Editorial

The editors are pleased to welcome you to the first issue of the seventh volume of FULL, an open access international journal providing a platform for linguistic research on modern and older Finno-Ugric or other Uralic languages and dialects. FULL publishes comparative research as well as research on single languages, including comparison of just Uralic languages or comparison across family lines. We encourage both formal linguistic submissions and empirically oriented contributions.

The present issue contains two articles and one book review. The first article is by Elsi Kaiser, and presents an investigation of a Finnish 'imposter', that is a lexical 3rd person expression used as a 1st or 2nd person pronoun. The imposter is *meikäläinen*, literally roughly 'one of our kind' but used as a 1st person singular pronoun in colloquial Finnish. It turns out to have interesting effects on agreement with possessive pronouns/affixes, shown by Kaiser to have consequences for the analysis of possessives and agreement in Finnish as well as for imposters and the theory of pronominal reference in general.

The second article, by Anastasia Voznesenskaya, focuses on two nominalizers in Hill Mari. The paper presents a syntactic analysis of nominalizations involving these two nominalizers, based on data collected by the author. The main question is whether, or to what extent, the nominalizations have clausal properties. The paper provides an account of how the nominalizers differ from each other in this regard.

The third contribution is a thorough review, by Satu Manninen, of a volume titled *Uralic Essive and the Expression of Impermanent State*, edited by Caspar de Groot. The book is the outcome of an ambitious project involving a large team of researchers investigating the essive (or the essive function) in as many as twenty-one Uralic languages. Satu Manninen's review is sufficiently detailed to be read also as an overview of the key results of this empirical project.

We take this opportunity to thank the anonymous reviewers who generously lent their time and expertise to FULL. Our publications can be freely accessed and downloaded without any need for prior registration. At the same time, those who register, or have already registered, are provided with the benefit of getting notified of new issues, calls, etc. via email. FULL welcomes manuscripts from all the main branches of linguistics, including phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics, employing a diachronic or synchronic perspective, as well as from first language acquisition and psycholinguistics. Whatever the theoretical or empirical orientation of the contributions may be, our leading principle is to maintain the highest international standards.

The Editors

(Lack of) Person agreement in Finnish: Imposters, possessives and bound variables*

Elsi Kaiser

Imposters are grammatically third-person expressions used to refer to the first-person speaker or second-person addressee (e.g. 'the present authors' when used to refer to the first-person writer, or 'yours truly' when used to refer to the speaker.) I present novel data illustrating seemingly puzzling agreement behavior of the first-person Finnish imposter *meikäläinen* (refers to the speaker, can be roughly translated as 'yours truly'). This form, on its imposter use, only allows first-person pronoun agreement in possessives that have overt possessive pronouns and lack possessive suffixes, although it permits both first and third person agreement in possessives with possessive suffixes and also in reflexives. I propose that these agreement patterns can be derived once we combine insights about (i) differences in the semantic binding properties of the two possessive constructions that exist independently of imposters and are correlated with the presence/absence of an overt possessive pronoun, and (ii) the interpretational properties of imposters.

Keywords: *Finnish, possessive suffixes, person agreement, imposters, possessive pronouns, genitive, bound variables, variable binding, coreference*

1 Introduction

Language usually distinguishes speaker (first person), addressee (second person) and others (third person) by means of grammatical person. However, sometimes this division breaks down and third-person expressions are used to refer to first- and second-person referents. For example, in (1), the first-person speaker, normally realized as "I", is referred to with the third-person expressions 'Daddy' and 'this reporter', respectively:

(1) a. Father to child: *Daddy needs to rest!*
    b. News anchor about himself: *CBS News and this reporter fully believed the documents were genuine.* (Collins & Postal 2012)

These kinds of expressions are often referred to as imposters. Collins and Postal (2012:5) define an imposter as a "notionally 1st or 2nd person DP that is grammatically 3rd person." (Collins & Postal 2012:5). The term 'illeism' is also used for third-person forms referring to the first person (e.g. Zwicky 2007, Horn 2008, see also Land & Kitzinger 2007 for a conversation-analysis based account of illeisms/imposters). Additional examples of first-person imposters are in (2).

In addition to first-person imposters, languages also have second-person imposters, exemplified in (3). Thus, semantically first-person referents (the speaker) and semantically second-person referents (the addressee(s)) can be referred to with

* I would like to thank the audience at the 2017 Conference on the Syntax Of Uralic Languages, held in Budapest, for their helpful questions and feedback. Thanks also to two anonymous reviewers for in-depth comments and suggestions.

syntactically third-person expressions, under certain circumstances.[1] In the present paper, I focus on first-person imposters.

(2) First-person, speaker-referring imposters
a. *At the same time, the present authors had been asking ourselves whether there should be a model of cooperative governance.*
(source: *www.grocer.coop*)
b. *The undersigned authorizes my student to participate in authorized DoDEA school study trips…*
(source: *DoD Education Activity form*)
c. *…the emphasis on restoring functions, as opposed to designing projects around the benefits themselves, seems sensible and appropriate to this reviewer.*
(source: *http://tahoe.ca.gov/*)

(3) Second-person, addressee-referring imposters
a. *Would little Jimmie like another ice-cream cone?*
b. *How is my darling tonight?*
(Collins & Postal 2012:7)

Due to their two-faced nature – the fact that the semantic/notional person (first or second) diverges from the syntactic person (third) – imposters pose challenges for theoretical accounts of agreement phenomena. In English, imposters trigger third-person verb agreement, but pronoun agreement patterns are more complex. For example, consider (4a,b):

(4) a. Plural imposter:
Father says to child: *Mommy and Daddy need to take {their/our} glasses off first!*
b. Singular imposter:
Father says to child: *Daddy needs to take {his/*my} glasses off first!*

In English, plural imposters can antecede third-person or first-person pronouns and anaphors – in other words, pronouns that refer to imposters can agree in person with the notional or syntactic component of the antecedent, whereas singular imposters require syntactic, third-person agreement (Collins & Postal 2012, see Kaiser, Nichols & Wang 2018 for psycholinguistic evidence).

Crosslinguistically, imposters differ in the kind of person agreement that they trigger, and this can also vary depending on whether one is dealing with pronominal agreement or verb agreement. In Mandarin, for example, pronominal agreement with imposters is always with the notional component (Wang 2014), whereas in Bangla, it is always with the grammatical component (Das 2014). Generally speaking, the crosslinguistic agreement behavior of imposters is not yet well-understood.

[1] Related work by Collins, Moody and Postal (2008) looks at a close relative of imposters, namely camouflage DPs. Camouflage DPs are third person DPs that contain a possessive pronoun that matches the referent in person, but additionally contain a DP (a 'mask'), e.g. *Your Honor*, *her grumpiness*.

2 Finnish imposter '*meikäläinen*'

In this paper, I investigate the pronominal agreement patterns exhibited by the Finnish imposter *meikäläinen*. This expression is grammatically third-person and triggers third-person verb agreement, as shown in (5a).[2] It is ungrammatical with first-person verb agreement (compare ex.5b-5c). However, on its imposter use, the expression *meikäläinen* is notionally first person and refers to "I", the speaker. There is no exact translation equivalent in English, as this expression also carries affective meaning (see also Raevaara 2015 on the related form *meitsi*), but it could roughly be translated as 'yours truly'. (Note, however, that the Finnish expression has no second-person component, unlike the 'yours' part of the English version.)

(5) a. First-person imposter with third-person verb agreement
Meikäläinen ***osti*** *juuri "uuden" auton.*
Imposter.NOM bought.3SG just new.ACC car.ACC.
'Yours truly just bought a 'new' car.'
(source: http://lampopumput.info/foorumi/index.php?topic=10713.75)
b. First-person pronoun with first-person verb agreement
Minä ostin uuden auton.
I.NOM bought.1SG new.ACC car
'I just bought a new car'
c. First-person verb agreement is unacceptable with first-person imposter
Meikäläinen* ***ostin* *juuri "uuden" auton.*
Imposter. NOM bought.1SG just new.ACC car.ACC
'Yours truly just bought a 'new' car.'

The notionally first-person, speaker-referring nature of the imposter is also shown by the fact that a subsequent or preceding clause or sentence can use a regular first-person expression (as revealed by the first-person verb agreement on *kävin* (went.1SG) in (5d)). Use of a third-person pronoun in this context would be highly marked or unacceptable.

(5) d. Imposter can be followed by a (null) first-person pronoun in the next clause
Eipä sitä ***meikäläinen*** *ehtinyt paljoa kotona olemaan, kun* ***kävin*** *tutustumassa Tallinkin uutukaiseen m/s Megastariin sen neitsytristeilyllä.*
'**Your truly** didn't have much time to be at home, as **I went** to check out Tallink's new m/s Megastar (cruise boat) on its maiden voyage.'
(http://www.rantapallo.fi/kthetraveller/2017/12/22/matkavuosi-2017-paketissa-mites-sita-tuli-reissattua/)

This imposter has a range of dialectal variants, including the abbreviated form *meikä* and variants such as *meikämandoliini* and *meikämanne* (see Raevaara 2015 for a sociolinguistic analysis of the related form *meitsi*). In the present paper I focus on *meikäläinen*, as this is a

[2] The following abbreviations are used in this paper: NOM = nominative, ACC = accusative, GEN = genitive, PART = partitive, ALL = allative, ADESS = adessive, ILL = illative, ELA = elative, INESS = inessive, TRANS = translative, 1sgPX = first person singular possessive suffix, 3PX = third person possessive suffix (unmarked for number), sg = singular, DET = determiner, CL = clitic, DEM = demonstrative

frequent and unabbreviated form. It is expected that the agreement patterns discussed in this paper would also extend to the other related first-person imposter forms in Finnish, but this is something that should be verified in subsequent work.

Meikäläinen also has a non-imposter use, where it means 'one of us'. Finnish has a derivational adjectival suffix [*–lAinen*] (capital letters indicate vowels subject to vowel harmony). When combined with the plural pronoun *me* 'we', this suffix yields the meaning 'one of us.' The suffix is also used to create nationality adjectives and nouns (e.g. *suomalainen* 'Finnish', 'Finn,' *saksalainen* 'German', *italialainen* 'Italian,' *ruotsalainen* 'Swedish,' 'Swede'). In the present paper, I put aside this meaning of the word *meikäläinen* and focus solely on its imposter use.

