

MARI SARAHEIMO (Helsinki), REBEKA KUBITSCH (Szeged)

DISCOURSE-INTERACTIONAL FUNCTIONS OF UDMURT *val* AND *vylem*

Abstract. The paper discusses the discourse-interactional functions of the past tense forms of the 'be'-verb in Udmurt (*val* and *vylem*). We focus on the analytic past tenses, in which forms of the 'be'-verb are traditionally analysed as auxiliaries. Our main attempt is to characterise these discourse-interactional uses, and their relation to analytic past tense forms and functions. We claim that these discourse-interactional functions should rather be attributed to the past tense forms of the 'be'-verb than to the analytic tenses themselves. In connection, the pragmatization of *val* and *vylem* can be postulated. We propose that the use of *val* and *vylem* as tools of organising discourse is also linked to intersubjectivity. The results of our study show that *val* and *vylem* have a variety of discourse-interactional functions, independently of the tense of the finite verb in the analytic past tense. They are used to mark adversative, contrastive, additive, old, new and emphatic information. Similar phenomena occur in contact languages as well.

Keywords: Udmurt, analytic past tenses, 'be'-verb, discourse particles, intersubjectivity.

1. Introduction

In Udmurt, the past tense forms of the 'be'-verb *val/vylem* ('was') have a wide range of functions in different clausal positions. In a present tense context, Udmurt does not use a copula, whereas in a past context, either the non-evidential (often called the first past) *val* or the evidential (often called the second past) *vylem* will be used (1). The paradigm of the 'be'-verb (**vily-*) is highly incomplete: morphologically, it only has past tense forms (Winkler 2011 : 92). In the first past tense, the paradigm only consists of the form *val*, which is unchanged in all persons, whereas in the second past tense the paradigm of the verb is complete. The second past form in the focus of the paper is *vylem*, the third person singular form of the paradigm as only this form appears in the analytic past tenses, which are the topical constructions under scrutiny in this study.

Received 24 November 2022, accepted 19 April 2023, available online 10 June 2023.

© 2023 the Authors. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence CC BY 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

- (1) *So student val // vyl-em*
 s/he student be.PST// be-EV.PST[3SG]
 'S/he was a student.'¹

In the analytic past tenses, *val* and *vylem* have traditionally been analysed as auxiliaries participating in the formation of verbal forms with different aspecto-temporal functions (Bartens 2000; Тараканов 2011; Winkler 2011). In a recent study, the reanalysis of the analytic past tenses has been addressed, namely, that some of these forms are able to additionally carry out modal and pragmatic functions, such as future counterfactuality and reference to previously discussed matters (2) (Saraheimo 2022). However, modal and pragmatic functions are not alien of *val* and *vylem* either — both of them also participate in the attenuation of non-declarative moods, and in this context, they have been analysed as modal particles (cf. Winkler 2011; Kubitsch 2020; see also Section 4).

- (2) *Vožyt-tem, mar daurt-iškod, ton mon-e jarat-iško šuy-sa*
 shame-CAR what do-PRS.2SG you I-ACC love-PRS.1SG say-CV
š u - i - d v a l u k ! ? (Udmurt duńne 8/16/2013)
 say-PST-2SG be.PST EMPH
 'It's shameless what you are doing, you said you loved me, didn't you?'

Considering the use seen in the example above, the paper argues that in the formation of the analytic tenses, on many occasions *val* and *vylem* should be analysed and described as pragmatic particles with independent functions. There are both formal and functional reasons to do so. Functional reasons will be elaborated further along in the study (Sections 3, 4, 6). The forms do not conjugate in person nor number (this is more relevant for *vylem* as it has a complete paradigm). Since the lexical verb is already conjugated in person and number, the conjugation of the auxiliary would be redundant — thus, not marking the auxiliary for person and number could be seen as a condition necessary but not sufficient alone in order for the auxiliary to undergo a process of reanalysis.² Additionally, *val* and *vylem* do not contribute to the propositional content of the utterance (Section 6). The forms have been referred to as "particle-resembling" auxiliaries or retrospectivising clitics in previous literature (Bartens 2000 : 214–215; Arkhangelskiy 2014), and corresponding forms in Mari have recently been justifiably argued to act as deictic particles rather than auxiliaries in the corresponding analytic structures (Spets, forthcoming). Furthermore, the results show that whereas *val* still operates only in past contexts, *vylem* seems to be losing its temporal reference in the analytic tenses.

Our research questions root in the above-seen use of *val* and *vylem*:

1. What kind of contribution do the elements have in the analytic past tenses when they are not used to express aspecto-temporal relations?
2. How can these functions be described from a discourse-organising perspective and how are they related to intersubjectivity?
3. Can we observe similar uses of the past tense form of the 'be' verb in other languages in the area?

The study is primarily corpus-based: the language data used in the study are mostly newspaper articles. Observations are complemented by a ques-

¹ For this particular example we do not comment on the differences between the two past tense forms (see Section 2).

