Mari Saraheimo
University of Helsinki

The finite remote past tenses in Udmurt:
From temporal to modal and pragmatic functions

In addition to synthetic past tenses, there are several analytic past tenses in the Udmurt language. The analytic remote past tenses have been scarcely studied and they are inconsistently described in previous studies, grammars and textbooks. The present contribution aims to describe the functions of two finite remote past tenses in Udmurt. The data used in the study are newspaper texts, and the analysis has been conducted with the help of native speakers. I have analyzed two sets of forms: the first representing the finite remote past and the second the finite remote past. The results show that Serebrennikov's (1960) description of the analytic remote pasts is in many ways accurate, and that contrary to what many newer descriptions suggest, the forms in question do not differ in aspectual notions. The forms have the temporal properties of general remote pasts. Nonetheless, the remote past constructions in Udmurt do not only operate on a temporal level but also bear modal and pragmatic functions. Both forms have a future counterfactual function, which is used to express an unfulfilled action or intention. Both forms may also be pragmatically motivated: the first remote past may be used to mark information as shared knowledge and it may alter the tone of the utterance, whereas the second remote past may imply a combination of evidential, inferential and mirative notions.

1. Introduction

In addition to synthetic past tenses, many Uralic languages use analytic forms to refer to past events. Analytic past tenses consisting of an auxiliary and a finite form of the lexical verb are typical for the Uralic languages spoken in the Volga region, such as Mari and Udmurt, and similar forms are found in the Turkic languages spoken in the area (Honti 2000; Bradley et al. 2022). Although the tense systems of these languages are particularly rich in form and function, the analytic forms have not received much attention in earlier studies. The aim of this article is to introduce the temporal, modal and pragmatic functions of the finite remote past tenses of Udmurt.

Udmurt belongs to the Permian branch of the Uralic language family. As a highly agglutinative and morphologically rich language with a dominantly head-final word order, Udmurt represents features very typical of the Uralic languages (Edygarova 2022). Udmurt has undergone significant influence from the neighboring Turkic languages Tatar, Chuvash and Bashkir. In addition to the Turkic languages, a major influence is Russian (Bartens 2000; for more details, see Edygarova 2022). In Udmurt, the past tense system consists of two synthetic past tenses, the witnessed or neutral first past and the evidential second past, and a variety of analytic forms. Most studies on the Udmurt tense system have focused on the two synthetic past tenses (Siegl 2004; Kubitsch 2022). The analytic past tenses are formed by combining finite and non-finite verb forms with the past copula. Some of the analytic past forms are remote past tenses, which resemble pluperfects in Standard Average European (SAE) (cf. Dahl 1985: 144–149). The analytic past tenses of Udmurt, including the remote past, have scarcely been studied and are only briefly presented in the existing grammars and textbooks. The remote past forms are relatively marginal and infrequent, yet they are regularly encountered in texts and grammars and they offer intriguing insights into the typology of remote pasts.

Serebrennikov (1960: 121–125) describes the analytic remote pasts in Udmurt as having a wide range of functions. In addition to marking an action as preceding another action in the context, the remote pasts are used to mark actions and events interrupted by a following event, as well as in anaphorically referring to something that has been said or discussed earlier. In her article on the remote past forms, Zaguljaeva (1984) states that the forms express distant past events which take place and end before

another event. Zaguljaeva also claims that the forms may express an action "contradicting" another action or event. While she gives some examples, she does not elaborate further on the topic.

The recent western Udmurt grammars have a different take on describing the functions of the finite remote past forms. Kel′makov and Hännikäinen (2008: 268–269) refer to the forms as pluperfects, and claim that they express an action or event, taking place before the moment of speech or possibly in a remoter past, happening before another action or event in synthetic past (first past or second past). Although Kel′makov and Hännikäinen do not use aspectual terminology to describe the forms, their description seems to suggest the difference between the two forms to be of aspectual nature: the first remote past would pay attention to the process (1), while the second remote past would be used to denote the result of the action (2).

(1)   Со толон тонэ **утчаз вал** но, ӧз шедьты.

    So   tolon   ton-e   utča-z   val   no,
    s/he yesterday you-ACC search-PST1.3SG be.PST1 but

    ę-z   šed′ţi.
    NEG.PST1-3 find.CNG
    'He was looking for you yesterday but did not find [you].'
    (Kel′makov & Hännikäinen 2008: 269)

(2)   Кылем арняе соос доры эшъёссы **лыктӥллям вылэм.**

    Ķil′em arńa-je soos dor-į eš-jos-sį
    last   week-ILL they home-ILL friend-PL-POSS.3PL

    ļikt-il′l′am   vįlem.
    come-PST2.3PL be.PST2
    'Last week, their friends came to visit them [according to them]'
    (Kel′makov & Hännikäinen 2008: 269)

While the descriptions do not include words such as aspect, imperfective or perfective, the description as such suggests that the first remote past conveys an imperfective meaning, whereas the second past would be used as a perfective form. A similar explanation is offered by Winkler (2011: 99–100), who refers to Kel′makov and Hännikäinen's textbook in his grammar, and Kozmács (2002). In the examples which Kel′makov and Hännikäinen (2008: 269) provide, it is apparent that the chosen example of the first remote past (1) denotes an action or event not ending in results, or

somehow contradicting the following events, which Serebrennikov (1960) and Zaguljaeva (1984) had previously described as characteristic of the Udmurt remote pasts. A contradictive use, however, is not exclusively typical of the first remote past: according to Serebrennikov (1960: 122–123), the second remote past may convey similar meanings as well.

As there is no consistent nor exhaustive description of the Udmurt remote past forms, this article aims to give a deeper insight to the functions of the remote past and the contexts in which different functions and motivations may arise. I call these forms remote pasts, as their semantic profile only partially fits that of typical pluperfects – in Udmurt, there is no unambiguous category of perfect, although the second past carries some typical semantic features of perfects (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000). The functions which are to be given closer scrutiny in the analysis of the data are (i) the temporal function, (ii) the future counterfactual function, referred to as contradictive or discontinued function in previous literature, and other categories connected with future counterfactuality, such as frustrated mental states, (iii) discourse-anaphoric function and (iv) evidential and mirative functions. On a larger scale, the paper contributes to tracing the typology of remote past functions and semantics.

The results of the study show that the functions of the two forms do not differ in aspect, rather they differ in the notion of knowledge management. Both forms are used to express future counterfactuality, although the first remote past seems more prone to future counterfactual use. Both remote pasts may also be used to refer to something that has been earlier discussed by the discourse participants. Connected with future counterfactuality, or possibly also rising from the context of having been discussed before, the first remote past may also convey frustrative meanings. The second remote past, on the other hand, may have a mirative or a counterexpectational meaning.

The structure of the article is as follows: in Section 2 I present the materials and methods used for the study. In Section 3, I present the tense system of Udmurt, with special attention paid to previous descriptions and studies on past tense. In Section 4, I present the main theoretical framework of the study, reflecting on how the Udmurt remote past relates to different categories intertwined with temporality. In Section 5 I present the analysis of the two forms in question. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Data and research

The study is a synchronic linguistic analysis on the function of the forms in question. Newspaper texts form the most significant part of the data used for the study. I have used the corpus database Udmurt Corpora provided by Timofey Arkhangelskiy and Maria Medvedeva at the School of Linguistics of HSE (http://udmurt.web-corpora.net). This database consists of a corpus of contemporary written literary Udmurt, a corpus of Udmurt-language social media and a sound-aligned corpus of Udmurt dialects. The corpus of contemporary written literary Udmurt is the main corpus of the database, and I have specifically used the subcorpus of *Udmurt duńńe*, the most popular and well-known Udmurt-language newspaper. I chose to examine newspapers from the years 2013 and 2014 (633,672 tokens), with the exception of the negative second remote past forms, as the subcorpus search yielded no results for them; I ran the search for the negative second past forms across the whole subcorpus of *Udmurt duńńe* (2007–2017, 6,364,820 tokens). I searched the subcorpus for both finite synthetic past forms combined with the past auxiliary *val/ṿlem*. For this article, altogether 122 instances[1] of remote pasts have been analyzed, of which 86 represent the first remote past and 36 represent the second remote past. The analysis is conducted by examining the forms in their context, paying special attention to other tense forms, elements of future counterfactuality, discourse-pragmatic use in interviews and questions as well as evidential and mirative meanings. Cyrillic (Russian) language data is transcribed according to the International Scholarly System, while the Uralic Phonetic Alphabet (UPA) is used for transcribing Udmurt.

I have complemented the research by consulting two native speakers, Svetlana Edygarova and Lukeriya Shikhova. All the main observations have originally been made by the author; the native speakers have provided me with some further reasoning for choosing a remote past instead of a non-remote past in certain contexts and confirmed my observations to be correct and justified. Both native speakers produced some additional examples to help clarify the difference between certain forms and they gave me advice on which factors could affect the choice of the form. In my analysis, I have marked the source of the produced examples accordingly.

---

1.   This includes all the forms found in the data.

The articles in *Udmurt duńńe* deal with political, societal, economic and cultural issues of the Udmurt Republic. The newspaper represents the standard language, although the journalists are nowadays encouraged not to avoid dialectal expressions and forms. As the grammatical phenomenon in question has not yet been adequately described, I have chosen to focus the study on the representation of these forms in standard language. It should be noted that while the materials in question represent newspaper texts, with only a few exceptions,[2] all of the occurrences are found in interviews and stories people tell about their or someone else's lives. It is important to note the genre of the texts, as the forms are remarkably rare[3] in the corpus, and this observation supports the results of the study concerning the future counterfactual, frustrative and pragmatic functions of the finite remote past forms, as the forms are mostly used in contexts of discourse and (inter)subjective positioning.

3. Past tense in Udmurt

Udmurt uses two synthetic past tenses. The first past is often described as the default past tense, whereas the second past is its evidential pair, a form of unwitnessed or reported action. (Bartens 2000: 207–208; Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000; Siegl 2004.) The forms of first past and second past are presented in Tables 1a and 1b below.

Evidentiality in Udmurt has been discussed in various previous studies (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000; Siegl 2004; Kubitsch 2022). The Udmurt second past expresses non-eyewitness and indirect evidence, including hearsay and inference, but also mirativity and sometimes a lower degree of commitment (Kubitsch 2022). Siegl (2004: 12) sees the first past predominantly as a general or evidentially neutral past instead of a definitively "witnessed" past. Nevertheless, as Kubitsch (2022) points out, when in contrast with the the second past, it could be associated with direct experience, firsthand information or accurate knowledge. Evidentiality is considered a category separate from mood and modality, but evidential markers may develop secondary meanings connected with e.g. the reliability and

---

2. In the first remote past sample, only one occurrence was found in a news article; in the second remote past, the corresponding number was two.
3. In comparison, a search for the synthetic first past forms in the subcorpus yielded over 40,000 results.