As I show in the subsequent sections, the imposter *meikäläinen* shows a surprising split in its pronominal person agreement patterns. To appreciate this split, it must first be noted that in standard Finnish, possessive structures and reflexive pronouns involve a possessive suffix (Px) on the possessed noun or the reflexive stem (e.g. *auto[nsa]* 'car.3PX' or *itse[nsä]* 'self.3PX'). In the present paper, these will be called ***Px possessives***. The possessive suffix agrees with the antecedent in person: Finnish has distinct first, second and third person possessive suffixes.[3] Px suffixes occur with and without overt possessive pronouns, as discussed in Section 2 below.

In contrast, in many dialects of colloquial Finnish, the possessive suffix is frequently absent in possessive structures (e.g. Paunonen 1995), though it is still present on reflexive pronouns even in those dialects that lack suffixes in possessives. When there is no possessive suffix on the possessed noun, possession is indicated by a genitive pronoun (e.g. 'her car'). In this paper, I call these ***genitive-pronoun possessives.***

Crucially, as I show in the subsequent sections, (i) Px possessives with no overt genitive pronouns allow imposters to antecede *both* first-person and third-person possessive suffixes, but (ii) in possessives with an overt genitive pronoun and no possessive suffix, imposters can *only* antecede first-person possessive pronouns, and third-person agreement is unacceptable. Before investigating these patterns in more depth, the next section presents background information about possessive suffixes in standard Finnish, as well as the divergence between standard and colloquial Finnish.

2.1 Background: Finnish possessive suffixes

First, a brief comment on the distinction between standard and colloquial Finnish is necessary. Standard Finnish is used in formal writing (e.g. newspapers, textbooks, some fiction) and public/official speech (e.g. television news). However, in casual writing and speech, people use dialects of colloquial Finnish. These diverge from standard Finnish in terms of their lexicon, morphology, syntax and phonology/phonetics (see Karlsson 1999 for an overview, see also Rapola 1962, Ikola, Palomäki & Koitto 1988, Mielikäinen 1991, Hakulinen et al. 2005, Hyvönen, Leino & Salmenkivi, 2007, Lyytikäinen, Rekunen & Yli-Paavola 2013). Colloquial Finnish has a number of regional variants, though variants of the basic southern colloquial dialect, spoken in the greater Helsinki area, appear to be gaining dominance. A full discussion of the register-based and regional variation of Finnish, the gradient nature of register use, and on-going language change is beyond the scope of this paper, but see e.g. Paunonen (1995), Mitrunen (2005), Tiittula & Nuolijärvi

[3] Third-person possessive suffixes in Finnish agree with the antecedent in person but not in number. This differs from third-person subject-verb agreement which, in Finnish, encodes both person and number.

(2013) for further information and discussion. Generally speaking, Finnish speakers are fluent both in standard Finnish and at least one dialect of colloquial Finnish. In this paper, I will be making a distinction between standard Finnish (known in Finnish as *kirjakieli*, lit. 'book language' or *yleiskieli* 'standard language') and a widely-used, wide-spread register/type of colloquial Finnish (known as *yleispuhekieli*, 'standard spoken language.') that is not associated with any one specific region but is widely used in spoken communication. I use the general term 'colloquial Finnish' for this variant.

As we will see in the rest of this section, Finnish reflexive pronouns – as well as possessives in standard Finnish – contain a possessive suffix (traditionally abbreviated Px) that agrees with the antecedent in person. The third person possessive suffix is [-nsA] or [-An], and the singular first person possessive suffix is [-ni]. I consider reflexive pronouns in Section 2.1.1 and possessives in Section 2.1.2.

2.1.1 Reflexive pronouns

Ex.(6a–b) illustrate the person-matching suffixes on third and first person reflexive pronouns. The possessive suffixes are present on reflexive pronouns in both standard and colloquial Finnish.[4] (Finnish allows optional pro-drop of first and second person subjects, as indicated by the parentheses around the subject in ex.6a.)

(6) a. *(Minä) petyin itseeni.*
I.NOM disappointed.1SG self.ILL.1SGPX$_{I}$
'I disappointed myself.'

b. *Matti pettyi itseensä.*
Matti.NOM$_{I}$ disappointed.3SG self.ILL.3PX$_{I}$
'Matti disappointed himself.'

2.1.2 Possessives

When it comes to possessive structures, I first discuss standard Finnish and then move on to colloquial Finnish, as they show different patterns. In **standard Finnish**, the Pxs discussed in the preceding section in connection with reflexives also occur in possessive constructions (e.g. *her book, my car*), where the suffix occurs on the possessed noun.[5] In the case of third person possessors, whether an overt genitive possessive pronoun is also present depends on the syntactic locality and position of the antecedent: When an overt possessive pronoun is not present, the possessor is the local c-commanding subject (ex.7a). (The subscripts in the Finnish original on the possessed object signal the possessor.) In contrast, the standard view is that when an overt possessive pronoun is present in addition to the Px, the local subject is not the possessor (ex.7b).[6] Furthermore,

---

[4] More specifically, Makkonen-Craig (1996) and others have noted that even in dialects where possessive suffixes are not used (or very rarely used) in possessive constructions (see Section 2.1.2), the suffixes nevertheless persist in reflexive pronouns as well as some adverbial constructions (see also Mitrunen 2005).

[5] When the possessive pronoun is a personal pronoun (*hänen* 'her/his', the Px must be present on the possessed noun in standard Finnish. However, when the possessive pronoun is *sen* (inanimate 'its' in standard Finnish, also functions as the default human-referring 'her/his' in colloquial Finnish), the possessed noun cannot be marked with a possessive suffix (e.g. ISK § 717). The same holds for names, full NPs, demonstratives etc. (see Trosterud 1993:230). To the best of my knowledge there does not yet exist an entirely satisfactory account of these doubling restrictions.

[6] However, diverging from these 'standard judgments', some of my Finnish informants permit a c-commanding subject to be the possessor in Standard Finnish even when an overt genitive *hänen* is

the possessive pronoun cannot be null when it has no local c-commanding antecedent, as in (7c).

(7) a. *Liisa$_j$* *luki* *ø* *kirjansa$_j$.*
Liisa.NOM read.3SG ø book.ACC.3PX
Liisa$_j$ read her$_j$ book.

b. *Liisa$_j$* *luki* *hänen$_k$* *kirjansa$_k$.*
Liisa.NOM read.3SG s/he.GEN book.ACC.3PX
Liisa$_j$ read her$_{k/*?j}$ book.

c. **(Hänen) kirjansa putosi lattialle.*
s/he.GEN book.ACC.PX3 fell.3SG floor.ALL
'His/her book fell to the floor.'

In this paper, I focus on locally c-commanded possessives in standard Finnish – i.e., the type that, in Standard Finnish, typically occur without overt genitive pronouns. I chose to focus on occurrences of *meikäläinen* in subject position because prior work suggests that personal pronouns are much more likely to occur in subject position than in other syntactic positions (e.g. Aarts 1971/2004, see also Fox & Thompson 1990) – thus, as a starting point for looking at the first-person imposter *meikäläinen*, the subject position is a natural choice. As a consequence of the focus on subject-position occurrences of the imposter, in this paper I do not consider standard Finnish possessives with overt genitive pronouns and Pxs, and leave this as an area for future work.

In the case of first- and second-person possessors in standard Finnish, whether an overt genitive pronoun is present or not is not syntactically determined. With first- and second-person possessors, presence of a genitive pronoun is optional (e.g. Paunonen 1995:505) and presumably influenced by pragmatic and discourse-related factors such as contrast. The genitive pronoun is often omitted unless it is contrastive or otherwise emphasized. What is relevant for us here is that, just like with third person possessors, the possessed noun (in standard Finnish) has a possessive suffix that agrees with the possessor in person.

(7) d. *(Minä) luin (minun) kirjani.*
I.NOM$_i$ read (I.GEN) book.1PX$_i$
I$_i$ read my$_i$ book.

In **colloquial Finnish**, both first and third-person possessives pattern differently from standard Finnish. Specifically, in the widespread form of colloquial Finnish (*yleispuhekieli*), the possessive suffix is often omitted and an overt genitive pronoun used to mark possession (e.g. Paunonen 1995, Makkonen-Craig 1996, Mitrunen 2005). I refer to this construction as the ***genitive-pronoun possessive***.

---

present. Other sources also suggest that the interpretation of Standard Finnish possessive constructions with overt possessive pronouns is not straightforward. E.g., Niendorf and Peterson (1999)'s corpus study of written Finnish found cases of overt third person possessive pronouns co-occurring with the possessive suffix in contexts where the subject is the possessor. Ikola (1986:74-75) also notes that overt possessive pronouns sometimes occur in sentences where the subject is the possessor. In other words, violations of the standard generalization (i.e., that an overt possessive pronoun cannot be used when the subject is the possessor) are not unheard of. See Kaiser (2003) and Section 6 of this paper for more discussion

Let us first consider **third-person possessives** in colloquial Finnish. It is important to note that many dialects of colloquial Finnish use the word *se* (*sen* in the genitive) as the default pronoun[7] for humans, animals as well as inanimates (e.g. Kallio 1978, Suonperä 2012). This contrasts with standard Finnish which uses *hän* for humans (*hänen* in the genitive) and *se* for animals and inanimates – similar to *he/she* and *it* in English. Since *se* is the default pronoun for humans in colloquial Finnish, I will gloss it as 'he/she', as we are focusing on human antecedents in this paper.

The form *se* that is the default for anaphoric reference to humans in colloquial Finnish is often regarded as a hybrid possessing properties of both anaphoric and demonstrative pronouns (e.g. Larjavaara 1990). In contrast to the proximal demonstrative *tämä* 'this' and the distal demonstrative *tuo* 'that', *se* has been analyzed as placing the referent in the addressee's sphere and being unmarked / neutral with respect to the speaker (see Laury 2005). *Se* can also occur as a prenominal modifier, in which case its meaning is similar to English 'the' or 'that', e.g. *se kissa* 'the cat/that cat' (see Laury 1997). (Finnish has no definite or indefinite articles.) S*e* is also used for discourse deixis (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1989:316). I return to this pronominal/demonstrative status of *se* below when I consider the difference between bound variable and coreferential interpretations.