² We would like to express our gratitude to our perceptive reviewer for this particular insight.

tionnaire concerning examples found in the corpus, and finally, the analysis is supplemented by consulting native speakers individually. The paper is organised as follows: first we introduce the category of intersubjectivity, and the concepts and terminology we use for describing the discourse-interactional functions of *val/vylem*. We then discuss the tenses under examination as well as previous remarks made concerning the non-temporal uses of the analytic past tenses and past tense forms of the 'be'-verb. Before the analysis, we present our data and methods. In our analysis we introduce the discourse-interactional functions (adversative, contrastive, additive, old, new, and emphatic), and contemplate their link to intersubjectivity. Finally, similar phenomena in contact languages are discussed.

1.1. Intersubjectivity

Intersubjectivity is a term used to mark the assessment of speech-act participants about their epistemic perspective and signalling the distribution of their attention or knowledge, whether the information is shared or exclusive to one of the speech-act participants (Evans, Bergqvist, San Roque 2018 : 110, Bergqvist, Kittilä 2020 : 3). A term used in connection with intersubjectivity is engagement, which refers to grammaticalised intersubjectivity systems (Evans, Bergqvist, San Roque 2018 : 113). The notion of intersubjectivity has functional and semantic overlap with other categories related to knowledge, such as evidentiality (linguistic marking of information source and type), mirativity (marking of non-assimilated knowledge) and egophoricity (marking of epistemic authority regarding to involvement in a talked-about event) (Bergqvist, Kittilä 2020 : 2–5). Intersubjective relations can be expressed by various means, for example through lexical items, deictic elements, markers of definiteness or indefiniteness, and through verbal inflection. In Example (3) the use of the Russian indefinite pronoun *nekto* 'someone' indicates that the speaker assumes that the addressee does not know the person in question.

(3) *Prišol nekto Petrov.*
 come:3SG:PRF IGNORATIVE PN

'Someone called Petrov has come (i.e., I know who he is, I assume you do not know who he is).' (Wierzbicka 1980 : 326, cited by Evans 2006 : 109)

Example (4) shows what is called engagement in the literature, i.e., a grammaticalised mean of encoding intersubjective relations. Example (4a) and (4b) are from Andoke (Colombian Amazon) and they illustrate shared and unshared knowledge, respectively.

(4a) *páa b-a a-pó'kã-i*
 already +SPKR+ADDR.ENGAG-3SG.INAN 3SG.INAN-light-ARG
 'They day is dawning (as we can both see).'

(4b) *páa kã-ø a-pó'kã-i*
 already +SPKR-ADDR.ENGAG-3SG.INAN 3SG.INAN-light-ARG
 'They day is dawning (as I witness, but which you were not aware of).'

(Evans, Bergqvist, San Roque 2018 : 114)

As the phenomena we present in this study do not all clearly fall under one of the above-mentioned categories, but rather show shared features and semantic interplay with one another, we use the broader term intersubjec-

tivity in our study to describe some of the discourse-pragmatic functions of *val* and *vylem* in general.

1.2. Discourse particles

From our point of view, it is important to highlight the connection between intersubjectivity and discourse particles. In this study, we follow the narrow interpretation of discourse particles and treat them as elements which can express the speaker's attitude towards the propositional content and express the speaker's assumptions about the attitude or epistemic state of the speech-act participants (Zimmermann 2011 : 2012). In this sense, discourse particles can encode intersubjectivity, mark the perspectives of speech-act participants, and provide information about the relation of the current utterance to the common ground (Haselow 2012 : 189–190, Djenar, Ewing, Manns 2018 : 67–70, Evans, Bergqvist, San Roque 2018 : 165, see also Evans 2006 on multiple perspective constructions).

Discourse particles are non-propositional, they contribute to the expressive content of an utterances and do not affect their truth-conditionality (Zimmermann 2011). Their interpretation is context-dependent and they typically have a constant form (Aijmer, Simon-Vandenberg 2011). Formally, when *val* and *vylem* appear in the functions presented in the study, they do not conjugate neither in person, nor number. Furthermore, they do not contribute to the propositional content, therefore they cannot be neither negated, nor questioned. They can be omitted without damaging the syntactic structure of the clause.

Even though the analysis of *val* and *vylem* purely as discourse particles in all the reviewed constructions is not unambiguous (see Sections 6 and 7), we believe that the discourse-interactional functions assigned to them can be described the most precisely if we treat them as discourse particles. For characterising these functions, we rely on the classification of discourse particles by Zeevat (2006 : 138–139), adding other functions which seem to be relevant in Udmurt (functions e. and f.):

- a. The content has been suggested to be false in the context (ADVERSATIVE).
- b. The topic has been addressed before but the content gives an expansion of the earlier answer (ADDITIVE).
- c. The new content addresses the inversion in polarity of the old topic (CONTRASTIVE).
- d. The content is already part of the common ground (OLD).
- e. The new content is highly informative in the context (NEW).
- f. The content is emphasised due to personal involvement or emotional response (EMPHATIC).

Discourse-interactional elements typically develop through the process of pragmatization (cf. Frank-Job 2006), i.e., markers or elements in a context change their propositional meaning to encode discourse-interactional functions. Based on our analysis, we suggest that *val* and *vylem* in the analytic past tenses are undergoing the same process.

