps and Karelian, although the translative is also found with verbs of considering in Votic, Ingrian and Karelian. In section 3 we have seen that the distinction between essive and translative is blurred in Karelian. Like in non-verbal main predications, Estonian employs the translative instead of the essive (see section 3 above for details) with verbs of considering:

(83) Estonian (de Groot, ch. 1, this volume)

- Ma pea-n neid poisse targa-ks
I hold-PRES.1SG these.PL.PART boy.PL.PART intelligent-TRA
'I consider these boys intelligent.'

Hungarian, which also has essive and translative markers, employs the dative with verbs of considering and dative and translative with verbs of appointing.

(84) Hungarian (de Groot, ch. 14, this volume)

- a. Okos-nak tart-om a fiú-t.
clever-DAT hold-1SG the boy-ACC
'I consider the boy clever.'
- b. Igazgató-vá nevez-i ki Pali-t.
Director-TRA appoint-3SG.2f PV PN-ACC
'S/he oppoints Paul director.'
- c. Ők Kiss Sándor-t választot-t-ák meg elnök-nek.
they PN-ACC elect-PST-3PL.2f PV chairman-DAT
'They selected Sándor Kiss as chairman.'

The languages with one marker, such as Saami, Mansi, Nenets, Enets, and Nganasan, use that marker with both classes of verbs. Khanty, however, uses the nominative with verbs of considering and the translative with verbs of appointing.

A comparison between the marking of non-verbal predicates, depictives and predicative complements makes clear that the essive and translative are found in all three domains, where the essive is basically used in stative expressions and the translative in expressions denoting a change. Deviations in the standard marking of non-verbal predicates, as found in Estonian, Votic, Ingrian, Veps and Karelian, also partly arise in the marking of depictives and predicative complements. This suggests that the notion of non-verbal predication is relevant in all three domains. Hungarian, in contrast, has different markers in all three domains. There is no differential marking of non-verbal main predicates, they all take the nominative. The essive marker *-ként* is found on depictives, but not in the other two domains. The favorite marker of predicative complements is the dative for both state and change. The last observation suggests that verbs with a predicative complement may take a

genuine three-place predicate as a model, particularly the verb ‘give’ with an agent (nominative), patient (accusative) and recipient (dative).¹²

Planck (1985) put forward the hypothesis that depictive constructions are always derivative of [stative] predicative complement constructions, i.e. that they always exhibit the same structure and marking as predicative complement constructions. This is correct for a number of Uralic languages such as Finnish, Saami, Mansi, Tundra Nenets, Enets, Nganasan, and Selkup, partly correct for Estonian, Votic, Ingrian and Karelian, Mari, Komi, and Udmurt, but definitely not correct for Hungarian and Khanty.

7. Essives in adverbial phrases

This sections deals with the essive marker or alternative in the domain of adverbial phrases: manner, temporal, circumstantial, locational, comparative and simile phrases.

7.1. Manner

Himmelman and Schultze-Berndt (2005: 7-15) point out that there may be an overlap between depictives and manner adverbials, or that one form or marker may be ambiguous between a depictive or manner interpretation in the languages of the world. This is illustrated in (30c) above with the example ‘Peter stupidly answered the question.’, where *stupidly* is ambiguous between manner (the way Peter answered) and depictive (Peter is stupid). The conclusion for the Uralic languages is that ambiguity of depictives marked by the essive, translative or essive/translative does not arise. Given the data discussed in this volume it can be noted that the many Uralic languages have distinct markers for depictives and (manner) adverbials. Hynönen (this volume) contrasts depictive and manner in the following fashion:

(85) Finnish (Hynönen, ch. 2, this volume)

Pääministeri	avasi	tilaisuuden	tyylikkää-nä	~ tyylikkää-sti.
prime.minister	open.PST	ceremony	stylish-ESS	~ stylish-ADV

‘The prime minister opened the ceremony in a stylish outfit ~ with style.’

The essive case form in (85) refers to the minister’s appearance during the process of opening the ceremony (‘The prime minister is stylish and s/he is opening the ceremony’) and is therefore a clear depictive, whereas the adverb form is a clear adverbial describing the manner of the opening.