As already mentioned in footnote 5, *se* is not compatible with the possessive suffix, which yields the pattern shown in (8a-b): use of genitive *sen* and no possessive suffix on the noun. Thus, in this paper the genitive-pronoun possessives that I focus on use the genitive form *sen* and have no possessive suffix.

(8) a. *esim jos se on korjaamassa* ***sen autoa,*** *se saattaa laittaa*
e.g. if it.NOM is fixing **it.GEN car.PART**, it.NOM might put
siitäkin kuvaa whatsapissa
it.ELA.CL picture.PART whatsapp.INESS
'for example if he is fixing **his car**, he might send (me) a picture of it in whatsap'
(source: https://www.demi.fi/keskustelut/suhteet/miten-pojat-nayttaa-tunteet)

b. (context: listing TV ads that people find annoying)
se toinenki lidlin mainos mis se kakara pyytää
it.NOM other.CL lidl.GEN ad.NOM where it.NOM kid.NOM asks
sen isää *leikkimään kauppaa*
it.GEN father.PART play.INF store.PART
'the other Lidl ad, too, where the kid asks **his/her father** to play shop'
(source: https://www.demi.fi/keskustelut/ajankohtaista/listataan-taman-hetken-rasittavimpia-mainoksia)

When it comes to **first person possessives**, a frequent pattern in colloquial Finnish is to use the colloquial form of the genitive first person pronoun (*mun*) with no

[7] Even in standard Finnish, *se* refers to humans in some contexts, e.g. in otherwise 'headless' relative clauses (ex.i).

(i) *Pekka on se, jota etsit.*
Pekka.NOM is it.NOM, who.PART look.for.2SG
'Pekka is the one you are looking for.' (Sulkala & Karjalainen 1992:120)

possessive suffix on the noun, as in ex.(9a-b). In both of these examples, the possessed noun is preceded by the genitive *mun* ('I-GEN') and has no possessive suffix.[8]

(9) a. (context: talking about refurbishing cars)
Mä oon pitäny ***mun auton*** *ihan orkkiskunnossa*
I.NOM have kept **I.GEN car.ACC** quite original-state.INESS
'I have maintained **my car** in its original state'
(source: https://keskustelu.suomi24.fi/t/1885906/peltoautot!!!)

b. (context: a popstar is asked about being 'worshipped' by fans. She responds:)
Voin sanoa että mä palvon yhtä ***mun frendiä***
Can.1SG say that I.NOM worship.1SG one.PART **I.GEN friend.PART**
jos se pääsee oikikseen.
if it.NOM get-in.3SG law-school.ILL
'I can say that I will workship **my friend** if s/he gets into law school'
(http://www.mlab.uiah.fi/~viikari/circus/dokumentit/nro0498_Nylon_Beat/lisaa.html)

Although the combination of a genitive pronoun with a 'bare' possessed noun that lacks a possessive suffix is not the only option in colloquial Finnish (see e.g. Paunonen 1995, Mitrunen 2005), it is an option that exists in colloquial Finnish but not in standard Finnish.

2.1.3 Grammatical status of the possessive suffix

Prior work on Finnish has reached divergent conclusions regarding the status of the possessive suffix in standard Finnish. Some researchers – myself included – have analyzed the suffix as an agreement marker licensed by a null *pro* (e.g. Nikanne 1989, van Steenbergen 1991, Kaiser 2003, Huhmarniemi & Brattico 2015; see also Huhmarniemi & Brattico 2015 on whether the *pro* is anaphoric or pronominal). However, some others argue that the possessive suffix itself is the anaphoric element (Pierrehumbert 1980, Vainikka 1989, 2012) and must be bound by the subject of the sentence, by an overt third person possessive pronoun (see also Trosterud 1993 for a slightly different account of the role of the third person possessive pronoun) or, in the case of a first- or second-person suffix, by an overt or null pro. There are also hybrid accounts, such as Nelson (1998) and Toivonen (2000). For example, Toivonen, within Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG), argues that the third person possessive suffix [-nsA] is "a single phonological form [that] corresponds to two distinct sets of lexical features" (Toivonen 2000:34). She argues that when the third person possessive suffix occurs without an overt possessive pronoun in a context where the subject is the possessor, then the [-nsA] suffix is a subject-bound reflexive pronoun, but when the suffix occurs in the presence of an overt possessive pronoun and with a subject that is disjoint in reference, the possessive suffix is an agreement marker (Toivonen 2000:30). In the present paper, I assume that the possessive suffix is an agreement marker, in line with my prior work. As

[8] With genitive first person *mun*, in contrast to third-person *sen*, use of a possessive suffix is not ungrammatical, though already in young people's speech in 1990s *mun*+noun rarely occurred with a suffix (see e.g. Paunonen 1995:551 for quantitative data): The genitive form *mun* without a suffix was already emerging as the dominant option thirty years ago – a trajectory which is expected to strengthen.

will become clear, this assumption receives additional support from the data presented in this paper.

2.2 Summary of the Finnish reflexive and possessive patterns for standard and colloquial Finnish

	Standard Finnish	Colloquial Finnish
Reflexive third person	SELF+3PX	
Reflexive first person	SELF+1sgPX	
Possessive third person	(poss pro) + NP+3PX	poss pro *sen* + NP
Possessive first person	(poss pro) + NP+1sgPX	poss pro *mun* + NP

Table 1. *General reflexive and possessive patterns for standard and colloquial Finnish.* (Parentheses around the possessive pronoun in Standard Finnish indicate that it is absent if the possessor locally c-commands the possessed noun.)

It is worth noting that we are not dealing with a dialect split or a register split: It is *not* the case that possessive suffixes do not occur in colloquial Finnish and only occur in standard Finnish. As mentioned above, reflexive pronouns in colloquial Finnish usually still have possessive suffixes, for example. Thus, it would be inaccurate to view colloquial Finnish as a 'Px suffix-free' language and standard Finnish as a 'Px suffix containing' language. Possessive suffixes exist in both systems, but in colloquial Finnish they are less widespread (and appear to be becoming even less so, over time). Thus, the claims I make in this paper should not be construed as claims about two different grammatical systems or two different dialects.

3 Agreement patterns with imposter *meikäläinen*

In this section, I provide previously unnoticed data showing that the person agreement patterns with the imposter *meikäläinen* exhibit a seemingly unexpected split: We find more flexible person agreement patterns in structures with possessive suffixes (namely with reflexive pronouns and Px possessives), without genitive pronouns, than we do in genitive possessives that have overt possessive pronouns and lack possessive suffixes.

3.1 Agreement pattern #1: Structures with possessive suffixes and no overt possessive pronoun

Recall that the imposter *meikäläinen* is (i) notionally first-person, as it refers to the first-person speaker, but (ii) syntactically third-person, at least in that it requires singular third-person agreement on the verb (ex.5). What about pronominal person agreement? Since Finnish possessive suffixes agree with the antecedent in person, they provide an ideal testing ground for (pro)nominal person agreement.

Both corpus data (from Google web searches and from novels) and native speaker judgements indicate that with both reflexive anaphors (10a-b) and possessive constructions like (10c-d), the imposter *meikäläinen* is acceptable with a Px with either first-person (notional) agreement or third-person (grammatical) agreement. This is illustrated with naturally-occurring corpus examples below:

(10) a. Reflexive anaphor with first-person Px [✓refl, 1sgPX]
Nyt oli ***meikäläinen**$_i$* *iskenyt* ***itse<u>ni</u>**$_i$* *jälleen*
Now was.3SG **imposter.NOM**$_i$ struck **self.1PX**$_i$ again
mielenkiintoiseen paikkaan
interesting.ILL place.ILL
'Now yours truly$_i$ had gotten myself$_i$ into an interesting situation'
(source: janimaukonen.wordpress.com/)

b. Reflexive anaphor with third-person Px [✓refl, 3PX]
***Meikäläinen**$_i$* *sai* ***itse<u>nsä</u>**$_i$* *taas takaisin bloggerin ääreen*
Imposter.NOM$_i$ got.3SG **self.3PX**$_i$ again back blogger.GEN at
'Yours truly$_i$ got herself$_i$ back to using blogger'
(source: deathliciouskisses.blogspot.com/2010/06/hellsinki-city-girl.html)

c. Possessive structure with first-person Px [✓poss w/ Px, 1sgPX]
***Meikäläinen**$_i$* *on ollut* ***ikä<u>ni</u>**$_i$* *huono teroittamaan*
Imposter.NOM$_i$ has.3SG been **whole-life-1PX**$_i$ bad sharpen.INF3.ILL.SG
veitsiä
knifes.PART
'**Yours truly**$_i$ has been bad at sharpening knives **my**$_i$ whole life'
(source: www.kettunet.com/veitsen-teroitin/)

d. Possessive structure with third-person Px [✓ poss w/ Px, 3PX]
***Meikäläinen**$_i$* *jättää* ***auto<u>nsa</u>**$_i$* *orkkikseksi*
Imposter.NOM$_i$ leaves.3SG **car.ACC.3PX**$_i$ original.TRANS
'Yours truly$_i$ will leave his$_i$/her$_i$ car in its original state'
(source: www.volvofinns.com/index.php?topic=1144.0)

In sum, the imposter *meikäläinen* allows both first-person (notional) and third-person (grammatical) person agreement on the possessive suffix, both with reflexive pronouns and Px possessives, although it requires third person verb agreement. Informal counts based on the number of corpus examples (based on Google web searches and novels/fiction) suggest that third-person Px agreement may be more frequent but, crucially, first-person Px agreement also occurs.

3.2 Agreement pattern #2: Structures without PXs, with genitive pronouns

In the preceding section we considered imposters that antecede possessive structures with possessive suffixes, without overt possessive pronouns. Recall, though, that when it comes to possessives, colloquial Finnish also uses an alternative possessive structure with an overt genitive pronoun and without a possessive suffix (Section 2.1.2). In light of the observation in Section 3.1 that *meikäläinen* occurs with both first and third person Pxs, the default expectation is that in genitive possessives, both first *mun* and third person *sen* should also be possible (e.g. both 'my car' and 'his/her car').