2. Overview of the past tenses and the 'be'-verb in Udmurt

Udmurt uses four synthetic tenses, present, future, the first past and the second past (Winkler 2011 : 95–98; Тараканов 2011). Traditionally, the differ-

ence between the first and the second past tenses lies in the notion of evidentiality (Тараханов 2011 : 189; Skribnik, Kehayov 2018 : 539). Having a more elaborated analysis, the first past tense can be considered the default choice for narrating events that happened in the past. However, contextually it can be associated with eyewitness and directness of evidence as well as with assimilated knowledge, and with a higher degree of certainty and commitment. The second past tense expresses indirect evidence (e.g., hearsay, inference), but it is also used to mark unassimilated knowledge (mirativity), and, contextually, a lower degree of certainty and commitment³ (Siegl 2004; Kubitsch 2022). In Example (5) sentence (a) can be a default expression of an event that happened in the past. The use of the evidential past tense in sentence (b) indicates that the fall of the tree was not witnessed by the speaker, but the event is either inferred or reported.

- (5a) *Pispu pogra-z.* (5b) *Pispu pogra-m.*
tree fall[PST]-3SG tree fall-EV.PST[3SG]
'The tree fell.' 'The tree has fallen.' [I infer or I heard the info
from someone else]

In addition to the synthetic past tenses, Udmurt uses a variety of analytic past forms, which are formed by combining finite and non-finite verb forms with the 'be'-verb in the past tense (*val/vylem*). The past tense forms of the 'be'-verb **vylly-* participate in the formation of the analytic past tenses. The forms are used as past tense copulas in nominal predication, and in the analytic past tenses they are usually analysed as auxiliaries. As discussed previously in Section 1, the form *val* is the so-called first past form, while *vylem* is a third person singular, second past tense form. However, we only deal with *vylem* as only this form occurs in the analytic past tenses and has discourse-organisational functions. The analytic past tenses with a finite main verb are shown in Table 1. In this article, we will consider the continuous analytic past and the two finite remote pasts, leaving the less frequently encountered future-based habitual past⁴ aside.

In the negation of the analytic past tenses, it is the finite main verb that is negated, not the auxiliary, i.e. *val* and *vylem* appear in the same form in affirmation as well as in negation.

The continuous past is used to express imperfective past actions, typically continuous and progressive events that create a general backgrounding for other actions and events (6). In this function, the form is equivalent to the English past continuous tense (Keľmakov, Hännikäinen 2008 : 270; Серебренников 1960 : 127).

- (6) *Otyñ pu k-o val kyk jegit pi-os.* (Серебренников 1960 : 127)
there sit-PRS.3PL AUX two young boy-PL
'Two young boys were sitting there.'

³ Commitment refers to the speaker's commitment to the truth value of the propositional content. Connections have been established in the typological literature between evidential markers and speaker's commitment (Faller 2002; Brugman, Macaulay 2015; Cornillie 2018).

⁴ The future-based habitual analytic past has been noted to be rarely used in "Udmurt duńré" (Saraheimo 2018). There are two possible reasons for this: 1. There is dialectal variance in the usage of the habitual and the continuous forms: in Southern dialects, the continuous form may also be used to express habituality (Horváth 2015), and in "Udmurt duńré", the Southern model seems to be favoured in this case. 2. A derivational frequentative suffix may also be used to express habituality (Keľmakov, Hännikäinen 2008 : 270).

Table 1

The analytic past tenses

	Finite verb	Auxiliary	Temporal function
1 st remote past	default/1 st past	<i>val</i>	a distant past event
2 nd remote past	evidential/2 nd past	<i>vylem(/val⁵)</i>	a distant past event; evidential
Continuous ⁶ past	present	<i>val/vylem</i>	antecedent, frame of an already ongoing event
Habitual past	future	<i>val/vylem</i>	regular activity in the past

In their temporal function, the two remote past tenses refer to actions or events that have taken place in a more distant past (7). Typically, the event time (*kost um no tufl i bašti val* 'I had bought a new suit and shoes') precedes another past reference time (*ukšo zes öz bydte* 'they didn't have enough money'), usually given in a simple past tense, but the forms may also have the speech moment as their reference time (Серебрянников 1960 : 124; Keřmakov, Hännikäinen 2008 : 269; Saraheimo 2022).

- (7) *Vypusknoj-ly mynym diškut bašty-ny anaj-ataj-e*
 graduation-DAT I.DAT clothes buy-INF mother-father-POSS.1SG
ukšo-zes öz bydte. Ugoś kost'um no tufl'i
 money-ACC.POSS.3SG NEG.PST-3 spend-CNG.PL because suit and shoes
bašt-i val tue dyšetskon ar kutskon-yn.
 buy-PST[1SG] AUX this.year study year beginning-INE
 'For my graduation, my parents didn't spend money to buy me clothes.
 For I had, indeed, bought a new suit and shoes at the beginning of this
 study year.' (Saraheimo 2022 : 180)

The choice between a default past and a remote past tense is based on the subjective evaluation of the speaker, and the use of a remote past is always optional (Uusikoski 2016 : 107; see Saraheimo 2022 for Udmurt). Aside from their aspecto-temporal functions, both the continuous and the remote pasts have also been found to carry out different modal and pragmatic functions, as further elaborated in Section 3.

