

Non-finite-based remote past in Udmurt: Resultative and experiential functions

The article deals with three constructions in Udmurt based on the past participle, combined with the past tense copula (*val*_{PST1}/*vjlem*_{PST2}). The aim of the study is to describe the functions of the following constructions: 1) the experiential construction + *val/vjlem*, 2) the resultative construction + *val/vjlem* and 3) the past participle + *val/vjlem*. These constructions are examined through the theory of perfects and pluperfects and whether the constructions carry out functions typical of those of a (plu)perfect. The results of the study show that the constructions in question carry out functions typical of pluperfects, such as past relevance perfect, past experiential and counterfactual functions. The construction formed with the past participle is found to be evidentially neutral and by and large corresponding to the first finite remote past, albeit declining in use and stylistically nuanced. The so-called resultative construction, on the other hand, may acquire various meanings depending on the semantics of the verb, among them past resultative action, past relevance perfect, and past continuative. Contrary to previous descriptions, the resultative construction may also occur with an external subject argument. Finally, the constructions also carry out similar discourse-pragmatic functions as their finite counterparts, such as attenuating questions, expressing assertivity, mirativity, and marking a pre-mirative context.

1. Introduction
 2. What is (more than) perfect?
 - 2.1. The perfect in Udmurt
 - 2.2. Remote past categories in Udmurt
 3. Data and research
 4. Analysis
 - 4.1. The past experiential
 - 4.2. Past participle + *val*
 - 4.3. The past resultative
 5. Conclusions
- Abbreviations
Primary data sources
References

1. Introduction

Uralic languages use a variety of both finite and non-finite verb forms that by definition fit clearly into the said categories. However, many forms and constructions are more ambivalent in regards to their (non-)finiteness (Ylikoski 2022: 936). In Udmurt, a central Uralic language of the Permic group, events and actions in the past can be referred to by using a variety of synthetic and analytic past tenses. The two synthetic past tenses are the first past (1) and the second past (2) (see e.g. Bartens 2000; Winkler 2011; Kubitsch 2022), of which the former is either evidentially neutral or associated with firsthand knowledge, and the latter an evidential past form. The analytic past tense system consists of various combinations of finite or non-finite verb forms and the unchanged past tense form of the copula *val/vilem*, such as the remote past constructions with the lexical verb in the first (3) or the second past tense.

- (1) Со студент вал.
So student val.
 3SG student be.PST1
 ‘S/he was a student.’ (non-evidential)
- (2) Со студент вылэм.
So student vilem.
 3SG student be.PST2
 ‘S/he was [apparently, as I have heard] a student.’
- (3) Со толон тонэ утчаз вал но, öз шедьты.
So tolon ton-e utčá-z val no,
 3SG yesterday 2SG-ACC search-PST1.3SG be.PST1 but
ę-z šedťj.
 NEG.PST1-3SG find.CNG
 ‘He was looking for you yesterday but did not find you.’
 (Kel'makov & Hännikäinen 2008: 269)

Although the analytic constructions have been mentioned and often briefly described in grammars and other studies (see e.g. Serebrennikov 1960; Zaguljaeva 1984; 1986; Bartens 2000; Kozmács 2002; Tarakanov 2011; Winkler 2011), the descriptions remain general, offering many options for both form and function without an exhaustive insight into when and why certain constructions are preferred over another and what the full semantic profiles of the individual constructions are. In a recent study, however, the finite-based

remote past constructions have been found to carry out temporal, modal, and pragmatic functions (Saraheimo 2022). Most prominently, the finite remote pasts are used modally to indicate that the event or action deviates from or contradicts the course of events in the real world or fails to receive an expected continuation, much like in (3), where the action of the subject does not result in the intended outcome. Furthermore, the constructions cannot be considered as past perfects and should thus be viewed as general remote pasts rather than pluperfects (Saraheimo 2022). Additionally, the finite constructions have pragmatic functions, such as expressing evidentiality, mirativity, and emphasis (Saraheimo 2022; Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023).

In addition to finite-based constructions, there are similar pluperfect-like constructions based on non-finite forms of the lexical verb. These constructions are the past experiential construction (4), which denotes an experience the speaker possesses, and formally consists of a genitive-marked subject, a person-marked past participle, and the existential copula; the so-called resultative construction (5) based on the inessive-marked past participle, and lastly, the past participle combined with *val/vjlem* (6).

- (4) Со музей сярысь мынам кылэме вал ини.
So muzej śariś mīnam kīl-em-e
 that museum about 1SG.GEN hear-PTCP.PST-POSS.1SG
val inī.
 be.PST1 already
 'I had already heard about that museum.' (Udmurt duńńe, 6 June 2007)
- (5) Нылмурт синмаськемын вал лесниклы.
Nīlmurt śinmaśk-em-īn val lesńīk-lī.
 woman fall.in.love-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1 forester-DAT
 'The woman had fallen in love ~ was in love with a forester.'
 (Udmurt duńńe, 21 Oct. 2013)
- (6) Мон та сярысь вунэтэм вал ини.
Mon ta śariś vunet-em val inī.
 I that about forget-PTCP.PST be.PST1 already
 'I had already forgotten about that.' (Udmurt duńńe, 23 Oct. 2009)

The constructions presented above are often mentioned in grammars in connection with participles or as for (6), in connection with other analytic remote past constructions, but without further elaboration on how and when exactly the constructions are used and when a certain construction

is preferred over another (see e.g. Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000; Šutov 2011; Tarakanov 2011; Winkler 2011). The aim of this paper is to describe the use of these constructions in which the lexical verb is in a non-finite form, more precisely, in the past participle, as opposed to the variants based on a finite-conjugated main verb and *val/vilem*. These analytic constructions largely resemble pluperfects, and the categories of the perfect and pluperfect will be discussed in terms of the characteristics of the constructions that correspond to prototypical (plu)perfects. Furthermore, this study participates in the ongoing discussion concerning the analytic past formation and functions in the Uralic languages of the Middle Volga region, in which similar analytic past tense patterns are manifested (see e.g. Spets 2023 for analytic past tenses in Mari). In a broader crosslinguistic context, this article adds to the general typological knowledge of the pluperfect, remote past, resultativity, and the use of the ‘be’-verb in analytic past tense constructions.

In the following I argue that in Udmurt, there is no unambiguous grammatical category representing the category of a pluperfect, but a variety of constructions which carry out functions typical of pluperfects. Although the actions are expressed by non-finites, the main functions are, especially when combined with *val/vilem*, typically associated with predicates, and the investigated constructions should be considered as participants in the past tense predication of Udmurt. As for the resultative construction, the study takes into account the recent studies that suggest the construction also carries out functions of a present perfect, or even a preterite (Asztalos 2022; Asztalos & Szabó 2023), and thus the functions and syntax of the past resultative might also be affected by reanalysis. The study shows that depending on the semantics of the verb, the past resultative construction may acquire resultative and continuative meanings and operate on different temporal levels. Evidential notions are not found in the construction where the unmarked past participle is combined with *val*, although the construction often occurs in a pre-mirative context. On the other hand, constructions built around the second past copula *vilem* carry referative and inferential evidential notions and possess a mirative extension.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I present the relevant theory and previous studies, reflecting on how the phenomena involved have been described in the Udmurt language. In Section 3, I elaborate on the data and research methods. The results of the analysis are laid out in Section 4, and the conclusions are summarized in Section 5. The analysis shows that the non-finite based remote past constructions do fulfill

functions typical and expected of pluperfects, but possess also other noteworthy and mutually overlapping functions and features which should be taken into consideration while performing research on corresponding constructions in Uralic and beyond.

2. What is (more than) perfect?

The perfect is an aspecto-temporal category used to express actions in the past that hold relevance in the present frame (Comrie 1976; Bybee et al. 1994; Lindstedt 2000; Comrie 2021). Typically, the actions expressed by perfects are completed, although one of the attested Indo-European semantic extensions for perfects includes universal or continuative action (Comrie 2021: 5). Perfects have a universal tendency to develop from completives and resultatives, of which the latter is the most common source for perfects in European languages (Lindstedt 2000: 366). Resultatives originally express a change in the state of the subject (7). The resulting state causes the current relevance of the past action (8). The present relevance is often morphologically reinforced through an auxiliary, as perfects tend to be periphrastic constructions (Bybee et al. 1994; Comrie 2021: 2).

(7) Italian

Siamo andat-i.

be.PRS.1PL go.PTCP-M.PL

‘We have gone [and are therefore no longer there].’

(8) English

I have already eaten [and therefore I am no longer hungry].

The perfect is a crosslinguistically attested category (Comrie 2021: 2). Of the typical sources for perfects listed by Bybee & Dahl (1989: 67–68), two are relevant for Udmurt: first, combining the copula with a past participle of the main verb, and second, a possessive construction involving a past participle of the main verb. While perfects with an auxiliary ‘be’-verb are crosslinguistically common, ‘have’-perfects have been considered by and large as an Indo-European phenomenon, although perfect constructions with ‘have’-verbs or other possessive constructions have also been attested outside the Indo-European family (Comrie 2021). According to Leinonen & Vilkkuna (2000), Udmurt lacks an unambiguous category of a perfect, but uses different inflectional categories to express meanings typically attributed to perfects. The events expressed through these forms may be moved into an even

earlier frame by combining them with *val/vjlem*, in which case the resulting constructions resemble pluperfects in Standard Average European (SAE).

Due to its fluid nature as a category between aspectual and temporal or verbal and non-verbal categories, the perfect is particularly susceptible to semantic change (Lindstedt 2000: 366). The semantic development of the perfect is crosslinguistically very similar. The most frequent extensions of the perfect include the experiential (especially in negated clauses, see e.g. Dahl 2021), the aforementioned universal or continuative meaning, and inferential and reportative evidentiality (Lindstedt 2000; Comrie 2021: 5–6). As regards Udmurt, the resultative, the experiential, the evidential, and as shown in Section 4.3, continuative meanings are relevant.

The pluperfect is a frequent perfect-related category in SAE languages. However, the pluperfect has larger variation in its definition and functions, and many languages have been claimed to have the category of pluperfect even when they do not have an unambiguous category of perfect (Dahl 1985: 144). Dahl also points out that the pluperfect tends to develop other secondary or extended uses uncharacteristic of perfects, such as counterfactual modality and less restricted use with time adverbs (Dahl 1985: 144–146; Comrie 2021). Concerning the counterfactual functions, pluperfects crosslinguistically indicate not only that a given situation preceded another past situation but emphasize that this situation belongs to another temporal plane, separated from the plane of the current narrative. In other words, the pluperfect distinguishes events in the discourse that fall outside of the main narrative line. Thus, the pluperfect could be said to mark a certain mental operation, where a return to a previous time frame takes place, breaking the order of event development (Plungjan 2004: 284–285; see also Givón 1982 and Plungjan 1998).