However, this prediction is not supported by corpus data nor by native speaker judgments. In possessive constructions with genitive pronouns, without Pxs, *meikäläinen* is acceptable with the first-person genitive pronoun *mun* (notional agreement, ex.11a) but *not* with third-person genitive pronoun *sen* (grammatical agreement, ex.11b). Sentences like (11b) are judged unacceptable by native speakers, and a corpus search (online, using Google) did not uncover any examples of this kind of structure. As expected, the third-

person genitive pronoun *sen* is fine with non-imposter third-person person antecedents (11c).

(11) a. Possessive without Px, with genitive pronoun: first person [✓1st gen poss, no Px]
Meikäläinen*$_i$* *on niin ylpeä* ***mun****$_i$* *asiakkaista*!
Imposter.NOM$_i$ is so proud **I.GEN**$_i$ clients.ELA
'**Yours truly**$_i$ is so proud of **my**$_i$ clients'
(source: http://minifitness.fitfashion.fi/avainsana/asiakkaan-5-kk-muutos/)

b. Possessive without Px, with genitive pronoun: unacceptable with third person [*3rd gen poss, no Px]
****Meikäläinen****$_i$* *on niin ylpeä* ***sen****$_i$* *asiakkaista*!
Imposter.NOM$_i$ is so proud **s/he**$_i$**.GEN** clients.ELA
'**Yours truly**$_i$ is so proud of **his**$_i$**/her**$_i$ clients'

c. Non-imposter third-person antecedents are fine with third person pronouns [✓ non-imposter, 3rd gen poss, no Px]
Liisa*$_i$* *on niin ylpeä* ***sen****$_i$* *asiakkaista*!
Liisa.NOM$_i$ is so proud **she**$_i$**.GEN** clients.ELA
'**Liisa**$_i$ is so proud of **her**$_i$ clients'

As mentioned above, in the examples here and subsequently, the third-person overt genitive pronoun is the genitive form of *se*, namely *sen*. *Se* is the default [±human] pronoun in the colloquial register where Px-less possessives are used, e.g. Kallio 1978, cited by Suonperä 2012.[9]

Thus, in this paper, the possessives with overt genitive pronouns that I focus on use the overt genitive *sen*, not genitive *hänen* 's/he-GEN'. This is because, as explained in Section 2.1.2, I focus on imposters in subject position, a configuration where (in Standard Finnish) Px-containing possessives do not typically have overt genitive pronouns (see ex.7b above, see also Kaiser 2003 on some specific exceptions). In contrast, use of overt genitive *sen* in possessives c-commanded by the possessor is completely acceptable in colloquial Finnish. Thus, this makes it possible for us to easily compare possessives with and without overt genitive pronouns. Furthermore, as will be discussed below in Section 5 and footnote 10, it appears that it is the presence/absence of the overt possessive pronoun that is the relevant key difference between the semantic, interpretational properties of the two possessive constructions, not the presence/absence of the possessive suffix.

In sum, in striking contrast to the patterns observed with possessive suffixes, when it comes to overt possessive pronouns, imposters allow only first-person (notional) but not third-person (grammatical) agreement on the possessive pronoun. The asymmetry is summarized in Table 2.

[9] The personal pronoun *hän* 's/he' – the regular human-referring pronoun in standard Finnish – is not the default in most colloquial dialects: In many, if *hän* is used at all, it is only used in embedded clauses under verbs of speaking/thinking (reported speech/reported thought contexts), which have been analyzed as logophoric (e.g. Laitinen 2002, 2005, Nau 2006, Priiki 2016, 2017, Kaiser 2017). The examples that we focus on in the present paper are not of this type.

	Standard Finnish	Colloquial Finnish
Reflexive third person	✓ SELF+3PX	
Reflexive first person	✓ SELF+1sgPX	
Possessive third person	✓ NP+3PX	* poss pro *sen* + NP
Possessive first person	✓ NP+1sgPX	✓ poss pro *mun* + NP

Table 2. *Person agreement patterns with imposters in reflexives and possessives*

The puzzle, then, is as follows: Why does the Finnish imposter *meikäläinen* (i) only allow first-person pronoun agreement in genitive possessives (without Pxs), when it allows (ii) both first person and third person pronoun agreement in Px possessives and reflexives? In the rest of this paper, I will offer an explanation of the 'odd' agreement patterns of *meikäläinen,* which also sheds light on differences between the Px-less and Px-containing possessives that have not received a thorough treatment in prior work. As will become clear, the crucial difference between the two types of possessives – at least insofar as imposters are concerned – appears to be the presence/absence of the possessive pronoun.

4 Taking steps to explain the puzzle: Binding vs. coreference

I propose that the agreement patterns exhibited by the Finnish imposter *meikäläinen* can be derived once we combine insights about (i) differences in the semantic binding properties of the two possessive constructions that exist independent of imposters and are correlated with the presence/absence of an overt possessive pronoun, and (ii) interpretational properties of imposters. Before getting into the details of my proposal, let us review the distinction made in the semantic literature between coreference and variable binding.

4.1 Semantic binding: Variable binding and coreference

It is well-known that there exist two distinct ways of semantically interpreting anaphoric expressions. A pronoun, such as 'she' in (12), can receive an interpretation by semantic binding or by coreference (e.g. Reinhart 1983, 2000, Heim 1993, Grodzinsky & Reinhart 1993, Heim 1998). In (12b) (from Reinhart 2000), the pronoun is ambiguous and could refer to Lili or to Lucie. According to Reinhart and Heim's approach, these two interpretations – Lili thinks Lucie has the flu, or Lili thinks that Lili herself has the flu – result from the two ways of interpreting the pronoun 'she.'

(12) *Lucie didn't show up today. Lili thinks* ***she*** *has the flu.*
a. Binding: Lili (λx (x thinks **x** has the flu))
b.Coreference: Lili (λx (x thinks **z** has the flu) & z = Lucie)
c.Coreference: Lili (λx (x thinks **z** has the flu) & z = Lili)

As shown in (12b,c), the pronoun can receive its interpretation via *coreference,* in which case it is "a free variable [that is] assigned a value from the discourse storage" (Reinhart 2000). Coreference involves reference to a specific, concrete entity in the discourse model. This is illustrated in (12b,c). Under this interpretation, the free variable can be associated with Lucie (12b) or with Lili (12c). Thus, the coreference construal generates

two possible interpretations for the sentence in (12b): Lili thinks Lili herself has the flu, or Lili thinks that Lucie has the flu. However, the pronoun can also be interpreted via semantic *variable binding*. Under the binding construal shown in (12a), where the pronouns is a variable that is bound by the λ-operator, 'she' refers to Lili and the sentence is interpreted as meaning 'Lili thinks that she herself has the flu.'

Additional data from quantified noun phrases shows that interpretation via variable binding is indeed a necessary mechanism: In contrast to referential antecedents (e.g. Lili, Lucie), quantified noun phrases (QuNPs) like 'everyone' and 'every woman' cannot be interpreted via coreference. This is because "every wife [and any other QuNP, *author's note*] does not have a discourse value that the pronoun can pick up" (Reinhart 2000). The fact that sentences such (13) are nevertheless interpretable (and grammatical) shows that QuNPs can be interpreted via variable binding (see also Heim 1998 and Reinhart 2000 on the notion of covaluation):

(13) *Every professor thinks she has the flu.*
(13') *Every professor (λx (x thinks x has the flu))*

In situations where both a bound variable construal and a coreference construal are available and would yield the same interpretation (e.g. Lili thinks that Lili has the flu), it has been proposed that binding is preferred (or perhaps even required) over coreference (Rule I of Reinhart 1983). Rule I states that "NP A cannot corefer with NP B if replacing A with C, C a variable A-bound by B, yields an indistinguishable interpretation" (This formulation is from Grodzinsky & Reinhart 1993:79). Relatedly, psycholinguistic work has found a preference for bound variable interpretations (e.g. Frazier & Clifton 2000) even when the bound variable and coreferential interpretations differ in meaning (but see Shapiro et al. 2003 for evidence that both bound variable and coreferential construals are computed during the earliest stages of processing).

In what follows, I first consider the interpretation of different kinds of possessive structures in Finnish in terms of binding and conference (Section 5). I show, extending some of my earlier work, that Px-containing possessives without overt possessive pronouns can be interpreted via (semantic) binding as well as (pragmatic) coreference, whereas genitive possessives (with overt possessive pronouns) appear to be interpreted via coreference. This is entirely independent of imposters.

Then, in Section 6, I discuss and extend claims made by Collins (2014) and others about the semantic interpretation of 'notional' imposters that exhibit first person agreement and 'grammatical' imposters that exhibit third person agreement. As we will see, the core idea is that imposters with notional (first-person) agreement involve coreference whereas imposters that involve grammatical (third-person) agreement are more flexible in their semantic interpretation.

In Section 7 I put together (i) the observations regarding the interpretation of Finnish possessive structures by means of binding or coreference, and (ii) claims about how the agreement patterns of imposters map on to binding and coreference. As we will see, combining these two pieces explains the seemingly unexpected agreement pattern shown in Table 2.

5 Interpretation of different possessive constructions: Variable binding or coreference?

In this section, I consider the interpretation of Finnish Px possessives and genitive possessives in terms of binding and conference. I show, extending some of my earlier work, that (i) possessive structures with third-person Pxs allow both variable binding and coreference (as claimed in Kaiser 2003), whereas (ii) Px-less possessive structures with the overt genitive *sen* (3rd person) or *mun* (1st person) exhibit a strong preference for coreferential interpretations. In the rest of this section I provide evidence for these claims and show that these interpretational restrictions on the two types of possessive constructions hold independently of imposters.

Before getting into the details, it is worth noting that in Kaiser (2003), I focused on Px-containing possessives in standard Finnish with and without overt possessive pronouns. As we saw above in Section 2, in standard Finnish the possessive pronoun is typically null when the possessor locally c-commands the possessive construction. In other contexts, the possessor is overt. In Kaiser (2003), I argued that possessives with Pxs and *null possessors* allow both bound variable and coreferential interpretations, whereas possessives with Pxs and *overt possessive pronouns* cannot be interpreted as bound variables.[10] These results are in line with crosslinguistic evidence from languages with pro-drop. For example, Montalbetti's (1984) Overt Pronoun Constraint (OPC) states that overt pronouns cannot be interpreted as bound variables in null subject languages such as Spanish and Japanese (at least in contexts where both null and overt pronouns are syntactically possible, see also Alonso-Ovalle & D'Introno 2000, Luján 1985, 1986, Kratzer 1998).

