Some notes on *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*

Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.). 2022. *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford University Press. LV + 1115 pp.

The book under consideration is so vast that it would be impossible to write an expert review on every chapter in it. Therefore, the choice of chapters to review was based on the expertise and current research interests of this reviewer, and it ultimately comprises Chapters 3–6 from Part I pertaining to sociolinguistics and related issues, Chapters 7–13 (on Saami), 23 (on Mordvin), 24 (on Mari), and 25–27 (on Permic) from Part II, and Chapters 44 and 50 considering adverbial marking, 48 on non-finites, and 51–52 on atypical predication.

I have decided to focus on things that I find problematic, or what is more often the case, things that are interesting and would benefit from more extensive discussion. This approach makes the review seem at times rather negative, but I would like to assure the reader that anything I do not mention in the text is on point and does not require any comment. In the end, this comprises the majority of the reviewed chapters.

1. Sociolinguistics and language policy

The handbook's one aim is to pay attention to issues pertaining to language endangerment, language policy, and sociolinguistics that have been ignored in previous handbooks of Uralic languages (p. lv). This is achieved mostly in the chapters on individual languages in Part II of the handbook, where the sociolinguistic situation of each language is outlined in its respective chapter. In addition to these outlines the handbook includes four chapters that cover issues related to language endangerment, language policy, and sociolinguistic questions. These chapters deal with important issues, as most of the Uralic languages are spoken in contexts where bilingualism, oppressive language policies, etc. affect their use on a daily basis.

1.1. The making of the Uralic nation-state languages

Chapter 3 by Johanna Laakso is a concise overview of the history of the nation-state languages Finnish, Estonian, and Hungarian. The chapter introduces the historical and political forces that have

 https://doi.org/10.33339/fuf.152530

affected the development of the nation-state languages. Their history is traced from the oldest writings in these languages right up to the modern era, the emphasis being on more modern times. The delimitation is justified, as the history of the languages prior to their written traditions is discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Furthermore, a chapter on the development of Finnish, Estonian, and Hungarian should be of interest to linguists who are not experts on Uralic languages (and maybe even to ones who are), as the histories of the respective written standards help to explain some properties of these languages that are not easily explained by purely historical, typological, or cognitive factors. This kind of historical overview is especially important for the nation-state languages for two reasons. Firstly, these languages are used most often as examples by linguists who do not specialize in Uralistics and thus do not necessarily know about how language planning has interfered in the languages themselves. Secondly, these languages themselves have been shaped by language planning the most among the Uralic languages.

The chapter starts from the emergence of the first texts. One important remark made about the oldest Uralic texts is that the Novgorod birch-bark letter, sometimes referred to as the oldest Finnish text, is not in fact Finnish, and thus does not belong to the history of written Finnish (cf. Laakso 1999). On the other hand, the lack of texts in Finnish or Estonian in the fifteenth century is not explained. Even though the explanation is as simple as that the languages were not written back then (cf. e.g. Häkkinen 1994: 37–43 for Finnish), this could have at least been mentioned. What caused the written standards to form could also have been elaborated on more (cf. e.g. Ising 1970: 126–215; Linn 2013 for general European trends).

Next, Laakso considers the developments in the seventeenth century. This period marks the beginning of the written use of Finnish and Estonian in addition to Hungarian. The developments are introduced well, but the small corpus of texts that were written in Finnish before Mikael Agricola could have been explicitly mentioned, in order to show that a Finnish literary standard did not suddenly spring into existence (cf. Häkkinen 1994: 79–80).

For the development of Finnish and Estonian nation-state languages this period includes two important phenomena which are mentioned by Laakso but merited being underlined more. This is namely the fact that the standards,

especially old written Finnish, had their basis in one dialect, and that most of the oldest texts were translations which were related to the doctrines of the Church and therefore were translated very faithfully (cf. e.g. Häkkinen 1994: 79–90). In addition, as mentioned in the chapter, the first Estonian writers were mostly German-speaking clergymen that had no (good) command of Estonian and could not write the language in concise way (p. 60). It is important to acknowledge that in the beginning, the written standards of Finnish and Estonian were not standards for the whole language but rather for some (artificial) part of it. This is to some extent reflected in the modern written standards as well.[1]

Following the chronology, the chapter discusses the nation-state languages in the nineteenth century. Laakso discusses all the main developments regarding institutional possibilities, e.g. the status of the language at the time and the possibilities to change it, the orthographical developments at the time, vocabulary planning, as well as the codification of the languages. The differences between the situations of the nation-state languages are shown in the chapter well, but the similarities are left undisclosed, even though it is a reasonable assumption that they also affected the development of the written standards. The final section of the chapter discusses the modern-day nation-state languages. This section, the longest of the chapter, covers all the important aspects of the twentieth- and twenty-first-century developments. Undoubtedly there would have been more to say about the matters, but for a handbook-sized chapter there is enough information.

All in all, Chapter 3 is a good overview of the development of the Uralic nation-state languages and the forces that have affected them in the past. One could have hoped for an even more thorough account of the pre-twentieth-century developments, as these affected the structures of the written standards, which are today mostly the object of study of linguists working with Hungarian, Finnish, or Estonian. Understanding the history of the written standards could shed light on problems with seemingly no answer. Also, some kind of timeline could have made it easier to understand the sequence of the events examined in the chapter.

1. This is of course not a unique development for Finnish and Estonian (cf. e.g. Linn 2013), but one that seems to be forgotten from time to time.

1.2. The Uralic minorities

The theme of Chapter 4, written by Annika Pasanen, Johanna Laakso, and Anneli Sarhimaa, considers endangerment and revitalization of Uralic minority languages. The chapter functions as a nice crash course (or repetition) of the main issues of the Uralic minority languages. The chapter is based on a previous paper by one of the authors (Pasanen 2008) which has been translated and updated (p. 78). It is evident that the chapter is not a mere translation but actually incorporates research done after the publication of the first version, as the chapter refers to research published in the years since (e.g. Laakso et al. 2016; Sarhimaa 2017), and it makes use of what was then the latest Russian census data of 2010. The similarities between Pasanen (2008) and the chapter under review serve as a grim reminder of the fact that the intervening ten years had not seen any drastic improvement in the situation of most Uralic minority languages.

The chapter begins with a section on the problem of demarcating minority languages. It defines two problems of demarcation, namely the problem of endangerment in different areas, domains of use, etc., and the differentiation between a language and dialect or variety. Even though both issues affect also Uralic languages, and the language-or-dialect-problem is elucidated by the situation of a number of Uralic varieties (p. 68), the demarcation problem should be basic knowledge for any sociolinguist and thus should not need the amount of discussion dedicated to it in a handbook of a single language family. The next section deals with more theoretical issues of endangerment and revitalization. This section is less tightly tied to Uralic minority languages per se. Here Pasanen et al. introduce the theoretical notions of language shift and reverse language shift (e.g. Fishman 2013). This section, like the previous one, seems a bit unnecessary, as any sociolinguist should be familiar with language-shift theory. The theory is, however, linked somewhat to the reality of Uralic languages by discussing the situations of Aanaar and Kildin Saami, and with a nod to the reality of many Uralic minorities in Russia (p. 69). Maybe the first two sections could have been merged into one, and the theoretical content explained more concisely via the Uralic examples.

The following section also has a somewhat theoretical background. Here Pasanen et al. discuss the most common ways of assessing endangerment, i.e. the different

scales of endangerment that have been put forward in the literature. These include GIDS (e.g. Fishman 2013: 484–489), EGIDS (Lewis & Simons 2010), the UNESCO framework (UNESCO 2003), and EuLaViBar (e.g. Laakso et al. 2016: 33–48), among others. Like with the previous section, the discussion of the assessment tools seems a bit unnecessary, as they should be common knowledge for those interested. However, after explaining the general mechanism of the assessment tools, Pasanen et al. give examples of seven common criteria with Uralic minorities, which ties the general discussion to the subject matter of the book.

Following the general overview of typical criteria for assessing endangerment, Pasanen et al. take a more thorough look at two central phenomena. Firstly, Pasanen et al. discuss intergenerational transmission of different Uralic minority languages. Especially interesting is seeing a figure on how intergenerational transmission is present in different Uralic minority languages (p. 73) and comparing it to a similar one in in Pasanen (2008: 61). For example, it seems that Lule Saami is slowly starting to regain the intergenerational transmission it had once lost, whereas Karelian has lost such intergenerational transmission between the two publications. Secondly, Pasanen et al. review the role of the educational system in assimilation or revitalization of minority languages with regard to different Uralic languages. These tie the Uralic reality nicely to the general research tradition of language endangerment. The examples Pasanen et al. have chosen, show that there are similar forces affecting the minority languages that have been shown to be present also in non-Uralic contexts, but also that one cannot blindly apply the results of other research to the Uralic minority languages.

The chapter ends with a section on how language assimilation and revitalization are constantly in competition. This takes the form of four theses which can be read as guidelines for those who are involved in preservation and revitalization of minority languages, including professionals and laypeople alike. The theses describe the different steps that are vital to revitalization, but also underline the responsibilities different parties must take. The theses discuss very important matters, but I still wonder whether the handbook under review is the best place for such a call to action. The section does not discuss mostly Uralic languages but rather a general situation, and it does not describe a phenomenon but rather actions that ought to be

taken. Nonetheless, the matter really is important, and hopefully it will find the right audience from the pages of this handbook.

1.3. Language policy in Russia

The subject of Chapter 5 by Konstantin Zamyatin is the language policy in Russia. This is a justified choice, as most of the Uralic languages are spoken in Russia. Furthermore, the Uralic languages in Russia are more or less endangered minority languages there, and as such are strongly affected by whatever language policies are implemented in Russia. However, a mention of a source on the language policies affecting Uralic minorities in Western Europe, e.g. Laakso et al. (2016), could have been provided for those who are interested in the status of Uralic minorities elsewhere. The chapter represents a synthesis of almost a decade of the author's research on language policy in Russia (e.g. Zamyatin 2012; 2020), and thus is a reliable overview of the phenomenon.

The chapter begins with a rather brief portrayal of Russian language policies from the tsarist era through the Soviet regime until the disintegration of the Soviet Union. In principle, there were no clear language policies in place for most of this time, and of course there is no sound documentation of their effect even when some policies were implemented, but there were some periods, most notably the 1920s and the first half of the 1930s, when the policies enabled the development of minority languages. These periods are mentioned (p. 79), but a somewhat wider discussion would have been interesting. For example, the discussion of the language policy of the 1920s and 1930s with regard to individual Uralic languages that is presently scattered across different publications (e.g. Ivanov & Moisio 1998: 18–112 on Mari) could have been summarized here. Otherwise, the choice of focusing on the present is well founded.

Zamyatin has divided the main discussion into four parts. First, the language policies of Russia in the 1990s are discussed at length. The language policies of the 1990s serve as a good starting point for surveying the present-day language policies and the changes in the status of minority languages in Russia. Next, Zamyatin discusses the language policies in the 2000s. This era has overall been a dark time for all minority languages of the Russian Federation, and Zamyatin manages to highlight the key points of the fresh decline in minority-language rights that occurred and is still occurring. This section is divided into two subsections, the first of which discuss

the changes of the early 2000s, and the second focuses on the period from 2014 to the present. The general part is comprehensive, but similarly to Chapter 4 (see above), the focus is on rather general phenomena. Even though the average potential reader probably does not know a lot about the language-political situation in Russia, in a handbook about Uralic languages the general part seems a bit too long.