Syncretism plays a minor role in possible ambiguity between manner and depictive. Veps has notorious syncretism in the morphological system. The suffix *-n* is the marker of manner adverbials, genitive, adessive, and essive. Word specific inflectional rules may help to distinguish one from another. See Grünthal (this volume) for details. Votic translative and adverbial markers take the same form *-ssi*. The interpretation of manner or depictive is, however, always evident in Votic. Compare:

(86) Votic (Markus and Rozhanskiy, ch. 4, this volume)

a.	aj	ku	päiv’	üvä-ssi	pajse-B
	oh	how	sun	good-ADV	shine.PRS-3SG
	‘How nicely the sun is shining!’ (manner)				
b.	tämä	tul-i	kotto	esimäje-ssi	
	3SG	come-PST.3SG	house.ILL	first-TRA	
	‘He came home first.’ (depictive)				

¹² See, for instance, Working group Functional Grammar (1981) for examples of the moulding of semantic content on different predicate structures.

Skolt Saami offers a few examples where the essive is found in a pure manner way, as in (87). The depictive interpretation is excluded here.

- (87) Skolt Saami (Feist, ch. 10, this volume)
âlgg	lee'd	samai	jõnn	puõlâšinn,	de
must.PRS.3SG	be.INF	quite	big	subzero+night.SG.NOM	and
te'l	pue'rben			poppad	
at.that.time	good.CMPR.ESS			stick.INF	
- 'It must be a severe freezing night and then they will stick better.'

More so than Skolt Saami, Mansi allows the essive/translative to express manner as in (88). The marker can also be found on lexicalized forms such as *akway* 'fully, completely', *ilttiy* 'suddenly' (Sipőcz, this volume).

- (88) Mansi (Sipőcz, ch. 16, this volume)
taw	saka	kārkam-iy	rūpita-n	xum-ikwe	ōl-əs
s/he	very	skillful-ESSTR	work-PTCP.PRS	man-DIM	be-PST.SG3
- 'He was a man working skillfully.'

In a similar way as in English (Himmelman and Schultze-Berndt 2005: 6), expressions with the adverbial marker in Hungarian may be ambiguous between depictive and manner as in (89).

- (89) Hungarian (de Groot, ch. 14, this volume)
János	mérges-en	ment	el.
John	angry-ADV	go.PAST.3SG	away
- 'John went away angry / angrily.'

The adverbial marker in Hungarian also counts as an essive marker found on adjectival and numeral depictives.

The conclusion for the Uralic languages is that ambiguity of depictives marked by the essive, translative or essive/translative arises only very marginally. The Uralic languages have distinct markers for depictives and (manner) adverbials which do not overlap. Due to a few cases of syncretism, essive and manner may have the same form but are semantically different.

7.2. Temporal adverbial phrases

One category of nouns with an essive, translative or essive/translative counts as a temporal adverbial phrase in all Uralic languages, namely, one denoting a life-stage, such as 'as a child', or 'as a young woman'. Phrases like these look very much like depictives in the Uralic languages, however, they all remain outside the scope of negation as a diagnostic to distinguish depictives from adverbial phrases. Consider:

- (90) a. As a child Janice liked Brussels sprouts.
 b. As a child Janice [did not like Brussels sprouts.]

Hynönen (this volume) argues that the essives with a temporal meaning usually take the position in the clause where other temporal phrases are found. In de Groot (ch. 14, this volume) I argue the same for Hungarian. Finnish and Hungarian thus provide evidence in support of the view that temporal essives are semantically and or syntactically different from depictive essives.

Uralic languages do not systematically, productively use essival markers in temporal phrases of the type 'for a long time' or 'during the war'. They can, however, be found as lexicalized markers in

a limited set of temporal expressions, referring to parts of the day, days of the week, yesterday, today, tomorrow, weeks, months, seasons, dates, years, or festivals.¹³ The distribution of essive markers over these categories differs widely over the various Uralic languages. See the sections 6.1 of the chapters with the individual descriptions of the languages.