Because Kaiser (2003) focused on Standard Finnish (more specifically, third-person possessors in Standard Finnish), I did not consider genitive possessives without Pxs and with third-person *sen* or first-person *mun* as the possessive pronoun, although these are very frequent structures in colloquial Finnish. Given that the imposter *meikäläinen* is often used in colloquial contexts, in the present paper we also need to consider how possessives with overt *sen* or *mun* are interpreted, even in the absence of imposters: It is important to determine whether genitive possessives allow bound variable and/or coreference readings independent of the presence of imposters. When considering this structure, we should also keep in mind that *sen* is a hybrid form that has properties of both pronouns and demonstratives (see Section 2.1.2).

5.1 Evidence from quantified NPs

Evidence for the claim that (i) possessive constructions with third-person Pxs and without overt genitive pronouns (what I call ***Px possessives***) allow both bound variable and coreferential construals whereas (ii) possessives without Pxs and with genitive *sen* (what I call ***genitive possessives***) only allow coreference comes from sentences with quantified antecedents.

As can be seen in (14), possessive constructions that have a third-person possessive pronoun *sen* and no possessive suffix are unacceptable with QuNPs but fine with referential antecedents. (First person *mun* cannot be tested with QuNPs.) Given that

---

[10] Because I focused on Standard Finnish in Kaiser (2003), the overt genitive pronouns investigated in that paper had the form *hänen*, not *sen*. That work investigated possessives that had Pxs and differed only in terms of whether they had overt genitive pronouns or not. The key point relevant to the current paper is that the claim about possessives with overt genitive pronouns seeming to resist bound variable construals is not specific to colloquial genitive *sen* (discussed more below), but also appears to hold for *hänen*.

QuNPs can only be interpreted via variable binding, not coreference, this suggests that variable binding is not possible with Px-less *sen* possessives and that they are interpreted via coreference.[11]

(14) {*? *Joka iikka*$_i$ / ✓*Liisa*$_i$} *hermostuu* *joskus* **<u>sen</u>**$_i$
{*? Every person$_i$ / ✓Liisa$_i$} gets-annoyed-at sometimes **he$_i$/she$_i$.GEN**
naapurille.
neighbor.ALL
'{*? Everyone$_i$/ ✓Liisa$_i$} occasionally gets annoyed at his/her neighbor.'

In contrast, Px possessives with third person agreement and without overt possessive pronouns can occur with third-person quantified antecedents as well as referential antecedents (ex.15). This is predicted by my earlier claim in Kaiser (2003) that these kinds of possessives can be interpreted via binding or coreference (see Kaiser 2003 for additional discussion and examples).

(15) {✓*Joka iikka*$_i$ / ✓*Liisa*$_i$ *hermostuu* *joskus* **naapurille<u>en</u>**$_i$.
{✓Every person$_i$/ ✓Liisa$_i$} gets-annoyed-at sometimes **neighbor.ALL.3PX**$_i$
'{✓Everyone$_i$/ ✓Liisa$_i$} occasionally gets annoyed at his$_i$/her$_i$ neighbor.'

Thus, the behavior of quantified antecedents corroborates my earlier claim that bound variable construals are available with suffix-containing possessives that lack overt genitive pronouns. (In Kaiser 2003, I conclude that coreferential interpretations are also possible with this kind of possessive.) The data presented in this paper provide new evidence that suffixless possessives with an overt *sen* possessive pronoun resist bound variable interpretations – in line with what I claimed in Kaiser (2003) for Standard Finnish possessives with an overt *hänen* possessive pronoun (and possessive suffixes). Thus, what seems crucial for the availability of bound variable vs. coreference construals is the presence/absence of an overt possessive pronoun.

5.2 Evidence from ellipsis

Ellipsis provides additional evidence that (i) Px possessives without overt possessive pronouns can receive a bound variable construal (or a coreferential construal) while (ii) possessives with the genitive pronoun *sen* strongly prefer coreferential construals.

It is well known that elided constructions are often ambiguous between a strict and a sloppy interpretation, as shown in ex(16) with English verb-phrase ellipsis.

(16) *Lisa defended her friend better than Anna (did).*
a. Anna defended Anna's friend (sloppy = variable binding)
$\lambda x.x$ defended x's friend
b. Anna defended Lisa's friend (strict = coreference)
$\lambda x.x$ defended y's friend & y=Lisa

The reading that Anna defended her own friend (sloppy) is generated via variable binding (cf. Rule I), whereas the reading that Anna defended Lisa's friend (strict) is

[11] Examples (14-15) use the informal quantifier *joka iikka* 'everyone' to ensure that the Px-less form is not blocked by register clash.

generated via coreference. Thus, we can use the availability of strict vs. sloppy interpretations to test whether coreference vs. binding is possible with a particular construction.

As shown in (17a), Finnish comparative ellipsis constructions involving Px possessives and no overt genitive pronouns allow both sloppy (bound variable) and strict (coreferential) interpretations. As I noted in Kaiser (2003), the sloppy reading seems to be preferred although the strict one is also available. This indicates that this kind of possessive construction can be interpreted either via coreference or via variable binding.

(17) a. Comparative ellipsis with Px possessive
Liisa$_i$ *puolusti* **kaveriaan**$_i$ *paremmin* *kuin Anna.*
Liisa$_i$ defended **friend.PART.3PX**$_i$ better than Anna.
'Liisa$_i$ defended her$_i$ friend better than Anna.'
Sloppy (bv): Anna defended Anna's friend ✓
Strict (coref): Ana defended Liisa's friend (✓) (marked but possible, Kaiser 2003)

In contrast, ex(17b) shows that once we turn to overt genitive possessives (no possessive suffixes, an overt genitive *sen*[12]), the strict reading (coreference) is clearly available whereas the sloppy reading (bound variable) is highly dispreferred or unavailable:

(17) b. Comparative ellipsis with genitive-pronoun possessive
Liisa$_i$ *puolusti* **sen**$_i$ **kaverii** *paremmi* *ku Anna.*
Liisa$_i$ defended **he/she.GEN**$_i$ **friend.PART** better than Anna.
'Liisa$_i$ defended her$_i$ friend better than Anna.'
(i) Sloppy (bv): Anna defended Anna's friend ??
(ii) Strict (coref): Anna defended Liisa's friend ✓

In sum, evidence from ellipsis converges with the patterns we saw with quantified antecedents, and suggests that possessives with third-person Pxs and no overt genitive pronoun allow both strict and sloppy interpretations, which indicates that they allow interpretation via variable binding as well as coreference. In contrast, possessives with genitive third-person pronouns and no Pxs strongly prefer strict interpretations, which points towards coreference.

5.3 Evidence from 'Only'

Another means of probing the availability of coreferential vs. bound variable construals involves sentences like (18a-b). These are ambiguous and can receive a bound-variable interpretation according to which I am (or Peter is) the only person who becomes annoyed at their neighbor (i.e., no one else becomes annoyed at their own neighbor), or a coreferential interpretation according to which I (or Peter) is the only one who becomes annoyed at the specific person who is my (or Peter's) neighbor, say Mr. Jones.

---

[12] Ex.(17b) is given in colloquial Finnish, as that is the register that allows overt genitive *sen* to refer to humans.

(18) a. *Only I became annoyed with my neighbor.*
b. *Only Peter became annoyed with his neighbor.*
(i) Sloppy (bv): Other people do not become annoyed at their own neighbors.
(ii)Strict (coref): Other people do not become annoyed at my (or Peter's) neighbor, Mr. Jones.

In Finnish, Px possessives with no overt possessive pronouns and a third-person Px (19a) or a first-person suffix (20a) allow both the bound variable and coreferential interpretations. However, genitive possessives with third-person *sen* or first-person *mun* prefer coreferential interpretations over bound variable interpretations (19b, 20b). These *sen/mun* possessives are judged to involve reference to a specific, concrete person (coreferential construal) more strongly than the Px possessives without overt genitive pronouns. Thus, these patterns corroborate what we saw with data from ellipsis and quantified NPs.

(19) a. 'Only' with 3Px possessive
Vain Pekka hermostuu joskus naapurilleen.
Only Pekka.NOM gets-annoyed sometimes neighbor.3PX.ALL
'Only Pekka sometimes gets annoyed at his neighbor.'
(i) Sloppy (bv):Other people do not become annoyed at their own neighbors. ✓
(ii)Strict (coref):Other people do not become annoyed at Pekka's neighbor, Mr. Jones. ✓

b. 'Only' with genitive *sen* possessive
Vain Pekka hermostuu joskus sen naapurille.
Only Pekka.NOM gets-annoyed sometimes s/he.GEN neighbor.ALL
'Only Pekka sometimes gets annoyed at his neighbor.'
(i) Sloppy (bv):Other people do not become annoyed at their own neighbors. ??
(ii)Strict (coref): Other people do not become annoyed at Pekka's neighbor, Mr. Jones. ✓

(20) a. 'Only' with 1sgPx possessive
Vain minä hermostun joskus naapurilleni.
Only I.NOM get-annoyed sometimes neighbor.1SGPX.ALL
'Only I sometimes get annoyed at my neighbor.'
(i) Sloppy (bv):Other people do not become annoyed at their own neighbors. ✓
(ii) Strict (coref): Other people do not become annoyed at my neighbor, Mr. Jones. ✓

b. 'Only' with genitive *mun* possessive
Vain minä hermostun joskus mun naapurille.
Only I.NOM get-annoyed sometimes I.GEN neighbor.ALL
'Only I sometimes get annoyed at my neighbor.'
(i) Sloppy (bv):Other people do not become annoyed at their own neighbors. ??
(ii) Strict (coref): Other people do not become annoyed at my neighbor, Mr. Jones. ✓

It is worth noting that the intuitions with 'only' constructions are delicate, which may be due to the relation between contrast and overt pronouns (possessive suffixes cannot be focused for purposes of contrast), as well as the existence of alternative forms such as *oma* 'own'. Thus, in Finnish, 'only' constructions are less suitable than the other tests described above (see also Wurmbrand 2015 on crosslinguistic variation on the interpretation of false indexicals). However, because the other diagnostics do not lend themselves straightforwardly to probing the interpretation of possessives with first-person *mun* genitive pronouns (though they work well with this-person *sen*), I include the 'only'-constructions here to show that possessives with overt first-person *mun* appear to pattern like possessives with overt third-person *sen* in preferring coreference. In other words, the relevant generalization appears to be that possessives with overt genitive pronouns have a strong preference for coreferential interpretations. I return to this in the next subsection.