Table 1a: The first past   Table 1b: The second past[a]

	Positive	Negative		Positive	Negative
1SG	*mịnị*	*ẹ-j mịnị*	1SG	*mịn-iśkem*	*mịn-iśkymte-je*
2SG	*mịn-i-d*	*ẹ-d mịnị*	2SG	*mịn-em(-ed)*	*mịnị-mte-jed*
3SG	*mịn-i-z*	*ẹ-z mịnị*	3SG	*mịn-em*	*mịnị-mte*
1PL	*mịn-i-m(ị)*	*ẹ-m mịn-e*	1PL	*mịn-iśkem(mị)*	*mịn-iśkịmte-mị*
2PL	*mịn-i-dị*	*ẹ-d mịn-e*	2PL	*mịn-ilʹlʹam(dị)*	*mịn-ilʹlʹamte-dị*
3PL	*mịn-i-zị*	*ẹ-z mịn-e*	3PL	*mịn-ilʹlʹam(zị)*	*mịn-ilʹlʹamte*

a. I have only included the Southern negation type here, although a Northern variant, composed with the negative existential *ẹvẹl* and the main verb in the positive second past inflection, also exists. However, none of the examples in the article contain occurrences of the Northern variant, and all the negative second remote past occurrences are based on the Southern variant.

probability of the information, which resemble modal meanings (Aikhenvald 2004: 6–7). Givón (2001: 326) states that there is an implicit connection between evidentiality and epistemic modality. According to Kubitsch (2022), the difference between the first and the second past can be related to the accuracy or reliability[4] of the information, and the second past may also be connected to a lower degree of commitment.

The prototypical use of the first past and the second past is demonstrated below in (3a) and (3b).

(3) a. Коля толон **лыктӥз**.

   Kolʹa   tolon   lịkt-i-z.
   Kolja   yesterday   come-PST1-3SG
   'Kolja came yesterday.' (Kelʹmakov & Hännikäinen 2008: 200)

   b. Коля толон **лыктэм**.

   Kolʹa   tolon   lịkt-em.
   Kolja   yesterday   come-PST2.3SG
   'Kolja came yesterday [apparently].' (Kelʹmakov & Hännikäinen 2008: 200)

---

4. Leinonen and Vilkuna (2000: 498) also mention the matter of reliability in their study. However, they point out that the reliability of the source is not the real issue but rather whether the speaker takes responsibility for what they said.

Hearsay is the best-known and most often mentioned meaning of the Udmurt second past. Inference is the case when the speaker has not witnessed the action themselves but infer it based on visible or tangible evidence or results (Aikhenvald 2015). The mirative meaning can be described as an unprepared mind or new information that the speaker evaluates as surprising (DeLancey 1997). Mirativity should be considered a distinct semantic and grammatical category, though it is often shown to be linked with evidentiality (DeLancey 1997; Aikhenvald 2004: 195; Peterson 2010; see also Aikhenvald 2012). Mirative meaning is also connected to mental distancing: temporal distance encoded by the evidentials could be associated with mental distance (Kubitsch 2019). The mirative use of the Udmurt second past is shown in (4), where the speaker finds herself covered in thistles and is surprised at this.

(4)   Тйни ук копак люгы **лякиськем** бордам!

    Tińi uk kopak ľugi ľakiśk-em bord-am!
    here PTCL all thistle stick-PST2.3SG side-INE.1SG
    'Look, thistles all stuck to me!' (Kubitsch 2022: 274)

Kubitsch (2022: 273–275) points out that in Udmurt, the second past functions as a mirative strategy rather than a mirative marker, as it is not primarily a mirative marker but can be interpreted as mirative via context: mirativity in the second past is always implied. The only exception is the second past form of the verb 'be' (*vịlem*) which can refer to events or states effective in the present, and may in some contexts be considered a mirative marker.

Udmurt lacks an unambiguous category of perfect. Udmurt has three different past forms or constructions with perfect-like functions, but none of them entirely fits the category of a perfect (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000: 495–512). The typical functions of a perfect are divided between three forms: the evidential second past described above, the experiential and the resultative participle. The two latter forms may also combine with a past copula, and thus form remote past forms with functions similar to SAE pluperfects (cf. Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000: 511; Kelʹmakov & Hännikäinen 2008: 235, 237; see also Nasibullin 1984). As these forms are based on non-finites, they are outside the scope of this study and shall be studied in more detail in future studies.

The descriptions of the Udmurt remote past forms vary both regarding their form and function. Most studies, grammars and textbooks refer to them as pluperfects that, by and large, correlate in function with western pluperfects (cf. Serebrennikov 1960; Kozmács 2002; Kel'makov & Hännikäinen 2008; Winkler 2011), while some publications refer to them as remote analytic pasts (Zaguljaeva 1984). Different studies give different paradigms to the remote past constructions, as presented below in Tables 2 and 3. The forms taken into consideration in this study are the finite variants, as shown in Examples (1) and (2) in Section 1, and they are set in bold in Table 3.

Table 2: Earlier descriptions of Udmurt remote pasts

	1st remote past	2nd remote past
Serebrennikov 1960	-Vm(POSS) + val / PST2 + $vilem$	PST1 + val
Zaguljaeva 1984	-Vm(POSS) / PST2 + val	PST1 + val

Table 3: Descriptions of the Udmurt remote pasts in modern grammars and textbooks

	1st remote past	2nd remote past
Kel'makov & Hännikäinen 2008	**PST1 + val**	-Vm(POSS) + val / PST2 + $vilem$
Winkler 2011	**PST1 + val**	-Vm(POSS) / PST2 + val
Kozmács 2002	**PST1 + val**	PST2 + val / $vilem$
Tarakanov 2011	**PST1 + val**	-Vm(POSS) + val / PST2 + $vilem$

In addition to the above-mentioned works (Tables 2 and 3), Bartens (2000: 208–210) mentions the forms and explains that they express "a remoter past". Leinonen and Vilkuna (2000: 511) briefly review the remote past forms in their study on the Permian past tense and conclude that the Udmurt analytic remote past tense forms "signal a break in the narrative sequence", which concurs with how Serebrennikov (1960: 121–124) and Zaguljaeva (1984) describe the form to express an action that was interrupted, led to no results or contradicts the following. Serebrennikov (1960: 125) also claims that the first remote past is used to refer to earlier discussions. This function is not mentioned in the later grammars and studies written on the subject. In the later western grammars and textbooks (Kozmács 2002; Kel'makov & Hännikäinen 2008; Winkler 2011) the functions of the

remote past forms are described as differentiated based on whether it is the process or the result which is given attention. The problem with this explanation for the functions of the remote past constructions is that it leaves the reader under the impression that the two forms differ in aspectual nature, but when one studies the forms more closely, it is apparent that both respective forms may denote a perfective or an imperfective action, which I will show later in the analysis in Section 5.1.

As this article concerns only the finite forms, the non-finite second remote past in Tables 2 and 3 (-*Vm*(POSS) + *val*) is not taken into consideration in this study. Some studies (Kozmács 2002, Winkler 2011) do mention the possibility of combining the finite second past and a first past auxiliary *val*, and it remains unclear whether this form would be evidential or non-evidential. I ran a search in the Udmurt corpus (whole corpus search, as a search in the subcorpus defined in Section 2 did not yield any results) for second past forms combining with a non-evidential auxiliary *val*, and it seems that these types of forms occur only rarely, mostly found in an Udmurt-language newspaper published in Tatarstan. This would suggest that this form is an areally used variant for either the first or the second remote past. As this article concerns itself only with the finite forms in standard literary Udmurt, these forms will not be taken into consideration in this study.

In his recent study of the Udmurt analytic forms focusing on aspectual differences between different combinations of *val* and *v̇ilem* the analytic past tenses,[5] Németh (2019) consulted a group of six native speakers on the choice of the form of the auxiliary with the said forms. According to Németh, all the informants would also accept a combination of the first past and the second past auxiliary *v̇ilem*. In my data, this combination is nonexistent, which may be due to the said combination being understood as non-standard or unsuitable for the literary language, as it is also lacking from the descriptions of Udmurt grammar. Nevertheless, the question of the morphological variation of the form in spoken variants of Udmurt remains a topic outside the scope of this study. Németh also takes

---

5. In addition to the remote past tenses, Udmurt uses a durative analytic past (PRS + *val*/*v̇ilem*) and a habitual analytic past (FUT + *val*/*v̇ilem*). As these forms temporally operate on a non-remote level and are thus outside the scope of this article, I instruct the reader to turn to Winkler (2011: 98–99) for further information on the use of the said analytic forms.

aspectuality into consideration in his study, and the results of this study mostly align with his observations, as discussed further in Section 5.1.

In addition to remote past forms, *val* and *vịlem* participate in attenuating the tone in modal constructions (Kubitsch 2020, 2021). According to Kubitsch, *val* and *vịlem* attenuate the tone of commands in the imperative mood as well as in other deontic modal constructions (*lịktị* 'come!', *lịktị val* 'come, please!', Kubitsch 2020: 107). Kubitsch (2021) concludes that when *val/vịlem* is combined with moods or in modal constructions, it may be either temporally or modally motivated: it might indicate that the action took place in the past, but depending on the context, it may be interpreted as a modal particle with no past reference.

4. Typology of the remote past tenses

As the forms in question have been called pluperfects in earlier works and studies, and the category of pluperfect is perhaps the best-known remote past category in linguistics, it is appropriate to take a closer look here at the definitions and differences between the categories of a pluperfect and a remote past. In SAE languages, remote past mostly manifests through a tense called the pluperfect, which falls under the said category of a remoter past (Dahl 1985: 144–149). Comrie (1985: 65) describes the pluperfect as a tense with a reference point in the past, expressing an action or an event located prior to that reference point: it could be described as a "past in the past". Dahl (1985: 144) sees the category mostly as a combination of two categories – past and perfect – although he admits that this view is somewhat problematic, as some languages do possess the category of a pluperfect but lack an unambiguous category of a perfect. As Udmurt represents a language that lacks the said category, and typical pluperfects are deictically dependent on other past reference times, I have chosen to address the forms in question as remote pasts, not pluperfects. The name pluperfect unnecessarily leads the reader to assume a perfect reading for the main verb, and thereby relying on such a term hinders a comprehensive understanding of the forms.

In his study, Reichenbach (1947: 297) describes the relations between different tenses in English formally as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Reichenbach's formal presentation of past tenses in English. Key: E = event time, R = reference time, S = speech time

Structure	Name
E – R – S	Past perfect (pluperfect)
E, R – S	Simple past
E – S, R	Present perfect

In Table 4, E stands for event time (the time the referred event or action takes place), R for reference time (the time of the main storyline) and S for speech time (the time when the utterance is spoken). In the simple past, the event time and reference time are simultaneous, but they precede the speech time. In the present perfect, the speech time and the reference time are simultaneous, but the event time precedes them. In the pluperfect, the event time precedes the reference time, which in turn precedes the speech time. Reichenbach's study serves as a base for describing tense forms in many languages and linguistic works, and it will serve as a tool for describing the temporal profile of the Udmurt remote past.