7.3. Circumstantial adverbial phrases

Like temporal adverbial phrases with an essive, circumstantial adverbial phrases with an essive are outside the scope of negation. Compare:

- (91) a. As a father, Richard inquired after what was happening.
b. As a father, Richard [did not inquire after what was happening.]

The phrase ‘as a father’ does not denote a life stage, instead, it offers circumstantial information in this utterance. Several, but definitely not all, Uralic languages allow this type of phrases marked by the essive, translative or essive/translative.

7.4. Locational adverbial phrases

Uralic languages do not use essive-like forms to mark locations. None of the essival markers discussed in this volume are found as markers of location.¹⁴

7.5. Comparative and simile expressions

Interestingly, none of the Uralic languages uses the essive, translative, or essive/translative in comparative or simile constructions of the type ‘look like’, or ‘similar to’. This may come as a surprise, because depictives are close to similarity: ‘He worked as (if he is) a car mechanic.’ All Uralic languages have other means to express comparison or similarity which are distinct from essive or alternative markers.

7.6. Conclusions of this section

The often attested ambiguity between depictive and manner in languages of the world only marginally occurs in the Uralic languages. They have distinct markers for depictive and (manner) adverbial phrases. Essival markers are not productively used in temporal phrases. They are found in a limited set of temporal expressions referring to parts of the day, days of the week, yesterday, today, tomorrow, weeks, months, seasons, dates, years, or festivals. The use of the essive in circumstantial phrases is found in several, but not all Uralic languages. They are never used for locational expressions, and they do not occur in comparative and simile expressions.

8. Word order

Uralic essives are found in four syntactically different types of phrases, namely, in manner, depictive, temporal, and circumstantial phrases:

(92)	Manner	You think <i>as a child</i> .
	Depictive	Paul is working <i>as a guide</i> in Greece. / Mary ate the fish <i>raw</i> .
	Temporal	<i>As a child</i> I lived in London.
	Circumstantial	<i>As prime minster</i> , he did not intervene.

¹³ This is their original location in time meaning and a relic of pre-essive semantics (Florian Siegl p.c.).

¹⁴ Florian Siegl pointed out to me that essives on weekdays, as in Finnish, or with cardinal directions, as in Saami, or on postpositions are historically markers of location.

Clauses can be analysed as hierarchical structures, consisting of different layers, each having their own set of operators and restrictors (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008). Manner can be considered a restrictor of a verb, where depictive is associated with a verb and its arguments. Temporal and circumstantial phrases have a much wider scope. An example of an operator is negation, which has scope over a verb and its arguments. Example (93) summarizes the (partial) hierarchical structure of the clause relevant to the essives in Uralic:

- (93) ... [NEG { ...(Verb...manner ...) NP, NP... depictive ... }]... temporal, circumstantial ...
- a. Manner is a modifier of the verb
 - b. Depictive is specified on the level of the verb and its arguments
 - c. Negation has scope over manner, verb, arguments, and depictive
 - d. Circumstantial and temporal modifiers are on a higher level, i.e. outside the scope of negation

With the exception of Tundra Enets, Forest Enets, and Tundra Nenets, which have strict SOV word orders, the order of constituents in all other Uralic languages is relatively free, i.e. all permutations of verb, subject, object and adverbs are grammatical with the same cognitive meaning (cf. chapters 2-20, this volume, and also Comrie 1988, Vilkuna 1998). There are, however, various restrictions which have *inter alia* to do with scope distinctions, as indicated in (93) and pragmatics, where topic and focus, or given and new information may play a role in the order of constituents. Manner expressions are likely to be found in the vicinity of the verb, because it is a restrictor of the verb, where circumstantial phrases are more likely to be found in the periphery of a clause, because of their wide scope. As for the temporal and circumstantial phrases marked by an essive, it is indeed the case that these phrases tend to occur at the beginning or end of clauses. As scene setting expressions, they prefer the beginning. As for manner phrases and depictives, they have a preference for a place close to the verb, or for depictives in some languages close to the element they further specify as a predicative adjunct. Specific positions for topic or focus constituents cannot be identified although focus constituents tend to prefer the sentence final position in Estonian, Ingrian, and Veps, and (immediately) before the verb in Mari, Udmurt, Hungarian, Khanty, Tundra Nenets and Enets. The syntax and discourse functions in most of the Uralic languages are generally rather poorly understood, as Vilkuna (1998: 227) concludes. Many contributions in this volume make similar statements in their section on word order and focus. However, on the basis of the many examples and statistics presented in this volume, the following general picture arises, as summarized in Table 6. Note that the statements made in this table are not absolute, they represent the patterns found in the majority of examples in this volume. Also note that the order of focus and verb, and depictive and verb does not necessarily indicate adjacency, i.e. that the focus or depictive immediately precedes or follows the verb. There may be constituents in between the focus or depictive and the verb.