5.4 Interim summary on bound variable and coreferential interpretations

In sum, the data presented in the preceding sections and in Kaiser (2003) suggests that in Finnish, Px possessives with null possessive pronouns can be interpreted via coreference or variable binding, whereas genitive *sen* and *mun* possessives seem to be interpreted via coreference. In this regard, genitive *sen* and *mun* possessives resemble Standard Finnish Px-containing possessives with overt possessive pronouns: As discussed in Kaiser 2003, the latter appear to be interpreted via coreference (see footnote 10).[13] The finding that null vs. overt possessive pronouns in Px-containing possessives show this pattern fits with what has been observed for null and overt pronouns in pro-drop languages (see e.g. Montalbetti 1984, Alonso-Ovalle & D'Introno 2000 on Spanish), where bound variable interpretations are normally not possible for overt forms.

Furthermore, crosslinguistic work suggests that demonstrative pronouns or demonstrative-resembling pronouns (when acting anaphorically) cannot normally receive bound variable interpretations. According to Wiltschko (1998a), for example, German d-pronouns *der/die/das* cannot be interpreted as bound variables (and are also subject to Principle C) – in contrast to personal pronouns *er/sie/es* which allow bound variable readings (and are governed by Principle B, not Principle C).[14]

(19) a. *Peter$_i$ glaubt, dass er$_i$/*der$_i$ stark ist.*
Peter believes that he / DEM strong is.

b. *Jeder Mann$_i$ glaubt, dass er$_i$ / *der$_i$ stark ist.*
Every man believes that he / DEM strong is.

---

[13] This is a slight oversimplification. As discussed in Kaiser (2003), possessives with an overt possessive pronoun *hänen* and a Px are interpreted semantically via a process called covaluation, or pragmatically via coreference. The differences between coreference and covaluation are not critical to the main claims of this paper.

[14] However, see Hinterwimmer (2015) for data showing that German d-pronouns *der/die/das* can receive bound variable interpretations in certain contexts, e.g. when their referent is not the 'aboutness topic' of the sentence. As our focus in this paper is on potential antecedents (imposters and otherwise) in subject position, the contrast observed by Wiltschko (1998a) is more relevant for the structures we are considering. However, it important to acknowledge that a claim such as 'demonstrative pronouns can never receive bound variable readings' is probably too strong.

A possibly related pattern is observed in Halkomelem Salish (Wiltschko 1998b). In addition to pronominal clitics and affixes, Halkomelem also has free-standing pronouns which can also function as articles (thus resembling the German d-pronouns). These free-standing pronouns cannot receive bound variable interpretation (Wiltschko 1998b).

(20) *[*Me´kw' ye swõ ´yeqe*]$_i$ *kw'a´kw'ets-et-es* *te* *sto´les-s* [*tu´-tl'o'lem*]$_i$.
every DET.PL man looking-TRANS-3.SUBJ DET wife-3.POSS DET-3.PL
≠ 'All men$_i$ are looking at their$_i$ wives.' (Wiltschko 1998b:445)

Given that Finnish *se* has been characterized as a hybrid personal pronoun/demonstrative pronoun, the finding that possessives with genitive *sen* appear to resist bound variable interpretations (at least in the structural configurations considered in this paper) fits with these crosslinguistic patterns. A full comparison of the referential and structural properties of *sen* (as well as *hänen*) relative to these other languages is beyond the scope of this paper.

In light of the Finnish data and the additional crosslinguistic observations – both regarding demonstratives and null vs. overt pronouns in pro-drop languages – I assume that it is not the presence/absence of the possessive suffix (Px) *per se* that is crucial for the availability of bound variable vs. coreferential interpretations, but rather the nature of the possessive pronoun – in particular, whether it is a null pro vs. an overt personal pronoun (*hänen*) / hybrid pronoun (*sen*). This assumption is also in line with the discussion in Section 2 and my treatment of the Px as an argument marker and the possessive pronoun (whether overt or null) as the anaphoric element.

6 Binding and coreference with imposters

In the preceding sections we saw evidence that in Finnish, in contexts where the possessor is the subject, possessives with a Px and without an overt possessive pronoun can be interpreted via variable binding as well as coreference, whereas possessives without a Px and with the overt possessive pronoun *sen* or *mun* appear to be biased towards coreferential interpretations.[15] This pattern exists independent of the phenomenon of imposters. Armed with this information, let us now return to imposters and consider how the alternation between first and third person agreement relates to the distinction between variable binding and coreference.

According to Collins & Postal (2012)'s analysis of English imposters, the left periphery contains null DPs for AUTHOR (Speaker, first person) and ADDRESSEE (second person), represented in an expanded left periphery (Rizzi 1997) or as arguments

[15] These observations generate interesting predictions regarding the availability of agreement patterns in partitive constructions. In English, partitives like "every one of us" can antecede singular 3rd person pronouns or plural 1st (or 2nd) person pronouns (Collins and Postal 2012, chapter 13):

(i) *Every one of us thinks that she is/we are talented.*
(ii) *Every one of you thinks that she is/you are talented.*

The behavior of similar constructions in Finnish (with possessives) is an intriguing question that deserves to be investigated in future work.

of a covert performative clause (Collins 2014, see also Speas & Tenny 2003, Haegemann & Hill 2013 on the Speech Act Projection, see also Sigurðsson 2014 for related discussion).[16] Under this view, in sentences like (21), the pronoun can agree with (i) the *immediate antecedent* Mommy and Daddy, yielding third person *their*, or (ii) with the *ultimate antecedent* AUTHOR, yielding first person *our*. (See Collins & Postal 2012 for details). The same holds for reflexive pronouns (*themselves* vs. *ourselves*) in English, under this approach.

(21) [[$_{DP}$ **AUTHOR**] **Mommy and Daddy** *need to take* {*their/our*} *shoes off first.*]

Building on observations by Collins (2014), I assume that when an imposter-referring pronoun exhibits first person agreement, it refers to the AUTHOR and thus is interpreted via coreference (not variable binding), since AUTHOR refers to the specific/concrete person who utters the sentence. Collins (2014:13) notes that "If AUTHOR were the ultimate antecedent, then the pronoun would not have a bound variable interpretation; rather it would simply refer to the people that AUTHOR refers to." Putting it differently, AUTHOR can be viewed as an antecedent that is present in the discourse storage (as it is the specific person who is uttering the sentence at that point in time), that the pronoun deictically 'points to' (see e.g. Rullmann 2004 for discussion), and thus involves coreference. The notion of 'discourse storage' was introduced in Section 4.1, based on work by Reinhart (2000). Entities present in the discourse storage are concrete, specific, referential entities that are present in the discourse model (such as the speaker of the sentence).

(However, it is important to note that Collins & Postal 2012 do not follow a Reinhart-style distinction between coreference and variable binding, and specifically argue against the notion of coreference as defined by Reinhart (1986). Thus, the discussion of coreference and variable binding with imposters presented in this section builds on observations by Collins & Postal 2012 and Collins 2014, but does not necessarily reflect their views. See also Podobryaev 2014, 2017.)

Thus, the prediction is that in sentences with imposter-referring pronouns that exhibit **first person agreement**, only a coreferential reading is possible. A bound variable construal is predicted to be out, if AUTHOR reference can only be done via coreference. This is illustrated for English by constructions with 'only', as in (22) from Podobryaev (2014:35) (see also Podobryaev 2017, Collins and Postal 2012: 253, footnote 1). This example, with the speaker-referring imposter 'yours truly' only allows the coreferential (strict) reading, namely that no one else talks to people who criticize the speaker's theory. The observation that (22) only allows the coreferential reading supports the claim that AUTHOR-reference (realized as first-person agreement) involves coreference (see Collins 2014).[17]

(22) *Only yours truly talks to people who criticize my theory.*

[16] However, one does not necessarily have to assume syntactically-encoded speech-act related projections at the left periphery (see e.g. Gärtner & Steinbach 2006). The question of whether the representation of AUTHOR (speaker) and ADDRESSEE is syntactically encoded (vs. encoded in some other way) is not central to the main claims of this paper. See also Giorgi (2010) for related discussion.

[17] I use 'only' constructions rather than ellipsis when discussing English because singular English imposters do not alternative between third and first person agreement in ellipsis. As we saw in Section 1, they only allow third person agreement.

What about reference to the immediate linguistic antecedent, realized as **third-person agreement**? In this case, there is no reason to expect a restriction to coreferential construals only. Indeed, prior work leads us expect that both bound variable and coreferential construals are predicted to be available, if they differ in meaning (as posited by Reinhart's Rule I). Indeed, 'only' constructions like (23) allow both the bound variable and coreferential readings, as noted by Podobryaev (2014:35-36).

(23) *Only yours truly talks to people who criticize his theory.*

In sum, prior work on imposters suggests that first-person agreement – i.e. agreeing with the AUTHOR – is associated with a coreferential interpretation, whereas third-person agreement – i.e., agreement with the immediate antecedent – allows both bound variable and coreferential interpretations.

7 Conclusions: Back to the Finnish puzzle

As I showed in Section 3, the Finnish imposter *meikäläinen* allows (i) only first-person pronoun agreement in possessive constructions with overt genitive pronouns (i.e. requires use of first-person *mun*, not third-person *sen*), whereas it allows (ii) both first person and third person agreement in possessive constructions with null possessive pronouns and Px suffixes and also in reflexives (which also contain possessive suffixes and lack genitive pronouns). I suggest that this is due to (i) the differences in the availability of bound variable vs. coreferential interpretations in these two kinds of possessives (Section 5) and (ii) the relation between first- vs. third-person agreement and reference to the AUTHOR vs. the immediate linguistic antecedent (Section 6).