Temporally, Reichenbach's description often fits the use of the Udmurt remote past forms, as in (5), where the reference time is given in the (mirative) second past (*potil'ĺam*) (R), and the action in the second remote past marks an even earlier event (E), which is relevant at the reference time (E – R – S).

(5) Валлы бертылыкуз, гондырез кутэммы сярысь кинлы-солы **верам вылэм**. Гуртэ вуим но […] гондыр ваеммес учкыны пичиен бадӟымен потӥллям.

Val-ḷi   berti̯ḷi-ku-z,   gondi̯r-ez   kut-em-mi̯
horse-DAT return-CVB-POSS.3SG bear-ACC   catch-NMLZ-1PL

śari̯ś   kin-ḷi̯-so-ḷi̯   vera-m   vi̯lem.   Gurt-e
about   who-DAT-he-DAT   say-PST2.3SG be.PST2 village-ILL

vu-i-m   no, […] gondi̯r   vaj-em-mes
come-PST1-1PL   and   bear   bring-NMLZ-POSS.1PL.ACC

ućk-i̯ni̯   piči-jen   badẓim-en   pot-il'ĺam.
watch-INF   small-INS   big-INS   come.out-PST2.3PL

'As he returned to the horse, he had [apparently] told someone we had caught a bear. We arrived in the village and […] [to our surprise] everyone came out to see us bringing the bear.' (Serebrennikov 1960: 122)

According to Serebrennikov (1960: 124), as well as Kel'makov and Hän-nikäinen (2008: 269), both remote pasts may also have a present reference point, the speech moment, rather than a past reference time. In (6), a use of the first remote past with a present perfect meaning is demonstrated.

(6) Туж кемалась кылӥ мон со сярысь. Кураськись **вераз вал** мыным.

Tuž   kemalaś   kịl-i   mon so   śarịś.
very   long.ago hear-PST1.1SG   I   it   about

Kuraśkiś   vera-z   val   mịnịm.
beggar   tell-PST1.3SG   be.PST1   me.DAT

'I heard of it long ago. A beggar has told me.' (Serebrennikov 1960: 124)

In (6), the action referred to in the remote past does not precede the actions referred to in the first past. The actions bear results in the speech moment, and in English, the perfect would be used, as the result of the actions in the present are emphasized: the speaker is aware of what is being discussed, as they have heard it from someone before. If S and R can be simultaneous (S, R), the formal presentation (E – S, R) resembles that of a perfect instead of a pluperfect. Thus, the remote past would not be dependent on a reference time given by a synthetic, non-remote past tense frame (first past or second past) but could be used independently. Operating independently of another past reference time also supports the choice of addressing the Udmurt remote pasts as remote pasts rather than pluperfects: they seem to have no requirement to relate their temporal location to another past reference time. As perfects tend to further grammaticalize to have a simple past meaning, the pluperfects seem to sometimes develop a more general remote past meaning (Bybee et al. 1994: 102). Whereas the pluperfect may refer to a close past situation, as long as it happened prior to another reference point in the past, the remote past is used to express a generally remoter location in time, as the form loses its requirement to relate its temporal location to the reference time given in the non-remote past tense (Comrie 1985: 68; Bybee et al. 1994: 102).

According to Uusikoski (2016: 99–107), there are several different remoteness distinction systems in the languages of the world besides the typical hodiernal interval (earlier today / later today). While some may be as specific as distinguishing between actions and events taking place this year or before this year, some languages have less restricted criteria

for the cutoff point between a non-remote and a remote past. Some languages make a remoteness distinction between a non-remote past tense, which can always be used, and a remote past tense, which is used when the speaker wants to emphasize a greater temporal distance. Uusikoski points out that in languages which make a remoteness distinction between a non-remote past and a remote past, the choice between these forms is highly subjective. Thus, the remoteness of the events that a remote past denotes in these cases is difficult to define in temporal units, as it depends on the speaker's subjective evaluation.

Dahl (1985: 144–149) points out that a pluperfect may also develop other secondary or extended uses. The contradictive or discontinued use of the Udmurt remote past mentioned by Zaguljaeva (1984) and Serebrennikov (1960) seems to relate the action to a later state of affairs. This raises the question of whether the functions of the form are connected with the encoding of epistemic values, which falls within the categories of mood and modality. The categories of mood, modality and tense, though separate, are often interdependent (Lyons 1995: 332). Modal connotations have been observed in both future and past tenses (Lyons 1977: 809–816). Aikhenvald (2004: 7) refers to Matthews (1997: 228) in her definition of modality as being connected with the degree of certainty of what is being said, and mood, on the other hand, acting on the same semantic dimension but at the level of speech act. Spronck (2012: 103) summarizes a popular view on how to distinguish between mood and modality: mood operates at the level of utterances, whereas modality functions at the level of states of affairs (Dik 1997; Van Valin & LaPolla 1997). Spronck sees the category of mood as a grammatical expression of illocution, which is an upper category for questions, commands and suggestions. As the modal use of the Udmurt remote past rather relates the action to states of affairs than attenuates the tone of a speech act, the focus of this article is on modality, not mood. The distinction between these two categories is, however, not entirely without debate, and in some cases – especially when the remote past acquires a frustrative reading – the use of the form also alters the tone of the utterance.

One of the common secondary uses of the pluperfect, according to Dahl (1985: 146), is counterfactual, which is demonstrated through an English example in (7), where the pluperfect is used modally to express a past event that never actually took place.

(7) *If JFK had not been assassinated, he would obviously have been re-elected.*
(Patard 2019: 178)

The tendency of past tense forms to acquire modal meanings has been explained through a distancing effect that the use of a past tense creates: from a temporal aspect, this is distancing the events from speech moment or the reference point, and from a modal aspect, it is distancing events from factuality (Iatridou 2000: 244; Palmer 2001: 203; de Haan 2010: 461). The use of morphological past tense forms to encode modal meanings is a common phenomenon across languages, and when past tense forms are used modally, they may lose their specific past time reference (Iatridou 2000: 244). Counterfactual modality, however, excludes the reference event from the reality, as shown in (7) (Patard 2019: 177–178).

Examples of false or divergent belief, or actions performed under such beliefs, encoded through verbal inflection can be found in languages which use modal forms called frustratives (Evans 2006). The frustrative denotes an action which did not end in the desired result (Spronck 2012: 103–104; see also Dixon 2000: 293). Spronck describes the frustrative as a category expressing a double referential relationship between two moments containing discordant intentions and results: at the first moment, a discourse entity has an intention and at the second moment, this intention has not been fulfilled. In his grammar of Russian, Timberlake (2004: 397–398) describes a form with a function very similar to the frustratives described above. In this form, a temporal-modal particle *bylo* ('was') is combined with the past tense form of the main verb to compose a form with the function of a reversal of fortune, as shown in (8).

(8) Он **пошёл было** прогуляться, но передумал.

On pošël bylo proguljat´sja, no peredumal.
he go.PST be.PST walk.INF but change.mind.PST
'He was going to go out carousing but changed his mind later on.'
(Timberlake 2004: 398)

The form in (8) expresses a preceding action in comparison to the other, as a remote past would, and the form resembles a remote past structure. Nevertheless, the construction implies that the preceding action achieved no results. In Russian, a tense with the aforementioned past-tense form of the verb 'to be' no longer exists, and the meaning of the form is modal. Old

Russian, on the other hand, used pluperfect forms consisting of a past form of the verb 'be' and a past participle[6] of the main verb (Goeringer 1995). Goeringer (1995: 324) claims that Old Russian pluperfects performed a future counterfactual meaning, where the actions or events are not counterfactual at their event time, but the counterfactuality arises in comparison with a later point of time. The contradictive or discontinued use of the Udmurt remote past noted by Zaguljaeva (1984) and Serebrennikov (1960: 121–124) seems very similar to the Old Russian future counterfactual (9).

(9)   Ӵукна валэн нуыны **косй вал** но, ӧз-а, мар-а, нуэ соос?

Čukna   val-en   nu-ini̯   kos-i   val   no,
morning   horse-INS   carry-INF   ask-PST1.1SG   be.PST1   but

* e̯-z-a,   mar-a,   nu-e   soos?*
NEG.PST1-3-Q   what-Q   carry-CNG.PL   they

'I asked them to take it with the horse in the morning, didn't they do that?' (Zaguljaeva 1984: 51)

In (9), the remote past is used in the first predicate (*kosi val* 'I asked') to mark an unfulfilled request. The second predicate in the first past expresses the actual outcome (*e̯z-a nue soos* 'did you not take them'). It should be noted that while Zaguljaeva makes no remark on this in her study, she does translate the contrastive use to Russian by using a construction formed with the Russian particle *bylo*, accordingly to Timberlake's (2004: 397–398) example of the use of *bylo* in a corresponding context (8). A similar meaning can be detected in the example Kel'makov and Hännikäinen (2008: 269) give for the first remote past, as shown in (1) in Section 1. In addition to Russian, a corresponding form exists in Tatar, where a structure consisting of the non-evidential simple past with a non-evidential auxiliary 'be' denotes a non-realized or unfulfilled past (Šakirova 1953: 298; Poppe 1963: 104).

I have chosen to refer to this function as the future counterfactual function, as the description of a similar function of the Old Russian pluperfect fits the findings of the study best. The form may also be used to imply frustrated mental states, and the future counterfactual use is certainly in many ways similar to the use of frustrative modal verb forms (see Dixon 2000: 293, Spronck 2012: 103–104). I will take this into consideration in the

---

6. The modern Russian finite past tense originates in the very same Old Russian *l*-participle (Laurent 1999: 37).

analysis regarding the emotional implications of the remote pasts. This meaning of the form is also close to a mistaken belief or an action performed under a false or divergent belief, which is noted by Evans (2006: 107) to be a common modal category in the languages of the world.

Lastly, Serebrennikov (1960: 124) mentions the use of the first remote past to anaphorically refer to something which has been discussed earlier by the participants (10). This function is not referred to in later studies and grammars.

(10) Мон **верай вал** ини вань островме котыртэме потэм сярысь.