Table 6. Word order patterns, focus, and the position of the depictive relative to the verb.

Language	word order	major pattern	focus position	depictive position
Finnish	free	SVO		V dep
Estonian	free	SVO	clause final	V dep
Votic	free	SVO		V dep
Ingrian	free	SVO	clause final	V dep
Veps	free	SVO	clause final	V dep
Karelian	free	SVO		V dep

South Saami	free	SOV/SVO		V dep / dep V
North Saami	free	SVO		V dep
Skolt Saami	free	SVO		V dep
Erzya	free	SVO		V dep
Mari	free	SOV	Foc V	dep V
Komi	free	SOV/SVO	Foc V/V Foc	V dep / dep V
Udmurt	free	SOV	Foc V	dep V
Hungarian	free	SOV/SVO	Foc V	dep V
Khanty	free	SOV	Foc V	dep V
Mansi	free	SOV		dep V
Nenets	not free	strict SOV	Foc V	dep V
Enets	not free	strict SOV	Foc V	dep V
Nganasan	free	SOV		dep V
Selkup	free	SOV		dep V
Kamas	free			

Considering Table 6 it becomes clear that there is a striking correlation between the languages with the statistically preferred order of SVO and the position of a focus after the verb, and the ordering of verb vs. depictive. Languages which favor the order SOV prefer the focus and the depictive before the verb. Nose (2003) suggests a relation between depictive and focus in Finnish and Hungarian while discussing the *essive* in the two languages. In de Groot (ch. 14, this volume) it is demonstrated for Hungarian that almost one third of all nominal depictives with *-ként* ‘as’ of the Hungarian Gigaword Corpus are in the position immediately preceding the finite verb, the position for focus constituents in Hungarian. It is argued here, however, that depictives in the position special for focus constituents, are not necessarily the focus of the clause. This follows from examples of depictives in *thetic* expressions, i.e. all new information utterances with no special focus. Hungarian depictives in *thetic* expressions prefer the position otherwise occupied by the focus constituent, as can be seen in (94).

(94) Hungarian (de Groot, ch. 14, this volume)

- a. Anikó orvos-ként dolgoz-ik.
PN doctor-ESSF work-3SG
‘Anikó works as a doctor.’
- b. Pista nyers-en et-te meg a kagyló-t.
PN raw-ADV eat-PST.3SG.2f ASP the mussel-ACC
‘Pista ate the mussel raw.’

It can thus be concluded that depictives are not (necessarily) the focus constituents in clauses. There is, however, a relation between depictives and focus, visible in all Uralic languages as shown in Table 6. A straightforward explanation for the relation between depictives and focus is that depictives are predicating expressions which rank high on a focus scale. In non-verbal main predications, the non-verbal predicate is basically the focus, where the subject counts as given information. In focus constructions, i.e. cleft constructions, the predicate is an emphatic focus. Consider:

- (95) a. Mary is **ill**.
- b. It was **a book** that Peter received as a present.

There may be another type of explanation based on the consideration that depictives denoting a function or profession, i.e. the majority of nominal depictives in the Uralic languages, look very much like an argument of the verb ‘work’:

(96) work-V (John) (as a carpenter)

If (96) were the underlying representation of ‘John works as a carpenter.’, the second argument would count as a prime candidate for the function of focus. We should leave this as a possible option.