After the chronological review Zamyatin turns to the general tendencies of regional language policies in Russia. He shows that previous language-revival attempts have not been successful, and the attitude of minority-language speakers in Russia seems to be that the government should take care of language transmission. Finally, Zamyatin gives an overview of the situation of the Uralic minority languages in their titular areas (republics or autonomous districts). This part goes through the problems of language policy with regard to the Uralic languages well, but it could have been even more thorough at the expense of the general overview. All in all, Zamyatin manages to show the problematic reality of policies and the status of minority languages rather well, pointing out the gap between the official (theoretical) status of the languages and the actual reality.

1.4. The orthographies of Uralic minority languages

The subject of Chapter 6 by Johanna Laakso is the graphization and orthographies of Uralic minority languages. The chapter complements Chapter 3 in those parts where the development of the written standards of the Uralic nation-state languages is discussed. The end of the chapter discusses briefly the scientific transcriptions used with Uralic languages. Chapter 6 is a concise but welcome overview of the development of written standards for Uralic minority languages. The chapter nicely rounds off the section on sociolinguistic and language-political issues. It also summarizes well the history of the written standards of Uralic minority languages, as this is scattered across publications that might not be easily accessible to an international audience (e.g. Korhonen 1981: 53–65 for the Saami languages; Bartens 1999: 22 for Erzya; Bartens 2000: 24–25, 27–28, 30–31 for the Permic languages; Moisio et al. 2020: 24–31 for Mari; all in Finnish). In addition, the information given in the prior literature is typically rather scanty.

First, Laakso goes over the Saami and Finnic orthographies. The development of the different Saami orthographies differs greatly, as the languages are spoken in four

different countries. Thus, the discussion raises the question of whether the complexity of the orthography poses problems for e.g. language teaching. Even if this is not the main topic of the chapter, a brief commentary or maybe some relevant references could have been given (here and in other places in the chapter). The Cyrillic alphabets of the Uralic minorities are discussed more thoroughly, which is a good choice, because the Cyrillic alphabet and especially the Russian spelling rules tend to yield rather complex phoneme–grapheme correspondences. This discussion also raises an important point for the student of Uralic languages not familiar with the history of these languages' standardization. One should always first familiarize oneself with the writing system and its phoneme correspondences.

The final section of the chapter introduces the scientific transcriptions for the Uralic languages. The focus is on the Finno-Ugric Transcription (FUT), but some others are also mentioned. In my opinion, FUT is so important to any scholars wanting to familiarize themselves with the Uralic languages that the explanation of the system should not have been buried in a chapter on orthographies in general. The ASCII-based system developed by Tapani Salminen for (Tundra) Nenets is mentioned (p. 99), but it merited a little more discussion, as some central works in Nenets studies (e.g. Salminen 1997) use this system. In addition, Salminen's system seems to cause confusion even within the Samoyedist community (Siegl 2013: 33, fn. 7). The chapter ends with a brief discussion of the effects of digitalization on the Uralic minority orthographies. This discussion could have been even longer, as the difficulties in using orthographies with special characters and diacritics pose a real problem in the digital world.

2. Some language groups

2.1. Saami languages

The handbook contains six chapters on individual Saami languages, namely South, Lule, North, Aanaar, Skolt, and Kildin, as well as a general introduction to the history of different aspects of Proto-Saami. The languages have been chosen from different parts of the Saami continuum and represent the different types of Saami languages rather well. The only slight shortcoming is that the easternmost Saami language, namely Ter Saami, lacks a description. This is of course understandable, as the language is scarcely described, rather remote, and lacks large amounts of data necessary for description.

However, it would have been interesting to have both ends of the Saami continuum described in the handbook.

2.1.1. The history of the Saami languages

Chapter 7, written by Eino Koponen, is a general introduction to Saami languages. Such a chapter is much needed, as the standard introductions to Saami languages and linguistics (e.g. Korhonen 1981; Sammallahti 1998) are somewhat outdated. Koponen seems to be of the opinion that all the Saami varieties, i.e. South, Pite, Ume, Lule, North, Aanaar, Skolt, Kildin, Akkala, and Ter Saami, are languages in their own regard, even though some of them, e.g. South and Ume Saami, are sometimes conflated (p. 103). Considering all Saami varieties to be languages seems a good approach for the classification of the varieties, as it gives each variety a certain status. The discussion also highlights the important point that the Saami languages represent a continuum.

The same section also motivates the choice of the languages described in the following chapters of the handbook. The chosen languages seem to be representative examples of the continuum and, as an additional feature, they have codified written standards. Opinions can differ on this matter, for after all also Pite and Ume Saami have a written standard, and Ter Saami would probably also be representative of one end of the continuum. Due to the constraints of space, and possibly because of the lack of competent researchers in one or the other language, the selection still seems adequate.

The descent of the Saamic group is also touched upon briefly, as is the internal division of the languages. The former is discussed more thoroughly elsewhere in the handbook, and therefore it does not necessitate a longer consideration, but the latter issue is interesting, and, in my opinion, Koponen could have examined it a little further. This issue pertains to the fact that the Saami languages can be divided into two groups, a western one comprising North Saami and the languages west of it, and an eastern group comprising the languages spoken east of North Saami. North Saami, however, shows both western and eastern traits in various areas of its language structure. The reason for this and the classification itself merited more consideration.

The first part of the actual historical description concerns phonology. The Saami languages exhibit diverse and sometimes extremely complex patterns of morphophonological alternation, and therefore

this section is of utmost importance for anyone interested in the Saami languages. The word structure of Proto-Saami is discussed in its own section, which is a good choice as the system is somewhat complicated, and many of the present-day languages show similarities to it. Koponen also introduces the traditional terminology of the parts of a foot in the text (p. 106; cf. Sammallahti 1998: 39). The use of discipline-internal terminology in a handbook could be criticized in itself, but in this case a bigger problem is that the discussion is unnecessary as the terminology is not really used in the handbook. A typical feature for most Saami languages, namely consonant gradation, is briefly summarized. Koponen mentions that the background of the phenomenon is still unclear (for a previous explanation, cf. Korhonen 1996 [1969]), but as the phenomenon is one of the most prevalent features across the Saami languages, a more thorough discussion would have been in order.

Koponen also discusses the morphology and syntax of Proto-Saami. Both sections are rather concise overviews. However, as most of the chapters on individual Saami languages exhibit the same structure as the introductory chapter, it is possible to compare the reflexes of the Proto-Saami structures in the modern-day languages. Therefore, it is good that even a small amount of information has been offered here.

2.1.2. South and Lule Saami

Chapters 8 and 9 by Jussi Ylikoski concentrate on two of the less-spoken Western Saami languages, South and Lule Saami, respectively. These languages are part of the western arm of the Saami continuum, specifically the westernmost Saami language (South Saami) and the easternmost Saami language before North Saami (Lule Saami). Therefore, these languages serve as representative examples of the Western Saami languages. The languages are really similar, however, so maybe one chapter covering both would have been enough. Such a choice has been made with regard to the Mordvin languages (Chapter 23) in the handbook.

Both chapters begin with an overview of the sociolinguistic situation and the dialectal division of the languages. The most important feature in this field is the problem of delimiting one language against the neighboring Saami languages. The discussion makes it clear why the different Saami varieties have been regarded as dialects rather than languages. Ylikoski demonstrates that the languages

have a linguistically distinct core, and based on this core the languages can be defined (cf. also Salminen 2007: 212), and he discusses which varieties of each language are easy to classify, and which are not. These overviews will most likely be useful for students of the Saami branch in the future.

The next section of both chapters describes the phonology. The sound system of Lule Saami is compared to North Saami, which is closest to it (p. 132). This solution partly works: on the one hand, the comparison to a comparably more well-known language helps to see the similarities and peculiarities of the system. On the other hand, the reader must have some kind of command of North Saami phonology, or resort to looking at the system as presented in Chapter 10 of the handbook, which can be somewhat annoying. Moreover, the phonological system of a language should be presented independent of any comparisons in a handbook chapter.

The next section in both chapters is the section on morphology. The discussion is structured very similarly in both chapters, and Ylikoski even uses exactly the same text in some places of the description (cf. e.g. pages 119 and 137). In general, the discussion of nominal inflection is good, but some things are mentioned too briefly, or omitted altogether. The same applies to pronouns, of which only personal pronouns are mentioned, as well as numerals. Some of the information one would expect to find in the morphology section, is found under syntax instead, like the discussion on the semantics of cases and inflection (pp. 144–145), and of demonstratives and numerals (p. 144) in Chapter 9. This makes the chapter somewhat difficult to use.

Verb inflection is discussed at greater length in both chapters. Most interesting is the discussion of non-finite verb forms, where Ylikoski comments on the alleged non-finiteness of some of the forms of South Saami (p. 123). Ylikoski also highlights the symmetry of the periphrastic aspect forms of Lule Saami (p. 141; cf. also Ylikoski 2016a). The proposal to name the South Saami mood previously known as the "potential" the "dubitative" (p. 124) seems warranted and the analysis of the Lule Saami potential as a future tense (p. 139) is an interesting proposal.

All in all, both chapters are a good description of the respective languages. Ylikoski focuses on the peculiarities of each language, and the reader gets a good picture of how the Saami languages differ from each other. This approach also underlines that each Saami language can indeed be regarded as a distinct

language. The decision to describe a lot of the structure of the respective languages by comparing them to other Saami languages, on the other hand, is a bit questionable. There are a lot of commonalities between the Saami languages, but if these languages are viewed as independent entities, also their structure should be described independently.

2.1.3. North Saami

Chapter 10, by Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte (Ante Aikio) and Jussi Ylikoski, focuses on the biggest, most researched, and probably internationally most well-known Saami language, namely North Saami. The chapter is the most comprehensive of all the chapters describing the Saami languages, and one of the longest chapters in the part of the handbook describing the various Uralic languages. This is warranted only to the extent that North Saami functions as a kind of default for the structure of the Saami languages in the handbook, so that many typically pan-Saami phenomena, e.g. consonant gradation, are described in more detail in this chapter. The handbook could also have been structured so that there would be no need in other chapters to refer to Chapter 10. In its present form the chapter is rather overwhelming and taxing to read.

The chapter begins, as is typical for the chapters of the handbook, with an overview of the sociolinguistic situation and dialectal division of the language. In Chapter 10 this section seems to be somewhat shorter than in other chapters on Saami languages. It is easy to find additional information on these matters (e.g. Pasanen 2008; Aikio et al. 2015), but having all the information in one place would be helpful. Especially considering the overall length of the chapter, the brevity of this section is remarkable.

After the introduction, there is a section on phonology. This section begins with a disclaimer saying that the phonology of North Saami is very hard to describe within a grammatical sketch, and that only the main features of the phonology of the main dialects are discussed (p. 148). The section is long, and it discusses a wide variety of phonological phenomena in North Saami. The analysis sometimes even goes into unnecessary detail, for example when discussing marginal phonemes and allegro shortening of certain word forms. Even the discussion of differences in phonological systems between dialects can be considered superfluous information for a handbook chapter.