In some languages, such as Finnish and Argentinian La Paz Spanish, pluperfects are known to have developed referative¹ and evidential functions (see Lampela 2004: 27–34 and Pallaskallio 2016 for Finnish; for La Paz Spanish, see e.g. Quartararo 2020). In Udmurt, evidentiality and the modal aspects are of specific interest, as the second past is by default evidential, and the ‘be’-verb in analytic past tenses may inflect in either the first (witnessed information or evidentially neutral) or the second (evidential) past.

1. I choose to use the term *referative* instead of *reported* in the context, as past perfects are characteristically used to relay the speech of another person, while reported evidentials mainly mark the information source as other (Lund 2015: 64–68; Pallaskallio 2016: 103–109).

In the following Sections 2.1 and 2.2, I will discuss the categories of perfect and other related categories, such as the resultative and the experiential, reflecting on how these phenomena manifest in the Udmurt language, such as the pluperfect-like constructions these forms participate in.

2.1. The perfect in Udmurt

Udmurt represents the Permic subgroup of the Uralic languages. Udmurt also belongs to the Volga–Kama Sprachbund, which consists of Uralic and Turkic languages spoken in the Middle Volga region. Affected by contact-induced processes due to intense and long-standing language and cultural contacts, the languages spoken in the area share a remarkable amount of common properties, such as rich agglutinative inflection, evidential verbal categories and an SOV word order. An abundant analytic past tense predication is also typical of the Volga-area languages (Honti 2000; Bradley et al. 2022).

In their study on the past tenses of Permic languages from a typological perspective, Leinonen & Vilkuna (2000) present three inflectional categories which have functions typical of perfects in Udmurt: the evidential second past, the resultative construction, and the experiential construction. Traditionally, the difference between the first and the second past tenses is described as evidential (Aikhenvald 2004: 26, 28; Tarakanov 2011: 189; Skribnik & Kehayov 2018: 539). The first past tense is predominantly a general or evidentially neutral past, although contextually it is sometimes associated with eyewitness and direct evidence. The first past may also be used to express assimilated knowledge or a higher degree of certainty and commitment. The second past is used to express actions and events based on indirect evidence, most importantly hearsay and inference, while also marking mirative notions and a lower degree of certainty and commitment (Siegl 2004; Kubitsch 2022; see also Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000). When used in the first person, evidential forms in Udmurt denote the speaker's lack of control, which refers to a semantic content of non-volitionality (Curnow 2003: 42–43; Kubitsch 2022; see Section 4.2).

The Udmurt second past forms derive from the Permic past participle, which is also the base of the evidential second past in Komi, a Permic language closely related to Udmurt. While Udmurt has developed a particular inflectional paradigm for the second past tense (the *Kjri̯kmas* variant in Table 1), the Komi paradigm uses the plain past participle with the adjectivizing

Table 1: The two variants of the Udmurt second past in the positive conjugation, the Kirjkmäs variant (standard, widespread) and the Bavlj variant (dialectal, narrow spread) (Saarinen & Kel'makov 1994: 132–133).

	Kirjkmäs	Bavlj
1SG	<i>mjiniškem</i>	<i>mjineme</i>
2SG	<i>mjinemed</i>	<i>mjinemed</i>
3SG	<i>mjinem</i>	<i>mjinem(ez)</i>
1PL	<i>mjiniškem(mi)</i>	<i>mjinemmi</i>
2PL	<i>mjinil'lam(di)</i>	<i>mjinemdj</i>
3PL	<i>mjinil'lam(zi)</i>	<i>mjinemzi</i>

suffixes *-a* (SG) and *-aęs'* (PL) in the third person forms. The Komi paradigm resembles the dialectal Bavlj variant presented in Table 1, and according to the reconstruction of the Permic second past by Csücs (2005), it is closer to the original form. The other inflectional categories with perfect functions in Udmurt are based on the same participle. Udmurt has previously used the past participle to express resultative past, which is known to have a connection with evidentiality through the element of inference, resulting in the form grammaticalizing into an evidential past (Asztalos & Szabó 2022; Szabó 2022). The grammaticalization of the evidential second past could have triggered the marking of other functions of the past participle with additional markers to avoid the overlapping of distinct inflectional categories.

For experiential past, Udmurt uses a periphrastic construction based on a past participle inflecting for the possessive conjugation (identical to the Bavlj second past in Table 1) combined with the present existential *vań*, or, if manifesting a past frame, with *val/vjlem*. This construction is mentioned in several grammars and studies on Udmurt tenses (Nasibullin 1984; Bartens 2000: 237–238; Winkler 2001: 47–48; Kel'makov and Hännikäinen 2008: 235). When formed with a present copula, the construction resembles a (present) perfect in an experiential function (9) (Leinonen & Vilkkuna 2000: 508).

- (9) Тынад кылэмед вань-а революционеръяс сяръсь?

Tjnad kjl-em-ed vań-a revolucioner-jos śariś?
 you.GEN hear-PTCP.PST-POSS.2SG be.PRS-Q revolutionary-PL about
 'Have you [ever] heard about the revolutionaries?'
 (Leinonen & Vilkkuna 2000: 509)

Leinonen & Vilkkuna (2000: 509) point out that the semantic connection to an experiential perfect is clear: the experiential perfect often occurs in

languages as a grammaticalized ‘have’ construction, where the speaker is considered to possess the experience of having done something. The experiential perfect has also been described as a category that expresses distinct qualities of an agent due to past experiences (Bybee et al. 1994: 62; Lindstedt 2000: 369), and these kinds of attributes are characteristics of the agent.

Should a past participle be used in a predicative position, it displays the inessive marker *-jn*. The *-(e)mjn* construction has regularly been referred to as the resultative construction or described as denoting the result of the action expressed with the verbal head (Bartens 2000: 239; Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000: 504; Šutov 2011: 272; Winkler 2011: 115). Prototypically, it is formed from a transitive verb and takes on an impersonal meaning: the participle then denotes a result of a change in the patient argument’s state, as in (10) (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000: 504–505).

(10) Укно усьтэмын.

Ukno ušt-em-jn.

window open-PTCP.PST-INE

‘The window is open.’ (Leinonen & Vilkuna 2000: 505)

In the first Udmurt grammar by Venjamin Pucek-Grigorovics from 1775, the *-(e)mjn* construction is not presented (Alatyrev 1975), nor does it occur in the first folklore collection by Bernát Munkácsi (1887). In the first grammar, the past participle is claimed to have perfect and resultative meaning, and it occurs also in the complement position. During the twenty-first century, it has been attested that the perfect and resultative meaning is now much more often expressed by the resultative construction compared to the second past tense (Szabó 2022: 124–128). The use of the inessive case in the resultative construction originates in the essive functions of the Udmurt inessive. In addition to its locative meaning ‘in’ (11), the inessive case in Udmurt is used in an essive function (‘as’, 12) (Edygarova 2017: 312). The essive is a category of a “state of being” or an impermanent state described for many Uralic languages. Udmurt has no essive case, but both the inessive and instrumental cases are historically and functionally linked to essives (de Groot 2017: 2; Edygarova 2017).

(11) Удмуртиын уйлiсько.

Udmurti-jn ul-iško.

Udmurtia-INE live-PRS.1SG

‘I live in Udmurtia.’

(12) Дышетйсьын ужасько.

Djšetiš-ŷn uža-ško.

teacher-INE work-1SG.PRS

‘I work as a teacher.’ (Winkler 2011: 56)

The meaning of the resultative construction is best described as “being in a state”, while also expressing the action leading to the state, which fits the typology and definition of resultatives. Another category expressing states is the stative, which, as opposed to resultatives, makes no explicit reference to the cause of the state (Nedyalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 6). The resultative construction may, depending on the semantics of the verb, acquire both stative and resultative meaning. This is a consequence of the aspectuality of the resultative, as it implies an unlimited or ongoing duration through its stative meaning. Thus, the resultative, although often intuitively associated with completed action i.e. perfectivity, has an affinity to the imperfective aspect (Nedyalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 16). In Chinese, for instance, the marker for resultativity and progressivity is one and the same. A locative marker, however, is more prominently associated with progressives (Bybee et al. 1994: 128). Such locative progressive markers exist also in some Western Uralic languages (e.g. Finnic, Saami). In the Saami progressive forms such as North Saami *mannamin* (13), the final element *-n* in the suffix *-min* goes back to the Proto-Uralic locative case marker **-na*, the ancestor of the inessive and instrumental case markers in Udmurt and the essive case marker in Saami and Finnic (Edygarova 2017: 312; Ylikoski 2017: 229).

(13) North Saami

Ovlla ii astan go šlubistit
Ovlla NEG.3SG have.time.PST.CNG except gulp.down.INF

gáfe ja dalle lei mannamin.
coffee.SG.GENACC and then be.PST.3SG go.PROG

‘Ovlla only had time to sip the coffee, and then he was already going.’
(Kuokkala 2021: 339)

In addition to transitive verbs, the Udmurt resultative construction may be formed with intransitive verbs (Leinonen & Vilkuuna 2000: 504–505; Šutov 2011: 272). In this case, the construction expresses a change in the state of the subject, i.e. the result of an action affecting the subject. The use of an intransitive verb in the resultative is demonstrated in (14) through comparing the uses of the resultative and the first and the second past.

Later on, Asztalos (2022) corrected her statement to include peripheral and even some core unergatives, which in turn have an agentive (active) subject. According to Asztalos (2022), the construction accepts peripheral unergative intransitives expressing smell emission, physiological processes, and controlled processes of motion such as *bižilini* ‘run’ (16), while uncontrolled, non-motion processes, such as *djrekjani* (‘tremble’) are not accepted. Certain core unergatives, some controlled, non-motion processes such as *užani* ‘work’ (17), may occur.