  Mon vera-j   val   ińi   vań
  I   say-PST1.1SG be.PST1 already whole

  ostrov-me   kotı̣rt-em-e   pot-em   śarı̣ś.
  island-POSS.1SG.ACC go.around-NMLZ-1POSS want-NMLZ about
  'I already told you, I want to go around my whole island.'
  (Serebrennikov 1960: 124)

In his study on multiple perspectives, Evans (2006: 108–111) discusses particles and verbal forms that relate the proposition or state of affairs to the congruence or divergence of knowledge between the speaker and the hearer. The anaphoric use of the first remote past in Udmurt as referring to a previously discussed topic seems to relate to this semantic field: it is used to mark shared knowledge. The matter will be further discussed in the analysis for both the first and the second past (Section 5.4.).

In Section 5.1., I will briefly discuss the relevance of aspect in defining the difference in the functions of the forms. I will mainly consider two hypernyms of viewpoint aspect, perfective (e.g. resultative) and imperfective (e.g. progressive, durative), leaning to the traditional definitions of Comrie (1976) and Smith (1997): perfective aspect is used to denote a complete event with a clear endpoint and could be considered as an undivided whole, being viewed from the outside of the situation, whereas imperfective action is seen as divisible, without an endpoint, being viewed inside the situation. The typical perfective situation relevant for the analysis is dynamic, whereas the typical imperfective situation is durative. Although justifiably criticized for being too vague and not giving parameters or tools specific enough for a thorough aspectual analysis (cf. Klein 1994, 1995; Borik 2006), the general definitions of Comrie and Smith will suffice to point out that aspect is not the category to distinguish between the first and the second remote past of Udmurt.

5. Analysis

The analysis is divided into sections for each of the functions described and defined above: the temporal, future counterfactual and anaphoric use, which I will analyze for both finite remote pasts taken into consideration in the study. Additionally, I will discuss mental states expressed through the first remote past as well as evidential and mirative functions connected with the second remote past. In Section 5.1 I will briefly discuss the relevance of aspect in the analysis, reflecting on notions from previous literature, mainly pointing out that aspect plays no significant role in differentiating between these two forms. I will wrap up the analysis with a short summary of the results of the study.

5.1. Evaluating the relevance of aspect

As stated in previous literature, the first remote past may refer to actions finished before or continuous until another reference time, either in the past or at the speech time; the actions may or may not bear results at the reference time (Serebrennikov 1960). In the earlier studies, including Zaguljaeva (1984), there is no specific reference to the aspectuality of the forms, and Serebrennikov's notions point to the direction of the forms being ambiguous in regard to aspect. Németh (2019) gives a similar conclusion in his study on the aspectuality of the forms: the first remote past is, according to him, neutral concerning an opposition between repetitiveness and a one-time event. As the use of the first remote past in denoting imperfective action (paying attention to the process, as described by earlier studies) is already demonstrated in Section 1 (1), I shall attest the perfective use of the first remote past in the following example (11).

(11)   Одйг кыл гинэ **верай вал**.

Odig kịl   gine   vera-j   val.
one   word only   say-PST1.1SG   be.PST1
'I had only said one word.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 9/8/2013)

In (11), the action referred to in the first remote past cannot be seen as imperfective: the situation is not a durative action nor does it pay attention to the process, but rather it is an undividable whole, a dynamic action with a

clear endpoint. Therefore, the first remote past may be used to express both perfective and imperfective actions.

According to Németh (2019), the second remote past may convey a one-time action or repetitive action. Contrary to what has been stated by Kel′makov and Hännikäinen (2008), Winkler (2011) and Kozmács (2002), the second remote past may also denote an imperfective action as shown in (12), where a group of women fell victim to a pyramid scheme.

(12)   Уно аръёс ҷоже люкам коньдонзэс вакчи дыр куспын уноятыны
       малпаллям вылэм, нош асьсэос «штанитэк » кылиллям.

       Uno   ar-jos   čože   ľuka-m   końdon-zes
       many   year-PL   during   gather-PTCP.PST   money-POSS.3PL.ACC

       vakči   dịr   kusp-ịn   unojat-ịnị malpa-ľľam   vịlem,
       short   time   distance-INE   grow-INF   think-PST2.3PL   val.PST2

       noš   aś-seos   "štańi-tek"   kịl′-il′l′am.
       but   self-POSS.3PL   pants-ABS   stay-PST2.3PL

       'They had been planning to increase, within a short time, the amount of money they had saved over many years, but they were left with nothing.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 11/8/2013)

In (12), the second remote past denotes a durative situation (*malpal′l′am vịlem* 'they had been thinking'), which does not lead to results. A perfective interpretation is not possible: as the form is used in a future counterfactual function, it cannot be seen as paying attention to the result of the action or emphasizing the action as a whole. The action is not viewed from the outside but rather from the inside, as an irresultative process.

In line with the results of Németh (2019), there is no relevant aspectual difference between these two forms. When one reviews the earlier literature on the Udmurt remote past, it appears that the descriptions of the functions in the Russian literature set researchers on the wrong track. The remote past forms were described as expressing unfulfilled actions that were somehow interrupted by the following events, which is why the future counterfactual function has been referred to as *nesoveršennoe* [*dejstvie*], an incomplete action, which may be understood to refer to imperfective aspect (Serebrennikov 1963: 268). Additionally, the forms have been described as taking on present perfect readings, which is also characteristic for the Russian imperfective aspect (see e.g. Borik 2006). The imperfective

aspect has accordingly been used in the translations of the forms in such contexts. Nevertheless, as known from Serebrennikov's (1960) and Zaguljaeva's (1984) examples, combined with the data and new information in the present article, aspectuality does not determine the distinction between the two remote past forms presented in this study.

5.2. Temporal profile of the remote pasts

5.2.1. First remote past

The first remote past may be used for temporal ordering: it is used to express events and actions taking place prior to other events mentioned in the context (E – R – S, see Table 4 in Section 4). A temporal distance from either the reference time or speech time can be recognized in all occurrences. Temporal ordering is a typical function for a remote past. Other events, which define the reference point (R), are referred to in a simple past tense, and the event or action expressed in remote past has preceded the aforementioned actions and events (13). The first past is the past tense used when narrating the main storyline.

(13)   Выпускнойлы мыным дїськут басьтыны анай-атае ук-сёзэс öз быдтэ. Угось костюм но туфли **басьтй вал** туэ дышетскон ар кутсконын. Выпускнойлы чебер галстук гинэ басьтй – 250 манетэн.

Vịpusknoj-lị   mịnịm dịśkut baśt-ịnị
graduation-DAT me.DAT clothes buy-INF

anaj-ata-je   ukśo-zes   ẹ-z
mother-father-POSS.1SG money-POSS.3SG.ACC NEG.PST1-3

bịdt-e.   Ugoś   kosťum no tufľ´i baśt-i   val
spend-CNG.PL because suit   and shoes buy-PST1.1SG be.PST1

tue   dịśetskon ar kutskon-ịn.   Vịpusknoj-lị
this.year study   year beginning-INE graduation-DAT

ćeber   galstuk gine baśt-i –   250 mańet-en.
beautiful scarf   only buy-PST1.1SG 250 ruble-INS

'For my graduation, my parents didn't spend money to buy me clothes. For I had, indeed, bought a new suit and shoes at the beginning of this study year. For graduation I only bought a nice tie for 250 rubles.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 6/25/2013)

In (13), the reference time is given in the first predicate in the first past, which indicates the reference time to be earlier than the speech time (E – S). The second predicate is in the remote past, and the use of a remote past indicates that the event in question happened before the reference time (E – R).

The first remote past may also be used in the function of a general remote past without a past reference time (14). In these cases, the reference time may be the present. Therefore, instead of the prototypical pluperfect sequence E – R – S, the temporal structure is E – R, S.

(14)   Удмурт-а, уйгур-а, брангурт-а, бурят-а – ваньмыз дунне. Тод-
мо венгер тодосчи Золтан Кодай **вераз вал**: фольклор – со кы-
кетй анай кыл, крезьгуро анай кыл. Та малпан – туж шонер.

Udmurt-a, ujgur-a,   brangurt-a, burjat-a – vańmiz duńńe.
Udmurt-Q Uyghur-Q Brangurt-Q Buryat-Q all   world

Todmo   venger   todosči Zoltan Kodaj   vera-z
well.known Hungarian scholar Zoltan Kodaly say-PST1.3SG

val: folklor – so   ķiketi   anaj   ķil,   kreźguro
be.PST1 folklore it   second mother tongue   melodic

anaj   ķil.   Ta   malpan – tuž   šońer.
mother tongue that   thought   very   correct

'Udmurt, Uighur, Brangurtian, Buryat – we are all people [lit. the world]. The well-known Hungarian scholar Zoltán Kodaly has stated: folklore is the second mother tongue, a melodic mother tongue. This idea is very true.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 4/19/2013)

In (14), the speaker refers to a quote from a famous scholar sometime in the distant past. The copula is not used in present-tense predicative clauses in Udmurt – hence, the absence of a copula in this context should be interpreted as a present tense marker. As the form seems to have no requirement for a past reference frame, the temporal properties of the form should be viewed as those of a general remote past, as described by Bybee et al. (1994) and Uusikoski (2016).

5.2.2. Second remote past

From their temporal profile, the first and the second remote past correspond to each other. Typically, the second remote past is used to express actions or events completed or finished before the reference time given in the context (E – R – S), as in (15).

(15) Со учыр бере ар ортчыса, ми ивор басьтймы – карт луо-
      нэ мынам Дальнёй Востокын, каторгаын кулэм. Отчы сое
      месйллям вылэм войнаын пленэ шедемез понна...

    So   učir   bere   ar   ortči-sa,   mi   ivor
    that incident after year pass-CVB   we   message

    bast-i-mi –   kart   luon-e   minam
    receive-PST1-1PL husband becoming-1SG me.GEN

    Dal'ńoj Vostok-in, katorga-in   kul-em.
    far   east-INE   forced.labour-INE die-PST2.3SG

    Otči   so-je   mes-il'l'am   vilem   vojna-in
    there.ILL he-ACC put-PST2.3PL be.PST2 war-INE

    pl'en-e   šed'-em-ez   ponna …
    captivity-ILL end.up-NMLZ-POSS.3SG for

    'A year after that incident we got a message – my future husband had died in the Far East, in forced labor. He had been sent there after being taken as a prisoner of war…' (*Udmurt duńńe* 4/5/2013)

Example (15) also represents a prototypical use of the second past: the speaker first refers to an event, which she witnessed herself firsthand, in the first past (*ivor baśtimi* 'we received'), and the contents of the letter are referred to in the second past (*kart luone minam* […] *kulem* 'my future husband had died [according to what was told]'). The speaker then refers to what had happened before the man's death in the second remote past (*soje mesil'l'am vilem* 'he had been taken'). The evidential second past denotes hearsay evidentiality as well as temporal ordering: the information referred to is found in the letter, not coming from the speaker.

    The second remote past, much like the first remote past, may be used as a general remote past: the speaker does not give an exact time for when the event has taken place, and the time of the event must be assumed to have been in the relatively distant past (16).