Next up is the section on morphology. The inflectional categories of nominals are discussed in greater

depth than in Chapters 8 and 9, and for example the functions of the cases are explored in detail. A minor but nonetheless interesting comment comes in the discussion of the locative case (p. 159). As is well known, the North Saami locative (and its counterparts in more eastern Saami languages) exhibits a typologically highly uncommon syncretism, namely location–source syncretism (cf. e.g. Creissels 2009; Pantcheva 2010). This syncretism can cause problems in comprehension in some situations, and Aikio and Ylikoski mention that the adverb *eret* 'away' is used to disambiguate source from location. To my knowledge this is the only description of any Saami language that has a locative case, where such a device is mentioned, and it will probably prove very useful for future research. At the end of the section on nominal inflection there is a rather long list of nominal derivational suffixes, which seems unnecessary, as it only lists derivational morphemes. After nominal inflection, the verbal inflection is discussed. In general, the section discusses verbal inflection in sufficient detail for a handbook chapter, i.e. neither too little nor too much, but the discussion of non-finite inflection seems disproportionately large. As there are studies focusing specifically on this matter (e.g. Ylikoski 2003), this section could have been shorter. The section on verb inflection ends with a rather long subsection on verbal derivation that, like its nominal counterpart, seems unnecessary in the context of a handbook chapter of this magnitude. The final section of the chapter covers syntax, including word order, phrase and clause structure, and clause combining. This section is short compared to the other sections, which gives an unbalanced feel to the chapter.

Chapter 10 describes the structure of North Saami in detail, so that this chapter can be used as a reference for the chapters on the other Saami languages. The chapter focuses disproportionately on phonology, and even though North Saami phonology is highly complex and needs much explanation, some things discussed in the chapter seem to be too specific for a handbook chapter.

2.1.4. Aanaar, Skolt, and Kildin Saami

The last three chapters on Saami languages describe three Eastern Saami languages, namely Aanaar Saami (Chapter 11 by Taarna Valtonen, Jussi Ylikoski, and Luobbal Sámmol Sámmol Ánte [Ante Aikio]), Skolt Saami (Chapter 12 by Eino Koponen, Matti Miestamo, and Markus

Juutinen), and Kildin Saami (Chapter 13 by Michael Rießler). As mentioned above, the range of the Saami languages discussed in the handbook does not reach the easternmost end of the branch, i.e. Ter Saami. The easternmost language described is Kildin Saami. Although it would have been interesting to have in the handbook chapters on both the westernmost and easternmost Saami languages, the choice is justified: there simply were not any linguists available who focus on Ter Saami. On the other hand, the number of linguists focusing on Kildin Saami is also very small, so it is great that even this Saami language is included in the handbook. The obvious easy route would have been to exclude all the Saami languages spoken in Russia. Furthermore, the sample of Eastern Saami languages include two languages, namely Aanaar and Kildin Saami, which lack a modern grammatical description. Therefore, the selection of Eastern Saami languages in the handbook should be considered as comprehensive as possible.

All the chapters begin with a concise overview of the dialectal and sociolinguistic situation of the respective languages. Aanaar and Skolt Saami are interesting examples from a sociolinguistic perspective, as Aanaar Saami almost went extinct but has been since revitalized (cf. also Pasanen 2008: 61–63), and Skolt Saami speakers suffered from the effects of World War II because they were forced to leave their original home region and resettle in present-day Finland. Such events naturally affect the structure of a language, and the discussion functions as a useful backdrop for the rest of the respective chapters.

Following the sociolinguistics section, every chapter has a section on phonology. A typologically interesting phenomenon is the distinction between palatal and palatalized laterals and nasals in Kildin Saami, which Rießler describes in detail (pp. 221–222). Chapter 12 seems to be the only one (except for the introductory Chapter 7) to employ the traditional analysis of Saami word structure (cf. Sammallahti 1998: 39), which underlines the lack of utility in discussing it in Chapter 7. A considerable amount of space is given to the description of morphophonological alternations, as these are so pervasive in these languages. In Chapter 13, the discussion is, however, hidden in the subsection on prosody (pp. 223–224). To facilitate comparative and typological research, a separate section on morphophonological processes would have been a better idea.

Following phonology is a section on morphology, which is divided

into nominal and verbal morphology. The emphasis in these sections seems to vary according to what is deemed most complicated in a certain language. For example, in Chapter 11 adjectival inflection is named one of the most complex areas of Aanaar Saami inflection (p. 187), which probably motivates the rather lengthy analysis of this part of speech. The description of morphology is somewhat uneven in the chapters. For example, the inflection of the copula and negation are discussed separately and only in the main text in Chapter 12, whereas in Chapter 11 the inflection is presented in tabular form, and Chapter 13 has a table of the inflection of the copula, but generally a very short and rather unclear discussion on negation (pp. 228–229). Such differences are of course due to the fact that the chapters have different authors, but the editors could have maintained some kind of coherence within the descriptions of Saami languages. This applies, naturally, also to the chapters discussed above.

After morphology there is a section on syntax in every chapter. Negation in Kildin Saami is treated under syntax (p. 235). This decision is somewhat confusing, as all the other chapters on Saami languages include the discussion in the section on morphology. In all chapters the semantics of cases is, somewhat unintuitively, discussed in the subsection on clause structure. The same was not done, for example, with the semantics of moods or non-finite forms. All the Eastern Saami languages have the syncretic locative case combining the expressions of location and source, which is very rare in the languages of the world (cf. e.g. Creissels 2009; Pantcheva 2010). Unfortunately, even though many typologically interesting aspects of these languages are described in this chapter, there is no comment on this rare phenomenon.

All the chapters on Eastern Saami languages are very good, and cover all the important aspects of the languages, even though their emphases differ somewhat. The chapters are a bit uneven in the way that they discuss the same or similar phenomena differently. As the Eastern Saami languages do exhibit similarities, a bit like the Western Saami languages do, an approach similar to that employed in Chapters 8 and 9, i.e. to compare the languages more to each other, could have yielded more insight into the structure of the languages. Occasionally this is done, and it is a solution that works. Finally, a minor comment on the glossing conventions of Chapter 13 is in order. The chapter employs glosses like "*tenn* [DISC.SG.GEN|ACC]" and "*liejb* [bread\ACC.SG]". The use of

the symbols | and \ is not immediately clear, especially for someone not acquainted with the structure of Kildin Saami, and therefore it should have been explained.

2.2. Languages of the Volga-Kama area

The handbook includes a chapter on all Uralic languages spoken in the Volga-Kama area, namely Erzya and Moksha, Mari, Komi, and Udmurt. In addition, there is an introduction to the history of the Permic branch. The division of the languages into chapters, i.e. that the Mordvin languages and Mari varieties get one chapter each whereas both Permic languages get their own chapters, is justified, as the Mordvin languages and Mari varieties are more closely related among each other than the Permic languages. However, the decision to not include separate chapters on the history of the Mordvin languages and Mari seems not to be in line with the general organization of the volume, as every other branch has such a chapter. Maybe a combined chapter on the history of Mordvin and Mari would have been in order? Another detail that could have been implemented differently is the chapter titles for Mari and Komi. As there are two literary standards for Mari and Komi, respectively, which do exhibit differences (see below), the chapters could have been titled *Mari (Hill and Meadow Mari)* and *Komi (Zyrian and Permyak)*, as was done with the Mordvin languages.

2.2.1. The Mordvin languages

The chapter on the Mordvin languages by Arja Hamari and Rigina Ajanki treats Erzya and Moksha as different languages. This has not always been the case, as the authors of the chapter also point out (p. 392). The languages are discussed side by side, which clearly shows that the Mordvin languages should not be considered as dialects of one language, as has been done in a great deal of previous research (e.g. Raun 1988; Zaicz 1998). Considering that other languages that have traditionally been regarded as dialects of one language, e.g. Estonian and Võro, the Mansi languages, and the Khanty languages, have gotten their own chapters in the handbook, one could ask whether Erzya and Moksha would have also merited two chapters, and maybe even a chapter on Mordvin in general, like Chapter 25 on the Permic languages. In my opinion, the decision in the handbook is well thought out, even though a chapter on Mordvin in general could have added some historical insight on the evolution

of the languages from Proto-Mordvin. However, there exist previous treatments of the history of the Mordvin languages that are not hard to find, e.g. Zaicz (1998) and Bereczki (1988: 316–331; somewhat obsolete) in previous handbooks, so this is not a big deficiency.

In general, the different aspects of grammar are treated well in the chapter. However, it could have been pointed out more strongly why the voiceless fricatives /f ʟ ʟ′ ʀ ʀ′ j/ in Moksha can be considered phonemes and not mere allophones. The discussion (p. 395) seems to point to the direction that at least /f/ is an allomorph of /v/ before /t/. This otherwise minor thing catches the eye, because the palatalization opposition in dental-alveolars is clearly argued for (p. 394).

The morphology of nouns and verbs is discussed at length in the chapter, but other word classes, especially adjectives, numerals, and quantifiers do not get much more than a mention. Personal pronouns are discussed hastily, but other such forms like interrogatives, indefinites, or demonstratives are lacking. I assume that this choice was based on length restrictions, but Hamari and Ajanki could have at least noted that the aforementioned word classes mostly behave like nouns. Postpositions and relational nouns are discussed at slightly more length. The series of "locative postpositions" (p. 407) could have been termed inflection, as they parallel nominal inflection in spatial cases, and the series can be seen as rudimentary inflectional paradigms.

The discussion of the cases of the Mordvin languages describes the case systems of the languages well and uses sufficient tables to illustrate the complexities of this morphological category. The discussion of the status of certain cases deserves special mention. Firstly, the explanation that the causative has only recently been grammaticalized and alternates, to some extent, with the original postposition nicely shows that the case system is a dynamic entity, and not a static whole like it is too often described. However, the question of whether the causative is a case or not could have been raised. The causative is semantically rather narrow, which is less typical for cases (cf. e.g. Malchukov & Narrog 2009: 518), and as mentioned, it alternates sometimes with the postposition. The discussion would have benefited from an assessment of the productivity of the case in comparison to the postposition. Secondly, the status of the comparative and the abessive is considered and different views are compared. The elative has a similar double function as an adverbial derivational suffix, but this is not mentioned until the

discussion on derivation, which is somewhat strange.

The rest of the discussion of cases is good, but the semantics get too little mention. For example, the dative is given six meanings in Bartens (1999: 93), but only two are mentioned in the chapter here (p. 399). The same goes for the spatial cases, e.g. the illative can be shown to express up to ten distinct meanings (Erkkilä 2022b), but they are not mentioned at all. In the same vein, labeling the illative as a goal case and the lative as a direction case is a big oversimplification of the semantic interplay of these cases (cf. Erkkilä 2022a). All in all, the discussion seems to rely a little too much on the use of terms as meanings and readers' knowledge of the semantics of cases, which can lead to different kinds of trouble.