- (16) Анае [...] ас вакытаз куасэн бызьылэмын.
Anaj-e [...] *as* *vakjt-a-z* *kuas-en* *bižil-em-ijn*.
 mother-POSS.1SG self time-INE.POSS.3SG ski-INS run-PTCP.PST-INE
 ‘My mother skied in her youth.’ (Asztalos 2022)
- (17) Зоја Ермакова 30 ар ужамын фермаын.
Zoja Jermakova *30 ar* *uža-m-ijn* *ferma-ijn*.
 Zoja Ermakova 30 year work-PTCP.PST-INE farm-INE
 ‘Zoja Ermakova worked 30 years on a farm.’ (Asztalos 2022)

Crosslinguistically, resultativity is typical for unaccusative intransitive verbs as well as transitive verbs. During the earliest stages of perfects, transitive verbs drop the agent and present the patient in subject position (Comrie 2021: 6–7). Extending the formation of resultatives into transitive verbs without a change in the diathesis happens in later stages of perfect development. It is noteworthy that the Udmurt resultative may also occur with unergative intransitives, which is untypical of resultatives, as well as with some transitive verbs “with an external argument as the subject of the *-(e)mijn-* construction” (Asztalos 2022; see Section 4.3). Recently, Asztalos & Szabó (2023) have brought up the possibility that the resultative construction in Udmurt may be a resultative on the path of grammaticalization to a perfect. As mentioned above, and also brought up by Asztalos and Szabó, in Udmurt a development from a resultative to an evidential

transitives into two different types. In short, for unaccusatives, the subject is internal, i.e. unaccusative verbs have a patient subject, while unergative verbs have an agent subject (for a more detailed description, see Perlmutter 1978). The unergative/unaccusative split has been later described to divide further into core and peripheral unaccusatives and unergatives, of which the peripheral ones show more variance crosslinguistically in how they behave syntactically, whereas the core verbs are more uniform in their syntactic properties (Sorace 2000).

perfect has already happened once, and thus a consequential development would not be unexpected. This notion will be taken into consideration in Section 4.3, where the past resultative construction is analyzed.

2.2. Remote past categories in Udmurt

Udmurt uses a variety of analytic past constructions. The languages of the Volga–Kama region have a particular model for analytic past formation, which consists of the main verb in finite conjugation combined with the unchanged auxiliary past form of the ‘be’-verb (Honti 2000; Bradley et al. 2022). In Udmurt, two remote past forms may be formed by combining the main verb in the first past with *val* or the main verb in the second past combined with *vilem*, or, less frequently, with *val*. I will refer to these two forms as the first and the second remote past, respectively. The auxiliary follows the main verb, as the prototypical word order is SOV (Vilkuna 1998; 2022). Traditionally, these are referred to as the pluperfects in Udmurt (Serebrennikov 1960; Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 2008). In the latest Western³ grammar descriptions and textbooks (Kozmács 2002; Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 2008; Winkler 2011), the difference between the first and the second remote past is characterized as aspectual: the first remote past is described as a progressive, whereas the second remote past is allegedly a resultative or completive. This claim, however, has recently been tested and shown to be incorrect (Saraheimo 2022). The grounds for labeling these forms pluperfects have also been scrutinized, as they are clearly not past perfects, and their temporal profile corresponds more to those of general remote pasts. Additionally, the forms are frequently used in modal and pragmatic functions (Saraheimo 2022; see also Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023). In addition to these forms, the experiential and the resultative construction may combine with *val/vilem*, connecting the actions with a past time frame instead of the present, resulting in constructions largely resembling pluperfects.

-
3. The notion of the grammars and descriptions being “Western” is based on the fact that Uralistics have been studied actively both in Russia and Europe, while different traditions prevail in European and Russian linguistics. This is also due to the language barrier, and it is often visible in the descriptions of Uralic languages that some notions and conclusions concerning certain grammatical categories are based on erroneous interpretations of source materials, and then prevail in subsequent works if the description of the category is not thoroughly revised.

Grammars and language descriptions typically include different morphological variants of the two remote pasts in Udmurt. While accounts of the first remote past are uniform, the inflectional properties and the motivation for the variation of the second remote past are more ambiguous. Table 2 shows variants for the remote pasts in the published Udmurt grammars, textbooks, and more specific case studies. As seen in Table 2, earlier descriptions label the PST1 + *val* variant as the second remote past, whereas the constructions based on a participle or second past are referred to as the first remote past. This could be due to a change in the prevalence of different forms, or due to the later studies finding it more consistent to refer to the first-past-based forms as the first remote past or pluperfect and the second-past-based forms as the second remote past or pluperfect. In my study, I refer to constructions based on finite second past forms as the second remote past, whereas the construction including first past forms is labeled the first remote past.

Table 2: The remote past (pluperfect) structures as presented in previous studies

	First remote past	Second remote past
Serebrennikov 1960	PTCP.PST(-POSS) + <i>val</i> / PST2 + <i>vilem</i>	PST1 + <i>val</i>
Zaguljaeva 1984	PTCP.PST(-POSS) + <i>val</i> / PST2 + <i>vilem</i>	PST1 + <i>val</i>
Kel'makov & Hännikäinen 1998	PST1 + <i>val</i>	PTCP.PST(-POSS) + <i>val</i> / PST2 + <i>vilem</i>
Kozmács 2002	PST1 + <i>val</i>	PST2 + <i>val/vilem</i>
Winkler 2011	PST1 + <i>val</i>	PTCP.PST(-POSS) / PST2 + <i>val</i>
Tarakanov 2011	PST1 + <i>val</i>	PTCP.PST(-POSS) + <i>val</i> / PST2 + <i>vilem</i>

As Table 2 shows, there are three constructions to which the label *second remote past* has been applied: a main verb in the second past combined with either *val* or *vilem*, or the past participle (optionally) combined with a possessive marker, co-occurring with *val*. Within the scope of this article the last variant is relevant, as it is based on a non-finite form of the main verb. It cannot go unnoticed that this construction is strikingly similar to the past experiential, the only difference being that the subject is marked here in the nominative instead of the genitive in the past experiential. Subject

marking, however, does not always reveal the construction type, as overt subject expression is not required in either case. A possessive-marked past participle also resembles the Bavli variant of the evidential second past conjugation (see Table 1 in Section 2.1), which is the more archaic second past variant. The evidential⁴ properties of the PTCP.PST(-POSS) + *val* construction are not discussed in older studies, such as Serebrennikov (1960) and Zagulyaeva (1984). Both Serebrennikov and Zagulyaeva describe it as a variant of the first remote past (PST1 + *val*), while other grammars, such as Tarakanov (2011: 182–184) and Winkler (2011: 100), describe it as a variant of the second remote past, yet neither of them take a clear stance on whether the construction is evidential or not, either. According to Bartens (2000: 208), the form may be interpreted either as a second-hand evidential or evidentially neutral. While Tarakanov claims that the evidentiality of all the analytic constructions is determined by the inflection of the past copula, he also states that the three remote past constructions – PST1 + *val*, PTCP.PST(-POSS) + *val*, and PST2 + *vilem* – are functionally identical and he presents the latter two constructions as variants of one inflectional category. Skribnik & Kehayov (2018) claim that the construction is a witnessed remote past, but in their description of the analytic past tenses in the Uralic languages, the first remote past (PST1 + *val*) is not taken into account, i.e. only PTCP.PST(-POSS) + *val* / PST2 + *vilem* are presented.

As mentioned above, Tarakanov (2011) claims that the evidential value of the analytic past forms is defined by the tense of the copula. Spets (2023) has recently suggested analyzing the ‘was’-element in the formally corresponding analytic tenses of Mari as a retrospectivization particle, one which operates on a clausal level. As such, the element cannot shift epistemic modal or evidential values of other clausal elements to the past, as they rank higher than time in the scope hierarchy (18) (Aikhenvald 2004: 96; Nuyts 2014: 48).

(18) Scope hierarchy of different TAME values

epistemic modality / evidentiality > time > aspect > state of affairs

It can, however, according to the chosen tense (evidential or non-evidential) define the evidential value of the whole clause. While the study at hand mainly examines each construction as a whole, the status of *val* and

4. As pointed out by the reviewer, evidentiality was a lesser-known category in the 1960–1980s, but the epistemic properties of the second past as a category of second-hand knowledge or inference were already well known by that time, and similar characteristics were not described for the construction in question.

vjlem as auxiliaries or particles is subject to debate (see e.g. Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023, and Spets 2023 for Mari), and this observation will be taken into account while defining the evidential status of the forms. If this is the case, the PTCP.PST(-POSS) + *val* construction should rather be characterized as a variant of the first remote past than the second remote past, assuming that the crucial characteristic of the second remote past is evidentiality. In the analysis below, I will scrutinize the evidential values of the PTCP.PST(-POSS) + *val* construction in more detail.

The functions of various remote past categories are, as a rule, only briefly described in available grammars and other studies. However, as pointed out in Section 1, it has recently been shown (Saraheimo 2022) that the finite first remote past and the finite-based second remote past are predominantly used modally, while also maintaining a temporal function, marking a remote past event, typically preceding another past event (past reference time). In the predominant modal function, the event shown in the remote past contradicts the states of affairs or, more precisely, course of events, in the actual world. The action expressed in the remote past, or the result of it, may be annulled, is intended but unrealized, or differs from reasonable or presumable expectations (Saraheimo 2022; Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023). In this function, the construction largely resembles the *bylo* construction in Russian (19) (see e.g. Goeringer 1995; Kagan 2011), as well as pre-mirative context marking attested in some Turkic and Samoyedic languages (19) (Skribnik 2023). A pre-mirative context is a concept used to describe a sequence in storytelling that precedes an unexpected event, typically but not exclusively expressed in a mirative form (Skribnik 2023). In the Buryat example (20), a terminative converb⁵ is used in a pre-mirative function, while mirativity per se has no dedicated miratives, and mirativity is expressed through periphrastic forms with mirative extensions or through marking the pre-mirative context.

(19) Russian

Lena otkry-l-a bylo okno, no tut že
 Lena open-PST-F be.PST window.ACC but immediately

snova ego zakry-l-a.
 again 3SG.ACC close-PST-F

‘Lena opened the window but closed it again at once.’ (Kagan 2011: 79)

5. The terminative converb *-tAr* in Buryat marks a terminal boundary ‘A until B’, but also an unexpected succession of events (‘A, until unexpected B’) (Skribnik 2023: 251)

(20) Buryat

... *oj sooguur jaba-na xa. Tiige-že*
 forest in go-PRS[3SG/PL] PTCL.MOD V.DEM-CVB

jaba-tar-aa, baaxalda-taj uulza-ba xa.
 go-CVB.TERM-REFL bear-COM meet-PST[3SG/PL] PTCL.MOD

[The trickster wanted to hide his mother from the revenge of his last victim.] ‘(They) went into the forest. While (they) were walking this way, (they) met (lit. with) a bear.’ [The trickster fights with it.] (Skribnik 2023: 251)

The first remote past is most frequently used to express abnormally proceeding events, while the second remote past construction has a mirative extension, as also attested for the synthetic second past (Saraheimo 2022; Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023). The constructions have been shown to also carry out discourse-interactional and intersubjective functions, such as marking emphasis or (un)common ground (Saraheimo 2022; Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023). The categories investigated in this study, however, are syntactically different from juxtapositional finite-based analytic constructions, where both the ‘be’-verb and the lexical verb display the same, finite tense. Furthermore, in the finite-based analytic past tenses, *val/vilem*, originally third person singular forms of ***vili-* (‘be’), remain unchanged, whereas the analysis shows that in the past resultative construction, the evidential *vilem* may inflect for person (see Section 4.3, example 45). While the evidentially neutral *val* does not inflect for person, *vilem* has a full paradigm, and some occurrences of third person plural forms (*vililʹlam* ‘they [allegedly] had’) are attested.