Specifically, why would imposters only allow first-person agreement in Px-less possessives with an overt genitive pronoun? If my proposal is on the right track, this is because (i) the overt pronouns in Px-less genitive-pronoun possessives (regardless of person) are interpreted via coreference, and (ii) in the case of speaker-referring imposters, coreference is associated with reference to AUTHOR, which in turn (iii) triggers first-person agreement in sentences with imposter antecedents, realized with first-person *mun* (my, I-GEN).

Conversely, imposters allow both first-person and third-person agreement in Px possessives without overt genitive pronouns, because (i) the null pronouns in Px-containing possessives can be interpreted either via coreference or via variable binding, and (ii) coreference is associated with reference to AUTHOR, which triggers first-person agreement, whereas (iii) variable binding is associated with reference to the immediate antecedent, which triggers third-person agreement.

This account further predicts that imposters exhibiting third person agreement should pattern like quantified antecedents, since both are analyzed (under my approach) as involving variable binding. Indeed, this is what we find: Third-person Px possessives without overt pronouns, which I argue allow variable binding, permit both quantified antecedents and imposter antecedents (ex.24a). Third-person genitive *sen* possessives, which I argue are interpreted via coreference, allow neither quantified antecedents nor imposter antecedents (ex.24b). (The imposter would of course be acceptable with a first-person genitive *mun* possessive, as we saw in Section 3, under a coreference construal.)

(24) a.
{✓*Joka iikka*$_i$ / ✓*Liisa*$_i$ / ✓*meikäläinen*$_i$} *hermostuu joskus* naapurille<u>en</u>$_i$.
{✓Every person$_i$ /✓Liisa$_i$ /✓imposter$_i$} gets-annoyed sometimes neighbor.ALL.3PX$_i$
'{✓Everyone$_i$/ ✓Liisa$_i$/ ✓yours truly$_i$} occasionally gets annoyed at his$_i$/her$_i$ neighbor.'

b.
{*? *Joka iikka*$_i$ / ✓*Liisa*$_i$ /* *meikäläinen*$_i$} *hermostuu joskus* <u>sen</u>$_i$ naapurille.
{*? Every person$_i$/✓L$_i$ /* imposter$_i$} gets-annoyed sometimes s/he$_i$.GEN *neighbor.ALL*
'{*? Everyone$_i$/ ✓Liisa$_i$/* yours truly$_i$} occasionally gets annoyed at his/her neighbor.'

Further evidence comes from the availability of strict vs. sloppy interpretations of Px possessives without overt possessives in comparative ellipsis constructions. (We cannot test the interpretation of possessives with third person genitive *sen* as they are ungrammatical with imposter antecedents.) Crucially, if we test imposters with possessives with third person possessive suffixes, as in (25), both the sloppy and the strict interpretation are available, as predicted.

(25) *Meikäläinen puolusti* **kaveria<u>an</u>** *paremmin kuin Anna.*
Imposter.NOM defended **friend.PART.3PX** better than Anna.NOM
'Your truly defended his/her friend better than Anna.'
(i) Sloppy (bv): Anna defended Anna's friend ✓
(ii) Strict (coref): Anna defended my friend ✓

This contrasts with a (colloquial) variant that pairs an imposter subject with a possessive with an first-person genitive *mun* ('I-GEN), as in ex.(26), which clearly allows a coreferential (strict) interpretation but seems to disprefer the bound variable (sloppy) interpretation:

(26) *Meikäläinen puolusti* **<u>mun</u> kaverii** *paremmi ku Anna.*
Imposter.NOM defended **I.GEN friend.PART** better than Anna.NOM.
'Your truly defended my friend better than Anna.'
(i) Sloppy (bv): Anna defended Anna's friend (?)
(ii) Strict (coref): Anna defended my friend ✓

However, when considering the interpretations available with first-person subjects in ellipsis constructions, such as ex.(26), one must be very careful. Prior work in English has reached divergent conclusions about whether first-person pronouns (anteceded by first-person subjects) can be bound variables in ellipsis constructions or not (e.g. Déchaine & Witschko 2002 vs. Rullmann 2004, see also Kratzer 2009). Déchaine & Witschko (2002) note that in examples like (27a), no bound variable interpretation is available. In other words, according to Déchaine and Wiltschko, (27a) cannot mean that Mary knows that John saw her, and can only mean that Mary knows that John saw me (coreferential interpretation). However, Rullmann (2004) notes that in other examples with seemingly comparable configurations, bound variable readings are indeed available. For example, he notes that ex.(27b) can be interpreted to mean that John got a question that he did not understand (bound variable interpretation). However, he notes that judgments tend to be "somewhat variable" (2004:162).

(27) a. *I know that John saw me and Mary does too.*
b. *I got a question I understood, but John didn't.*

This is only a very partial discussion of a large and complex issue pertaining to ellipsis, and I am glossing over distinctions involving binders and bindees, but the main point relevant to the current discussion is as follows: In light of the debates concerning the available interpretations – as well as the possibility of crosslinguistic variation (see Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002 on English vs. French) – it seems that further research is needed before we can use ellipsis to probe the strict/sloppy interpretation of Finnish possessives involving *first-person* elements.

Encouragingly, we already saw that ex.(25), with third-person agreement, patterns as my account leads us to expect, and even ex.(26) – while potentially tricky due to multiple factors that can apparently influence availability of bound variable readings with first-person pronominal expressions – also seems to pattern in the expected way. A further investigation of ellipsis constructions involving first-person pronouns in Finnish is an important direction for future work.

In sum, in this paper I present novel data illustrating the seemingly puzzling agreement behavior of the first-person Finnish imposter *meikäläinen:* This form, on its imposter use, only allows first-person pronoun agreement in the Px-less, genitive-containing possessive construction, although it permits both first and third person pronoun agreement with Px-containing possessives and reflexives. Using data from ellipsis and quantified NPs, I claim that this behavior follows from general, non-imposter specific properties of Finnish possessives structures and – when combined with the idea that AUTHOR reference with imposters triggers first person agreement and reference to the linguistically immediate antecedent referent triggers third person agreement – generates the agreement patterns exhibited by the imposter *meikäläinen*. If my analysis of the semantic interpretational properties of Finnish possessive constructions in on the right track, it suggests that nothing 'extraordinary' is needed specifically for imposters.

References

Aarts, F. G. A. M. 1971. On the distribution of noun-phrase types in English clause structure, *Lingua* 26: 281-293. (reprinted as Aarts F. G. A. M. 2004. On the distribution of noun-phrase types in English clause structure. In Sampson Geoffrey & McCarthy Diana (eds.), *Corpus linguistics: Readings in a widening discipline*, 34–48. London: Continuum.)

Alonso-Ovalle, L. & D'Introno, F. 2000. Full and Null Pronouns in Spanish: The Zero Pronoun Hypothesis (2000). In Campos, H., Herburger, E., Morales-Front, A., Walsh, T. (eds.), *Hispanic Linguistics at the Turn of the Millenium*, Cascadilla Press: Somerville, 400–414.

Alonso-Ovalle, L., Clifton, C., Frazier, L. & Fernández-Solera, S. 2002. Null vs. Overt Pronouns and the Topic-Focus Articulation in Spanish. *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 14(2):151–169.

Collins, Chris & Postal, Paul M. 2012. *Imposters: A Study of Pronominal Agreement.* MIT Press.

Collins, Chris. 2014. *Cross-Linguistic Studies of Imposters and Pronominal Agreement* (ed.), Oxford University Press.

Collins, Chris, Moody, Simanique & Postal, Paul. 2008. An AAE Camouflage Construction. *Language*, 84(1), 29–68.

Das, Satarupa. 2014. (il)-licit pronoun-antecedent relations in Bangla. Collins, Chris (ed.), *Cross-Linguistic Studies of Imposters and Pronominal Agreement.* Oxford University Press.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie & Witschko, Martina. 2002. Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 409–442.

Fox, Barbara A., & Thompson, Sandra A. 1990. A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation. *Language,* 66(2), 297–316.

Frazier, Lyn, & Clifton, Charles. 2000. On bound variable interpretations: The LF-only hypothesis. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 29, 125–139.

Giorgi, Alessandra. 2010. *About the speaker: Towards a syntax of indexicality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grodzinsky, Yosef & Reinhart Tanya. 1993. The innateness of binding and of coreference. Linguistic Inquiry. 24(1):69–101.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Markus Steinbach. 2006. "A Skeptical Note on the Syntax of Speech Acts and Point of View." Pp. 213–222 in Form, Structure, Grammar, edited by Patrick Brandt and Eric Fuß. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Haegeman, Liliane & Virginia Hill. 2013. The Syntacticization of Discourse. In Folli, Raffaella, Christiana Sevdali, and Robert Truswell (eds.), *Syntax and Its Limits.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 370–390.

Hakulinen, Auli & Fred Karlsson. 1989. Nykysuomen lauseoppia. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

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

Heim, Irene. 1993. *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation: A Reinterpretation of Reinhart's approach.* Ms., MIT.

Heim, Irene. 1998. Anaphora and semantic interpretation: a reinterpretation of Reinhart's approach. In U. Sauerland and O. Percus (eds), *The Interpretative Tract*, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, vol. 25. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

Hinterwimmer. Stefan. 2015. A Unified Account of the Properties of German Demonstrative Pronouns, In P. Grosz, P. Patel-Grosz and I. Yanovich (eds.), *The Proceedings of the Workshop on Pronominal Semantics at NELS 40*, 61–107. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.

Horn, Laurence. 2008. *"I Love Me Some Him": The Landscape of Non-Argument Datives.* In O. Bonami and P. Cabredo Hofherr (eds), Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 7, 169–192.

Huhmarniemi, Saara & Brattico, Pauli. 2015. The Finnish possessive suffix. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics*. 4:2–41.

Hyvönen, Saara, Leino, Antti & Salmenkivi, Marko. 2007. Multivariate analysis of Finnish dialect data – an overview of lexical variation. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 22, 271–290.