The definite and possessive declension is discussed from the point of view of morphology and morphosyntax, but the functions of these declensions are not discussed at length. The function of the possessive declension to mark possessor and possessee is mentioned (p. 402), but the functions of the definite declension are commented on only minimally. As definiteness covers a large ground of notions tied to the givenness of a referent in the Mordvin languages (cf. Bernhardt 2021: 26–27), a brief comment on the matter would have been helpful.

Hamari and Ajanki cover the verbal inflection of the Mordvin languages well. The converb in *-do* (E), *-da* (M) which is frequently used with posture verbs could have been discussed further, as expressions of location and their variation is a topic of frequent attention in typology (cf. e.g. Levinson & Wilkins 2006; Vallejos & Brown 2021). In general, the section would have benefited from an additional historical overview which would explain the origins of different verbal morphemes and their development, as the verbal inflection system of the Mordvin languages is rather complex.

The section on syntax is the shortest, as is often the case in handbook chapters. Nevertheless, the authors manage to treat all the most important and typologically most relevant properties of the Mordvin languages. While discussing the object marking in Mordvin languages, the authors do not take up the recently proposed analysis of the inessive as a marker of antipassive (Kozlov 2018: 422–428). The analysis presented by the authors in the handbook and argued for by Bernhardt (2020) is, of course, more traditional, but also better argued for than the alternative analysis. However, the alternative analysis could have been mentioned and then dismissed.

2.2.2. Mari

Chapter 24 by Sirkka Saarinen concerns the Mari varieties. Saarinen discerns four dialect groups for Mari (p. 432). Later she voices the opinion that the two main dialects, Hill and Meadow Mari, underlying two literary standards are not wholly mutually intelligible (p. 432). This raises the question of whether the "dialects" would be better analyzed as separate languages. However, this decision is of minor practical concern in this chapter, as the author consistently presents both main varieties side by side, and comments on their differences where it is necessary. From a sociolinguistic point of view, however, a more neutral expression like "variety" would have been justified (I will follow this convention).

Saarinen has decided to take a diachronic point of view in addition to a strictly synchronic description. This choice is justified, as there is no separate chapter on the development of the Mari varieties (cf. e.g. Chapter 25 on Permic), and it gives an interesting insight into the matter. However, in some places Saarinen seems to refer to somewhat outdated views (e.g. Proto-Finno-Ugric, p. 443).

Following the introduction there is a section on phonology that covers all important aspects of the phonology of Mari varieties. From a typological perspective the different types of vowel harmony are an interesting phenomenon which probably would have merited even a longer discussion (cf. Kangasmaa-Minn 1998: 223–224). Furthermore, Saarinen uses the term *schwa* for the reduced vowels of the Mari varieties (pp. 433–434). For Meadow Mari this choice works well enough, but as Hill Mari has two reduced vowels, another term like "reduced vowel" could have worked better.

Next up is a section on morphology, which starts with a description of nominal morphology. The discussion of case is good, but there are a few things that should have been considered more. Firstly, the inclusion of the modal and comitative among the case paradigms is not unproblematic. Both exhibit morphosyntactic behavior that is not typical for cases. Secondly, the categorization of the lative as a spatial case could be disputed; it could also be analyzed as a primarily semantic case expressing change of state which has secondary spatial functions. On the other hand, Saarinen's choice to discuss the unproductive spatial cases alongside the productive ones is exceptionally good, as it illustrates the paradigmatic nature of the unproductive series and makes visible the continuum nature of productive and

unproductive inflection in Uralic relational nouns. Thirdly, the author draws a parallel between the Finnic and Permic *l*-cases and the dative of the Mari varieties (p. 437), but this was unnecessary as none of these have any relationship beyond a superficial similarity in the form (cf. Ylikoski 2011: 258–261). Other minor problems are the imprecise terminology used in the description of the non-possessive uses of the genitive (pp. 438–439), which could be described as well as part–whole or metonymic relations instead of "more abstract kinds of inclusion and affiliation", and the comment that the illative is used only spatially (p. 441) when the examples show that this is clearly not the case. However, the author has discussed the semantics of the cases exceptionally well, and such a presentation would have enhanced many of the other chapters on languages in the handbook.

The section on possessive inflection covers the morphosyntactic phenomena and most of the semantic phenomena well. The only thing lacking is a listing of all the types of possession that can be expressed by possessive suffixes instead of giving only two examples (p. 443). The section on nominal inflection ends with a discussion of morpheme order, which is undoubtedly one of the typologically most interesting phenomenon in the Mari varieties. As is well known, morpheme order is typically claimed to be rigid (e.g. Matthews 1991: 212–213) The author presents all the possible variants and quickly discusses the parameters affecting them, but a longer discussion with examples would also have been in order.

The section on verbs discusses all the important phenomena in the verbal inflection of Mari. The semantic analysis of the tenses, especially the compound tenses, is very thorough, which has not always been the case in treatments of Mari (cf. e.g. Kangasmaa-Minn 1998: 238–239). In the section on the non-finite forms, the discussion of the necessitive infinitive is especially interesting, as such modal expressions are potentially typologically interesting (cf. Narrog 2014). There are a few minor problems in the section, however. First of all, the author says that the origin of the infinitive suffix is in the lative *-s (p. 455). This analysis seems rather dubious, as the whole existence of the *s-lative is questionable (cf. Ylikoski 2016b).

Clause structure is considered at length, but otherwise the section on syntax is a bit compact. However, this section, and especially the part regarding clause combining, is thorough and discusses all the important matters.

2.2.3. The history of the Permic languages

The three chapters discussing the Permic languages have a clear division of labor: Chapter 25 by Gerson Klumpp discusses the history of the Permic languages from Proto-Permic to the present-day languages, whereas the other two chapters, 26 and 27, focus on Komi and Udmurt, respectively. There is some overlap between the chapters, but this is not a problem as in this way the reader can get all the necessary information on one language in one chapter.

Chapter 25 starts with a concise review of the language-sociological situation of the Permic languages, including a section on the history of literary languages. The treatment of Old Komi, though brief, is interesting, as this language variety is sometimes confused with Proto-Permian (which it is not) and has one of the oldest Sprachdenkmal among the Uralic languages, a fact that, for some reason is not brought up in the chapter. From a language-sociological point of view the rather brief mention of modern Permic varieties used on social-network sites (p. 474) is interesting, but the matter could have been considered more thoroughly.

The discussion of the dialects of the Permic languages is comprehensive enough, but the classification of Komi varieties is left open. Instead, Komi is portrayed as consisting of a continuum of dialects (p. 472). This raises the question of the status of especially Komi Permyak, which is mentioned as having its own literary standard (p. 471) and comprising two dialect groups and three dialect areas (pp. 472–473). If Komi (Zyrian) and Komi Permyak are dialects of the same language, it is a bit strange to talk about dialects of dialects. Furthermore, the dialect view is the dominant view at least in western scholarship on the Permic languages (Baker 1985: 50–72; Riese 1998: 250–251; Bartens 2000: 29–32), and it is the stance taken in the chapter on Komi in the current handbook. Thus, the chapter should have commented on the matter more strongly, or at least referred to the relevant section in the chapter on Komi (at the end of the chapter, on page 484, the author refers to "Komi languages", which seems to be at odds with the initial treatment).

The section on morphology begins with a comment on the morphological structure of Komi and Udmurt, i.e. that it is highly agglutinating with only minor stem alternations and a few portmanteau morphemes in the possessive declension. The Permic languages could have been compared to other Uralic languages in order to address the common misconception of

a purely agglutinating structure being the major Uralic inflection type, however. In addition, the history of the stem alternation could have been considered at greater length.

The section on nominal and pronominal inflection clearly shows that the categories of inflection (cases and possession) are semantically practically identical but differ formally between the languages. The so-called approximative cases of Komi are mentioned as being in the process of being introduced into the literary language (p. 479). Whether they can be considered cases at all should have been discussed, however (cf. Baker 1985: 230–231). The chapter shows the Komi prolative as having two allomorphs (*-ȩd* and *-ti*). This is incorrect, as these forms are not in complementary distribution, but rather they have their own semantic and morphosyntactic properties, as well as different dialectal distributions (cf. e.g. Partanen & Erkkilä 2022). Another somewhat problematic claim is that the Permic elative is implied to have cognates in other languages (p. 479). If such a view has been presented somewhere, it should be referenced. For example, Ylikoski (2016), the presently most comprehensive treatment of (western) Uralic spatial cases, does not even mention such a possibility.

The possessive cases of Komi and Udmurt (genitive, ablative, and dative) are historically compared to the similar case series of Finnic languages. The comparison is old and based on the fact that structurally the case series in both branches consist of a "coaffix" *-l-* and material reminiscent of spatial cases. The explanation that the cases are structurally similar is correct, but the section seems to suggest that the *l*-element is cognate with the Finnic element (p. 479). This is wrong, as already Ylikoski (2011: 258–261) shows that the *l*-element in Permic languages is probably a parallel development from a different postposition than the *l*-element in Finnic languages. In addition to the above-mentioned cases, only the history of the accusative is touched upon, even though a wider look at the development of the Permic cases would have been warranted.

Unlike nominal inflection, verbal inflection in Komi and Udmurt does differ, which is clearly stated at the beginning of the section on verbal inflection (p. 480). One could have expected a more thorough review of the historical development and comparative differences of the verbal inflection in the Permic languages, especially when both Komi and Udmurt have their own chapters in the handbook, for which such discussions would function as excellent background.

The section on syntax begins with a well-grounded note of caution about the difficulties of reconstructing Permic syntax, after which a brief discussion of word order follows. The section claims that in Udmurt the word order is rigid SOV (p. 483), but in the chapter on Udmurt the word order is said to be on its way to becoming SVO due to Russian influence (p. 518). This probably does not matter, as apparently both orders are possible, but a reference for the claim would not have hurt here.

The chapter is a useful addition to the handbook. At times, the author could have been more exact in his claims, and especially in the discussion of cases somewhat more critical. Also, a bit more historical treatment on the developments in morphology would have been interesting. However, the partly historical and thoroughly comparative approach gives useful background information on the Permic varieties.

2.2.4. Komi

Chapter 26 by Nikolay Kuznetsov discusses the Komi language. This is a synchronic description, which seems to lean a bit towards the traditional analysis of Komi instead of a fully typologically informed description.

The chapter starts with a short sociolinguistic and historical overview of Komi. Kuznetsov states that Komi has two or three varieties, namely Zyrian (he uses the form "Zyryan"), Permyak, and Yaz'va, which are dialects of the same language. His classification is argued for well enough and follows the western Uralistics tradition. However, as in Chapter 25, the choice brings about a terminological problem when Kuznetsov starts to speak about dialects of Zyrian and Permyak (p. 487): a dialect cannot have dialects, and even if this might not be the biggest problem, it is still an inconsistency that should have been avoided. Furthermore, the caption of Map 26.1 refers to Zyrian, Permyak, and Yaz'va as Komi languages, not dialects. In addition, the author states that the differences between Komi dialects, presumably the lower-level dialects of Zyrian and Permyak, are insignificant. The differences might be minor (cf. e.g. Baker 1985: 58–71; Hausenberg 1998: 306), but probably not insignificant.