3. Previous studies on the non-temporal functions of the analytic past tenses

In addition to their temporal functions, several modal and pragmatic functions have been attributed to the analytic past tenses. These functions include the future counterfactual⁷ and anaphoric use in discourse, as well as implications of a variety of different emotions, including anger and frustration (Серебрянников 1960; Saraheimo 2022). In fact, the temporal use of the remote past forms seems to be less frequent in comparison to other uses (Saraheimo 2022). Future

⁵ In most Udmurt grammar descriptions (e.g. Kozmács 2002; Bartens 2000), a form consisting of either the second past tense in combination with *val* or a nominal past participle form combined with *val* is mentioned. However, as these variants appear more rarely in the corpus (Saraheimo 2022), and there is no clarity behind the reasons for the formal variation, we have excluded the forementioned forms from our study.

⁶ This form has also been called the durative past in the previous literature. However, a durative event may be either bounded or unbounded (Niva 2022 : 36), and based on previous descriptions, in its aspecto-temporal function, the form is inherently unbounded (imperfective) and therefore better described as continuous.

⁷ Although both events happen in the past, the term *future counterfactual* refers to the nature of the action from the perspective of the event time.

counterfactual (8) is the most frequently encountered non-temporal function. It is used to express an action or event which contradicts the following state-of-affairs or will not be completed (Серебренников 1960 : 121–124; Заруляева 1984; Saraheimo 2022). It may refer to incomplete or disrupted actions or intentions, but it may also refer to completed actions, in which case the implemented action does not align with the following events. Both the first and the second remote past tenses may have a future counterfactual meaning: the difference between the two forms lies in the encoding of evidentiality (Saraheimo 2022).

- (8) *So tolon ton-e ut ě a-z val no,*
 s/he yesterday you-ACC search[PST]-3SG AUX but
ö-z šed'ty. (Keĭmakov, Hännikäinen 2008 : 269)
 NEG.PST-3 find.CNG
 'He was looking for you yesterday but did not find [you].'

As for the continuous analytic past, Serebrennikov also mentions a discontinuous use and refers to it as expressing an unfulfilled intention (9) (Серебренников 1960 : 130):

- (9) *Sergej košky-ny ö d j a val, no peres'*
 PN leave-INF begin.PRS[3SG] AUX but old
typy-jez adž-i-z no dugd-i-z.
 oak-ACC see-PST-3SG and stop-PST-3SG
 'Sergej began to leave, but as he saw the old oak, he stopped.'

When Examples (8) and (9) above are compared, one may notice that the discontinuous use of the continuous past tense greatly resembles that of the future counterfactual use of the remote pasts. Arkhangelskiy (2014) refers to *val* in analytic constructions in Beserman⁸ as a particle marking a retrospective shift or a discontinuous past.

As noted by Serebrennikov (Серебренников 1960) and Saraheimo (2022), the remote pasts may also be used anaphorically to refer to previously discussed matters (10). The angry and frustrated tones detected in connection with the remote pasts have been associated with both the future counterfactual and the anaphoric use (Saraheimo 2022).

- (10) *Mon vera-j val inĭ vañ ostrov-me*
 I say[PST]-1SG AUX already whole island-ACC.POSS.1SG
kotyrt-em-e pot-em śaryś. (Серебренников 1960 : 124)
 go.around-NMLZ-POSS.1SG want-PTCP.PRF about
 'I already told you; I want to go around my whole island.'

In the analytic past tenses, the syntactic position of the auxiliary is after the finite verb. As the prototypical word order is SOV, the typical position of *val/vylem* is sentence-final. According to Arkhangelskiy (2014 : 9), other particles and phasal adverbs are accepted between *val* and the main verb. As discussed in previous works, a syntagmatically less fixed nature favours analysing *val* as a particle rather than an auxiliary (Arkhangelskiy 2014 : 9). Concerning the continuous analytic past, Serebrennikov claims that the form is often used in connection with particles, in a "contrastive context", where the emphasis created

⁸ Beserman is a variety of Udmurt spoken in the northern region of the Udmurt Republic. Besermans are ethnically different from Udmurts and they consider their language different as well.

by the particle is pleonastically enhanced by using the continuous past (Семенов-Ренников 1960 : 127–129).

4. Earlier remarks on the use of *val/vylem* in non-declarative moods and modal constructions

The modal use of *val* is not unheard of in the descriptive literature of the Udmurt language (Тараханов 1998 : 174; Winkler 2011 : 137). Two functions are mentioned in relation to the imperative mood and deontic modal constructions: the weakening of the illocutionary force, and the expression of desires and hypotheticality. Once these elements are used modally, they lose their past time reference. The functions of *vylem* are less elaborated in such works and even if they appear, no difference is drawn between the two elements in this regard. In addition, there is no unanimity concerning the analysis of the forms in their modal function — some works describe them as modal auxiliaries (cf. Тараханов 1998 : 174; Keľmakov, Hännikäinen 2008 : 216) while others as modal particles (Winkler 2011 : 137).

In non-declarative moods and in modal constructions, when *val* and *vylem* are used modally⁹ they can be considered modal particles (for a more detailed analysis see: Kubitsch 2020). In such cases their function is to modify the modal strength of the original construction. This function also can be characterised as modal attenuation (Examples 11, 12).