As for the other constituents marked by the essive, for the temporal and circumstantial phrases, it holds that they basically belong to the domain of given or presupposed information. Manner phrases marked by the essive are modifiers of the verb (see 93) and therefore rank high on a focus scale, probably higher than the depictive.

(97)	a.	John works skillfully .	Manner
	b.	John works as a carpenter .	Depictive
	c.	John works skillfully as a carpenter.	Manner and depictive

9. The application of the essive questionnaire to non-Uralic languages

Before we end this chapter with the general conclusions, we will have a brief look at the applicability of the essive questionnaire to languages other than Uralic. It is stated in the introduction to this volume (de Groot, ch. 1, this volume) that apparently no other languages than the Uralic languages have a unique essive marker comparable to Finnish (98):

- (98) Finnish (Hynönen, ch. 2, this volume)
a.	Anna o-n	opettaja-na	~ sairaa-na.
	Anna COP-3SG	teacher-ESS	~ ill-ESS
	‘Anna is (working as) a teacher ~ (temporarily) ill.’		
b.	Anna o-n	opettaja	~ sairas.
	Anna COP-3SG	teacher.NOM	~ ill.NOM
	‘Anna is a teacher (by profession) ~ (chronically) ill.’		

This statement is too strong, because an opposition similar to that of Finnish is found in Akawaio (Cariban) as discussed by Meira and Gildea (2009: 109). Consider example (99):

- (99) Akawaio (Meira and Gildea 2009: 109)
a.	juwaŋ	kīrə-rə
	hunger	3AN-EMPH
	‘He is hungry (always).’	
b.	juwaŋ	be maŋ
	hunger	ESS 3.COP.IMMED
	‘He is hungry (now; a fact).’	

The application of the essive questionnaire to Cariban languages such as Akawaio seems very fruitful. In fact, the description of the grammatical element *me* in related Hixkaryana on the basis of the essive questionnaire reveals interesting new insights in the syntax and semantics of this postpositional relator (de Groot, forthcoming).

Example (98) shows that Finnish has a specific marker *-na* which is associated with impermanent state in contrast to the use of the nominative which is associated with permanent state. The opposition between impermanent vs. permanent state may, however, be expressed by other means than the essive vs. nominative, as for instance by different copulas, or by individual-

level versus stage level properties of non-verbal predicates. An overview of the studies on non-verbal predications of Eriksen (2006), Pustet (2003), Stassen (1997, 2001), and Wetzer (1996) reveals that the following languages apparently have essival properties, either semantic or formal.¹⁵

Table 7. Languages with essival elements

Language family	Language
Afro-Asiatic	Maltese
Austro-Asiatic	Mundari
Austronesian	Māori, Nakanai, Tonga, Chamorro
Basque	Basque
Cariban	Hixkaryana
Chukotko-Kamchatkan	Chukchi
Creoles and pidgins	Ndyuka, Tok Pisin
Dravidian	Tamil, Kannada, Telugu, Parji, Kurukh
Eastern Sudanic	Luo, Turkana
Hokan	Tiipai (Jamul)
Indo-European	Gaelic, Irish, Lithuanian, Polish, Russian, Spanish
Mayan	Jakaltek
Nakh-Daghestanian	Archi, Avar, Lezgian
Niger-Congo	Ewe, Gbo, Yoruba
Pama-Nyungan	Diyari
Sino-Tibetan	Limbu
Tai-Kadai	Thai
Tucanoan	Barasano
Tupian	Tupi
Uralic	Estonian, Finnish, Votic
Uto-Aztecan	Huichol, Shoshone

10. Conclusions

The general conclusions of the distribution of the essive in the Uralic languages can be summarized in the following way.