The past resultative is not typically mentioned in the descriptions of Udmurt remote past or pluperfect categories. According to Leinonen & Vilkuna (2000: 511) it corresponds to PST2 + *val*, although they do explain the restrictions for the use of the resultative earlier in the paper. Bartens (2000: 240) describes the past resultative as being marked as a verbal construction rather than a nominal one when combined with a past copula, and she claims that the construction is then interpreted as the predicate of the clause. In this paper, I will consider both the past experiential and the past resultative as possible representatives of a remote past or pluperfect category in Udmurt.

3. Data and research

The study is performed on the basis of material found in newspaper texts. The analysis is carried out by examining the functional context of individual constructions, with special emphasis on semantic content typical of perfects and pluperfects. The textual genre of the data is also taken into consideration. Concerning the past resultative construction, I have paid special attention to the syntactic properties of the construction.

The study focuses on the Udmurt-language newspaper *Udmurt duńńe*, which mostly uses language considered standard literary Udmurt, although dialectal expressions are not avoided. The data is drawn from the Udmurt corpus (see References), which consisted of approximately 73 million tokens altogether at the time the data was drawn (2020–2021). In the event that a search in the *Udmurt duńńe* subcorpus yielded no results, some examples of the more infrequent constructions were drawn from other newspapers. Newspaper materials constitute 91% of the content, of which *Udmurt duńńe* is the biggest source. For the past experiential and the PTC.PST + *val* construction I have performed a search across the whole subcorpus of *Udmurt duńńe*, whereas for the past resultative the search was limited to the year 2013,⁶ as the past resultative occurs far more frequently than the other constructions. The 2013 subcorpus data comprises approximately 570,000 tokens. I have analyzed altogether 922 non-finite remote past clauses: 637 past resultatives, 262 past experientials, and 23 PTC.PST + *val* constructions. This includes all the occurrences found in the specified subcorpus.

As regards certain ambiguous examples, I have consulted three native speakers who also have an academic background in studying the Udmurt language: Svetlana Edygarova, Natalija Kozlovceva, and Irina Krestjaninova. Whenever native-speaker evaluations have been used to supplement the analysis, this has been mentioned accordingly.

In the transcription of the examples, Cyrillic (Russian) language data is transcribed according to the International Scholarly System, while authors and persons (e.g. Plungian, Yeltsin) with an established romanization of their names in the field will be referred to accordingly. For transcribing Udmurt, the Uralic Phonetic Alphabet (UPA) is used.

6. In cases with a person-inflected *vilem*, the search consisted of the whole corpus, because the occurrences were rare and a search for solely the year 2013 yielded only one hit. Some of the older and newer materials yielded examples

4. Analysis

The analysis is divided into three parts: first, I will present the findings concerning the use of the past experiential construction PTCP.PST-POSS + *val* (4.1), then the PTCP.PST + *val* construction (4.2), and finally the past resultative construction PTCP.PST-INE + *val* (4.3). Occurrences with both *val* and *vilem* are taken into consideration in each subsection.

4.1. The past experiential

As expected for an experiential, the past experiential occurs most frequently with perception verbs such as *kil̄ini* ‘hear’ and *ad̄žini* ‘see’. Perception verbs comprise half of the data: out of 262 occurrences, 129 (49%) are formed with perception verbs, as in (21).

- (21) Иже вуи нырысьсэ, но та фестиваль сярысь кылэме вал ини.
Iž-e vu-i nīrīsse, no ta
 Iževsk-ILL come-PST1.1SG first.time but this
festival' śariś kil-em-e val in̄i.
 festival about hear-PTCP.PST-POSS.1SG be.PST1 already
 ‘I came to Iževsk for the first time, but I had already heard of the festival before.’ (*Udmurt duññe*, 11 March 2011)

In (21), the speaker tells a story in the first past (*vui* ‘I came’), which is the evidentially neutral narrative tense and marks the reference time as past. The speaker then refers, in the past experiential (*kileme val* ‘I had heard’), to an earlier experiential event which holds relevance in the reference time. The adverb *in̄i* ‘already’ is frequently used with the past experiential.

In addition to perception verbs, mutative intransitive (motion) verbs, such as *vetlin̄i* ‘come’, *vuīlin̄i* ‘go, visit’, and *p̄ir̄in̄i* ‘enter’ (22), form a significant group in the data. Motion verbs are used in 36 clauses, which is 14% of the total amount of occurrences.

- (22) Та стадионэ азьвыл но пыраме вал. Но туэ нырысьсэ котькуд адымили сётъязы пукон вылэ нимысьтыз шунит валён.
Ta stadion-e aźvyl no p̄ira-m-e val.
 this stadium-ILL before PTCL enter-PTCP.PST-POSS.1SG be.PST1

with similar verbs used in other relevant examples of past resultatives combining with *vilem* (see Section 4.3, example 36).

No tue n̄jrīsse koʔkud adami-l̄j ʃotja-z̄j
 but this.year first.time every person-DAT give-PST1.3PL

pukon v̄ile n̄im̄īst̄jz šun̄j̄t val̄on.
 seat over individually warm cover

‘I had been to this stadium before. But this year was the first time they gave everyone a warm cover over their seat.’

(*Udmurt duññe*, 19 Sept. 2008)

Both perception verbs and motion verbs (21, 22) have a clear semantic connection to experientiality, which as an act often involves movement to a location or sensory reception, or both: having been to a place can be seen as a combination of sensory experiences. The rest of the verbs used in the context do not form uniform semantic groups, but one common verb occurring in the past experiential is *d̄īšets̄k̄j̄n̄j̄* ‘study’. In the data, these cases most often address the basic education of the referent, as in (23). With the verb *d̄īšets̄k̄j̄n̄j̄* the thought of using the past experiential as means of describing an agent’s qualities, namely whether they have an education or not, or to what extent they possess one, is especially imminent.

- (23) Соослэн 7–8 класс дышетскемзы вал — со трос.

Soos-len 7–8 klass d̄īšets̄k-em-z̄j val – so tros.
 they-GEN 7–8 class study-PTCP.PST-POSS.3PL be.PST1 that much

‘They had studied until grade 7 or 8 – that is a lot.’

(*Udmurt duññe*, 29 March 2013)

In (24), the use of both the present and the past experientials is on display, which makes this example of particular interest. In two subsequent questions addressed to the same person, with no apparent switch in the reference time, the speaker first uses the present experiential and then resorts to the past experiential.

- (24) Со доры дырт̄йзы оже бырем̄г̄ёслэн кышнооссы. «Оло, ад̄зы-лэмед вань мынэсьтымзэ? Пленын, тюрмаын, оло, кылэмед вал фамилизэ?»

So dor-i d̄jrt-i-z̄j ož-e bjrem-jos-len
 he at-ILL hurry-PST1-3PL war-ILL perished-PL-GEN

k̄išno-os-s̄j. “Olo, ad̄ž̄il-em-ed vañ
 wife-PL-POSS.3PL maybe see-PTCP.PST-POSS.2SG EX.PRS

m̄j̄nešt̄j̄m-ze? Pl̄en-̄j̄n, t̄urma-̄j̄n, olo,
 I.ABL-DEF captivity-INE prison-INE maybe

In (25), the speaker talks about how they were drawn to the violin, although they had never seen one before (*noku adžileme ej val* ‘I had never seen’). The negative past experiential occurs remarkably frequently with the temporal adverb *noku* (‘never’) which is present in almost every third negative past experiential clause.⁷ Even more frequent is the adverb *na* ‘yet’ (25).

While the tendency of an experiential to be used in negative form is crosslinguistic, it should be noted that some Turkic and Samoyedic languages use similar constructions (subject_{GEN} + PTCP.POSS + existential verb) to convey emphatic assertive meaning (‘something happened; so it was’) (Skribnik 2005; see also Baranova & Mishchenko 2022 for Turkic; Wagner-Nagy 2011 for Samoyedic). Similar use of the negative existential verb has been attested in Mari (Klumpp & Skribnik 2023: 1020). The first remote past (PST1 + *val*) has also been attested in emphatic contexts, and the possibility to analyze *val/vilem* as emphatic particles is currently subject to debate (Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023). In the following example, where the evidential existential *vilem* is used, an emphatic assertive meaning can be detected. With the experiential, *vilem* is mostly chosen in instances where the information source is not the speaker himself or herself, which in the case of a pluperfect most typically applies to situations where the speaker is citing someone else’s narration (27). In (27), the speaker summarizes what another person told them about the war. They first use the second past (*žalam* ‘he pitied’), and then resort to the past experiential construction (*djšetskemzi vilymte* ‘they had not studied’) to mark emphatic, assertive information (‘they indeed / in fact / really had not studied’). The quotative particle *pe* marks the interviewee as the source of the whole utterance, whereas the second past marks the lack of education as something that was told to the interviewee by someone else.

- (27) Туж жаям чош служить карем эшгӧссӧ, тросӧзлӧн, пе, дышеткемзы вылымтӧ.

<i>Tuž</i>	<i>žal'-am</i>	<i>čoš</i>	<i>služit'</i>	<i>kar-em</i>
very	pity-PST2,3SG	together	serve	make-PTCP.PST
<i>eš-jos-se,</i>		<i>tros-ez-len,</i>	<i>pe,</i>	
friend-PL-ACC.POSS.3PL		many-DEF-GEN	QTV	
<i>djšetsk-em-zj</i>		<i>vilymte.</i>		
study-PTCP.PST-POSS.3PL		be.PTCP.NEG		

7. In addition to *noku*, I have counted in adverbs with similar meaning, such as *ogpol no* or *odig pol no* ‘not once, never’.

‘He really pitied his friends, with whom he went to serve [in the army] together, as most of them, he says, [really] had no education.’
(*Udmurt duńńe*, 24 April 2012)

In conclusion, the past experiential construction is used in ways typical of experientials: it is mostly used with perception verbs and motion verbs, describing experiences the referent had in a given reference time or did not have until that moment. Characteristic of experientials, the construction occurs most often in the negative form. The construction is composed of a past participle of completed action combined with a past copula, and the results of the action are relevant at the reference time; thus, both formally and temporally, it fits the profile of a past perfect, although restricted to experientiality. When used with *vilem*, the construction has a referative evidential meaning. As shown in (24), if the time window for the event is located in the past, and it is specified and delimited in the clause – even when not specifically with a time adverb – Udmurt favors using the past experiential instead of the present experiential. According to a native speaker’s judgment, the past experiential construction with *val* may also have a discourse-pragmatic function, in which it attenuates the question. It should also be taken into consideration that similar constructions are used in other Uralic and Turkic languages to express assertive emphatic meaning, and according to the analysis, this holds true also for Udmurt. The assertive emphatic meaning could have given rise to experientiality: assertivity or a higher level of confidence most often occurs at the level of personal experiences.