- (11) *Svetlana Dańilovna, nyryś ik vera-le val,*
 PN first PTC tell-IMP.PL ATT
pič'i dyr-dy šajer-my-len kyče sereg-az
 small time-POSS.2PL country-POSS.1PL-GEN which corner-INE.POSS.3SG
ortč'i-z? (Udmurt duńńe, 01/02/2018)
 happen-PST-3SG

'Svetlana Danilovna, first of all, please tell us in which corner of our country you spent your childhood?'

- (12) *Jurttet kule vylem.* (Social media corpus,¹⁰ 2014)
 help need ATT
 'I'd need some help.'

Furthermore, differences can be found between the modal use of *val* and *vylem* (cf. Kubitsch 2020; 2021). While both particles attenuate the modal strength, *vylem* (the indirect evidential form) suppresses the speaker's authority to a larger degree. *Vylem* is typically used in connection with state of affairs where the speaker has no actual effect on the outcome, e.g., social, political questions. In connection with this, *vylem* can indicate the speaker's estimation about the likelihood of the events in question — the speaker holds it less probable or even improbable that the propositional content can or will realise, the content can be characterised as an unreal wish. The state of affairs appearing with *vylem* are often counterfactual. Considering directives, the use of *vylem* lowers the degree of the listener's obedience. Utterances formed with *vylem* are extremely polite and respectful, such requests are often interpreted as suggestions, and

⁹ Considering modal constructions Kubitsch (2021) concludes that the combination with *val/vylem* may be either temporally (and evidentially) or modally motivated: it may indicate the action to have taken place in the past, but depending on the context, it may be interpreted as a modal particle instead of a temporal auxiliary.

¹⁰ http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/udmurt_social_media/search.

the execution of the actions uttered in the clause are not considered obligatory. According to the evaluations of native speakers, *val*, in comparison, is associated with a higher degree of modal force. Example (13a) can be interpreted as a request or command, i.e. the addressees are expected to obey the request. While in the case of Example (13b), the content is rather considered as a suggestion, i.e. the addressees have a choice. Moreover, some speakers did not even interpret the utterance as a suggestion but characterised it as the desire of someone who suspects at the same time that their wish will not come true. In the latter case, the utterance does not have an explicit addressee either, while in the case of imperative forms accompanied by *val* there is always an addressee.

(13a) *Bert-e val jegit-jos!*
 return-IMP.PL ATT young-PL
 'Please, come back, young ones!'

(13b) *Bert-e vylem jegit-jos!*
 return-IMP.PL ATT young-PL
 'I wish you'd come back, young ones!' 'If only the young ones would come back!' (but I think they won't)

Further difference between the modal use of *val* and *vylem* lies in the degree of mental distance they express between the speaker and the propositional content. *Vylem*, in its modal sense, is associated with a greater mental distance. Moreover, native speakers often connect an emotional value to the constructions with *vylem* (such as pathos, pity, hope), whereas constructions with *val* are considered emotionally neutral.

5. Data

Our research material is primarily based on texts and complemented with a questionnaire. The written material comprises newspaper articles from the most well-known Udmurt newspaper "Udmurt duńńe", interviews and entries on social media. Texts were collected via the online Udmurt corpora (Arkhangelskiy 2019)¹¹ and manually. Finally, the analysis has been supplemented by observations of three native consultants.

The questionnaire examined 16 instances of the analytic remote past tenses taken from corpus: ten instances of the first remote and six instances of the second remote past. At the time the questionnaire was created, the focus of our research was on the remote past tenses, and thus continuous forms were not included in the questionnaire; a native speaker was consulted individually concerning the interpretation and analysis of the combinations of the present tense and *val/vylem*. The questionnaire contained sentence and context evaluation tasks, a translation task, and metalinguistic observation of the informants. Fundamentally, two questions were in focus: 1. Are these analytic past tense forms interchangeable with synthetic past tense forms? 2. What is the difference in the interpretation of the analytic and the corresponding synthetic past tenses? The questionnaire was asked to be filled in by six native speakers. Table 2 gives a summary of the most important metadata on the answerers.

¹¹ Corpus data are from the main and one of the subcorpora of the online Udmurt corpora. The main corpus has 9.57 million tokens and consists of texts of contemporary press, blogs, the Udmurt translation of the New Testament and some articles of Udmurt Wikipedia. The subcorpus has 2.66 million tokens and comprises open posts and comments of social media (<http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/index.html>).

Despite the small number of informants, the results are consistent and thus supportive additions to our study.

Table 2

Metadata of the informants

	Age	Mother tongue(s)	Gender	Higher education	Place of birth	Place of Residence
01	20	Udmurt, Russian	female	Student in higher education	Udmurt Republic, Russia	Udmurt Republic, Russia
02	20	Udmurt	female	Student in higher education	Republic of Tatarstan, Russia	Udmurt Republic, Russia
03	37	Udmurt, Russian	female	Studied in higher education	Udmurt Republic, Russia	Udmurt Republic, Russia
04	38	Udmurt	female	Studied in higher education	Udmurt Republic, Russia	Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug, Russia
05	36	Udmurt, Russian	female	Studied in higher education	Udmurt Republic, Russia	Hungary
06	41	Udmurt, Russian	female	Studied in higher education	Udmurt Republic, Russia	Finland

6. Results of the analysis

In this section, we present the results of the analysis, and suggest a characterisation of the discourse-interactional functions attributed to *val* and *vylem*. These functions are: adversative, contrastive, additive, old information, new information and emphasis. Such functions appear independently of the tense of the finite verb in the reviewed constructions. This also suggests that *val* and *vylem* are going through pragmaticalisation, as well as a reanalysis of the analytical past tenses as synthetic tense and particle.