The phonology and phonotactics of Komi are dealt with mostly with precision. When discussing the phoneme inventory, the author seems to acknowledge that his statement about insignificant differences between the dialects of Komi is too strong, as he notes that

the phoneme inventories can vary across the dialects (p. 487). Here, a treatment akin to Hausenberg (1998: 308–310) would have been a good addition. A similar comment is made when discussing the differences in the stress patterns of the main varieties (p. 490).

The treatment of nominal inflection is riddled with problems and inaccuracies. Number is discussed properly, but case inflection and, to a smaller extent, possession are not. First of all, the case paradigm given (p. 491) is inconsistent. The cases consisting of the approximative suffix, and another spatial case suffix are considered as a part of the case system without any reservations, even though this cannot be considered an established view. Only a few students of Komi, including the author himself (Kuznecov 2012: 88–91; Kuznetsov 2012: 373–374) consider these forms as cases. Older treatments, e.g. Lytkin (1955), Bartens (2000) do not even mention these forms, and Baker (1985: 230–231) explicitly states that these forms should not be considered cases in their own right. The problem with the analysis presented in the chapter is not so much that it would be impossible to have such cases, but rather that the analysis of these forms is too vague to be considered as the correct one without further argumentation. Furthermore, if there is research on the matter, it should be properly cited (cf. Usačeva & Archangel′skij 2017 on Beserman Udmurt). Other analyses of these "cases" are equally possible, such as one put forward in Baker (1985: 230–231) that the approximative suffix would function as a derivational element. This analysis seems at least as plausible as the case analysis, as the approximative suffix is losing its productivity also in Udmurt (cf. Chapter 27, p. 512).

A second inconsistency in the analysis of the case system of Komi is the treatment of the prolative and the transitive (forms in *-ȩd* and *-ti*). The author considers them as suffix variants, as they are usually interchangeable (p. 492). First of all, this statement leaves the status of the two suffixes unclear. Does "suffix variant" mean a morphophonologically or syntactically conditioned allomorph, or something else? Secondly, the latest research (Partanen & Erkkilä 2020, 2022; Erkkilä & Partanen 2022) has shown that both suffixes have clear tendencies to appear in different morphosyntactic and semantic environments, and thus they are not always interchangeable. If the cases based on the approximative are considered cases, the prolative and transitive cannot be considered "suffix variants".

The third inconsistency is the inclusion of the comparative case in

the case paradigm while leaving out the so-called surface relational cases present in Southern Permyak (Baker 1985: 175–191). This is inconsistent because the comparative is, like the surface relational cases, present only in some varieties of Komi, namely in Permyak and in the Sysola and Luza dialects of Zyrian (Bartens 2000: 78; Bartens calls the case "preclusive" (Finnish *preklusiivi*). In general, it is worth questioning the case status of the comparative, which has rather narrow semantics as the marker of standard of comparison (p. 493). If, however, the case is productive enough, it could fit into the case paradigm, but then the other dialectal cases should also be accepted.

The semantics of the cases are described mainly well, albeit rather briefly. This is of course a typical problem of handbook chapters, for which the author cannot be held responsible. The typologically most interesting phenomena, e.g. the use of the accusative only with animate objects, are mentioned. For some reason the author does not, however, speak about Differential Object Marking, but rather presents the traditional analysis of an unmarked accusative (p. 492). The most problematic thing in the section is the division of spatial cases into three series and referring to two of them as "internal" and "external". The spatial cases form a basic four-way system consisting of inessive (location), elative (source), illative (goal), and prolative (path) which the other cases augment, e.g. the egressive and terminative mark a boundary, either at the beginning or the end, to the action expressed by the predicate. There is also no notion of internalness in the semantics of the inessive, elative, and illative (cf. Koivunen & Erkkilä 2022). Rather they express general spatial relations, and the configuration is either inferred from the context or specified by relational nouns. Similarly, the approximative, egressive, and terminative do not express externalness. Furthermore, it is highly questionable whether such series would be useful in classifying spatial cases, as they are really asymmetric. "Internal cases" express location, source, and goal, "external cases" have one case with source-oriented semantics and two with goal-oriented semantics, and "proximal cases" have double the number of spatial cases than any of the other two series. On top of that, the prolative is left outside the whole categorization. As a conclusion, it can be said that the proposed classification (the author calls it, on page 493, the common division but does not indicate from where it stems) is not useful or systematic, but rather brings up misconceptions about the semantics of the spatial cases.

The discussion of possession is rather short, but it does bring up the most important aspects of the possessive inflection of Komi. Definiteness marking could have benefited from a longer discussion, as the common ground for the interlocutors (p. 493) can include a lot of different aspects. For example, must the entities marked as definite, unique, etc. be known from the previous discourse, or can anything that is considered common ground between the interlocutors be marked with the possessive suffixes? Another question left unanswered is whether the marking is obligatory or not.

Verbal inflection is discussed in sufficient detail and without any apparent shortcomings, but the compound past tenses merited even more discussion in my opinion. The discussion leaves it unclear whether the author shows examples of all of the compound past tenses or only some of them. The brief mention of the marking of degree of action (p. 497) promises interesting avenues for future research. The non-finite verb forms are represented with plenty of examples, but their semantics are discussed only briefly, mostly by naming the form in a certain way. A little more analysis would have benefited the section.

In the section on direct object marking, the variation of object marking in Komi is discussed briefly. Even here the unmarked object is called "nominative-like", and a mention of the traditional unmarked accusative is given (p. 502; compare to p. 492). The phenomenon should have been analyzed as DOM. However, all the relevant parameters of the variation in object marking are given, so the analysis itself seems correct.

The chapter on Komi is rather uneven in its quality. Many parts, like phonology, pronominal and verbal inflection, and most of syntax, are as good as one could hope from a handbook chapter. Some of the discussion feels a bit too compact, but that is of course inevitable. Other parts like the description of object marking and especially nominal inflection seem to have been carried out without any actual analysis by repeating older sources uncritically. The section on spatial cases is so full of unjustified claims that it gives a false picture of Komi spatial case inflection.

2.2.5. Udmurt

Chapter 27 by Svetlana Edygarova discusses the Udmurt language. The chapter is a synchronic description, and the analysis is typologically informed. The section addressing sociolinguistic, dialectal, and language-policy issues is concise but informative. In my opinion,

the interplay between standard language, traditional dialects, and modern vernaculars could have been discussed even more, as the author has expertise in the field (cf. e.g. Edygarova 2014). The section on phonology and phonotactics is rather short. Mostly this does not matter, as all the important facts of the Udmurt sound system are covered. However, the distribution of phonemes is not discussed and the possibility of consonant clusters and vowel sequences on a morpheme boundary are not (explicitly) mentioned (cf. e.g. Csúcs 1998: 280).

The section on nominal inflection presents all the relevant information. The semantics of grammatical and semantic (non-spatial) cases are mostly discussed well, but the treatment could have been longer. However, even as it is, the section manages to bring up the typologically most interesting phenomena, e.g. the use of accusative in DOM. Unfortunately, this is not explicated well enough. The only real question in the treatment of non-spatial cases is the status of the so-called adverbial case. This case is traditionally counted as a case in Udmurt (e.g. Perevoščikov et al. 1962: 86–87), but its semantics raises the question of whether the form is polysemous enough to be considered a case (cf. Malchukov & Narrog 2009: 518), or whether it would be better analyzed as a derivational morpheme. Also, "adverbial" is an extremely unsuitable term for a case, which should have been considered.

The section on spatial cases is unfortunately rather short, and it has some inaccuracies. Firstly, the Udmurt spatial case system is best viewed as having a basic four-way distinction with one location (inessive), one source (elative), one goal (illative), and one path case (prolative). Secondly, egressive and terminative do not express only starting and end point, but rather boundedness of action in space or time (cf. Erkkilä 2024). In addition, all the basic spatial cases have diverse functions, but only those of the elative are even mentioned. The comment on the approximative is a good point, but it raises the question of why an unproductive suffix is analyzed as a case.

The treatment of possessive inflection is also generally good. The only minor complaint is that the different semantic functions traditionally bundled as definiteness are not explored further. In the discussion on pronominal inflection, the analysis of plural 1st person pronouns as having an inclusive–exclusive distinction would require some additional discussion. After all, the previous treatments of Udmurt (e.g. Perevoščikov et al. 1962; Bartens 2000) do not mention this division.

The section of verbal inflection introduces Udmurt verbal morphology well. A longer treatment of the so-called 2nd past tense would have been useful. This tense expresses evidential connotations and thus is also of interest to typologically oriented research. Some questions that could have been addressed are, for example, whether there are degrees of inference when using the tense, what the relationship of the tense to the compound tenses mentioned is (or whether this can presently be evaluated), and whether the tense can be used in narration. Furthermore, the comment on the use of the 1st person form of the 2nd past to express mirativity (p. 515) would need further elaboration. As this is a totally novel analysis of the form, some references or arguments in favor would be in order.

The moods are covered rather comprehensively. The only minor problem is that the semantics of the conditional are not discussed, but the reader must rely on the semantics of the Udmurt conditional being equal or similar to other conditionals they might be familiar with. The semantics of the imperative are also not discussed, but as the optative is contrasted to the imperative this does not pose much of a problem. Considering the number of non-finite verb forms in Udmurt, their treatment is rather short. This is probably due to space constraints and the lack of research on the topic, but there could have been more discussion than merely naming the forms.

The section on syntax begins with an overview of word order in Udmurt. Edyagrova states here (p. 518) that SVO word order is becoming more common in Udmurt, whereas in Chapter 25 this development is not mentioned. Phrase structure is covered rather briefly, and even though most of the basic phenomena are mentioned, a bit more discussion or examples would have been in order. For example, the author fails to mention that adpositional phrases in Udmurt are always postpositional and take their complement mostly in the nominative, even though some other cases are also possible (cf. e.g. Bartens 2000: 294–300).

In general, the chapter is good and covers all the important and typologically interesting aspects of Udmurt. However, a certain compactness can be noted in the treatment. Especially in the section on syntax, the topics are discussed rather briefly, and even though most of the important phenomena get a mention, the reader is left with the feeling that the subject has only partially been covered. Furthermore, the chapter voices a few more controversial analyses of Udmurt,

especially the inclusive–exclusive division in personal pronouns and the expression of mirativity. These claims would have needed either longer discussions, supporting references, or both.

3. Some typological issues of Uralic languages

3.1. Nominal and adpostional marking

There are two chapters in the handbook discussing the marking of non-possessive grammatical and semantic relations in the Uralic languages. The subjects treated are the case inflection and adpositions in Uralic. Both chapters are typologically oriented and thorough descriptions of their respective subject matters. The chapters reviewed here complement the individual language descriptions of Part II by giving a more general picture of the vastly varying marking of different relations in Uralic languages.

3.1.1. Cases

Chapter 44, written by Seppo Kittilä, Johanna Laakso, and Jussi Ylikoski, tackles a phenomenon that is traditionally seen as a hallmark of Uralic languages, namely case. The subject is studied from morphological, syntactic, and semantic perspectives through a typological lens. This is, as far as I know, the first comprehensive treatment of case and cases in Uralic languages, and as such a valuable addition to the handbook. The chapter manages at the same time to demonstrate the variation of cases and case systems and to correct common misconceptions about case in Uralic languages.