4.2. Past participle + *val*

As discussed in Section 2.2, most Udmurt grammars mention the construction consisting of the past participle with, optionally, a possessive marker in second and third person forms⁸ (Serebrennikov 1960; Zagulyaeva 1984; Kel’makov & Hännikäinen 2008: 268; Tarakanov 2011: 182–184; Winkler 2011: 100). The evidential status is not clearly defined in any of the studies. Another problem arises in comparison with the experiential. When comparing Tables 1 and 2 (in which the Bavlj variant follows the

8. Zagulyaeva gives allomorphs to 2PL and 3PL, which correspond to the finite second past conjugation, but does not mention the finite second past as a possible variant of first person singular or plural.

model $\text{PTCP.PST}(-\text{POSS})$, see Section 2.1), it cannot go unnoticed that the paradigms of the past experiential and the past participle + *val* construction almost entirely coincide, except for the subject being marked in the genitive for the experiential. As these constructions differ only by the subject case marking, and the overt subject expression is not obligatory due to the general tendency to omit topical subjects in Udmurt, it is not easy to ascribe concrete elliptic examples to one of these constructions.

The data for the analysis of this non-finite based construction was conducted as follows. As pointed out in Section 3, the search for the year 2013 yielded only a few results for the construction in question, and therefore a search was carried out across the whole corpus of *Udmurt duńńe*. Altogether 50 possible matches were found. The constructions which had the participle marked with a possessive suffix but lacked overt subject expression all turned out to be experientials and were thus excluded from this group. A closer look at the remaining examples shows that some of them are first person plurals of *-anj* verbs,⁹ where the first past differs from the past participle by a final vowel *-i* which, in fact, may drop because of apocope (Edygarova 2010). As there were no occurrences of first person plural forms of *-inj*-verbs representing the construction in question, it is safe to assume that the aforementioned forms actually correspond to the first finite remote past ($\text{PST1} + \text{val}$), which have been excluded from the data. Furthermore, as the first-person singular possessive marker *-e* may also drop (Edygarova 2010), and thereby an overlap with the past participle results, I monitored the remaining data for 1SG forms with a clearly experiential meaning and excluded them from the data as experiential constructions. The remaining data consists of 23 occurrences, which is significantly less than the experiential (262 occurrences) and the second finite remote past, for which a search across the whole corpus gives 378 occurrences.

The use of the $\text{PTCP.PST} + \text{val}$ construction greatly resembles that of the first finite remote past as described briefly in Section 2.2. The construction

9. Udmurt verbal conjugation is traditionally divided into the first and the second conjugation. The first conjugation includes verbs with the infinitive in *-inj*, whereas the second conjugation comprises of verbs with the infinitive in *-anj*. In the *-inj* conjugation, the *-i* in the stem changes to *-i-* in the finite conjugation, but becomes *-e-* in the past participle, whereas in the *-anj* conjugation, the vowel *-a-* in the stem remains unchanged for all forms. This causes syncretism between 1PL (*-am(i)*) and the past participle, if apocope takes place. For a more illustrative presentation of the Udmurt verbal conjugation, see Winkler (2011).

typically denotes a remoter past, much like pluperfects in SAE languages: it marks an action or event taking place before other past events or actions mentioned in the context, as in (28), where the speaker talks about their professional aspirations during their school years.

- (28) «Комсомольская правда» газетэ гожтэт лэзи юрист луэме потэ шуыса, пöрамме печатлазы. Мон та сярсыс вунэтэм вал ини, дышетйсе öтиз учительское.

“Komsomolskaja pravda” gazet-e gožtet lež-i
 Komsomolskaya Pravda newspaper-ILL letter send-PST1.1SG

jurist lu-em-e pot-e
 lawyer become-PTCP.PST-POSS.1SG want-PRS.3SG

šujša, peram-me pečatla-zj. Mon ta
 COMP creation-POSS.1SG.ACC print-PST1.3PL I that

šariš vunet-em val iní, džšetis-e
 about forget-PTCP.PST be.PST1 already teacher-POSS.1SG

et-i-z učitelskoj-e.
 invite-PST1-3SG teachers.room-ILL

‘I sent a letter to the newspaper *Komsomolskaya Pravda* saying I want to become a lawyer, and they published my text. After I had already forgotten about that, my teacher invited me to the teacher’s room.’ (*Udmurt duńne*, 23 Oct. 2009)

In (8), the speaker first refers to how their letter got printed in a newspaper, in the first past (*peramme pečatlazj* ‘they published my text’). Again using the first past, the speaker then moves on to a later point in time, where their teacher invited them to visit the teacher’s room (*džšetise etiz* ‘my teacher invited’), but first they point out, with the remote past construction, that by the time this happened, they had already forgotten about the letter (*vunetem val iní* ‘I had already forgotten’). In this case, the use of the remote construction corresponds to a prototypical past-relevance perfect, as it expresses an event taking place before another past event, with consequences relevant at the time in which the subsequent event takes place.

The PTCP.PST + *val* construction often expresses an unfulfilled intention or expectation, or an initiated action or event, which is either interrupted or fails to receive an expected continuation (29). Thus, it marks a pre-mirative context. This function is also predominant for the first finite remote past (see Section 2.2).

- (29) Тау карыны шуыса берытскем вал, но мышказ нокин өвөл ни.
Tau kar-ɨɲi ʃujsa berjtsk-em val, no
 thanks make-INF COMP turn-PTCP.PST be.PST1 but
mjšk-az nokin evel ńi.
 behind-INE.POSS.3SG nobody NEG.EX.PRS anymore
 ‘He turned around to say thanks, but there was no longer anyone behind him.’ (Udmurt *duńne*, 9 July 2008)

In (29), the action expressed with the PTCP.PST + *val* construction (*berjtskem val* ‘he turned around’) did not lead to the expected result: the speaker turned around to express their gratitude, but to their surprise, there was no one to direct the intended thanks towards. For the most part, Udmurt uses the second past to convey mirative meaning, but in this case the unexpected revelation is expressed through a present negative existential (*evel* ‘is not’) instead. In Udmurt, a narrative present tense or *praesens historicum* is frequently used in past context, and here it conveys the meaning of a vivid immediacy of a firsthand account (see e.g. Quirk et al. 1985: 181 for English). The first finite remote past (PST1 + *val*) is often used in a similar context, cf. (30), where the pre-mirative context is marked with the first finite remote past, while the mirative is marked with *vjem* (‘be’, PST2), which is used as a mirative particle.

- (30) Мон тонэ бадžым ни кожай вал, нош тон весь анаедлэн вера-
 мезъя гине ульськод вылэм...
Mon ton-e badžym ńi koža-j
 I you-ACC big already reckon-PST1.1SG
val, noš ton veś anaj-ed-len
 be.PST1 but you always mother-POSS.2SG-GEN
vera-m-ez-ja gine uli-škod vjem...
 say-NMLZ-POSS.3SG-ADV only live-PRS.2SG be.PST2
 ‘I’ve reckoned you as a grown up, but you always turn out to act as your mother says...’ (Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023: 141)

When used in a clause with the conjunction *ke* ‘if’, the construction acquires a counterfactual modal function (31). As opposed to unfulfilled intentions, the counterfactual action or event is not intended or interrupted, as it does not take place to begin with.

- (31) Я, čok, ойдо, čok, оломар но мултэссэ супыльтыны кутски кадь.
 [...] Мон ке дорады чылкак мукетыз пумысен лыктэм вал.
Ja, čok, ojdo, čok, olomar no multes-se
 okay INJ INJ INJ something PTCL extra-ACC

supjilt-jinj kutsch-i kad. [...] Mon ke dor-adj
 chatter-INF begin-PST1.1SG like 1SG if side-ILL.POSS.2PL
čjilkak muket-iz pumišen ljkt-em val.
 completely other-DEF reason come-PTCP.PST be.PST1
 ‘Okay, so be it, I like, started talking about something redundant.
 [...] As if I had come to your place for a completely different reason.’
 (Udmurt *duññe*, 17 March 2010)

In order to determine whether the PTCP.PST + *val* construction has evidential or evidentiality-connected semantic content, we will take a closer look at examples (28) and (29). In (29), the rest of the story is mostly narrated in the first past, in which case genre marking or hearsay do not explain the use of an evidential – the context, however, is pre-mirative, but pre-mirative contexts also accommodate the use of PST1 + *val*. In (28), a mirative interpretation is possible: the action of forgetting could be seen as out of the speaker’s control, and therefore non-volitional. Here the three native informants were consulted in order to determine whether the constructions are interchangeable with the evidentially neutral first finite remote past (PST1 + *val*) and if so, if and how the change affects the meaning. Two of them claimed that the constructions are interchangeable without a change in the evidential semantic content, and both did find there to be a greater (temporal or mental) distance between *vunetem val* and the reference time than *vuneti val* (first finite remote past, PST1 + *val*) and the reference time. The third informant stated that the PTCP.PST + *val* variant could be interpreted as secondhand information, but not necessarily.

As a whole, the analysis does not support a scenario according to which the PTCP.PST + *val* construction would be evidential. Conclusively, the results fit the scope hierarchy of Nuyts (2014) and Aikhenvald (2004) mentioned in Section 2.2, as suggested by Spets (2023) for the Volga–Kama analytic pasts in general, where the tense of the past copula would define the evidentiality of the clause. This, of course, leads us to wonder about the combination of PTCP.PST + *vjlem* – a formally challenging question, as 3SG forms of the second past are identical with the unmarked past participle, and evidential forms in persons other than third persons are rare. A search in the corpus yielded no results for a combination of PTCP.PST + *vjlem* that would indisputably represent the construction in question. Nonetheless, especially concerning the formal correspondence, the function of the construction is similar to the finite second remote past (see e.g. Saraheimo 2022).

It should be pointed out, however, that the *PTCP.PST + val* constructions in the data are often found in texts representing poetry or fiction (short stories). The functions of the construction in these contexts correspond to the ones presented above, as shown in (32) where the use of the construction is used to mark a pre-mirative context.