As a general comment for the whole analysis, it is crucial to point out the following information obtained from the questionnaire and individual consultations of native speakers. In the remote past tenses, the removal of *val/vylem* does not affect the propositional content of the sequence. As discussed in Section 2, *val/vylem* can be omitted in remote past forms: it could be replaced with a synthetic past form without harming the syntactic or temporal structure of the utterance. As for the continuous past, *val* always locates the situation in a past temporal frame, while *vylem*, essentially, does not. As mentioned in Section 5, the continuous past was left out from the questionnaire, and thus, a native speaker was consulted separately concerning some of the observations we, the authors, made in the analysis, and the results of those discussions have been mentioned in connection with said examples in the following subsections, when relevant.

From now on in the examples we gloss *val* and *vylem* in accordance with the discourse-interactional function we attributed to them in a certain construction.

6.1. Adversative use of *val* and *vylem*

The adversative use of *val* and *vylem* was attested in all the examined tenses: the first remote past (14), the second remote past (15) and the continuous past (16). In the adversative use, *val/vylem* marks a false presupposition, and the presence of the particle suggests that contrary information, which

overrides the previous assumption, will be revealed later on. In the following examples, the clause marked with *val/vylem* expresses a false presumption or preparations that were done, but which, in the end, did not lead to the expected outcome.

- (14) *Mar-ly ke m a l p a - j v a l, tatyn tros-ges ukšo*
 what-DAT PTC think[PST]-1SG ADVS here much-COMP money
pott-o šuysa. (Udmurt duńńe 5/27/2009)
 bring-PRS.3PL CNJ
 'For some reason, I thought I would get more money here [but I did not].'
- (15) *Bub-iz Al'a-leś anaj-ze as vakyt-az*
 father-POSS.3SG Alya-ABL mother-ACC.POSS.3SG own time-INE.POSS.3SG
kura-ny v e t l - e m v y l e m, no so-iz piosmurt-e
 propose-INF go-EV.PST[3SG] ADVS but he-ACC.POSS.3SG husband
kule kary-mte. (Udmurt duńńe 3/7/2013)
 need make-NEG.EV.PST[3SG]
 'His father once went to propose to Alya's mother but got rejected.'
- (16) *Mon-e no šör-az ö t' - e v a l.*
 I-ACC too back_part-ILL.POSS.3SG invite-PRS[3SG] ADVS
Ö-j ěigna. (Udmurt duńńe 6/14/2013)
 NEG.PST-1SG give.in.CNG
 'He also invited me to his place. I did not give in.'

In (16), the possibility of a habitual reading could not be ignored, as the verb *invite* (*öťyny*) is transitive and dynamic. Nevertheless, a native speaker confirmed that the expression is not one of habituality, but refers to one event, and omitting *val* would only change the temporal frame from past to present. Saraheimo (2022) notes that the form is often followed by a juxtaposed clause beginning with the particle *no/noš* 'but', in which the new, contrary information is introduced, but not necessarily.

As the above examples show, aside from evidentiality, there seems to be no significant semantic difference between the use of *val/vylem* in the different analytic structures, which suggests that it is not the analytic form itself but *val/vylem* that triggers an adversative reading. This observation supports the argument of *val/vylem* acting as a separate particle with an independent function in the context. Another supporting factor was found in the questionnaire: when asked about how adding *val* after a past tense affects the interpretation of a clause, the informants would often claim that *val* signals a contrary follow-up for the story, even in such cases when no follow-up was provided.

Moreover, the adversative use cannot only be observed in the analytic past tenses, but in modal constructions as well (Kubitsch 2021 : 612). In Example (17), the imperative form combined with *val* indicates that the realisation of the action is desirable but blocked by some external factors.

- (17) *Kyče ke syče penžak z o l t y v a l, no gurt-amy*
 which PTC this jacket form.IMP ADVS but village-INE.POSS.1PL
vuriškiš-my övöl. (Udmurt duńńe, 19/06/2019)
 tailor-POSS.1PL NEG
 'I would have a kind of jacket made, but there is no tailor in our village.'

We propose that the adversative functions of *val* and *vylem* are connected to the spatio-temporal properties of a past tense form of the 'be'-verb, which, in addition to copular use, is typically used in constructions expressing a spatial or a temporal location. This creates a greater deictic distance between the two consecutive events. As presented in Section 3, both continuous and the remote past forms have also been previously noted to express interrupted actions or actions that did not lead to the expected outcomes. The particle may have undergone a pragmaticalisation into a common disrupted action marker, encoding a mental distance between the marked action and the actual outcome. The matter will be further discussed in Section 7.

6.2. Contrastive use of *vylem*

In connection with the adversative function, it can be observed that while *val* (or if evidentially motivated, *vylem*) shows that the presupposition is false, the new, contradicting information may be introduced with a clause marked with *vylem* (18 and 19). Note that in such cases the analytic past tense should not be considered as such, but the finite verb form and *vylem* should be analysed independently.