The chapter begins with a discussion of what is considered a case in Uralistics. After some consideration, Kittilä et al. define cases in the traditional Uralistics way (a kind of a word-and-paradigm model, e.g. Blevins 2009) based on the similar morphosyntactic behavior of case suffixes and other, less controversial nominal inflection suffixes. This definition is not airtight, as some Uralic languages lack morphosyntactic features capable of distinguishing case and postposition, but it is a good working definition that covers most cases in Uralic languages. It is nice for a change to see a definition of case in literature on Uralistics.

The next section treats the case inventories and the sizes thereof across Uralic languages. In this section Kittilä et al. state that even though some of the Uralic languages do have a lot of cases, this is not the case for all languages. In the *World Atlas of Language Structure* (Iggesen 2013), however, a case

system consisting of six to nine cases is considered large, and a case system of over 10 cases is very large. This means that, according to the criteria of Iggesen (2013), most Uralic languages do, in fact, possess large case inventories. This perspective could have also been mentioned.

In the following section the grammatical cases and their use in the different Uralic languages is discussed. First Kittilä et al. discuss Differential Object Marking (DOM). It is shown that in most Uralic languages patient marking is not based on (purely) grammatical factors, but semantics and pragmatics also play a role. Kittilä et al. show many examples of DOM in Uralic languages, but I would have hoped, however, that the use of the inessive as an object case in the Mordvin languages would have been mentioned, as it has recently stirred some controversy (cf. Toldova et al. 2018: 422–428; Bernhardt 2020).

After discussing DOM, Kittilä et al. turn to other Differential Argument Marking (DAM) phenomena in Uralic languages. In general, this section is good and highlights typologically interesting DAM phenomena in the family. The section focusing on DOM is understandably longer than the section focusing on the other DAM phenomena, but as DOM already has its own chapter in the handbook, the focus could have been on the other types of DAM. One could even imagine that a separate chapter for all the DAM phenomena would have been useful, as the DAM phenomena mentioned in the chapter range from DOM to Differential Goal and Location Marking (DGM and DLM), and even to Differential Adjunct Marking. The discussion of DGM and DLM is centered on the variation of internal and external cases, which raises the question of why Kittilä et al. do not distinguish also Differential Source Marking (e.g. in Finnish where there are two of each spatial case) or even Differential Path Marking in Komi, where there are two different path cases (cf. e.g. Partanen & Erkkilä 2022). With this in mind, the adoption of a new terminology for variation between internal and external cases seems a bit unwarranted.

Moreover, the section on DAM seems to paint a picture of some of the cases as typologically rare. Especially the treatment of DGM and DLM seems to imply that these phenomena are somehow special and exclusive to the Uralic languages. They are of course typologically interesting, but not especially rare. Similar phenomena can be attested in practically any language with spatial cases and adpositions (e.g. most languages of Siberia), only adpositions (e.g. Indo-European languages of

Europe), or multiple locational predicates (e.g. some Mayan languages), to name a few examples. However, if Kittilä et al. intend the scope of DGM and DLM to cover only variation in case marking, the phenomena can be seen a lot less frequently across languages. Their discussion on DGM (p. 877) does not support the latter interpretation, however.

The discussion on the tripartite division of Uralic spatial case systems is basically correct, but it considers only one viewpoint. It is true that there are no valid reasons to present most of the Uralic case systems as consisting of multiple series of location, source, and goal cases, and especially the discussion on the position of a path case (the prolative) is very welcome. However, from a cognitive and perceptual point of view the different cases expressing starting point, endpoint, direction, etc. cannot be considered on the same level as location, source, goal, and path cases. The four latter cases cover the four basic perceptual/conceptual spatial relations (cf. e.g. Zlatev 2007: 330–332), whereas the others convey complex relations consisting of a basic spatial relation and a semantic specification. In this vein a three or four partite system underlies all Uralic spatial case systems. The same goes for syncretic cases, which cover more than one of the basic relations. However, from a paradigmatic point of view the chapter definitely has a point, and most of the spatial case systems of the Uralic languages cannot be reduced to (multiple) tripartite subsystems. Kittilä et al. describe the variation in spatial cases among Uralic languages in sufficient detail. In such a chapter serving as a mere overview, a deeper semantic analysis would have been unnecessary. A slight fault is that the Zyrian approximative cases are, in my opinion, presented too uncritically (p. 889).

All in all, this chapter is a valuable addition to the study of one of the most prominent features of the Uralic languages, namely cases. Kittilä et al. manage to cover all the important and typologically interesting features of the Uralic languages and discuss them extensively enough, maintaining at the same time a sufficiently general level of treatment.

3.1.2. Adpositions

This chapter by Riho Grünthal discusses adpositions,[2] which are one of the basic parts of speech in Uralic (and many other) languages.

2. I will use the terms *adposition*, *postposition*, etc. in accordance with Grünthal. However, in my opinion, some of the "adpositions" would be better classified as relational nouns.

What makes this chapter especially important is that adpositions tend to get rather minor attention in descriptions of Uralic languages (e.g. Bartens 1999: 163–165, 2000: 294–300; Siegl 2013: 206–215; Grünthal 2015: 214–218, to name a few). Even though there have been studies concentrating on the analysis of adpositions (e.g. Grünthal 2003), this field of study is fairly underrepresented in Uralistics.

Grünthal goes through the morphosyntactic properties of adpositional phrase (AdpP). First, he discusses the variation in the order of the adposition and its dependent in Uralic languages. As mentioned above, Uralic languages mostly exhibit postpositions, but the westernmost groups also have prepositions, and even a few ambipositions, which can function as both pre- and postpositions (p. 963). This variation in the position of the adposition is typologically interesting but is covered rather briefly. The next matter that is discussed is the case marking of the dependent in an AdpP, which varies between different Uralic languages.

The section on the inflection of adpositions is the most thorough of the sections on the morphosyntactic properties. It starts with a division of adpositions into uninflected and inflected, which I think corresponds more or less to the division between adpositions and relational nouns. Grünthal uses the paradigm of the Finnish postposition *sisä-* 'inside', which can take both inner and outer spatial cases, as an example of the versatility of spatial case in the inflection of adpositions, and he comments that the semantic differences between the inflected forms are subtle and difficult to describe (p. 965, fn. 2). I do not think that this is the case, as the differences have been investigated rather thoroughly (Ojutkangas & Huumo 2010; however, this does not apply to all adpositions in Uralic languages).

Furthermore, Grünthal makes a distinction between productive and unproductive spatial cases adpositions take, which is a bit unnecessary. It would be better to at least entertain the idea that the so-called unproductive spatial cases, i.e. the older stratum of spatial cases that are not used (in spatial function) in content noun inflection, would rather form a spatial case paradigm for relational noun inflection. After all, they do have some properties of productive inflection. The forms are, for example, transparent to some extent, regular, natural in their category, and the default forms with a number of stems (cf. Bauer 2001: 51–62).

The interplay of case inflection and adpositions are mentioned in

passing in a dedicated section. The tendency of supplementing disturbed spatial case paradigms with postpositions (e.g. in Mari varieties, p. 968) is considered. This is welcome, as the supplementing and subsequent re-establishment of spatial case systems is a tendency in Uralic languages, cf. e.g. Veps and different Karelian varieties (e.g. Larjavaara 1986) where the postposition *päin* 'towards' has become grammaticalized with the syncretic location–source cases to form new unambiguous source cases. On the other hand, the complementing function of case-inflected postpositions in comparison to plain cases could have been discussed more. It is typical for the Uralic languages that plain spatial cases express only the relation (e.g. location, source, goal) between two entities, and an inflected postposition supplies the configural information (e.g. under, on, behind, in front of). This fact is mentioned only implicitly.

The final section in the chapter discusses the diachrony of adpositions. This section, even though it is interesting, could have been somewhat shorter as the chapter discusses the diachrony of adpositions also elsewhere. This would have provided space for tackling the interesting aspects of the adpositional systems of Uralic languages mentioned above.

There is only one thing in the chapter that would need a more thorough discussion, namely the distinction between relational noun and adposition. First, the term "relational noun" is used in the chapter somewhat ambiguously, but it is implied that a relational noun is a noun expressing a concept that has relational properties (e.g. 'inside'; p. 962). The chapter proposes a few distinctions between (relational) nouns and adpositions. One is that adpositions display "unproductive" spatial case markers, as mentioned above. In addition to the properties of at least partial productivity mentioned, the so-called unproductive inflection cannot be considered a decisive property differentiating between relational nouns and adpositions, as it is common that nouns of different classes exhibit different kinds of inflectional paradigms (cf. e.g. Blevins 2009: 210–215). Moreover, in many languages both adpositions and nouns exhibit similar case inflection, the only difference being that adpositions have a smaller case paradigm.

Other criteria mentioned include the lack of plural (and dual) inflection, which is also not decisive. The same applies to the deviant order of possessive marking and case. The Permic languages serve as a counterexample to both criteria, as in these languages an adposition can take plural marking, and the

order of possessive marking and case differ also in nominal inflection depending on the case (Bartens 2000: 117–118). Furthermore, it is not uncommon to find languages where different subclasses of nouns behave differently. For example, animate nouns or mass nouns can have different inflectional behavior. Following this line of argumentation, one could rather easily consider some of the postpositions of this chapter to represent a subclass of nouns, i.e. relational nouns. These nouns would then have morphosyntactic and semantic properties setting them apart from content nouns (e.g. they express a relational area; cf. Carlson 2010). The category of adpositions in Uralic languages would then be formed by postpositions with only one (lexicalized) form, and prepositions and ambipositions in languages which have them. A similar analysis is put forward by Arkhangelskiy & Usacheva (2015) for inflecting "postpositions" in Beserman Udmurt.

The chapter takes in general a rather historical point of view with regard to adpositions. This is not a bad thing per se, as many phenomena tied to adpositions and AdpPs are tied to the diachronic developments in morphosyntactic structure and grammaticalization tendencies in Uralic languages. However, it seems that this emphasis has taken up space that could have gone to more thorough considerations of the synchronic categorization of adpositions, which might also have brought some interesting views on the typology of Uralic languages.

3.2. Non-verbal and atypical predication

There are three chapters in the volume which touch upon predication that does not involve a typical finite verb form in Uralic languages. These chapters consider non-finite verb forms, existential, locational, and possessive sentences, and nominal predication. The chapter on non-finite verb forms discusses the use of non-finites in general, not restricted to their predicative function. All the chapters are written from a typological point of view, which is a rather novel approach to the phenomena at hand. The chapters under review here complement the descriptions of the individual languages in Part II nicely.

3.2.1. Non-finites

In Chapter 48, Jussi Ylikoski discusses the classification and functions of non-finite verb forms in the Uralic languages. The analysis is based on typological knowledge, which is definitely an improvement in the Uralic tradition. Ylikoski has

discussed the non-finites in Uralic languages before (cf. e.g. Ylikoski 2003), so the approach is not entirely novel. However, in my opinion, it is important that such a chapter has been included in the handbook, as it adds to the comprehensiveness of the work.