(16) Вавож ёросысь Гурезь-Пудга гуртын со Кузебай Гердлэсь
музейзэ кылдытӥз, выльысь куштэм Эмезьгуртэз улӟытӥз.
Та гуртэз куке но Кузебай Герд агай-вынъёсыныз ӵош
пуктэм вылэм.

Vavož	*joros-i̦ś*	*Gureź-Pudga*	*gurt-in so*
Vavož	area-ELA	Gureź-Pudga	village-INE he

Kuźebaj Gerd-leś muzej-ze kildit-i-z,
Kuźebaj Gerd-ABL museum-POSS.3SG.ACC found-PST1-3SG

vi̦l´-i̦ś kušt-em Emeźgurt-ez
new-ELA abandon-PTCP.PST Emeźgurt-ACC

ulʒit-i-z. Ta gurt-ez kuke no
revive-PST1-3SG this house-ACC sometime PTCL

Kuźebaj Gerd agaj-vi̦n-jos-i̦n čoš
Kuźebaj Gerd big.brother-little.brother-PL-INS together

pukt-em vi̦lem.
build-PST2.3SG be.PST2

'He founded the Kuzebaj Gerd museum in the village of Gureź-Pudga of the Vavož region, revived the abandoned Emeźgurt. Kuzebaj Gerd and his brothers had built that house sometime [in the past].' (*Udmurt duńńe* 1/15/2013)

In (16), the speaker tells the story of the museum to Kuźebaj Gerd,[7] which was opened in a house that Gerd and his brothers themselves built at some point in a more distant past. The story is first told in the first past, which is the default tense for reciting past events. At the end, the speaker adds the notion of the house being built by Kuźebaj Gerd, and here he uses the second remote past: in this case, the interpretation is that of hearsay (marked by the use of the second past) and a general remoter past (marked by the use of a remote past construction). In (16) however the reference time is past, so the formal representation remains that of a typical pluperfect (E – R – S); the temporal adverb *kuke no* 'sometime', on the other hand, would already by itself imply an earlier time frame and therefore, the use of the remote past as a tool for temporal ordering is not motivated.

---

7. Kuźebaj Gerd (1898–1937) was a well-known Udmurt author and cultural figure.

As the temporal profile of the remote pasts suggests that these tenses are general remote pasts with no specific cutoff point nor a past reference frame, and the choice between a non-remote past and a remote past in these circumstances should be made on subjective grounds, it is of great interest to find out what these subjective criteria could be. In the following Sections 5.3. through 5.6., I will discuss the non-temporal factors that motivate the use of a remote past instead of a non-remote past.

5.3. Future counterfactual

5.3.1. First remote past

A future counterfactual meaning is very prominent in the data. A future counterfactual relation between two events or states of affairs can be detected in three out of four first remote past occurrences. The future counterfactual use of the remote past denotes an unfulfilled action or intention, as the expectation of the addressee in the past of what was to come was false, and the implemented action does not align with the course of the events. Example (17) shows a typical case of the future counterfactual use of the remote past, and the use of the remote past here greatly resembles that of the Russian construction in (8).

(17) Кирпич шуккон заводын кӧня ке ужамез бере, **бурдъяськиз вал** Ижевске яке Казане, но егит муртэ дышетскемез ӧвӧлэн нокытчы кутӥллямтэ.

> *Kirpič̆ šukkon zavod-ịn   kęńa   ke*
> brick   blow   factory-INE how.many   PTCL

> *uža-m-ez   bere burdjaśk-i-z   val*
> work-NMLZ-POSS.3SG after get.inspired-PST1-3SG be.PST1

> *Iževsk-e   jake Kazań-e, no jegit murt-e*
> Iževsk-ILL or   Kazan-ILL but young person-ACC

> *dịšetsk-em-ez   ęvęl-en nokịtč̆ị no   kut-il'l'amte.*
> study-NMLZ-POSS.3SG   NEG-INS nowhere PTCL take-PST2.3PL.NEG
> 'After working at a brick factory for a while, she was tempted to go to Iževsk or Kazan, but without education, this young person did not find a job.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/12/2013)

In (17), the young woman's intentions are brought up in the first remote past: *burdjaśkiz val* 'she was inspired', but the plan did not unfold in the

way she intended. The actual outcome – her not getting a job – is expressed in the second past (*nokịtčị no kutiľľamte* 'she was not taken anywhere'). The use of the first remote past here resembles the one presented in Example (1) by Kelʹmakov and Hännikäinen, as presented in Section 1. In the future counterfactual context, the actual outcome is often given in a juxtaposed clause starting with the adversative conjunction *no/noš* 'but'.

In (17), the first action in the first remote past precedes the following action in the second past, and the temporal structure would therefore fit the profile of a remote past (E – R – S). Nevertheless, when I consulted Svetlana Edygarova on the motives behind choosing a remote past instead of a non-remote past in this context, she confirmed the observation that the use of a remote past signals a contrast between the event in the remote past and the followup to the story. According to Edygarova, the non-remote first past would be a more intuitive choice in the context if the outcome would align with the expectations, as shown in (18).

(18) Кирпич шуккон заводын көня ке ужамез бере, **бурдъяськиз**
      Ижевске яке Казане, но егит мурт Ижевске мынйз.

      Kirpič̆ šukkon zavod-ịn kẹńa ke
      brick   blow   factory-INE how.many PTCL

      uža-m-ez bere burdjaśk-i-z Iževsk-e jake
      work-NMLZ-POSS.3SG after get.inspired-PST1-3SG Iževsk-ILL or

      Kazań-e, no jegit murt Iževsk-e mịn-i-z.
      Kazan-ILL and young person Iževsk-ILL go-PST1-3SG

      'After working at a brick factory for a while, she was tempted to go to Iževsk or Kazan, and the young person did go to Iževsk.' (Example produced by Svetlana Edygarova)

As Uusikoski (2016: 107) points out, in languages that use a general remote past with no specific cutoff point, the use of a remote past instead of a non-remote past is always optional. This is the case with Udmurt, too: first past could be used instead of the first remote past in (17) even without modifications, as well as in any other example in the analysis. Nevertheless, the data and the native speaker's assessments suggest that the context in (17) is more suitable for accommodating a remote past.

The actual result may not always be included in the same sentence as the remote past. The outcome may also be expressed in the following sentence, as in (19).

(19) Нош тужгес но сюлэмме вырӟытӥз Елена Вахрушевалэн «Кионлэн пытьыез кузя» веросэз. Нырысь газетэз лисъяй но **дэйми вал**, мар туж кузь веросэз сётӥллям шуыса. Нош лыдӟыны кутски но ӧй но шӧды, кызьы пумозяз вуи.

Noš tužges no śulem-me viṛžit-i-z
but most PTCL heart-POSS.1SG.ACC move-PST1-3SG

Elena Vaχruševa-len "Kion-len piťi-jez kuźa"
Elena Vakhruseva-GEN wolf-GEN mark-POSS.3SG along

veros-ez. Niṛiś gaźet-ez lisja-j no
story-POSS.3SG first newspaper-ACC leaf-PST1-1SG and

dejm-i val, mar tuž kuź veros-ez
cringe-PST1.1SG be.PST1 what very long story-ACC

śot-iľľam šuṣa. Noš liẓ-iṇi kutsk-i
give-PST2.3PL COMP but read-INF start-PST1.1SG

no ẹ-j no šẹdi, kiźi
and NEG.PST1-1SG even realise.CNG how

pum-oźa-z vu-i.
end-TERM-POSS.3SG arrive-PST1.1SG

'But what moved my heart the most, was Elena Vakhrusheva's story "In the Tracks of the Wolf". First I leafed through the newspaper and cringed – what a long story they had published! But then I started reading it and did not even notice how I finished it.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 1/23/2013)

In (19), the speaker expresses her preliminary state of mind in the first remote past (*dejmi val* 'I cringed'), seemingly reluctant to read a lengthy story. The first remote past in (19) clearly denotes an action performed under a false belief: the actual nature of the entity in question (the story), which is contrary to what the reader first assumed, is expressed in the first past (*liẓiṇi kutski no ẹj no šẹdi* 'I began to read and did not even notice'): in the end, she enjoyed reading the story.

Sometimes, the actual outcome is not given in the immediate context, but the remote past implies the course of events to differ from previous aspirations (20). In the context, it is explained that a group of teachers went on strike as the director of the school was almost removed from her post.

(20)   13-ТӢ южтолэзе сютэм улонзэс дугдытӥзы, ёрос кивалтӥсьёсын огкылэ вуыса. Куинь толэзь талэсь азьло школалэн директорез Людмила Сомова соглаш **ӧз кариськы вал**, дышетскон юртэз автономной карыны. Соку дышетскон понна дун трослы бу-доз, шуиз.

13-ti	*južtoleź-e*	*śutem*	*ulon-zes*		*dugḍịt-i-zị,*
thirteenth	march-ILL	hungry	life-POSS.3PL.ACC		stop-PST1-3PL

joros	*kivaltiś-jos-ịn*	*ogkịl-e*	*vuị-sa.*	*Kuiń*
area	leader-PL-INS	agreement-ILL	arrive-CVB	three

toleź	*ta-leś*	*aźlo*	*škola-len*	*direktor-ez*
month	that-ABL	before	school-GEN	director-POSS.3SG

Ľudmila	*Somova*	*soglaš*	*ẹ-z*	*kariśḳị*	*val,*
Ljudmila	Somova	agreeable	NEG.PST1-3	make.CNG	be.PST1

dịšetskon	*jurt-ez*	*avtonomnoj*	*kar-ịnị.*	*Soku*
studying	house-ACC	private	make-INF	then

dịšetskon	*ponna*	*dun*	*tros-lị*	*bud-o-z,*	*šu-i-z.*
studying	for	price	much-DAT	grow-FUT-3SG	say-PST1-3SG

'On the 13th of March they quit their hunger strike, reaching an agreement with the leaders of the area. Three months earlier the director of the school, Ljudmila Somova, had not agreed with making the school private. That would raise the price of studying too high, she said.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/14/2013)

In (20), the main storyline concerning the teachers' strike is told in the first past. A relevant fact about the situation is expressed in the first remote past (*soglaš ẹz kariśḳị val* 'she had not agreed'). The action the predicate expresses has happened in an earlier time and could therefore also be temporally motivated (E – R – S). The larger context reveals that the school did become private in the end. In this context, as confirmed by Svetlana Edygarova, the first past would be a more intuitive choice if the situation had remained in the status quo, despite the event time being earlier than the main storyline. Example (20) also demonstrates the negative use of the first remote past: the form may well be negated, but the negation in itself does not imply a counterfactual nature between two events.