- (18) *Mon ton-e badžym ní koža-j val,*
 I you-ACC big already reckon[PST]-1SG ADVS
noš ton veš anaj-ed-len vera-m-ez-ja gine
 but you always mother-POSS.2SG-GEN say-NMLZ-POSS.3SG-ADV only
u li-ś k o d v y l e m ... (Udmurt duńie, 20/11/2009)
 live-PRS.2SG CTR
 'I've reckoned you as a grown up, but you always turn out to act as your mother says...'

It must also be mentioned that the contrastive function of *vylem* seems to typically appear with present tense verb forms. However, instances can be found when *vylem* marks a contrasting proposition next to an evidential verb form too. In such cases, though, the contrasting function is not as clear as in Example (18) as contrast can be retrieved only from the broader context. For instance, in Example (19), the context provides that according to a folklorist, Shoshma Udmurts have a lot of old traditional songs, which did not change in a long time. The proposition marked with *vylem* reveals that he actually wrote down different versions of the same type of song, so there are not many songs, but different versions of a few songs, and thus, his original claim is false. *Vylem* indicates that the propositional content of the sentence is in contrast with that of the preceding statements. Our informants in the questionnaire suggested that the use of *vylem* highlights the contrast between the two states of affairs (i.e., there are not as many types of songs as suggested), and that it makes the utterance more like an explanation or refutation. Therefore, it connects the two states of affairs and makes the nature of their relationship more explicit. On the other hand, without the element *vylem*, the statement was considered more factual and neutral.

- (19) *Noš učk-ono ke, so udmurt zout-leś (gur-leś) no śuan*
 but look-PTCP.NEC if s/he Udmurt song-ABL song-ABL and wedding
zout-leś pörtem variant-jos-ses gine
 song-ABL different version-PL-ACC.POSS.3PL only

g o ž t - e m v y l e m. (Udmurt duńńe, 29/03/2013)
 write-EV.PST[3SG] CTR

'But if we look at it, he actually only wrote down different versions of Udmurt and wedding songs.'

This contrastive use roots in the fact that *vylem* is frequently used to mark mirativity. Realisation and counter-expectation can appear when the new topic is in contrast with the old topic. These notions are considered part of the category of mirativity (cf. Aikhenvald 2012). This also explains why *val* never has such a contrastive use. Instead, *val* may add information to a previous topic, thus linking it to common ground, as further elaborated in the following sections.

6.3. Additive use of *val*

The additive use of *val* was attested in the first remote past and in the continuous past. In the additive function, the clause marked with *val* gives further information on a previously addressed topic. The interpretation of *val* as an additive particle is supported by the findings of the questionnaire: in some cases, the informants would suggest that *val* marks a piece of additional information related to something else in the context (20). The additive marker ties the two topics together and creates cohesion: if the additive information goes unmarked, the recipient may assume a new topic being introduced. For a form to be analysed as additive, we have used the criterion that there should be no temporal or aspectual motivation for the use of a remote past or the continuous past: that is, for a combination of the first past and *val*, the action should not precede the action or event it adds information to (20) nor contradict the following (and thus be interpreted adversative), and for the continuous past, there should be no motivation for the form to be marked continuous, i.e. the verb is semantically stative or non-dynamic (21).

(20) *Mon otčy kylem ar-yn no pyrišk-i. V o r m - i v a l*
 I there last year-INE too participate-PST[1SG] win-PST[1SG] ADD
 "Socialnoj projekt" nomiaci-yn. (Udmurt duńńe 5/27/2013)
 social project nomination-INE

'I also participated last year. I won in the category of "Social project".'

(21) *Dyšetis-my kyknames nyrýseti parta šör-y*
 teacher-POSS.1PL us.two.ACC first row back_part-ILL
pukt-i-z. Kaťa, olo, myneštym no ľab
 sit-PST-3SG PN probably I.ABL PTC weak
a d ž - e v a l. (Udmurt duńńe 6/14/2013)
 see-PRS.3SG ADD

'Our teacher put us two in the first row. Katja's eyesight was probably even weaker than mine.'

In Example (20), the action expressed in the first sentence does not precede the action expressed in the following sentence; thus, there is no temporal motivation for the use of a remote past. The information given in the sentence adds information to a previous topic and does not introduce a new topic or storyline, nor does it contradict the upcoming events. A similar situation can be seen in (21), where a person with bad eyesight talks about her school years

with another visually impaired student. The verb form in the second sentence corresponds to the continuous past, but as the verb *adžyny* 'see' is semantically stative, there is no motivation for the use of a continuous form. The clause marked by the additive *val* gives further information on the previously discussed topic, and thus, the additive use relates the information to the common ground. Functions connected to the marking of common ground may relate to the affirmativity of *val*. The particle is affirmative by nature as in this clausal position it cannot be negated: it carries the inherent meaning 'so it was' (cf. Spets, forthcoming on the 'was'-elements in the Mari analytic tenses).