The chapter begins with a general introduction and a discussion of the phenomenon. The discussion on the problems of classifying non-finites in the chapter is good and highlights the biggest issues in analyzing the non-finite verb forms of Uralic languages. One of the most prominent difficulties are the discrepancies between the traditional analyses (p. 936), which has led to one of the worst terminological jumbles in Uralistics (p. 938), comparable only to the indifferent use of case terminology. Ylikoski presents a system based on typological properties (and an according terminology), which enables the classification of Uralic non-finites a lot better than the idiosyncratic systems of the past. The system is of course not perfect, but still an improvement.

The system consists of a four-way distinction between infinitives, participles, converbs, and action nominals. The distinctions between the forms are based on the syntactic behavior of the forms. The inclusion of action nominals in the classification would have required here some further motivation, as they are not traditionally seen as verb forms, and they possess basically all properties of nouns in Uralic languages. However, Ylikoski returns to the question later and gives some convincing arguments for his position (pp. 943–944). In general, basing the classification only on syntactic properties of the non-finites raises the question of how clear-cut such a division can be. For example, Ylikoski states that the infinitive functions as an argument in a clause (table on p. 937), but in certain Uralic languages, for example in the Permic languages, an infinitive can function as a modal predicate (cf. Bartens 1999: 148–149). Therefore, some mention of prototypical syntactic function would have been in order.

After the theoretical introduction, Ylikoski discusses the types of non-finite inventories found in different Uralic languages. One typical property of the Uralic non-finite forms is that the same form can function in different classes of non-finites. The functional polysemy of non-finite forms could have been attested even more, however. It would have been interesting to see a more thorough discussion on the relationships between cases and non-finite verb forms, especially from the point of view that a nominalizing element and a case seem to underlie many of the non-finite

forms in Uralic languages, cf. e.g. Csúcs (2005: 284–285) for the relation of the suffixes *-töʒ* and *-öʒ* (p. 939). It would be quite natural that the cases contributed their own semantics, at least partly, to the new form. The phenomenon is mentioned (p. 946), but there is no lengthier discussion.

After these general sections Ylikoski turns to discussing the different categories of non-finites. Participles and action nominals have gotten their own sections, but infinitives and converbs are discussed together. I assume that this decision is based on the fact that participles and action nominals change the part of speech status of the inflected word (p. 937), but I think that all the classes would have merited their own section. On the other hand, the presentation does bring out certain generalizations that can be made between infinitives and converbs.

In the next two sections Ylikoski discusses the different kinds of participles and action nominals of Uralic languages. He proposes a new analysis of the participles of Uralic languages, namely that they orient towards core arguments or sometimes an adverbial. This seems like an interesting idea. Ylikoski also claims that action nominals have a special function as nominal verb forms in Uralic languages. This position is strengthened by means of examples of Udmurt action nominals that can take verbal arguments and participate in clause combining (pp. 942–943). This argument indeed supports the position, but it is based only on the Udmurt data and a mention of similar properties of Mansi action nominals (pp. 943–944). Therefore, I would regard it as a fruitful working hypothesis that requires more thorough analysis for support. Finally, Ylikoski discusses the infinitives and converbs together in one section. Converbs are covered well, except that the functional polysemy of some forms (e.g. participles and converbs) is unfortunately not analyzed further. Infinitives do not get as long and thorough a discussion as converbs, but the basic morphosyntactic tendencies are covered. The only thing that seems to be lacking is the discussion on infinitives as modal predicates, as witnessed e.g. in the Mordvin languages (Bartens 1999: 148–149).

In general, the chapter covers the system of non-finites from a typological perspective and defines the categories of non-finites more or less successfully. There are some issues, namely the rather straightforward definition of action nominals as non-finite, the lack of discussion of infinitives as predicates, and the neglect of form polyfunctionality, but all in all, the chapter manages to convey the versatility of the non-finites of Uralic languages well.

3.2.2. Existential, locational and possessive sentences

Chapter 51, written by Johanna Laakso and Beáta Wagner-Nagy, takes a look at some sentence types exhibiting non-verbal predication, namely existential, locational, and possessive sentences (cf. Hengeveld 1992: 94–101). This type of predication has been studied typologically, but in Uralistics such research is largely lacking (pp. 979–980). This overview will hopefully spark an interest in this line of study also in the Uralic languages. The point of view in the chapter is typological, which yields interesting comparisons between the previous research and the systems present in Uralic languages.

The chapter begins by discussing existential sentences. In the first section Laakso and Wagner-Nagy compare typological definitions of existential sentences to the reality of Uralic languages and argue that the definitions do not fit the Uralic languages very well. They point out that there are both terminological and structural problems (p. 970). Laakso and Wagner-Nagy draw the conclusion that the function of existential sentences in Uralic languages is to mark the pivot indefinite in a wide sense. This conclusion seems justified, but it could have been supported with additional data from other branches of Uralic. The conclusion is now based on (some) Finnic languages, the Permic languages, Hungarian, and marginally the Samoyedic languages. Even if the state of research is poor, the reader might want to know what the situation is in the other half of the language family. Laakso and Wagner-Nagy consider predicates attested in existential sentences. They show that Uralic languages have different types of existential predicates. This section utilizes sufficient examples from different branches and languages of the family, which gives a rather complete picture of the existential predicates of Uralic languages. The sections on the properties of pivot and predicate are mostly informative, but some more thorough typological comparisons would have been in order (cf. e.g. Hengeveld 1992: 73–126).

After existential sentences, Laakso and Wagner-Nagy turn to locational sentences. The semantics and syntax of the locational sentences are demonstrated with examples from many Uralic languages and from different branches. Especially valuable is the discussion on the information-structural properties of some languages (especially the Finnic and Samoyed languages, but also in some Mansi varieties and in Meadow Mari), as the information structure of the Uralic languages in general, and its ties to syntax,

should be studied more. Hopefully this section will spark an interest in this subject. Like in the discussion on existential sentences, some more typological insight could have helped readers to understand the peculiarities of the subject. From this chapter it is still unclear, for example, whether the variation in information structure is something special, found only in certain Uralic languages, or a wider phenomenon.

The final type of sentences discussed is possessive sentences. Laakso and Wagner-Nagy discuss in turn the two main types of possessive sentences, namely transitive (*have*-)possession and possession based on existential sentences (cf. e.g. Stassen 2013b). In the first part Laakso and Wagner-Nagy handle the *have*-possession, which is found in a minority of Uralic languages. They clearly point out that the *have*-possession is the result of developments in single languages, and not a feature of any branch of the Uralic languages.

In the second part of the section Laakso and Wagner-Nagy discuss the existential-type possession, which is far more widespread in the Uralic languages than the *have*-possession. A minor problem in the discussion of the possessor marking is that they draw a formal parallel between the Permic and Finnic *l*-cases, which is unnecessary and can even mislead a reader into thinking that the forms have something in common (cf. Ylikoski 2011: 258–260). The discussion of possession and possessee marking is rather compact but does not seem to miss any important features. The only shortcoming is that Laakso and Wagner-Nagy fail to mention the marking of the number of the possessee with a possessive suffix in e.g. the Mordvin languages (Bartens 1999: 100–105) and Tundra Enets (Siegl 2013: 149).

In general, the chapter discusses an interesting topic, where the Uralic languages have lot to offer for research. Laakso and Wagner-Nagy deal with all the major aspects of existential, locational, and possessive sentences in the Uralic languages, and most of the time compare the phenomena typologically, though this could have been done more concisely.

3.2.3. Nominal predication

In Chapter 52, Rigina Ajanki, Johanna Laakso, and Elena Skribnik discuss nominal predication in the Uralic languages. The discussion is limited to equative, and non-existential ascriptive predication (cf. Hengeveld 1992: 101–105), as existential, locational, and possessive predication is covered in Chapter 51. However, nonverbal possession expressed by a genitive attribute is

included in Chapter 52. This division is logical, as the constructions handled in Chapter 51 consist of predication with a spatial element, whereas the spatial element is lacking in the construction discussed in Chapter 52.

In the first part of the chapter, Ajanki et al. present the formal properties of nominal predication in the Uralic languages. The discussion of morphosyntactic properties of nominal predication in the Uralic language is comprehensive. The chapter points out typologically interesting phenomena in nominal predication, namely nominal conjugation, agreement in number, and negation. Also nominal predication with other cases than the nominative is discussed.

The discussion clearly shows that Uralic languages use many different strategies in nonverbal predication, and that the strategies can vary even within one language based on e.g. tense. This is an important point, though it may seem a trivial one. It is important to underline the differences between the Uralic languages to non-experts, in order to avoid any unfortunate misconceptions regarding the homogeneity of the family, or generalizations of Uralic languages based on only Finnish, Estonian, and Hungarian, as has happened with various phenomena in the past. Ajanki et al. could have, however, tied the discussion of the formal types more to the typological tradition of nonverbal predication (e.g. Hengeveld 1992).

The second part of the chapter discusses the semantics of nonverbal predication in the Uralic languages. Ajanki et al. show which construction types are used in different Uralic languages to express different functions. They consider a wide variety of different constructions, for example identifying, property assigning, and evaluative, and their properties and similarities with each other. When discussing the properties of subjectless clauses expressing physical or psychological states, it would have been worth a mention that, at least in Finnish, the experiencer construction of psychological states varies with prototypical intransitive clauses (cf. e.g. Siiroinen 2003). As with the first part of the chapter, also the second part would have benefited from more typological discussion of the functions.

The function that gets most attention in this section is comparison. This is a very good idea, as comparison in the Uralic languages had not previously been studied from a typological point of view (except for Finnish, Estonian, and Hungarian). Ajanki et al. point out that the original Uralic comparative type has been to express the standard with a source case

(locational comparative), but that language contact has also produced particle comparatives in various Uralic languages (cf. Stassen 2013a).

In general, the chapter is very good discussion of nonverbal predication in the Uralic languages. Ajanki et al. manage to cover all the typologically important features and even point out some Uralic rarities. As they mention (p. 995), the nominal predication of Uralic languages is understudied. Taking this into account, the chapter is definitely a valuable addition to the handbook.

Riku Erkkilä

References

Aikio, Ante & Arola, Laura & Kunnas, Niina. 2015. Variation in North Saami. In Smakman, Dick & Heinrich, Patrick (eds.), *Globalizing sociolinguistics: Challenging and expanding theory*, 243–255. London: Routledge.

Arkhangelskiy, Timofey & Usacheva, Maria. 2015. Syntactic and morphosyntactic properties of postpositional phrases in Beserman Udmurt as part-of-speech criteria. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 28. 103–137.

Baker, Robin. 1985. *The development of the Komi case system: A dialectological investigation* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 189). Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Bartens, Raija. 1999. *Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 232). Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Bartens, Raija. 2000. *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 238). Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Bauer, Laurie. 2001. *Morphological productivity* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 95). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bereczki, Gábor. 1988. Geschichte der wolgafinnischen Sprachen. In Sinor, Denis (ed.), *The Uralic languages: Description, history and foreign influences*, 314–350. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Bernhardt, Mariann. 2020. Encoding definiteness on pronominal objects in Mordvinic. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 65. 25–61. https://doi.org/10.33339/fuf.97179

Bernhardt, Mariann. 2021. *Määräisyys ja objektin merkitseminen mordvalaiskielissä* (Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, Serie B: Humaniora 558). Turku: University of Turku. https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-29-8639-2

Blevins, James. 2009. Case and declensional paradigms. In Malchukov, Andrej & Spencer, Andrew (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of case*, 200–218. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carlson, Laura. 2010. Parsing space around objects. In Evans, Vyvyan & Chilton, Paul (eds.), *Language, cognition and space: The state of the art and new directions*, 115–137. London: Equinox.