In a similar case (21) the contrastive use against a broader context is exemplified. In (21), however, the temporal structure is different from the previous examples: the first remote past and the first past are used within the same sentential unit to express simultaneous actions (E, R – S). In the context, the

daughter of the described person explains how she has to take care of her mother, who lives in a village in an area where there are no jobs. Going out of town to work is not an option (*transport ęvęl* 'there is no transport').

(21)   Нош уж öвöл. […] Нош палэнэ ужаны ветлыны транспорт öвöл. Колхоз вань дыръя со скал кыскисьын ужаз, **öз жожтӥськы вал**.

Noš	*už*	*ęvęl.* […]	*Noš*	*palen-e*	*uža-ny*	*vetl-ịnị*
but	work	EX.PRS.NEG	but	outside-ILL	work-INF	come-INF

transport	*ęvęl.*	*Kolχoz*	*vań*	*dịr-ja*	*so*	*skal*
transport	EX.PRS.NEG	kolhoz	EX.PRS	time-ADV	she	cow

kịskiś-ịn	*uža-z,*	*ę-z*	*žožtiśkị*	*val.*
milker-INE	work-PST1.3SG	NEG.PST1-3	complain.CNG	be.PST1

'But there are no jobs. […] But there is no transport to take you to work outside the area. During the era of the kolkhoz, she worked as a cow milker, and she didn't complain.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 4/12/2013)

In (21), the person refers an earlier point in time in the first past (*skal kịskiśịn užaz* 'she worked as a cow milker') and then continues to claim that at that time she did not complain (*ęz žožtiśkị val*), which is expressed in the first remote past. In this case, the reference event of the remote past is contrasted with the present situation: now, she is unsatisfied, as there is no work and no chances of living a life on her own without an income. The action in the first past (*užaz* 'worked') is not contrasted with the present situation, but rather it describes a past reality where the contrasted action took place. The actions expressed in the first past and the remote past are simultaneous, and therefore it may be assumed that the use of the remote past in this context is not temporally motivated (E, R – S) – it marks future counterfactuality.

In the future counterfactual function, the remote past construction should be considered to carry a modal notion, where the speaker wants to emphasize a mental distance between the subject in the past and the subject at another (later) moment. The form is clearly also temporal, but as shown in (21), it does not always necessarily precede another past action but may be simultaneous with a past action expressed in a non-remote past. When this is considered together with the native speaker's assessment in (17), with the existence of a similar form with a corresponding function in the major contact languages Russian and Tatar, and with the high frequency of this meaning in the data, it is clear that the future counterfactual is a significant motivation behind the use of a remote past instead of a non-remote past.

5.3.2. Second remote past

The second remote past may also be used to express future counterfactuality. The future counterfactual use of the second remote past is similar to that of the first remote past, the only difference being that the second remote past is, by default, also evidential. In the data, the second remote past occurrences were also often found to express events or actions which do not lead to the intended or expected results. A future counterfactual notion can be traced in one-third of the occurrences, which is less than with the first remote past, but still forms a significant part of the second remote past sample. The difference between the first and the second remote past lies in the encoding of evidentiality: the second remote past simultaneously signals a contradiction between two consecutive events, but the choice of the evidential past they use marks the information source to be someone other than the speaker. Such a case is presented in (22), where a future counterfactual meaning as well as a hearsay evidential meaning can be detected.

(22) Соослы шутэтскон нунал сётэ вошъясьсы Эмма Орлова. Кык арня талэсь азьло гинэ коткуд скаллэсь 18 килограммлэсь ятыр йӧл **кыскиллям вылэм**, но тулыс матэктэмен, пудо сиёнэн шугъяськонъёссы кылдиллям. Та вакытэ, пе, йӧлзы синэмын – 15,5 килограмм сяна кылымтэ.

Soos-lị   šutetskon nunal śot-e   vošjaś-sị̦
they-DAT resting   day   give-PRS.3SG substitutor-POSS.3PL

Emma Orlova. Kịk arńa ta-leś   aźlo   gine kot′kud skal-leś
Emma Orlova two weeks that-ABL before only every   cow-ABL

18 kilogramm-leś jatịr jẹl   kịsk-il′l′am   vịlem, no
18 kilogram-ABL over   milk draw-PST2.3PL be.PST2 and

tulịs   matekt-em-en,   pudo   śion-en   šugjaśkon-jos-sị
spring get.close-NMLZ-INS cattle fodder-INS worry-PL-POSS.3PL

kịld-il′l′am.   Ta   vakịt-e,   pe,   jẹl-zị
emerge-PST2.3PL this time-ILL QUOT milk-POSS.3SG

śin-emị̦n – 15,5 kilogramm śana   kịl′ị̦-mte.
deplete-RES 15,5 kilogram   except remain-PST2.NEG

'They are given a day off by their substitutor Emma Orlova. Only two weeks earlier each cow gave over 18 kilograms of milk, but as the spring approaches, worries have arisen about feeding the cattle. At the moment, they say, their milk production has declined – they gave only 15.5 kilograms. (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/15/2013)

189

In (22), the speaker elaborates on the difficulties a farm is facing. The speaker then refers to what has been said by the interviewees to have been the earlier situation in the second remote past (*kiskil'l'am vilem* 'was milked'), but afterwards, the situation has taken a different course of events, which is expressed in the second past (*šugjaśkonjossi kildil'l'am* 'worries have emerged'). All the storytelling is marked in the second past or with the quotative particle *pe*,[8] thus the information is marked as hearsay. The future counterfactual use is parallel to that of the first remote past, the only difference being the information source marking.

In the following example (23), the future counterfactual meaning appears against a broader context.

(23)   Озьы ке но песятайме 1930-ти но 1933-ти аръёсы кулакъёс радэ поттылӥзы. Одӥг гинэ скалзэ талазы. Огполаз Сибире келян вылысь вить нылпиен валче дӧдые **пуктӥллям вылэм** ни. Вылазы дӥськутэн гинэ кельтӥллям. Но палазы пырыса, гурткалык кылзэ верам.

Oźi	*ke*	*no*	*peśataj-me*		*1930-ti*
that.way	PTCL	PTCL	grandfather-POSS.1SG.ACC		1930th

no	*1933-ti*	*ar-jos-i*	*kulak-jos*	*rad-e*	*pottil-i-zi.*	*Odig*
and	1933rd	year-PL-ILL	kulak-PL	row-ILL	put-PST1-3PL	one

gine	*skal-ze*	*tala-zi.*		*Ogpolaz*	*Sibir-e*	*kel'an*
only	cow-POSS.3SG.ACC	take-PST1.3PL		once	Siberia-ILL	taking

viliś	*vit'*	*nilpi-jen*	*valče*	*ded'i-je*	*pukt-il'l'am*	*vilem*
for	five	child-INS	together	sleigh-ILL	sit-PST2.3PL	be.PST2

ńi.	*Vil-azi*		*diśkut-en*	*gine*
already	above-INE.POSS.3PL		clothes-INS	only

---

8. The particle *pe* is a quotative particle which marks the previous clause as originally being said by a third party (Bartens 2000: 321). The particle *pe* is a quotative index rich in function: it may convey reported and inferred meanings (Teptiuk 2019: 111–119). It may also function as a discourse marker with hedging function (Teptiuk 2019: 118). I found no remarks on the interaction or simultaneous use of *pe* and the second past, but the data reveals no combinations of *pe* and the second remote past. According to the descriptions of Bartens (2000) and Teptiuk (2019), the particle *pe* operates on a clausal level and marks the whole utterance as being stated by someone else, whereas the second past and the second remote past act on the level of the predicate.

> *kelʹt-ilʹlʹam.* *No* *pal-azị* *pịrị-sa,* *gurt*
> leave-PST2.3PL but side-ILL.POSS.3PL enter-CVB village
>
> *kalịk* *kịl-ze* *veram.*
> people word-POSS.3SG.ACC say-PST2.3SG
>
> 'In spite of that, my grandfather was assigned to the ranks of kulaks between 1930–1933. They took the only cow. Once he was [reportedly] even put on a sleigh with five kids in order to be taken to Siberia. They only left them the clothes on their backs. But the village folk came to them and defended him.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/13/2013)

In (23), the speaker is telling the story of their grandfather, who was accused of being a kulak during the years 1930–1933 and treated accordingly. The beginning of the story is told in the first past (*peśatajme* […] *kulakjos rade pottịlizị* 'they counted my grandfather as a kulak'). In the following sentence, the predicate is still in first past (*talazị* 'took'). The speaker then continues to refer what their grandfather has told them in the second remote past (*dẹdʹije puktilʹlʹam vịlem* 'he had been [according to the grandfather] put on a sleigh'). The remote past predicate is evidentially marked, and it represents the hearsay function. As the beginning of the story is marked in first past, the use of the second past in the followup marks the rest of the story as hearsay. The predicate in the remote past does not precede the previous event given in the first past. The use of the second remote past, however, signals that the story will not unfold towards the direction it seems to proceed towards. Svetlana Edygarova confirmed that the motivation behind the use of the remote past in this context is the future counterfactual nature of the event. In the last sentence of the story, it is pointed out that the village folk came to speak out against his being taken, and he was, in the end, not taken.

As Skribnik and Kehayov (2018: 543) point out, evidentiality cannot be negated in Udmurt, but evidentially marked actions can. The second remote past may also be negated. The negative forms were, however, extremely rare in the corpus. Even so, only three instances were found, each of them representing meanings typical of the second remote past (temporal, future counterfactual, mirative). A negative second remote past form with a future counterfactual meaning is presented below in (24).

(24)   Со вакытъёсы семьяезлы секыт йӧтылӥз, соин но, лэся, песяй-
ме **лэзиллямтэ вылэм** школае мыныны. […] Песяе лушкемен
пуксем кошовкаяз но школае мынэм.

So   vak̮it-jos-i̮   śemja-jez-l̮i   śekit̮   jet̮il̮-i-z,
DET   time-PL-ILL family-POSS.3SG-DAT difficult get.into-PST1-3SG

soin   no, leśa,   peśaj-me
therefore also probably grandmother-POSS.1SG.ACC

lez̮-il´l´amte   vil̮em   škola-je   m̮in-in̮i. […]
allow-PST2.NEG.3PL be.PST2 school-ILL go-INF

Peśaj-e   luškem-en pukś-em
grandmother-POSS.1SG   secret-INS   sit.down-PST2

košovka-jaz   no škola-je   m̮in-em.
sleigh-ILL.POSS.3SG   and school-ILL go-PST2.3SG

'During those times her family was facing difficulties, and that's
probably also why they didn't allow my grandmother to go to
school. […] My grandmother secretly got into a sleigh and went to
school.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 9/18/2012)

In (24), the speaker tells about her grandmother, who was not allowed to
go to school in her childhood due to difficult times the family was facing,
which is expressed in the second remote past (*lez̮il´l´amte vil̮em* 'they did
not allow'). Later on in the context, it is revealed in the second past that
in the end, she did secretly go to school, despite being told not to do so
(*pukśem* 'sat down', *m̮inem* 'went').