Ikola, Osmo, Palomäki, Ulla & Koitto, Anna-Kaisa. 1989. *Suomen murteiden lauseoppia ja tekstikielioppia*. SKST 511. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Ikola, Osmo. 1986. *Nykysuomen käsikirja*. Espoo: Weilin+Göös

Kaiser, Elsi. 2003. Encoding (Non)Locality in anaphoric relations. In Nelson, D. & Manninen, S. (eds.) *Generative Approaches to Finnic and Saami Linguistics*, 269–293. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Kaiser, Elsi. 2017. Pronoun use in Finnish reported speech and free indirect discourse: Effects of logophoricity. In Pritty Patel-Grosz, Patrick Grosz and Sarah Zobel (eds), *Pronouns in Embedded Contexts. Springer Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy.* 75–104.

Kaiser, Elsi, Nichols, Justin & Wang, Catherine. (2018). Experimenting with imposters: What modulates choice of person agreement in pronouns? In Uli Sauerland and Stephanie Solt (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 22,* vol. 1, ZASPiL 60, pp. 505–521. ZAS, Berlin

Karlsson, Fred. 1999. *Finnish*: An essential Grammar. Routledge.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1998. More Structural Analogies Between Pronouns and Tenses. SALT VIII. MIT

Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a pronoun: Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 187–237.

Laitinen, Lea. 2002. From logophoric pronoun to discourse particle. A case study of Finnish and Saami. In *New reflections on grammaticalization*, ed. I. Wischer & G. Diewald. 327–344. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Laitinen, Lea. 2005. Hän, the third speech act pronoun in Finnish. In *Minimal reference in Finnic: The use and interpretation of pronouns and zero in Finnish and Estonian discourse*, ed. R. Laury. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Land, Victoria & Kitzinger, Celia. 2007. Some uses of third-person reference forms in speaker self-reference. *Discourse Studies* 9(4): 493–525

Larjavaara, Matti. 1990. *Suomen deiksis.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Laury, Ritva. 1997. *Demonstratives in interaction: the emergence of a definite article in Finnish.* (Studies in discourse and grammar). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Laury, Ritva. 2005. *Minimal reference: the use of pronouns in Finnish and Estonian discourse.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. (Studia Fennica; no. [12])

Luján, Marta. 1985. Binding Properties of Overt Pronouns in Null Pronominal Languages. Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society Annual Meeting 21, 123–143.

Luján, Marta. 1986. Stress and Binding of Pronouns. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society Annual Meeting* 22. 69–84.

Lyytikäinen, Erkki, Rekunen, Jorma & Yli-Paavola, Jaakko (eds.). 2013. *Suomen murrekirja.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Makkonen-Craig, Henna. 1996. *Yleispuhekielisyydet lehtikielessä.* Pro Grade thesis (MA Thesis), University of Helsinki.

Mielikäinen, Aila. 1991. *Murteiden murros: Levikkikarttoja nykypuhekielen piirteistä.* Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopiston suomen kielen laitos.

Mitrunen, Hanna-Marika. 2005. *Possessiivikongruenssi ja muut omistusliiteilmaukset Tampereen puhekielessä 1970- ja 1990-luvuilla.*Pro Gradu thesis (MA thesis), University of Tampere.

Montalbetti, Mario. 1984. *After binding. On the interpretation of pronouns.* Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.

Nau, Nicole. 2006. Out of Africa: Logophoric pronouns and reported discourse in Finnish and High Latvian dialects. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica,* LV, 55–87.

Nelson, Diane. 1998. *Grammatical case assignment in Finnish.* New York: Garland.

Niendorf, Mariya & Peterson, Elizabeth. 1999. Variation in the Finnish Possessive: a new written standard? Talk given at *NWAVE 28,* Toronto, 1999

Nikanne, Urpo. 1989. Infinitiivien morphosyntaksia. Linguistic Conference in Jyväskyla.

Nikanne, Urpo. 1993. On assigning semantic cases in Finnish. In A. Holmberg & U. Nikanne (eds.) *Case and other functional categories in Finnish syntax,* pp.75–88. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Patel-Grosz, Pritty & Grosz, Patrick Georg. 2017. Revisiting pronominal typology. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 48(2), 259–297.

Paunonen. Heikki. 1995. Puhesuomen muuttuva omistusmuotojärjestelmä. *Virittäjä* 99: 501–531.

Pierrehumbert, Janet. 1980. The Finnish possessive suffixes. *Language* 56(3):603–621.

Podobryaev, Alexander. 2014. *Persons, imposters, and monsters*. PhD dissertation, MIT.

Podobryaev, Alexander. 2017. *Three Routes to Person Indexicality*. Natural Language Semantics 25 (4), 329–354

Priiki, Katri. 2016. Henkilöviitteisten kolmaspersoonaisten pronominien vaihtelu Satakunnan nykypuhekielessä keskutelukumppanin tuttuuden mukaan. *Puhe ja kieli,* 36:2, 123–144.

Priiki, Katri. 2017. The Finnish logophoric pronoun *hän* – a quantitative approach. *Journal of Estonian and Finno Ugric Linguistics* 8 (2), 327–349.

Raevaara, Liisa. 2015. Hyvä päivä olla minä, mä ja meitsi? Minän vaihtelevat asemat ja identiteetit helsinkiläisnuorten puheessa. 174–213. In Marja-Leena Sorjonen, Anu Rouhikoski and Heini Lehtonen (eds), *Helsingissä puhuttavat suomet*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.

Rapola, Martti, 1962/1990. *Johdatus Suomen murteisiin*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1983. *Anaphora and semantic interpretation*. London: Croom Helm

Reinhart, Tanya. 1986. Center and periphery in the grammar of anaphora. In Barbara Lust (ed), *Studies in the acquisition of anaphora*, vol. 1, 123–150. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Reinhart, Tanya. 2000. Strategies of anaphora resolution. In Hans Bennis, M. Everaert and E. Reuland (eds) *Interface Strategies North Holland Amsterdam*, p.295-324.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Haegeman, L. (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer Amsterdam, 281–337.

Rullmann, Hotze. 2004. First and second person pronouns as bound variables. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:159–168.

Shapiro, Lewis P., Hestvik, Arild, Lesan Lesli, Garcia A. Rachel. 2003. Charting the time-course of VP-ellipsis sentence comprehension: Evidence for an initial and independent structural analysis. *Journal of Memory and Language* 49:1–19.

Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2014. *Context-linked grammar. Language Sciences,* 46, 175–188.

Speas, Peggy & Tenny, Carol. 2003. Configurational Properties of Point of View Roles. In DiSciullo, A. (ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 315–344

Sulkala, Helena & Merja Karjalainen. 1992. *Finnish.* London and New York: Routledge

Suonperä, Anni. 2012. *Se, hän ja tekstityksen puhe: Pronominivariaatio elokuvakäänöksen puheen illuusiossa*. University of Tampere. Pro gradu (MA thesis).

Tiittula, Liisa & Nuolijärvi, Pirkko 2013: *Puheen illuusio suomenkielisessä kaunokirjallisuudessa*. SKS.

Toivonen, Ida. 2000. The morphosyntax of Finnish possessive. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 579–609

Trosterud, Trond. 1993. Anaphors and Binding Domains in Finnish. In *Case and Other Functional Categories in Finnish Syntax*, ed. Anders Holmberg and Urpo Nikanne, 225–244. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Vainikka, Anne. 1989. Deriving Syntactic Representations in Finnish. University of Massachusetts – Amherst, Ph.D. dissertation.

Vainikka, Anne. 2012. *The possessive suffix in Finnish.* Talk given at the Workshop on Finnish Syntax, University of Helsinki, March 9, 2012.

van Steenbergen, Marlies. 1991. Long-distance binding in Finnish. In *Long-distance anaphora*, ed. Jan Koster and Eric J. Reuland, 231–244. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vilkuna, Maria. 1996. *Suomen lauseopin perusteet.* Helsinki.

Wang, Chyan-an Arthur. 2014. Mandarin pseudo-imposters. In Collins, Chris (ed.), *Cross-Linguistic Studies of Imposters and Pronominal Agreement*, Oxford University Press

Wiltschko, Martina. 1998a. On the syntax and semantics of (relative) pronouns and determiners. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 2(2), 143–181.

Wiltschko, Martina. 1998b. The syntax of pronouns and determiners: A cross-linguistic study. *In Current research on language and linguistics*, ed. by Marion Caldecott, Suzanne Gessner, and Eun-Sook Kim, 293–320. UBC Working Papers in Linguistics. Vancouver: University of British Columbia, Department of Linguistics.

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2015. *Fake indexicals, feature sharing, and the importance of gendered relatives.* Colloquium talk, MIT. http://wurmbrand.uconn.edu/Susi/research/handouts-and-resources.html

Zwicky, Arnold. 2007. Illeism and its relatives. Language Log posting 29 July 2007, http://itre.cis-upenn.edu/~myl/languagelog/archives/004762.html

Elsi Kaiser
University of Southern California
emkaiser@usc.edu

BOOK REVIEW

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

Satu Manninen

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

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

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

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

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

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

ISSN: 2063-8825

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) a. *Tapasimme* [*puun* *luona*].
we.met tree.GEN by.ESS
'We met by the tree.'

b. *Puu* *on* [*talon* *takana*].
tree is house.GEN behind.ESS
'The tree is behind the house.'

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

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

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

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

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

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

References

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

Crystal, David. 2008. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th edition. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Essive. 2018. In *SIL Glossary of Linguistic Terms*. https://glossary.sil.org/term
Hakulinen, Auli, Vilkuna, Maria, Korhonen, Riitta, Koivisto, Vesa, Heinonen Tarja Riitta & Alho, Irja. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi* (A Descriptive Grammar of Finnish). Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
Hakulinen, Lauri. 1978. *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys* (The Structure and the Development of the Finnish Language). Helsinki: Otava.
Kiss, Katalin É. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2001. "A piece of cake" and "a cup of tea": Partitive and pseudo-partitive nominal constructions in the Circum-Baltic languages. In Östen Dahl & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology ad Contact. Volume 2: Grammar and Typology,* 523−568. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Vilkuna, Maria. 1996. *Suomen lauseopin perusteet* (The Foundations of Finnish Syntax). Helsinki: Edita.

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