Past progressive and past habitual evidential forms in Udmurt

Laura Horváth

Eötvös Loránd University

Evidentiality in Udmurt. Main research questions

In Permic languages, evidential meanings have been grammaticalized. In Udmurt, e.g., there are two non-compound past tenses: one of them (henceforth PST1) is regarded as being "witnessed" (with no specification of the source of information and the way the reception of the event is realised) and the other one (henceforth PST2) as being "unwitnessed" or "indirective". Indirective past is used, e.g., when the speaker has not witnessed the situation but knows it from hearsay (reportive uses) or by making an inference (inferential uses) (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000):

(1) Periph. Southern (Kelmakov 2006: 244)
кин'пон-эм   *но*   *ку*   *пон-ип'л'ам,*
who take-PST2.3SG   and   when   take-PST2.3PL
со-зэ   *гурт-ын но'кин но ук*   *то'ды*   *н'и.*
DET-ACC.DET   village-INE nobody PCL neg   CNG.PRS.3SG already
'Who gave it such a name and when did it happen, nobody knows.'

In Udmurt, evidentiality can not be used in future and present tenses: evidentiality is restricted to the past, which is not uncommon cross-linguistically (see, e.g. Aikhenvald 2004: 263–264), especially in the case of two-term evidential systems, like in Udmurt (see, e.g. Jalava 2016). Past tense copulas also have PST1 and PST2 forms, therefore all compound past tenses (consisting of a conjugated verb and a past tense copula *val/vilem*) have a possible evidential counterpart, too.
As most of the Udmurt compound tenses pay a significant role in expressing aspectual meanings, too, it is worth discussing the aspectual role of these evidential forms, paying special attention to the aspectual values of progressivity and habituality.

The notion of progressivity and habituality

Progressivity is often understood as a subtype of imperfectivity (see, e.g. Comrie 1976: 24– 40), howewer, IPFV and PROGR (and also continuous) should be distinguished from each other (Dahl 1985: 91–93). Progressive is an aspectual reading that „views an action as ongoing at reference time" (Bybee & Perkins & Pagliuca 1994: 126). There are also contexts where the progressive „indicates a situation [...] that frames another situation" (Comrie 1976: 30).
There differing opinions among scolars about the notion of habituality and the connection between habituality and other values, or the role of the repetition. In e.g., Comrie's (1976) and Mønnesland's (1984) opinion, events can be habitual even if there is no repetition involved, e.g. (2) *Simon used to believe in ghosts* (Comrie 1976: 27) There are, however, other theories (e.g., Bybee & Perkins & Pagliuca 1994, Bertinetto & Lenci 2012, LeBlanc 2010), assuming that considering habitual events, there is always a repetition involved. This presentation relies on theories working with scalarity and differentiates between plurational, non-plurational events and cases of limited repetition.

Progressive and habitual grams in Udmurt (witnessed) (Horváth 2015)

Function	Marker(s)	Structure of the marker
Progressivity	Durative preterite	V.PRS + COP.PST1
Event-external pluractionality with characterizing property (gnomic property): Habituality	1. FRV suffix 2. Durative preterite 3. Dur.pret.+ FRV suffix 4. Frequentative preterite (rare)	-*li̮, -ll'a-* V.PRS + COP.PST1 V.FRV.PRS + COP.PST1 V.FUT + COP.PST1
Ø pluractionality + characterizing property ?Habituality	1. FRV suffix 2. Durative preterite	*li̮, -ll'a-* V.PRS + COP.PST1

Results 1: simple PST2

According to my data, simple PST2 is much more frequently used than the other unwitnessed (compound) tenses:

PST2	PST2.FRV	Dur.pret.evid	Dur.pret.evid + FRV	Frequentative preterite evid	Plusq.perf.evid	Alt.
155	12	18	3	17	9	214 tokens
72,43 %	5,6%	8.41%	1.4%	7.94%	4,2%	100%

The aspectual function of this tense seems to be, however, quite diversified, as it can convey both imperfective and perfective meaning:

1. Perfective

(3) Southern (Kelmakov 2006: 226)
арн'а   *орччы-са*   *мун'чо-зы*   ***жуа-м.***
week   pass-CVB   sauna-3PL   burn.down-PST2.3SG
'After a week, their sauna burned down.'

It can be used even in case of perfective grammaticalized converb constructions:

(4) Southern (Kelmakov 2006: 260)
бод'она   *ныл-лэн шытсэ*   *ад'д'-эм*   *но,*
quail   girl-GEN soup-ACC.3SG see-PST2.3SG   PCL
с'и-са   ***бытт-эм.***
eat-CVB   finish-PST2.3SG
'The quail saw the girl's soup, and ate it up.'

2. Imperfective

(5) Northern (Kelmakov 2006: 191)
сэрэ со   *отын ик*   ***кӧл-эм***   *ни.*
then 3SG   there PCL   sleep-PST2.3SG   already
'And then he/she has slept there.'

From my data, only one example (6) emerged for habitual, and one for progressive function; imperfective meaning in case of this simple past tense seems to be rather less frequent than perfective meaning anyway:

(6) Periph.Southern (Kelmakov 2006: 244)
соин   *ик*   *сырйас'*   *инты*   ***шуи-л'л'ам.***
therefore   PCL   swamp   place   call-PST2.3PL
'Therefore they used to call it „swamp place".'