1. The study of the essive in Uralic is only meaningful in combination with the study of the translative.
2. The labels essive and translative in the grammars of Uralic languages are not used in a systematic way. They are partially functionally (state or change) and partially formally based on the form *-na* for the essive, and *-ks* for the translative, whatever their functions. There are languages with just one form used in both essive and translative sense. These labels could be renamed as essive/translative (or translative/essive) (although not necessarily), which would yield the following typology:

Table 8. Essive, translative and essive/translative in the Uralic languages (revision)

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
--------	--------	--------

¹⁵ I am very grateful to Emmi Hynönen who made the survey as a pre-study to her PhD.

Two markers			One marker		No marker
Essive		Translative	Essive/translative		no function
Finnish	-na	-ksi	South Veps	-ks	Mari
Estonian	-na	-ks	South Saami	-ne	Komi
Votic	-n	-ssi	North Saami	-n	Udmurt
Ingrian	-n	-kš	Skolt Saami	-n	Kamas
Veps	-n	-ks	Erzya	-ks	
Karelian	-na	-kši	Moksha	-ks	
Hungarian	-ként	-vá/-vé	Khanty	-ka	
	-ul/-ül		Mansi	-ŋ	
	-n/-an/-en		Enets Forest	-Vš	
			Enets Tundra	-ae	
			Nenets	-ŋæ	
			Selkup	-t-qo/-n-qo	
			Nganasan	is ^j a	

3. The essive, translative, and essive/translative markers are mainly found in non-verbal (main and secondary) predicates. Therefore, it is difficult to render them as case markers – predicative markers seem to be more appropriate. However, the central function of the essive (but not the translative) is to mark a non-verbal predicate as a stage level predicate, i.e. time instable, temporary, impermanent. They could be considered derivational markers.
4. Many Uralic languages have differential marking in non-verbal main predications. The bare form of the predicate (nominative) is contrasted with predicates marked by the essive, translative, or essive/translative. In only six languages the different marking corresponds to permanent vs. impermanent state. For the other languages, there is a weak correspondence or no such correspondence at all. Hungarian is the only language which has differential marking of secondary, depictive predications with a weak permanent vs. impermanent opposition. The typology is as follows.

Table 9. Differential marking and permanent-impermanent state in Uralic

		Differential marking of permanent vs. impermanent state	
		Non-verbal main predication	
Correlation	Language	Noun	Adjective
Strong	Finnish	nom-ess	nom-ess
	Karelian	nom-ess-par-tra	nom-ess
	North Saami	nom-ess	nom-ess
	Skolt Saami	nom-ess	nom-ess
	Tundra Nenets	nom-esstr	nom-esstr
	South Saami	nom-ess	
	Estonian	nom-tra	
Weak	Estonian dialect	nom-ine/ess	nom-ine/ess
	Komi	nom-ins	
	Komi dialect	nom-ine	
	Mari dialect	nom-ine	
None	Mansi	nom-esstr	nom-esstr
	Votic	nom-ess	
	Ingrian	nom-ess	

	Veps Erzya	nom-ess-tra nom-tra	
		Secondary predication - depictive	
		Noun	Adjective
Weak	Hungarian	ess-preposition	

The Uralic languages in the sample in this volume which have just one type of marking, the nominative, in non-verbal main predications are Mari, Udmurt, Hungarian, Enets, Nganasan, Selkup and Kamas.

- As can be seen from Table 3, nouns are prime candidates to be marked with the essive, translative, essive/translative, where adjectives do not always allow such markers.
- Almost all Uralic languages with differential marking of non-verbal predicates use a copula. A correlation according to Pustet (2003) between present tense zero-copula constructions, non-marked predicates, and permanent state, versus present tense overt copula constructions, marked predicates and impermanent state is only found in Mansi and Tundra Nenets, but not in the twelve other Uralic languages with differential marking of the predicate.
- Uralic languages do not use regular copulas, but other semi-copulas in non-verbal predications indicating a change. In this type of expressions, the non-verbal predicates are always marked by the essive, translative, or essive/translative.
- The converbal form of the copula 'be' may develop into an essive marker, as in Enets, Tundra Nenets, and Nganasan. The origin of the essive is thus not necessarily diachronically a case marker but may also be a converb.
- On the basis of the essive in Votic and Ingrian it is clear that in addition to copula and semi-copula constructions, also constructions with modal verbs taking non-verbal complements should be taken into consideration.
- The essive, translative or essive/translative is the marker *per excellence* of nominal depictives. All languages from the sample which distinguish an essive(-like) marker use this form on nominal depictives. Even languages or language variants which do not have an essive, such as Udmurt and dialects of Mari and Komi, may use the locative inessive marker instead of the instrumental, or the unproductive essive in Mari dialects. Many – but significantly fewer – languages allow the essive or alternative on adjectival depictives.
- Resultatives prefer the translative and other markers.