5.4. Anaphoric use in discourse

5.4.1. First remote past

Example (25) gives insight into how the first remote past may be used in
discourse to mark the given information as previously mentioned or dis-
cussed in the context. In the context, an interviewer is asking three young
women questions concerning their travels abroad. In the introductory sen-
tence, it is brought up that one of them has been on vacation in Egypt. The
interviewer starts the interview with the following question:

(25) Ирина, тон лымшорын **шутэтскид вал** ини. Кыӵе пӧртэмлыкез
Египет но Турция куспын?

Irina,   ton   ļimšor-ịn   šutetsk-i-d   val   ińi.
Irina   you   south-INE   rest-PST1-2SG   be.PST1   already

Ķiče pertemlịk-ez   Jegipet   no   Turcija   kuspịn?
how difference-POSS.3SG   Egypt   and   Turkey   between

'Irina, you have already been on vacation in the South. What are the
differences between Egypt and Turkey?' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/26/2013)

In (25), there is no apparent temporal or future counterfactual motivation
to choose a remote past instead of a non-remote past: there is no past time
reference, the question begins with a declarative clause where the predicate
is in the first remote past. The remote past is, instead, used to imply that
the matter in question has been discussed earlier, and both participants
are familiar with the information. Svetlana Edygarova was consulted on
the interpretation, and she confirmed that the form here implies that this
information is shared between the participants: the interviewer confirms
an already-known fact, which was most likely already discussed earlier.
In this use, the use of the form indicates shared knowledge between the
participants of the discussion.

5.4.2. Second remote past

In a question, the second remote past may be used to mark information as
previously discussed, but as opposed to the first remote past, the second
remote past marks the addressee as the information source (26). In an in-
terview, a teacher is asked to tell about his career and his choice to become
a teacher.

(26) Анай-атайды но **шуиллям вылэм** ик: воргоронлы дышетӥсе
мыноно шат?

Anaj-ataj-dị   no   šu-il′ľam   vịlem   ik:
mother-father-POSS.2PL   too   say-PST2.3PL   be.PST2   also

vorgoron-lị   dịšetiś-e   mịn-ono   šat?
man-DAT   teacher-ILL   go-NEC   SPEC

'Didn't your parents, too, say [according to what was told earlier],
that a man should not become a teacher?' (*Udmurt duńńe* 8/30/2013)

In (26), the interviewee told earlier during the interview of how his parents were opposed to his becoming a teacher, using the first past. Later in the interview, the interviewer returns to this comment by using the second remote past: they recite what the interviewee said before, only the tense changes (*Anaj-atajdị no šuilʼlʼam vịlem ik* 'didn't your parents say, too'). The form is evidentially marked, as it is based on information given by the interviewee. The motivation of the use of the second remote past in this context is to express that the interviewer is referring to something they have discussed earlier: the use can be compared to the use of the first remote past in (25). The choice of the first or the second remote past here lies in the encoding of evidentiality: according to Svetlana Edygarova, the use of the first remote past would be impossible here, as the information is only introduced during the interview, by the interviewee. When one compares the examples (25) and (26), the first remote past is used when the speaker confirms the information to be known and committed to by both participants, as they have either witnessed it or in some way commit to the truthfulness of the statement, whereas the second remote past shows a lower degree of commitment. As mentioned in Section 2, the Udmurt second past has been found to express a lower degree of commitment in previous studies (Kubitsch 2022). The use of the remote pasts in the contexts of (25) and (26) seems to be connected to encoding common ground, engagement, as well as divergence of knowledge of the speaker and the hearer, as discussed previously in Section 4.

5.5. Frustrated mental states implied with the first remote past

As future counterfactuality seems to relate to the frustratives described in Section 4, I have scanned the remote past occurrences for possible connections to frustrated mental states. In (27), the future counterfactual function is connected to a frustrated, even angry emotion. In the context, the speaker confronts a lover, at whom she is mad at, as he has spent the night with another woman.

(27) Возьыттэм, мар дауртӥськод, тон монэ яратӥсько **шуид вал**
      ук?!

    Voźit-tem,   mar   daurt-iśko-d,   ton   mon-e
    shame-CAR   what   do-PRS-2SG   you   me-ACC

    jarat-iśko   šuįsa   šu-i-d   val   uk!?
    love-PRS.1SG COMP   say-PST1-2SG be.PST1 EMPH

    'It's shameless what you are doing, you said you loved me, didn't
    you?' (*Udmurt duńńe* 8/16/2013)

In (27), a frustrated reading may be due to the presence of *uk*, which is a
particle carrying a notion of common or shared knowledge and may be
interpreted as having an angry tone depending on the context. There is
no apparent temporal motivation for choosing a remote past instead of
a non-remote past: there is no given reference point or point in time that
the remote past clause would relate to. The motivation appears to be the
emphasized distancing notion of the remote past, which links the use to
the future counterfactual function: the speaker implies that her lover has
lied to her, or has changed his mind, and the speaker is not happy about it.

    As the presence of *uk* in (27) cannot be ruled out as the source of an
emotional implication, Lukeriya Shikhova provided me with another
example where the use of the remote past can have an angry tone (28).
In (28a), the first past is used, and the tone remains neutral; in (28b), the
first remote past is used and it implies the speaker's frustration.

(28) a. Верай ни, но эшшо огпол верало.

    Vera-j   ńi,   no   eššo   ogpol   vera-lo.
    say-PST1.1SG already and   again once   say-FUT.1SG

    'I said already, but I will say again.' (neutral tone)

   b. **Верай** ни **вал**, но эшшо огпол верало.

    Vera-j   ńi   val,   no   eššo   ogpol   vera-lo
    say-PST1.1SG already be.PST1 and   again once   say-FUT.1SG

    'I said already, but I will say once more!' (dissatisfied tone) (Examples
    produced by Lukeriya Shikhova)

According to Lukeriya Shikhova, the dissatisfied implication in (28b) aris-
es from the form: the speaker wants to emphasize that what she is saying
has already been said, possibly a long time ago, and the recipient(s) should
have integrated the message, but it is implied that they have not. As the

possible frustrated implication is taken into consideration, one may notice that Zaguljaeva's example (9) (Section 4) has a very similar structure and clausal type to (27) and (28), and when I consulted Svetlana Edygarova on the matter, she confirmed that the use of the remote past form gives the utterance a dissatisfied undertone.

5.6. Evidentiality and mirativity in the second remote past

In (29), a future counterfactual relation is present, but instead of the false belief, the speaker uses the second remote past to express the actual course of events. In this example, the auxiliary *vilem* seems to act as a mirative marker instead of a remote past marker, which is in line with the results of Kubitsch (2022), who has previously noted *vilem* to mark mirativity without an intrinsic past reference.

(29) Кылсярысь, Ласло Викар гожтэ, макем трос шошма удмуртъ-ёслэн вашкала дырысен воштйськытэк кылем, «измем, кын-мем» гуръёссы. Нош учконо ке, со удмурт зоутлэсь (гурлэсь) но сюан зоутлэсь пӧртэм вариантъёссэс гинэ **гожтэм вылэм**.

Kilśariś,   Laslo Vikar gožt-e,   makem   tros   šošma
for.example László Vikár write-PRS.3SG how.much many Šošma

udmurt-jos-len vaškala dir-iśen voštiśki-tek kil'-em,
udmurt-PL-GEN ancient time-EGR change-ABS remain-PTCP.PST

"izm-em,   kinm-em"   gur-jos-si.   Noš
petrify-PTCP.PST freeze-PTCP.PST tune-PL-POSS.3PL but

ućk-ono ke, so udmurt zout-leś (gur-leś) no
look-NEC if he udmurt song-ABL tune-ABL and

śuan zout-leś pertem variant-jos-ses gine
wedding song-ABL different version-PL-POSS.3SG.ACC only

gožt-em   vilem.
write-PST2.3SG be.PST2

'For example, László Vikár writes how many of the old Šošma Udmurt tunes are[9] unchanged, "petrified, frozen". But when examined closer, he has [actually] only recorded different versions of Udmurt songs and wedding songs.' (*Udmurt duńńe* 3/15/2013)

---

9. Here a possessive structure is used, and as Udmurt does not use the copula in a present-tense clause, the clause is lacking a finite verb (and thus a tense marker).

In (29), the remote past predicate (*pertem variantjosses gine gožtem vilem* 'he has only recorded different versions') contradicts with what is previously stated in the present tense (*László Vikár gožte…* 'László Vikár writes'). The contrastive relation does not correlate to that which has been presented above: the old, false information is given in the present tense, whereas the actual state of affairs is expressed in the remote past (E – R, S). In (29), the use of the second remote past relates the clause to a prior expectation, which the use of the second remote past contradicts. This observation was confirmed by Svetlana Edygarova. In this case, the second past in the main verb of the remote past structure marks inferentiality, as when this is examined more closely, one may infer that the songs László Vikár has recorded were, in fact, just variants of a few songs. *Vilem*, on the other hand, marks the information as unexpected and contrary to what the speaker believed to be true before, which gives the form a mirative meaning. In this context, instead of a future counterfactual, the form has a counterexpectational meaning.

The use of the second remote past in this context resembles that of a corresponding Tatar form (30). In this context, the main verb in the evidential past marks inferentiality, while the evidential auxiliary *ikän* ('was') implies that the message given is based on an assumption.

(30) *Ej,   bezgä   qunaqlar kil-gän   ikän!*
      oh   we.DAT   guest.3PL come-PST.RES.INFER ASSUM
      'Oh, guests have [apparently] come to us!' (Greed 2014: 79)

Evaluative meanings and time are closely linked. The relation can be seen between two event times as evaluation moments on a timeline, when one event is marked for a mistaken belief or actions under such beliefs (frustrative or future counterfactual) or mirativity (Spronck 2012: 103–104). As Spronck (2012: 103–104) links evaluative meaning with time, he mentions the category of mirative aside from the frustrative mentioned in Sections 4 and 5.5. In the mirative construction, the information in the mirative is marked as unexpected for the speaker. In this context, the use of the form could also be described as an unprepared mind, which is very similar to that of the frustrative meaning (Spronck 2012: 104). Nonetheless, the perspective profiles of the forms are different: while the frustrative takes into consideration the past agent's mental state in regard to the actual course of events, the mirative meaning highlights the agent's mental state at the revelation of the course of events.

In (29), it has to be taken into consideration that as the main verb and the auxiliary seem to convey two different meanings connected with evidentiality, the form may not be a temporal composition but a double-marked evidential for referential meaning (main verb in the second past) and mirative meaning (*vị̆lem*). This could also be seen as evidential nesting, which is not an uncommon phenomenon in the languages of the world (Evans 2006: 102).