Simple tense PST2 with frequentative suffix is, howewer, a very typical way for coding habituality and non-firsthand evidentiality at the same time:

(7) (marjamoll.blogspot.ru)
Со Зигмунд Фрейд-лэн   *малпан-ъёс-ын-ыз*
3SG Sigmund Freud-GEN   thought-INSTR-3SG
соглаш   ***лу-ыл-эм.***
consentient   be-FREQ-PST2.3SG
'He/she used to agree with Sigmund Freud.'

PST2 is sometimes used with the particle *pe* that expresses reported/unwitnessed information:

(8) (marjamoll.blogspot.ru)
Кавказ   *падан (sic!)*   *ул-ись*   *ныл-ъес-ты,*   ***пе,***
Caucasus   around   live-PTCP   girl-PL-ACC   PCL
огпол ***вай-иллям.***
once   bring-PST2.3PL
'They once brought girls from the Caucasus region.'

In some cases, howewer, non-inferential simple PST1 is used with the particle *pe* instead of PST2.
It is also worth mentioning that non-firsthand information, unwitnessed events are not always expressed by unwitnessed simple PST2 but by PST1 instead:

(9) Northern (Kelmakov 2006: 173)
бэрло н'и   *оццы*   *зучч-ос*   ***лыкт-и-зы.***
then already there.ILL   Russian-PL   arrive-PST1-3PL
'And after that, Russians have come.'

Results 2: evidential forms expressing habituality and progressivity

Habituality and also progressivity can be expressed by unwitnessed compound tenses, too, by the same aspectual means, than in the case of the non-indirectives:. E.g., plurational habituality can be expressed by durative preterite, but also by other evidential tenses (e.g. by frequentative preterite):

(10) (marjamoll.blogspot.ru)
Сиен-   *юон*   *но*   *комната-язы*
food   drink   PCL   room-INE.3PL
нулл-о   *вылэм*
bring-PRS.3PL   AUX.PST2
'They used to bring foods and beverages to their room.'

Progressivity is expressed grammatically by durative preterite:

(11) (marjamoll.blogspot.ru)
Заочник-ъёс   *нош*   *ик*   *со*   *ныл-ъёс*
private.student-PL   but   PCL   DET   girl-PL
доры   *лыкт-иллям*   *лэся,*
to   come-PST2.3PL   apparently
нош   *вожась туган отын*   ***пук-е***   ***вылэм.***
but   jealous lover there.INE   sit-PRS.3SG   AUX.PST2
'Apparently, these private students came to the girls again, but the jelous lover was sitting in the room.'

Compound indirective past tenses conveying progressive or plurational habitual meaning can be replaced by present tense (in case of habitual events, often after unwitnessed compound tense form/forms) or by non-evidential forms of these tenses (with or without indirective particle *pe*):

(12) Northern (Kelmakov 2006: 173)
у ал'л'о   *отын*   *удморт'т'ос*
long.ago   there.INE   Udmurt-PL
ул-о   ***вал.***
live-PRS.3PL   AUX. PST1
'Udmurts used to live there a long time ago.'

Further goals

I tend to examine these functions on a larger data (interviews and texts from the literary language), paying special attention to the aspectual role of the simple tenses PST and PST2..
The aspectual function of the Plusquam Perfect is especially worth studying in case of witnessed/ evidentially neutral and unwitnessed verbal forms.

Data used

- Dialectal texts (15 000 n)
Kelmakov, V. K. = В. К. Кельмаков 2006. *Краткий курс удмуртской диалэктологии.* Ижевск: Изд. дом Удмуртский универ.
Kelmakov, V. K. & Hännikäinen, Sara 2008 (=1999). *Udmurtin kielioppia ja harjoituksia.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Blog texts: marjamoll.blogspot.ru (20 000 n)

Literature cited

Aikhenvald, Alexandra 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bybee, Joan & Perkins, Revere & Pagliuca, William 1994: *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
Comrie, Bernard 1976: *Aspect.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dahl, Östen 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems.* Oxford–New York: Backwell.
Horváth, Laura 2015: Habitualitás kifejezése udmurt nyelvjárásokban. – Katalin É. Kiss & Attila Hegedűs & Lilla Pintér (eds.), *Nyelvelmélet és dialektológia 3.* Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem. 99–125.
Leinonen, Marja & Vilkuna, Maria 2000. Past tenses in Permic languages.– Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Empirical Approaches in Language Typology: Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 495–514.

Jalava, Lotta 2016. Evidentials based on nominalizations in Uralic languages (presentation) http://www.academia.edu/28884462/Evidentials_based_on_nominalizations_in_Uralic_languages
LeBlanc, Carmen L. 2010: Coding compositional aspect in French. – James A. Walker (ed.), *Aspect in Grammatical Variation.* Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 65–81.
Mønnesland, Svein 1984: The Slavonic Frequentative Habitual. – Hannu Tommola & Casper de Groot (eds.), *Aspect Bound. A voyage into the realm of Germanic, Slavonic, and Finno-Ugrian aspectology.* Dordrecht – Cinnaminson: Foris Publications. 53–77.