- (32) Горд кышетэз мон басытэм вал,
 Горд кышет вуэ бездйз.
 Чебер пиез яратэм вал,
 Сьод, каргам война быдтйз.
 Из гурезь мон азе куашказ,
 Пыдме куажырак тйяз.
- Gord kjšet-ez mon bašt-em val,*
 red scarf-ACC I buy-PTCP.PST be.PST1
- gord kjšet vu-e bezd-i-z.*
 red scarf water-ILL fade-PST1-3SG
- čeber pi-jez jarat-em val,*
 beautiful boy-ACC love-PTCP.PST be.PST1
- šed, karga-m voina bđt-i-z.*
 black curse-PTCP.PST war kill-PST1-3SG
- Iz gurez mon aź-e kuaška-z,*
 stone mountain I front-ILL fall.apart-PST1,3SG
- pđ-me kuažyrak tija-z.*
 foot-POSS.1SG.ACC with.a.bang break-PST1,3SG
- ‘I bought a red scarf,
 [but] the red scarf faded in water.
 I loved a beautiful boy,
 [but] he died in the black, cursed war.
 A mountain of stone fell apart in front of me,
 broke my legs with a bang.’
 (*Udmurt duńńe*, 6 July 2015)

In (32), the speaker refers to two events which did not end the way she intended or was expecting: the red scarf she bought (*baštem val*) faded in water (*bezdziz*, first past), losing its red color, and the man she loved (*jaratem val*) died in war (*voina bđtiz* ‘war killed [him]’, first past). In the translation, this is illustrated by the adversative discourse particle ‘but’. In the rest of the poem, first past is used, although the actions follow one another, and thus one precedes the other. Therefore, there must be some other motivation for the use of *PTCP.PST + val*.

Concerning the negation of this construction, Winkler (2011: 98) does not present a negative paradigm, and the negative forms included in Kel'makov & Hännikäinen (2008), namely the *-mte* participle with possessive markers, are not found in the data. Zaguljaeva (1984) gives the same paradigm as Kel'makov & Hännikäinen, but with the option of leaving the possessive marker out. Negative constructions like these can indeed be found in the data, but when examined more closely, they appear to be negations of the past resultative and shall therefore be considered in Section 4.3.

In conclusion, the *PTCP.PST + val* construction is rare and mostly displays the same functions as the first finite remote past. In connection with the particle *ke*, the construction may be used counterfactually. As a rule, it does not have evidential semantic content and is often encountered in texts representing fiction or poetry. As mentioned in Section 2, the construction is based on a more archaic variant of the second past and could therefore be of more ancient origin. Considering these facts and the analysis conducted in this section, the construction can be considered a stylistic, declining alternative for the first finite remote past (*PST1 + val*).

4.3. The past resultative

The resultative construction appears remarkably often with the past copula *val*. With 630 occurrences in the corpus, it is overwhelmingly frequent in comparison to other remote past constructions, both finite¹⁰ and non-finite. This section seeks to shed more light on the use of the past resultative by elaborating on the prototypical use of the construction and, more precisely, by noting occurrences where the meaning cannot be described as resultative. In order to do so, I will discuss the syntactic properties of the verbs which are allowed in the construction, paying special attention to untypical occurrences. Lastly, I will take a closer look at how *vilem* behaves in the construction, both syntactically and semantically.

Much like the present resultative, the past resultative is prototypically, and most frequently, used in impersonal transitive clauses, where the agent is demoted and the object argument (patient) moves to the subject position. The resultative denotes the (changed) state of the patient. Temporally, the past resultative most typically expresses an action or event happening

10. In *Udmurt duññe* 2013–2014, 122 examples were found for the first remote past and 36 for the second remote past (cf. the total amount of 604 occurrences for the past resultative) (Saraheimo 2022).

in the same temporal order as a simple past tense (33), not locating the action as prior to another event. Thus, the temporal profile of it differs from that of a pluperfect.

- (33) Кылсярысь, Ижын тани кык пол ялймы нимаз нылпи сад усьтонъя конкурс. Та ивор паськыт вӧлмытэмын вал.
Kylsariš, Iž-in tani kjk pol
 for.example Iževsk-INE like.that two time
jali-mj nimaz niłpi sad ušton-ja
 announce-PST1.1PL separately child garden open-ADV
konkurs. Ta ivor paškjt velmiž-em-žn val.
 competition that news wide spread-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1
 ‘For example, in Iževsk such a competition for opening a kindergarten was announced twice. The news was spread widely.’
 (Udmurt duńne, 25 Jan. 2013)

The past resultative may also be formed from an intransitive verb. In most earlier descriptions, it has been claimed that the resultative may only be formed from intransitives that result in a change in the subject’s state, i.e. intransitives with no semantic subject, that is, unaccusatives, as in (34) (cf. Leinonen & Vilkkuna 2000; Asztalos 2011).

- (34) Нылмурт синмаськемын вал лесниклы.
Nilmurt šinmašk-em-žn val lesnik-ly.
 woman fall.in.love-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1 forester-DAT
 ‘The woman had fallen in love ~ was in love with a forester.’
 (Udmurt duńne, 21 Oct. 2013)

Asztalos (2022) points out that the present resultative construction also accepts a wide range of unergative intransitive verbs, such as the activity verbs *užani* (35), *veraškini* (36), and *keretiñi* (37). This holds true also for the past resultative. With unergatives, the resultative construction acquires typically an atelic reading (cf. Asztalos 2022). In (35), the construction would translate to the past perfect progressive in English, and in (36), the construction refers to an atelic event prior to another moment in the past. In these cases, the construction acquires a continuative reading. In (37), the situation is similar: when the informants were asked how the meaning of the construction would change if *val* were omitted from the clause, the informants stated that it would indicate the fight is still ongoing. Thus, in these instances, the construction has the meaning of a past-relevance perfect, or even a past continuous perfect.

- (35) Та нылкышно кема аръёс чоже ужамын вал ни.
Ta nilkışno kema ar-jos čože
 this woman long year-PL altogether
uža-m-ın val ni.
 work-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1 already
 ‘The woman had already been working for many years.’
 (Udmurt duńńe, 8 Feb. 2013)
- (36) Путинэз пуктыз Ельцин. Куспазы соос вераськемын вал: азь-
 выл президентлэсь командазэ возёно.
Putin-ez pukt-i-z Jelcin. Kusp-azi
 Putin-ACC put-PST1-3SG Yeltsin between-INE.POSS.3PL
soos verašk-em-ın val: aźvıl prezident-leś
 they talk-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1 former president-ABL
komanda-ze voź-ono.
 team-POSS.3SG.ACC keep-NEC
 ‘Putin was put [into his position] by Yeltsin. Among themselves, they
 had discussed: the previous president’s team had to be preserved.’
 (Udmurt duńńe, 25 July 2008)
- (37) Гажанэныды керетэмын вал ке, нырысь вамыш пумитаз лэсьтэ
 асьтэос.
Gažan-eni-dj keret-em-ın val ke, nırjś
 partner-INS-POSS.2PL quarrel-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1 if first
vamiş pumit-az lešt-e ašte-os.
 step against-ILL.POSS.3SG make-IMP.2PL yourself-PL
 ‘If you have fought with your partner, you shall take the first step [to
 make amends] toward them.’ (Udmurt duńńe, 22 March 2013)

Although the construction is characterized by its predominant resultative function, it co-occurs with both unaccusative and unergative verbs, and it may refer to continuative events. Thus, it should be taken into consideration whether the construction may be a resultative grammaticalizing into a perfect (Asztalos 2022; Asztalos & Szabó 2023; cf. Comrie 2021). As outlined in Section 2, Udmurt does not have an unambiguous category of a perfect, and the second past has assumedly developed from a resultative past participle (see e.g. Szabó 2022), so a similar development has already taken place earlier in the language. A possible way to examine the grammaticalization path to perfects is the ‘still’-test (Lindstedt 2000: 367). Adverbs of unlimited duration, such as ‘still’, can be used to test whether a

construction is grammaticalizing into a perfect. The resultative is considered a stative or statal variant of the perfect, and therefore, in the event that the construction does not permit an adverb of unlimited duration, such as ‘still’, it can no longer be considered to express a statal event (Lindstedt 2000; see also Nedyalkov & Jaxontov 1988; Bybee et al. 1994: 63–68). With some unaccusative motion verbs, such as *liktinji* (‘come’), a clause with the past resultative indeed does not permit ‘still’ (38). This holds true also for (36) and (37); with activity verbs, the use of an adverb of unlimited duration would mean that the structure would acquire an indisputably progressive meaning. In (38), the syntactic position of the place adverb is also unusual, as it typically would appear before the verb. This also supports the claim that instead of being understood as a complement clause, the past resultative construction indeed acts as a predicate.

(38) a. Тужгес но кыдѣкысез лыктэмын вал Туваысь.

Tužges no kjdokjš-ez likt-em-ïn val Tuva-jš.
 most distant-DEF come-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1 Tuva-ELA
 ‘The most faraway [guests] had come from Tuva.’
 (*Udmurt duńne*, 20 Feb. 2013)

b. *Тужгес но кыдѣкысез лыктэмын на вал Туваысь

Tužges no kjdokjš-ez likt-em-ïn na val Tuva-jš.
 most distant-DEF come-PTCP.PST-INE still be.PST1 Tuva-ELA
 ‘The most faraway [guests] had still come from Tuva.’

As Asztalos (2022) points out, the resultative construction sometimes, albeit rarely, displays transitive verbs with an external argument¹¹ as the subject, such as (39) and (40). As stated in Section 2.1, extending the formation of perfects to transitive verbs without a change in the diathesis belongs to the later stages of perfect development (Comrie 2021). While there were no such occurrences in the 2013 *Udmurt duńne* examples, a search through the entire corpus yielded results also for some transitive verbs with external arguments as subjects. Interestingly enough, most of them were

11. Here the term *external argument* is applied, as the subject of the resultative construction is typically an internal argument: the experiencer if intransitive (subject-oriented resultatives), the patient if transitive (object-oriented resultatives). In examples and descriptions given in previous literature, the resultative construction cannot acquire a subject if it is object-oriented, but as proven by the above examples, in some cases this is possible.

perception verbs, such as *adžinj* ('see'), *kilinj* ('hear'), and *šedinj* ('find, feel'), which are commonly associated with experiential meaning and the semantic group most often encountered in the experiential construction.

- (39) Арми улон сярысь мон зэмзэ ик трос кылэмын вал ни. Уродзэ но, зечсэ но ожыт өз вералэ.

Armi ulon šariš mon zem-ze ik
 army life about I truth-DEF.ACC EMPH

tros kil-em-ijn val ni. Urod-ze
 much hear-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1 already bad-DEF.ACC

no, žeč-se no ežit e-z vera-le.
 also good-DEF.ACC also little NEG.PST-3SG speak-CNG.PL

'I had really heard a lot about army life. Bad things as well as good things were told a lot.' (*Ošmes*, 19 Feb. 2015)

- (40) Мон ваньзэ сое ас вылам шөдэмын (вал).

Mon vań-ze so-je as vił-am
 I all-DEF.ACC that-ACC self on-INE.POSS.1SG

šgd-em-ijn val.
 feel-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1

'I (had) experienced [lit. felt] all of it myself.'