5.7. Summary

When comparing the first and the second remote past, the first thing to be noticed is that their temporal profile is very similar. It can be argued that the primary meaning of the forms is temporal: they represent general remote past forms with no specific past time reference. As all the other functions can be assumed to have arisen from the temporal meaning of the forms, they should be considered secondary, albeit pivotal functions when choosing to use a remote past instead of a non-remote past. Past tenses tend to develop modal meanings, and counterfactual modality has been considered a typical secondary function for pluperfects. In the Udmurt remote past, this manifests as future counterfactuality. Both forms may be used to express future counterfactual actions and events. Whereas the use of the first remote past may have frustrated or dissatisfied emotional implications, the second remote past may convey mirative meanings, and both forms thus participate in expressing mental states. Both forms may also be used anaphorically to refer to what has been previously discussed between the participants: in this case, the choice between the two forms is determined by the degree of commitment to the information. The frustrative use may arise pragmatically from the future counterfactual use, as the latter signals a disharmony between what has been said and done, or from the discourse-anaphoric use of referring to things discussed earlier, as the speaker wants to emphasize that the matter should be known to the participants.

All in all, as a temporal distance is present in all the occurrences, it can be assumed that the forms share a primary temporal nature. Nevertheless, as a future counterfactual meaning is present in most of the cases, the choice of a remote past over a non-remote past seems to be predominantly motivated by factors outside the scope of temporality. As Uusikoski (2016) points out, remote past is often chosen instead of a non-remote past on

highly subjective grounds, and the use of it is always optional. The semantic connection between a remote past and the future counterfactual use is clear: the reference event precedes the reference time, and there is a temporal distance between the two events. However, as a non-remote past could just as well be used, the remote past is favored instead of a non-remote past due to a mental distance between the subject at the event time and the subject at the reference time.

As the choice of the remote past is in general prone to be chosen based on subjective criteria, and past forms generally tend to acquire modal meanings, diachronic subjectification of the form from temporal to modal and pragmatic is a plausible explanation for the variance in the function of the forms.

6. Conclusions

The results of the analysis show that the finite remote pasts in Udmurt are rich in function and operate on multiple semantic domains. Contrary to what has been suggested in the recent Western grammars and textbooks, there is no aspectual difference between the forms: the predominant difference lies in encoding evidentiality. Temporally, their functions are in many ways similar to those of pluperfects: they are used to describe actions or events taking place earlier than other actions or events mentioned in the context. The forms can, however, also be used to express an indefinite, more generalized remote past, with no obligatory relation to another past reference time. Thus, the forms should not be addressed as pluperfects, but rather as general remote pasts which operate on a subjective level and could therefore always be expressed by means of simple pasts without a change in the temporal ordering of the utterance.

As the choice between a remote and a non-remote past is by default not restricted, the remote pasts seem to have developed meanings and functions that not only convey temporal meanings, but also carry a variety of modal and pragmatic notions. The most significant result of the study is the proposition that the first remote past is predominantly modal, as it is used to express future counterfactuality. Some of the older previous studies have noted this feature, but the function has not been properly described nor addressed in any of the studies, and it has been outright ignored in the recent grammars and textbooks.

Another important finding is the emotional use of the first remote past: the first remote past may be used to express conflicted feelings between a previously held belief of the state of affairs and the actual state of affairs. The use of the finite remote past forms in contexts of discourse (interviews, dialogues) and subjective positioning (sharing life stories and experiences) supports the connection to mental states as well as the discourse-anaphoric functions of the form.

In the data representing the second remote past, the most important findings are that the form may acquire similar modal meanings as the first remote past, although not as often. The main difference between the first and the second remote past is that the second remote past is evidentially marked and conveys evidential and related meanings. The opposition between the first and the second remote past in referring to what has been previously discussed associates the first remote past with a stronger first-handedness as it marks shared knowledge, and the use of *val* and *vịlem* in analytic constructions in this function should be considered and analyzed in more detail in further studies.

Non-standard abbreviations used in glosses

PST1	first past	EMPH	emphatic particle
PST2	second past	EX	existential
ABS	absentive	ILL	illative
ADV	adverbial case	INE	inessive
ASSUM	assumptive particle	INFER	inferential
CAR	caritive	NEC	necessive
CNG	connegative	PTCL	particle
EGR	egressive	SPEC	speculative particle
ELA	elative	INFER	inferential

Primary data sources

Udmurt corpora: http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). 435–485.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2015. Evidentials: Their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2). 239–277.

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

Borik, Olga. 2006. *Aspect and reference time* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 13). Oxford: University Press.

Bradley, Jeremy & Klumpp, Gerson & Metslang, Helle. 2022. TAM and evidentials. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 904–935. 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 & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: an introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics 17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

de Haan, Ferdinand. 2010. Typology of tense, aspect, and modality systems. In Song, J. J. (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology*, 445–464. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1. 33–52.

Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of functional grammar. Part 2: Complex and derived constructions*. Edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Edygarova, Svetlana. 2022. Udmurt. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 507–522. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, Nicholas. 2006. View with a view: Towards a typology of multiple perspective constructions. In Cover, Rebecca T. & Kim, Yuni (eds.), *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 93–120. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: an introduction, Vol. 1*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goeringer, Keith. 1995. The motivation of pluperfect auxiliary tense in the Primary Chronicle. *Russian Linguistics* 19(3). 31–332.

Greed, Teija. 2014. The expression of knowledge in Tatar. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra & Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.), *The grammar of knowledge: A cross-linguistic typology*, 69–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HONTI, LÁSZLÓ. 2000. Die zusammengesetzten Vergangenheitstempora in den mit Turksprachen kontaktierenden finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen. In Luutonen, Jorma (ed.), *Volgan alueen kielikontaktit: Symposiumi Turussa 16.–18.8.2001* (Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielititeteen laitoksen julkaisuja 70), 29–34. Turku: Åbo Akademis Tryckeri.

IATRIDOU, SABINE. 2000. The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality. In *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(2). 231–270.

KEL′MAKOV, VALENTIN & HÄNNIKÄINEN, SARA. 2008. *Udmurtin kielioppia ja harjoituksia* (Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen 14). Second edition. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

KLEIN, WOLFGANG. 1994. *Time in language* (Germanic linguistics). London: Routledge.

KLEIN, WOLFGANG. 1995. A time-relational analysis on Russian aspect. *Language* 71(4). 669–695

KOZMÁCS, ISTVÁN. 2002. *Udmurt nyelvkönyv*. Szeged: JATE Press.

KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2019. Az evidencialitás és az első személy kapcsolata az udmurt nyelvben. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 115. 85–108.

KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2020. A létige múlt idejű alakjai mint modális partikulák az udmurt nyelvben. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 116. 97–137.

KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2021. Past tense forms of the verb 'be' in modal constructions in Udmurt. *Ежегодник финно-угорских исследований* (Yearbook of Finno-Ugric Studies) 15(4). 599–618.

KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2022. The semantic profile of the evidential past in Udmurt. In Baranzini, Laura & de Saussure, Louis (eds.), *Aspects of tenses, modality and evidentiality*, 262–287. Leiden: Brill.

LAURENT, RICHARD. 1999. *Past participles from Latin to Romance* (University of California Publications in Linguistics 133). Berkeley: University of California Press.

LEINONEN, MARJA & VILKUNA, MARIA. 2000. Past tenses in Permic languages. In Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 495–514. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LINDSTEDT, JOUKO. 2000. The perfect. In Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 365–383. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LYONS, JOHN. 1977. *Semantics 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LYONS, JOHN. 1995. *Linguistic semantics: an introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MATTHEWS, PETER 1997. *The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

NASIBULLIN = Насибуллин, Р. Ш. 1984. О некоторых аналитических формах глагола в удмуртском языке. *Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка*, 38–44. Ижевск.

NÉMETH, ZOLTÁN. 2019. A functional analysis of the analytic past tenses of the Udmurt language. *Ежегодник финно-угорских исследовании* (Yearbook of Finno-Ugric Studies) 13(3). 520–527.

PALMER, FRANK ROBERT. 2001. *Mood and modality*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patard, Adeline. 2019. To the roots of fake tense and 'counterfactuality'. In Patard, Adeline & Peltola, Rea & Roussel, Emmanuelle (eds.), *Cross-linguistic perspectives on the semantics of grammatical aspect*, 176–212. Leiden: Brill.

Peterson, Tyler. 2010. Examining the mirative and nonliteral uses of evidentials. In Peterson, Tyler & Sauerland, Uli (eds.), *Evidence from evidentials* (University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics), 129–159. Vancouver: UBCWPL and PNWLL Press.

Poppe, Nicholas. 1963. *Tatar manual* (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 25). The Hague: Mouton & co.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. *Elements of Symbolic Logic*. New York: The Macmillan company.

Šakirova = Шакирова, Г. Ф. 1953. Особенности говора татар Красно-октябрьского района Горьковской Области. *Академику В. А. Гордлэвскому к его 70-летию*, 292–301. Москва: Издательство академии наук СССР.

Serebrennikov = Серебренников, Б. А. 1960. *Категории времени и вида в финно-угорскикх языках пермской и волжской групп*. Москва: Издательство академии наук СССР.

Serebrennikov = Серебренников, Б. А. 1963. *Историческая морфология пермских языков*. Москва: Издательство академии наук СССР.

Siegl, Florian. 2004. The 2nd past in the Permic languages. University of Tartu. (Master's thesis.)

Skribnik, Elena & Kehayov, Petar. 2018. Evidentials in Uralic languages. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 525–553. Oxford: University Press.

Smith, Carlota. 1997. *The parameter of aspect* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 43). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Spronck, Stef. 2012. Minds divided: Speaker attitudes in quotatives. In Buchstaller, Isabelle & Van Alphen, Ingrid (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, 71–116. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tarakanov = Тараканов, И. В. 2011. Каронкыл. In Тимерханова, Н. Н. (ed.) *Удмурт кыллэн вераськонлюкеттодосэз (морфологиез)*, 138–254. Ижевск: Удмурт университет Издалельтсво.

Teptiuk, Denys. 2019. *Quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric (Komi, Udmurt, Hungarian, Finnish and Estonian)* (Dissertationes Philologiae Uralicae Universitatis Tartuensis 21). Tartu: University of Tartu Press.

Timberlake, Alan. 2004. *A reference grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Uusikoski, Risto. 2016. *Concepts of tense*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki. (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Modern languages, University of Helsinki.)

Van Valin, Robert & LaPolla, Randy. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winkler, Eberhard 2011. *Udmurtische grammatik* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 81). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Zaguljaeva = Загуляева, Б. Ш. 1984. Сложные формы давнопрощедшего времени в некоторых удмуртских диалектах. *Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка*, 45–58. Ижевск.