Table 10. The marking of optional depictives and resultatives in Uralic

	Depictive			Resultative
	nominal	adjectival	numeral	
Two markers				
Finnish	Essive	Essive		Translative
Estonian	Essive	Essive		Translative
Votic	Essive	Essive	Translative	Translative
Ingrian	Essive	Essive		Translative
Veps	Essive	Essive		
Karelian	Essive	Essive		
Hungarian	Essive 1 and 2	Essive 3	Essive 3	Sublative

One marker				
South Saami	Essive			
North Saami	Essive	Essive		Essive
Skolt Saami	Essive	Essive		Essive
Erzya	Translative			
Mansi	Essive/translative			
Khanty	Translative			Translative
Tundra Nenets	Essive/translative		Essive/translative	Essive/translative
Enets	Essive/translative		Essive/translative	Essive/translative
Nganasan	Essive/translative			Prolative
Selkup (Taz)	Essive/translative			
No marker				
Mari				
Mari - dialect	Inessive	Unproductive essive		Accusative
Komi - dialect	Inessive			Instrument / Illative
Udmurt	Inessive			Nominative / Instrument

12. Depictives marked by the essive or alternative form preferably contain nominals denoting a function or profession. It is even claimed for Mansi and Khanty that the nouns available for depictives are restricted to the class of functions and professions. This observation supports the view that the nominal depictives are basically stage level secondary predications.
13. It can be concluded that the association of Uralic essive with impermanent state basically derives from the use of the essive on nominal depictives and only marginally from the differential marking of non-verbal main predicates.
14. Predicative complements also take the essive, translative, or essive/translative. A comparison between the marking of non-verbal predicates, depictives and predicative complements makes clear that the essive and translative are found in all three domains, where the essive is basically used in stative expressions and the translative in expressions denoting a change.
15. The often attested ambiguity between depictive and manner in languages of the world only marginally occurs in the Uralic languages. They have distinct markers for depictive and (manner) adverbial phrases.
16. Essival markers are not productively used in temporal phrases. They are found in a limited set of temporal expressions referring to parts of the day, days of the week, yesterday, today, tomorrow, weeks, months, seasons, dates, years, or festivals.
17. The use of the essive in circumstantial phrases is found in several but not all Uralic languages.
18. The essive is never used in locational expressions or in comparative and simile expressions.
19. Finally, there is a striking correlation in Uralic between the languages with the statistically preferred SVO order and the position of a focus after the verb and the order of verb vs. depictive. Languages which favor the SOV order prefer the focus and the depictive before the verb.

Table 11. Word order patterns, focus, and the position of the depictive relative to the verb.

Language	word order	major pattern	focus position	depictive position
Finnish	free	SVO		V dep

Estonian	free	SVO	clause final	V dep
Votic	free	SVO		V dep
Ingrian	free	SVO	clause final	V dep
Veps	free	SVO	clause final	V dep
Karelian	free	SVO		V dep
South Saami	free	SOV/SVO		V dep / dep V
North Saami	free	SVO		V dep
Skolt Saami	free	SVO		V dep
Erzya	free	SVO		V dep
Mari	free	SOV	Foc V	dep V
Komi	free	SOV/SVO	Foc V/V Foc	V dep / dep V
Udmurt	free	SOV	Foc V	dep V
Hungarian	free	SOV/SVO	Foc V	dep V
Khanty	free	SOV	Foc V	dep V
Mansi	free	SOV		dep V
Nenets	not free	strict SOV	Foc V	dep V
Enets	not free	strict SOV	Foc V	dep V
Nganasan	free	SOV		dep V
Selkup	free	SOV		dep V
Kamas	free			