Creissels, Denis. 2009. Spatial cases. In Malchukov, Andrej & Spencer, Andrew (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of case*, 609–625. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199206476.013.0043

Csúcs, Sándor. 2005. *Die Rekonstruktion der permischen Grundsprache*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Edygarova, Svetlana. 2014. The varieties of the modern Udmurt language. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 62. 376–398. https://doi.org/10.33339/fuf.86085

Erkkilä, Riku. 2022a. How to distinguish between semantically close cases: A case study of Mordvin illative and lative. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2022(5). 86–107. https://doi.org/10.31857/0373-658X.2022.5.86-107

Erkkilä, Riku. 2022b. The senses of the illative and lative cases in the Mordvin languages. *ESUKA – JEFUL* 13(2). 307–345. https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2022.13.2.10

Erkkilä, Riku. 2024. The interplay of conceptualization and case marking in the directional cases of Udmurt. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association* 12(1). 113–144. https://doi.org/10.1515/gcla-2024-0006

Erkkilä, Riku & Partanen, Niko. 2022. Mitä komin väyläsijoilla ilmaistaan? *Sananjalka* 64. 108–135. https://doi.org/10.30673/sja.115639

Fishman, Joshua A. 2013. Language maintenance, language shift, and reversing language shift. In Bhatia, Tej K. & Ritchie, William C. (eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*, 466–494. 2nd edn. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grünthal, Riho. 2003. *Finnic adpositions and cases in change* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 244). Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Grünthal, Riho. 2015. *Vepsän kielioppi* (Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen 17). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Häkkinen, Kaisa. 1994. *Agricolasta nykykieleen: Suomen kirjakielen historia*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Hausenberg, Anu-Reet. 1998. Komi. In Abondolo, Daniel (ed.), *The Uralic languages*, 305–326. New York: Routledge.

Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-verbal predication: Theory, typology, diachrony* (Functional Grammar Series 15). Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Iggesen, Oliver A. 2013. Number of Cases. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *WALS Online (v2020.4)*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13950591, available online at https://wals.info/chapter/49

Ising, Erika. 1970. *Die Herausbildung der Grammatik der Volkssprachen in Mittel- und Osteuropa* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für deutsche Sprache und Literatur 47). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Ivanov, Ivan & Moisio, Arto. 1998. *Marin kielen sanaston kehitys 1900-luvulla* (Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 57). Turku: Turun yliopisto.

Koivunen, Tomi & Erkkilä, Riku. 2022. The interaction between spatial cases and relational nouns in the Uralic languages of the Volga-Kama area. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2022(5). 64–85.

Korhonen, Mikko. 1981. *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan* (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 370). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Korhonen, Mikko. 1996 [1969]. Die Entwicklung der morphologischen Technik im Lappischen. In Salminen, Tapani (ed.), *Typological and historical studies in language by Mikko Korhonen* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 223), 17–142. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Kozlov 2018 = Козлов, А. А. 2018: Акциональная семантика основ и деривационный вид. In Толдова, С. Ю. & Холодилова, М. А. & Татевосов, С. Г. & Кашкин, Е. В. & Козлов, А. А. & Козлов, Л. С. & Кухто, А. В. & Привизенцева, М. Ю. & Стенин, И. А. (eds.), *Элементы мокшанского языка в типологическом освещении*, 417–437. Москва: Буки Веди.

Kuznecov 2012 = Кузнецов, Николай. 2012. *Пространственная семантика местных падежей коми языка (когнитивный анализ)* (Dissertationes philologiae uralicae universitatis Tartuensis 12). Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Kuznetsov, Nikolay. 2012. Matrix of cognitive domains for Komi local cases. *ESUKA – JEFUL* 3(1). 373–394. https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2012.3.1.18

Laakso, Johanna. 1999. Vielä kerran itämerensuomen vanhimmista muistomerkeistä: Karjalainen ukkosen loitsu? *Virittäjä* 103(4). 531–555.

Laakso, Johanna & Sarhimaa, Anneli & Spiliopoulou Åkermark, Sia & Toivanen, Reetta. 2016. *Towards openly multilingual policies and practices: Assessing minority language maintenance across Europe* (Linguistic Diversity and Language Rights 11). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Larjavaara, Matti. 1986. Itämerensuomen koillisryhmän synkretistiset paikallissijat. *Virittäjä* 90(4). 413–427.

Levinson, Stephen C. & Wilkins, David P. (eds.). 2006. *Grammars of space: Explorations in cognitive diversity* (Language, Culture and Cognition 6). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, M. Paul & Simons, Gary F. 2010. Assessing endangerment: Expanding Fishman's GIDS. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 55(2). 103–120.

Linn, Andrew. 2013. Vernaculars and the idea of a standard language. In Allan, Keith (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the history of linguistics*, 359–374. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lytkin 1955 = Лыткин, В. И. (ed.). 1955. *Современный коми язык: Учебник для высших учебных заведений, Часть первая: Фонетика, лексика, морфология*. Сыктывкар: Коми книжное издательство.

Malchukov, Andrej & Narrog, Heiko. 2009. Case polysemy. In Malchukov, Andrej & Spencer, Andrew (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of case*, 518–534. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matthews, P. H. 1991. *Morphology*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Narrog, Heiko. 2014. The expression of non-epistemic modal categories. In Nuyts, Jan & van der Auwera, Johan (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of modality and mood*, 89–116. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199591435.013.5

Ojutkangas, Krista & Huumo, Tuomas. 2010. Mikä erottaa muodot *sisällä* ja *sisässä*? "Synonyymisten" muotojen analyysi. *Sananjalka* 52. 19–45. https://doi.org/10.30673/sja.86695

Pantcheva, Marina. 2010. The syntactic structure of locations, goals, and sources. *Linguistics* 48(5). 1043–1081. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2010.034

Partanen, Niko & Erkkilä, Riku. 2020. Dialectal variation in the path-coding cases in Komi. In Кельмаков, В. К. & Стрелкова, О. Б. & Глухова, Г. А. & Ильина, Н. В. & Краснова, Т. А. & Самарова, М. А. & Семёнов, А. Ф. (eds.), *Диалекты и история пермских языков во взаимодействии с другими языками: Сборник статей, Часть 1* (Пермистика 18), 145–161. Ижевск: Удмуртский государственный университет.

Partanen, Niko & Erkkilä, Riku. 2022. Cases denoting path in Komi: Semantic, dialectological and historical perspectives. *Linguistica Uralica* 58(2). 81–111. https://dx.doi.org/10.3176/lu.2022.2.01

Pasanen, Annika. 2008. Uralilaiset vähemmistökielet assimilaation ja revitalisaation ristipaineessa. In Saarinen, Sirkka & Herrala, Eeva (eds.), *Murros: Suomalais-ugrilaiset kielet ja kulttuurit globalisaation paineissa* (Uralica Helsingiensia 3), 47–70. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.

Perevoščikov et al. 1962 = Перевощиков, П. Н. & Вахрушев, В. М. & Алатырев, В. И. & Поздеева, А. А. & Тараканов, И. В. (eds.). 1962. *Грамматика современного удмуртского языка: Фонетика и морфология*. Ижевск: Удмуртское книжное издательство.

Raun, Alo. 1988. The Mordvin language. In Sinor, Denis (ed.), *The Uralic languages: Description, history and foreign influences* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Achte Abteilung: Handbook of Uralic studies 1), 96–110. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Riese, Timothy. 1998. Permian. In Abondolo, Daniel (ed.), *The Uralic languages*, 249–275. New York: Routledge.

Salminen, Tapani. 1997. *Tundra Nenets inflection* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 227). Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Salminen, Tapani. 2007. Endangered languages in Europe. In Brenzinger, Matthias (ed.), *Language diversity endangered* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 181), 205–232. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sammallahti, Pekka. 1998. *The Saami languages: An introduction*. Kárášjohka: Davvi Girji.

Sarhimaa, Anneli. 2017. *Vaietut ja vaiennetut: Karjalankieliset karjalaiset Suomessa* (Tietolipas 256). Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Siegl, Florian. 2013. *Materials on Forest Enets, an indigenous language of northern Siberia* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 267). Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Siiroinen, Mari. 2003. Subjectivity and the use of Finnish emotive verbs. In Casad, Eugene H. & Palmer, Gary B. (eds.), *Cognitive linguistics and non-Indo-European languages* (Cognitive Linguistics Research 18), 405–417. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197150.10.405

Stassen, Leon. 2013a. Comparative constructions. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *WALS Online (v2020.4)*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13950591, available online at http://wals.info/chapter/121

Stassen, Leon. 2013b. Predicative possession. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *WALS Online (v2020.3)*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13950591, available online at http://wals.info/chapter/121

UNESCO 2003 = UNESCO ad hoc expert group on endangered languages. 2003. *Language vitality and endangerment*. UNESCO: Paris.

Usačeva, Maria & Archangel'skij, Timofej. 2017. Grammaticalization of new cases in Beserman Udmurt. *Linguistica Uralica* 53(1). 27–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.3176/lu.2017.1.03

Vallejos, Rosa & Brown, Hunter L. 2021. Locative construals: Topology, posture, disposition, and perspective in Secoya and beyond. *Cognitive Linguistics* 32(2). 251–286. https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2020-0099

Ylikoski, Jussi. 2003. Defining non-finites: Action nominals, converbs and infinitives. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 16. 185–237. https://users.utu.fi/jumyli/wp-content/uploads/sites/1378/2022/09/defining.pdf

Ylikoski, Jussi. 2011. A survey of the origins of directional case suffixes in European Uralic. In Ylikoski, Jussi & Västi, Katja & Kittilä, Seppo (eds.), *Case, animacy and semantic roles* (Typological Studies in Language 99), 235–280. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ylikoski, Jussi. 2016a. Future time reference in Lule Saami, with some remarks of Finnish. *ESUKA – JEFUL* 7(2). 209–244. http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2016.7.2.09

Ylikoski, Jussi. 2016b. The origins of the western Uralic s-cases revisited: Historiographical, functional-typological and Samoyedic perspectives. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 63. 6–78. https://doi.org/10.33339/fuf.86120

Zaicz, Gábor. 1998. Mordva. In Abondolo, Daniel (ed.), *The Uralic languages*, 184–218. New York: Routledge.

Zamyatin, Konstantin. 2012. The education reform in Russia and its impact on teaching of the minority languages: An effect of nation-building? *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 11(1). 17–47.

Zamyatin, Konstantin. 2020. The adoption of language policies in the republics of post-Soviet Russia: Actors, debates, decisions. *Sociolinguistics* 2(2). 30–66. https://doi.org/10.37892/2713-2951-2-2-31-67

Zlatev, Jordan. 2007. Spatial semantics. In Geeraerts, Dirk & Cyuckens, Hubert (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*, 318–350. Oxford: Oxford University Press.