(*Udmurt duńne*, 28 March 2008; clause altered by the author)

In (39), a man talks about what he had heard about the army before joining it himself. Although there is no explicit object, it is implicit; *kilinj* is a transitive verb which requires at least an elliptic object, and the adverb *tros* ('much') implies the presence of an implicit object, as well as the accusative-marked *žečse* ('good') and *urodze* ('bad') in the following clause. In (40), the speaker refers to their experience-based competence as a teacher, saying that they learned what they know through doing, using the verb *šedinj* ('feel'), and in this context, both the external subject and object-marked internal patient are present. *Val* could be added to the clause if it was part of a past narrative, and it would not otherwise affect the interpretation of the clause.

The resultative can be negated in two ways, either by using the negative participle *-mte* (41) or an analytic construction where the copula is negated (42) (see Section 2.2). The analytic construction, which has the Northern Udmurt negation pattern, is more common in the data, although the synthetic form (Southern type) is presented as primary in grammars. The negative participle suffix *-mte* in the Southern type is a special element preserved mainly as the negative counterpart for the past participle, and

the negation is understood to act on the level of the whole clause, including the predicate, not only on the level of the NP.¹²

- (41) Судьялэн юрттйсьёсыз но, администраторъёсыз но соку чак-
ламтэ вал.
Sud'ja-len jurttiś-jos-iz no, administrator-jos-iz
court-GEN assistant-PL-POSS.3PL and administrator-PL-POSS.3PL
no soku čakla-mte val.
and then appoint-PTCP.NEG be.PST1
'Court assistants and administrators had not yet been appointed.'
(*Udmurt duńńe*, 22 Aug. 2011)
- (42) Бюджетын талы коньдон чакламын öй вал.
Bjudžet-ın ta-lj końdon čakla-m-ın
budget-INE that-DAT money allocate-PTCP.PST-INE
ę-j val.
NEG.PST1-1SG be.PST1
'No money was allocated for it in the budget.'
(*Udmurt duńńe*, 23 Aug. 2013)

The resultative construction may also combine with *vilem* and thereby have an evidential meaning, although in the corpus, occurrences with *vilem* are remarkably rarer than with *val*: whereas with *val*, a search of the 2013 *Udmurt duńńe* subcorpus yields almost 568 results, PTCP.PST-INE + *vilem* occurs only 36 times. *Vilem* may mark the construction as hearsay (43), but it may also have a mirative meaning (44). Thus, the construction also functions as a past mirative strategy.

- (43) 22-тй июне Кам шурын Сарапул палан 19 аресъем егит пи
быриз, со кудземын вылэм но ярдурын эшгёсыныз шутэтскем.
22-ti ijuń-e Kam šur-ın Sarapul pal-an 19 ares-jem
22-ORD June-ILL Kama river-INE Sarapul side-INE 19 age-DER
jegit pi bir-i-z, so kudž-em-ın
young boy die-PST1-3SG he intoxicate-PTCP.PST-INE
vilem no jardur-ın eš-jos-ıńj-z šutetsk-em.
be.PST2 and shore-INE friend-PL-INS-POSS.3SG repose-PST2.3SG
'On July 22, along the Kama River in the Sarapul area, a 19-year-old
young man died, he was [reportedly] intoxicated and unwinding
with his friends at the riverside.' (*Udmurt duńńe*, 24 June 2013)

12. As pointed out by the reviewers, a question may arise whether the *-mte* participle here should be interpreted as a caritive adjective, corresponding to the

- (44) Пиез вордйськиз. Но Алёшалы шудтэм аджон гожтэмын вылэм.
Pi-jez vordisk-i-z. No Aloša-lj
 son-POSS.3SG be.born-PST1-3SG but Alěša-DAT
šud-tem adžon gožt-em-ijn vilem.
 happiness-CAR fate write-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST2
 ‘His son was born. But [it turned out that] an unhappy fate was
 predestined [lit. written] for Alěša.’ (*Udmurt duńńe*, 9 Aug. 2013)

In (43), *vilem* clearly marks hearsay in the construction: it is first stated as an evidentially neutral fact that the young man died, while the alleged circumstances, his intoxication (*kudžemjn vilem* ‘he had been drunk’) and having spent time in his friends’ company (*šutetskem* ‘relax, repose, unwind’) are reported information. In (44), the story of the unfortunate life of a rich man’s son is told: while the family was wealthy and well-established in their village, their son was, unexpectedly, born disabled and faced many other difficulties later in his life. Hearsay is not the motivation for *vilem* in this context, as the rest of the story is told in the first past. In this case, as confirmed by the informants, *vilem* marks the information as counterexpectational relative to the preceding course of events, which is semantically connected to mirativity (see Aikhenvald 2012; Saraheimo & Kubitsch 2023).

In a past resultative construction, *vilem* can inflect for person, although there were only a few occurrences to be found in the materials. In all the occurrences, *vilem* inflects in the third person plural form *vililʹlam*, as in (45) (cf. example 43).

- (45) Кылем арын Городлэн нуналаз 36 йыртэмась кырмемын вал.
 Та пöлысь 27-ез куджэмын выйллям.
Kilem arjn Gorod-len nunal-az 36
 last year-INE city-GEN day-ILL.POSS.3SG 36
jirtemaś kirm-em-ijn val. Ta peł-įś
 criminal catch-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST1 that among-ELA
27-jez kudž-emjn vililʹlam.
 27-DEF intoxicate-PTCP.PST-INE be.PST2.3PL
 ‘Last year during the city-day celebrations 36 lawbreakers were
 detained. Of them, 27 were intoxicated.’ (*Udmurt duńńe*, 10 June 2016)

type “prepared” vs. “unprepared”. As pointed out in Section 2.2, negation through non-finite elements is not uncommon in Uralic languages, and the negative participle suffix *-mte* in Udmurt is only encountered in connection with the past participle and the negative conjugation of the finite second past.

The past resultative is by far the only remote past construction where *vilem* may inflect for person. The observation is in line with the construction favoring the negation to happen analytically through the copula instead of using the negative participle suffix. In the finite constructions, it is the main verb that inflects for person, and therefore marking person on the copula is redundant. Person marking on the copula also speaks in favor of describing the construction as an analytic predicate.

As the construction is remarkably rare with *vilem*, and in some of the occurrences *vilem* acts as a mirative strategy rather than evidential, a question arises whether the resultative construction itself has an evidential value. The vast majority of the past resultative occurrences do represent non-witnessed information, e.g. accounts of political decision-making, which could be considered factual and thus common knowledge, but also stories from the lives of third parties, which were supposedly not witnessed firsthand by the speaker and not considered common knowledge. As mentioned in Section 2, pluperfects tend to develop referative, inferential, and evidential functions, and this could also be the case for the past resultative.

Conclusively, the analysis shows that the past resultative construction may acquire different meanings depending on the semantics of the verb. Some of these cannot be described as resultative, as they carry notions of continuative action, although the connection of resultatives and imperfectivity is known in typological studies (see Section 2.1). Temporally, the past resultative is most often used in a way corresponding to a simple preterite, and thus does not act typically like a pluperfect. It may, however, depending on the semantics of the verb, acquire also a past perfect meaning. With transitives and unaccusatives, the construction typically acquires a resultative reading, while with unergatives, the construction tends to acquire a past continuative reading. While the possible grammaticalization to a perfect should be studied more carefully, paying attention primarily to the use of the present resultative, the analysis shows evidence of the construction going through the said process. Of especial interest are the cases where a resultative construction is formed with a transitive verb in the presence of an external subject, as this kind of development is usually associated with later stages of perfect development. The use of the construction seems to also overlap with the experiential and may thus be acquiring experiential meaning.

5. Conclusions

The analysis above shows that the non-finite-based remote past constructions partially fulfill functions typical and expected of past perfects, and thus possess features typical of pluperfects. Temporally, the description of the PTCP.PST + *val* and the past experiential constructions matches one of a typical pluperfect: they are most typically used to describe actions or events that have taken place and were completed before the reference time, which is also located in the past. The constructions may also be used to express counterfactuality, and they can be used, and are sometimes even favored instead of other forms, in connection with time adverbs – as opposed to typical SAE pluperfects, in Udmurt, a delimiting temporal adverbial may trigger the copula to switch from present to past.

The past experiential is restricted to express past experientiality and assertivity, while the past resultative may also express experiential meanings. Taking into consideration the frequent use of the past resultative, as well as other factors mentioned in Sections 2 and 4.3, it should be noted that the resultative construction seems to be grammaticalizing into a perfect and the past resultative may therefore overlap with other forms with functions typical of perfects. The PTCP.PST + *val* construction should be considered as either a witnessed remote past, or as an evidentially neutral remote past functionally corresponding to the first remote past (PST1 + *val*), albeit being more rarely used and mostly encountered in prose or poetry. All the constructions may combine with both the evidentially neutral or witnessed *val* and the evidential *vilem*, although concerning PTCP.PST + *val*, the negative occurrences found in the data are identical in form to the second finite remote past. With the past resultative, *vilem* may also inflect for person, which supports analyzing the construction as an analytic verbal form instead of a complex predicate. Occurrences with *vilem* are rare, though, and raise the question of whether the resultative itself has reportative or evidential functions – it is known that past perfect constructions tend to have referative functions. In connection with the past experiential, the construction may be used in questions for pragmatic reasons, as to attenuate the question, and the past resultative construction with *vilem* has a mirative extension. As the constructions in question share similarities with SAE pluperfects, but also differ from them, the study offers future insights into what should be taken into account when studying corresponding categories in other Uralic languages, such as Mari, or the Turkic languages of the Volga–Kama Sprachbund.

Abbreviations

1	first person	INE	inessive
2	second person	INF	infinitive
3	third person	INJ	interjection
ABL	ablative	M	masculine
ACC	accusative	MOD	modal
ADV	adverbial case	NEC	necessive
ATTR	attributive	NEG	negative
CAR	caritive	NMLZ	nominalizer
CNG	connegative	ORD	ordinal number
COM	comitative	PL	plural
COMP	complementizer	POSS	possessive
CVB	converb	PROG	progressive
DAT	dative	PRS	present tense
DEF	definitive article	PST1	first past
DEM	demonstrative pronoun	PST2	second past
DER	derivative	PTCL	particle
EGR	egressive	PTCP	participle
ELA	elative	Q	question marker
EMPH	emphatic particle	QTV	quotative
EX	existential	REFL	reflexive
F	feminine	SG	singular
GEN	genitive	SUP	superlative
GENACC	genitive-accusative	TERM	terminative
ILL	illative	V	verb
IMP	imperative		

Primary data sources

Udmurt corpora: Main corpus of literary Udmurt.

https://udmurt.web-corpora.net/udmurt_corpus/search

References

- AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3). 435–485. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0017>
- ALATYREV 1975 = Алатырев, В. И. 1975. *Первая научная грамматика удмуртского языка*. Ижевск: Издательство «Удмуртия».
- ASZTALOS, ERIKA. 2011. Transitive and intransitive passivization in Udmurt. In Csúcs, Sándor & Falk, Nóra & Tóth, Viktória & Zaicz, Gábor (eds.), *Congressus XI Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Piliscsaba, 9–14. VIII. 2010, Pars VI: Dissertationes symposiorum ad linguisticam*, 53–61. Piliscsaba: Reguly Társaság.