References

- Ariste, Paul. (1968). *A grammar of the Votic language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications.
- Comrie, Bernard. (1988). 'General features of the Uralic Languages.' In: Sinor ed., 451-477.
- Dik, Simon C. (1980), *Studies in Functional Grammar*, 'Non-verbal predicates', 90-112. London: Academic Press.
- Erelt, Mati and Helle Metslang. (2003). 'Case marking of the predicative in Estonian.' *Linguistica Uralica* 39, 3. 166–174.
- Eriksen, Pål Kristian. (2006). *On the typology and the semantics of non-verbal predication*. Oslo: University of Oslo, PhD dissertation.
- Geuder, Wilhelm. (2002). Oriented Adverbs. Issues in the lexical semantics of event verbs. <http://w210.ub.uni-tuebingen.de/dbt/volltexte/2002/546/pdf/geuder-oriadverbs.pdf> (PhD dissertation, Konstanz, 2000)
- de Groot, Casper. (forthcoming). 'The essive in Hixkaryana'.
- Haspelmath, Martin. (2009). 'Terminology'. In: Malchukov, FIRST NAME & Spencer, FIRST NAME eds. *The Oxford handbook of case*, 505-517. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees and J. Lachlan Mackenzie. (2008). *Functional discourse grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. and Eva Schultze-Berndt. (2005). 'Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: an introduction'. In: Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt eds., 1-67.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. and Eva Schultze-Berndt eds. (2005). *Secondary predication and adverbial modification. The typology of depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meira, Sérgio & Spike Gildea. 2009. 'Property concepts in the Cariban family: Adjectives, adverbs and/or nouns?' In: Wetzels, W.L. (ed.) *The Linguistics of Endangered Languages – Contributions to Morphology and Morphosyntax*, 95-133. Utrecht: LOT Occasional Series.

- Miestamo, Matti, Anne Tamm and Beáta Wagner-Nagy. (2015). 'Negation in Uralic languages – Introduction'. In: Miestamo, Matti, Anne Tamm and Beáta Wagner-Nagy eds. *Negation in Uralic languages*, 1-41. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Nichols, Joanna. (1978). 'Secondary predicates' *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4: 114-127.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. (2014). *A grammar of Tundra Nenets*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Nose, Masahiko. (2003). 'Word order positions of the Finno-Ugric essive case forms.' *Asian and African Languages and Linguistics*, 2, 103-114.
- Planck, Franz. (1985). 'Prädikativ und Koprädikativ'. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik*. 13 (2), 154-185.
- Pustet, Regina. (2003). *Copulas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schultze-Berndt, Eva and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. (2004). 'Depictive secondary predicates'. *Linguistic Typology*, 8(1), 59-131.
- Siegl, Florian. (2013). *Materials on Forest Enets – an indigenous language of northern Siberia*. MSFOu 267. Helsinki: Finno-Ugric Society.
- Sinor, Denis ed. (1988). *The Uralic languages. Description, history and foreign influences*. Leiden: Brill.
- Stassen, Leon. (1997). *Intransitive predication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stassen, Leon. (2001). 'Nonverbal predication in the Circum-Baltic languages'. In Dahl, Ö. and M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (Eds.), *Circum-Baltic Languages. Vol 2: Grammar and typology*, 569-590. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Stump, Gregory T. (1985). *The semantic variability of absolute constructions*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Tauli, Valter. (1966). *Structural tendencies in Uralic languages*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Turunen, Rigena. (2013). 'Linguistic Questionnaire ESSIVE; Erzya.' Ms.
- Vilkuna, Maria (1998), 'Word order in European Uralic'. In: A. Siewierska ed. *Constituent order in the languages of Europe*, 173- 233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wetzer, Harrie. (1996). *The typology of adjectival predication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Working Group Functional Grammar. (1981). 'The Functional Grammar of teaching verbs'. In: Teun Hoekstra et al. eds. *Perspectives on Functional Grammar*, 203-231. Dordrecht: Foris