- ASZTALOS, ERIKA. 2022. Diagnosing unaccusatives in Udmurt. (Paper presented at the Syntax of Uralic Languages 4 conference, 14–16 June 2022, Saint Petersburg.)
- ASZTALOS, ERIKA & SZABÓ, DITTA. 2023. The resultative spiral in Udmurt. (Paper presented at the Cyclicity and the Theory of Language Change conference, University of Manchester, 17–18 July 2023.)
- BARANOVA, VLADA V. & MISHCHENKO, DARIA F. 2022. Non-verbal negation markers and the Negative Existential Cycle in Bashkir and Kalmyk with some typological parallels. In Veselinova, Ljuba & Hamari, Arja (eds.), *The negative existential cycle* (Research on Comparative Grammar 2), 403–439. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- BARTENS, RAIJA. 2000. *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 238). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- 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.
- BYBEE, JOAN & DAL, ÖSTEN. 1989. The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world. *Studies in Language* 13:1. 51–103.
- 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.
- COMRIE, BERNARD. 2021. Introduction. In Crelling, Robert & Jügel, Thomas (eds.), *Perfects in Indo-European languages and beyond* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 352). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.352.01com>
- CSÚCS, SÁNDOR. 2005. *Die Rekonstruktion der permischen Grundsprache* (Bibliotheca Uralica 13). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- CURNOW, TIMOTHY JOWAN. 2003. Nonvolitionality expressed through evidentials. *Studies in Language* 27. 39–60.
- DAHL, ÖSTEN. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Bath: Basil Blackwell.
- DAHL, ÖSTEN. 2021. Indo-European perfects in typological perspective. In Crelling, Robert & Jügel, Thomas (eds.), *Perfects in Indo-European languages and beyond* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 352), 635–668. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- DE GROOT, CASPER. 2017. Introduction. In de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state* (Typological Studies in Language 119), 1–28. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- DELANCEY, SCOTT 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1. 33–52.
- EDYGAROVA, SVETLANA. 2010. *Категория possessивности в удмуртском языке*. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli kirjastus. (Doctoral dissertation, Department of Estonian language and general linguistics, University of Tartu.)

- EDYGAROVA, SVETLANA. 2017. The Udmurt essive and its functional counterparts. In de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state* (Typological Studies in Language 119), 309–323. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 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.
- GIVÓN, TALMY. 1982. Tense-aspect-modality: the Creole prototype and beyond. In Hopper, Paul (ed.), *Tense-aspect: Between semantics and pragmatics* (Typological Studies in Language 1), 114–163. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- GOERINGER, KEITH. 1995. The motivation of pluperfect auxiliary tense in the Primary Chronicle. *Russian Linguistics* 19(3). 31–332.
- 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 kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 70), 29–34. Turku: Åbo Akademis Tryckeri.
- KEL'MAKOV, VALENTIN & HÄNNIKÄINEN, SARA. 2008. *Udmurtin kielioppia ja harjoituksia* (Hilfsmittel für das Studium der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen 14). 2nd edn. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- KLUMPP, GERSON & SKRIBNIK, ELENA. 2022. Information structuring. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 1018–1036. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KOZMÁCS, ISTVÁN. 2002. *Udmurt nyelvkönyv*. Szeged: JATE Press.
- KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2020. A létige múlt idejű alakjai mint modális partikulák az udmurt nyelvben. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 116. 97–137.
<https://doi.org/10.15776/NyK/2020.116.3>
- 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* (Cahiers Cronos 31), 262–287. Leiden: Brill.
- LAMPELA, KATI. 2004. Pluskvamperfekti nykytarinoissa. Helsingin yliopisto. (Master's thesis.)
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197099.3.495>
- LINDSTEDT, JOUKO. 2000. The perfect – aspectual, temporal and evidential. In Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, 365–383. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197099.3.365>
- LUND, KARL-HENRIK. 2015. Retrospection and the observer in a narrative text (in Danish and Russian). *Scando-Slavica* 61(1). 57–72.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00806765.2015.1042757>
- MUNKÁCSI, BERNÁT. 1887. *Votják népköltészeti hagyományok*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- NASIBULLIN 1984 = Насибуллин, Р. Ш. 1984. О некоторых аналитических формах глагола в удмуртском языке. In Вахрушев, В. М. (ed.), *Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка*, 38–44. Ижевск: Удмуртский научно-исследовательский институт.

- NEDYALKOV, VLADIMIR P. & JAXONTOV, SERGEY. 1988. The typology of resultative constructions. In Nedyalkov (ed.), *Typology of resultative constructions* (Typological Studies in Language 12), 3–62. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- NUYTS, JAN. 2014. Analyses of the modal meanings. In Nuyts, Jan & van der Auwera, Johan (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of modality and mood*, 31–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- PALLASKALLIO, RITVA. 2016. Absoluuttisuudesta relatiivisuuteen: Pluskvamperfektin diskursiiviset funktiot kertovissa teksteissä. *Virittäjä* 120(1). 84–121.
- PERLMUTTER, DAVID M. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4, 157–189.
- PETERSON, TYLER. 2010. Examining the mirative and nonliteral uses of evidentials. In Peterson, Tyler & Sauerland, Uli (eds.), *Evidence from evidentials*, 129–159. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics.
- PLUNGIAN 1998 = Плу́нгян, Влади́мир Алекса́ндрович. 1998. Плюсквамперфект и показатели «ретроспективного сдвига». In Выдрин, В. Ф. & Кибрик, А. А. (eds.), *Язык. Африка. Фильбе: Сборник статей в честь А. И. Коваль*, 106–115. СПб.: Европейский дом.
- PLUNGIAN 2004 = Плу́нгян, Влади́мир Алекса́ндрович. 2004. О контрафактических употреблениях плюсквамперфекта. In Ландер, Ю. А. & Плу́нгян, В. А. & Урманчиева, А. Ю. (eds.), *Ирреалис и ирреальность*, 273–291. Москва: Гнозис.
- QUARTARARO, GERALDINE. 2020. Epistemic uses of the *pretérito pluscuamperfecto* in La Paz Spanish. In Kittilä, Seppo & Bergqvist, Henrik (eds.), *Evidentiality, egophoricity and engagement* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 30), 239–262. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- QUIRK, RANDOLPH & GREENBAUM, SIDNEY & LEECH, GEOFFREY & SVARTVIK, JAN. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- SAARINEN, SIRKKA & KEL'MAKOV, VALENTIN. 1994. *Udmurtin murteet* (Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja 47). Turku: Turun yliopisto.
- SARAHEIMO, MARI. 2022. The finite remote past tenses in Udmurt: From temporal to modal and pragmatic functions. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 67, 161–203. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. <https://doi.org/10.33339/fuf.113825>
- SARAHEIMO, MARI & KUBITSCH, REBEKA. 2023. Discourse-interactive functions of Udmurt *val* and *vylem*. *Linguistica Uralica* 59(2). 130–153. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3176/lu.2023.2.04>
- SEREBRENNIKOV 1960 = Серебренников, Б. А. 1960. *Категории времени и вида в финно-угорских языках пермской и волжской групп*. Москва: Издательство академии наук СССР.
- SIEGL, FLORIAN. 2004. The 2nd past in the Permic languages. University of Tartu. (Master's thesis.)
- ЏКЛЈАЕВ 2000 = Шкляев, Александр. 2000. *Ванумысь вануме. Критика: статьяос, обзоръёс, диалогъёс, очеркъёс, портретъёс, рецензиос, модъ ваёнъёс*. Ижевск: Удмуртия.

- SKRIBNIK, ELENA. 2005. From complex sentence structures to complex predicates: Some grammaticalization patterns in Siberian languages. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 58. 139–148.
- SKRIBNIK, ELENA. 2023. Reading Siberian folklore: Miratives, pre-mirative contexts and “Hero’s Journey”. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra & Bradshaw, Robert L. & Ciucci, Luca & Wangdi, Pema (eds.), *Celebrating indigenous voice: Legends and narratives in languages of the Tropics and beyond* (Anthropological Linguistics 5), 237–259. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- SKRIBNIK, ELENA & KEHAYOV, PETAR. 2018. Evidentials in Uralic languages. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 525–553. Oxford: University Press.
- SORACE, ANTONELLA. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76(4), 859–890.
- SPETS, SILJA-MAIJA. 2023. Temporal perspective and its formal background: An explanation for aspectual synonymy between simple and analytic past tenses in Mari. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 99, 275–318.
<https://doi.org/10.33340/susa.123024>
- ЏУТОВ = ШУТОВ, А. Ф. 2011. Каронним. In Тимерханова, Н. Н. (ed.), *Удмурт кылэн вераськонлюкеттодосэз (морфологиез)*, 138–254. Ижевск: Удмурт университет издательство.
- SZABÓ, DITTA. 2022. *Az evidencialitás történeti-tipológia vizsgalata az udmurtban*. Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- ТАРАКАНОВ 2011 = ТАРАКАНОВ, И. В. 2011. Каронкыл. In Тимерханова, Н. Н. (ed.), *Удмурт кылэн вераськонлюкеттодосэз (морфологиез)*, 138–254. Ижевск: Удмурт университет издательство.
- VILKUNA, MARIA. 1998. Word order in European Uralic. In Siewierska, Anna (ed.), *Constituent order in the languages of Europe* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 20(1)), 173–234. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- VILKUNA, MARIA. 2022. Word order. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 904–935. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WAGNER-NAGY, BEÁTA. 2011. *On the typology of negation in Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic languages* (Memoires de la Société Fenno-Ougrienne 262). Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- WINKLER, EBERHARD. 2011. *Udmurtische Grammatik* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 81). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- YLIKOSKI, JUSSI. 2017. The essive in North Saami. In Casper de Groot (ed.), *Uralic essive and the expression of impermanent state* (Typological Studies in Language 119), 217–241. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- YLIKOSKI, JUSSI. 2022. Non-finites. In Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages*, 936–949. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ZAGULJAEVA = Загуляева, Б. Ш. 1984. Сложные формы давнопрошедшего времени в некоторых удмуртских диалектах. In Вахрушев, В. М. (ed.), *Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка*, 45–58. Ижевск: Удмуртский научно-исследовательский институт.