6.4. Old information (shared knowledge)

The so-called anaphoric use of the remote pasts by and large resembles marking shared knowledge or common ground, which we refer to as old information in this study. This function is often attributed to the first remote past, which is commonly used to mark information as shared by both participants, as shown in Example (22) (see also Saraheimo 2022 : 192–194). In the example, an interview is conducted concerning the trip of a group of girls to Istanbul. The interviewer starts the interview with a question to Irina, who was introduced at the beginning of the article as having visited Egypt before, which can be assumed to have been discussed before the start of the actual interview. Thus, the interviewer is referring to a previously discussed topic by marking a clause with *val*. The observation was confirmed by consulting a native speaker individually. The interview is introduced by the following sentences.

- (22) *Kuiñ udmurt nyljos Stambule vetlizy. Amerikaly šinmaškem Aña, Jevropa-
jez kotyrtem Nađa, Jegipete vuylem Irina. Irinaleš malpanjosse pyr-poč
todono kariškim.*

'Three Udmurt girls went to Istanbul. Anya, who adores America, Nadya, who has been all around Europe, and Irina, who has visited Egypt. We decided to know more about Irina's thoughts.'

Irina, ton lymšor-yn š u t e t s k - i - d v a l iñi. Kyče
PN you south-INE rest-PST-2SG OLD already which
pörtemlyk-ez Jegipet no Turcija kuspyn? (Udmurt duñne 3/26/2013)
difference-DET Egypt and Turkey between

'Irina, you have already been on vacation in the South. What are the differences between Egypt and Turkey?'

In a recent study (Saraheimo 2022 : 192–194), the anaphoric use has also been attributed to the second remote past. In Example (23), the interviewer refers to information previously shared in the context by the interview, but they use the second past and *vylem* instead of *val*.

- (23) *Anaj-ataj-dy no š u i - l' l a m v y l e m ik: v o r g o r o n - l y*
mother-father-POSS.2PL too say-EV[3PL] OLD PTC¹² man-DAT
dyšetiš-e myn-ono šat? (Udmurt duñne 8/30/2013)
teacher-ILL go-PTCP.NEC PTC

'Didn't your parents, too, say [according to what you told earlier]: should a man really become a teacher?'

¹² *Ik* is an emphatic particle.

In Example (23), the evidential past and *vylem* are used to mark the information source as indirect. On the other hand, the information in Example (22) is also indirect: the interviewer has not participated in the trip to Egypt, and yet uses the neutral first past and *val* to refer to the event. In the questionnaire, in addition to indirectivity, a "change in attitude" was mentioned as motivation for using *vylem* in this context. The use of *vylem* in Example (23) is presumably connected to epistemic authority and territories of information (see Labov, Fanshel 1977; Kamio 1997). As noted by Kamio (1997), the speaker may not possess authority to comment on the addressee's territory of information, and languages may develop markers to weaken the speaker's epistemic claims and reduce their force. According to Labov and Fanshel (1977), the addressee's territory of information typically comprises their opinions, beliefs, bodily states, or professional expertise. Distant memories from the addressee's personal life could easily be understood as such, whereas a recent trip to Egypt may not feel too intrusive to mark as shared territory of information.

It can be postulated that the choice of *vylem* in Example (23) is not only motivated by the speaker's indirect evidence, but it also indicates a lower degree of epistemic authority over the content of the utterance. Although the information is shared, the speaker does not possess epistemic authority over it that shows by the use of *vylem*, which creates a larger mental distance between the speaker and what they state. This way Example (23) illustrates that the remains of the original verbal properties of the elements affect the choice between them in certain functions: the choice of *vylem* to signal a lower degree of epistemic authority is in connection with the fact that it is an indirect evidential verb form, which can imply lower degree of certainty and commitment as well (see Kubitsch 2022).

6.5. New information (unshared knowledge)

The indirect evidential form, *vylem* can indicate that a given piece of information is new in the context. This use is inherently connected to its mirative function. The verb form has a prominent role in expressing unassimilated knowledge, and its grammaticalization to a mirative marker can be postulated (Kubitsch 2022). The mirative use of *vylem* (and the indirect evidential past tense) generally focuses on the speaker — the so-far unassimilated piece of information has just been realised. This realisation can have implications of surprise as well (24) (Social media corpus, 2017. http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/udmurt_social_media/search):

- (24) Speaker A: *Suter-dy kōña syl-e (stoit)?*
 currant-POSS.2PL how_much stand-PRS.3SG cost:PRS:3SG
 'How much does your currant cost?'
 Speaker B: *Šu kyž mańet.*
 hundred twenty ruble
 '120 rubles.'
 Speaker A: *O! Duno vylem.*
 EXCL expensive MIR
 'Oh! It's expensive.'

In our research material, though, several examples can be found when the information in the clause marked with *vylem* is not necessarily unassimilated

from the speaker's perspective, but can be considered new in the discourse, thus unshared between the discourse participants. Therefore, a change of perspective can be observed.¹³ Example (25) is a comment on a conversation on social media (Social media corpus, 2015. http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/udmurt_social_media/search) about the pronunciation of different vowels in dialects of Udmurt. In this case, the content is not new to the speaker but it is assumed to be new (and even surprising) in the discussion.

- (25) *Alnaš pal-jos no (y) kuara-zes*
 PN side-PL too [y] sound-ACC.POSS.3PL
kukmor-jos kad' vera-lo vylem.
 PN-PL like say-PRS.3PL NEW
 'Also around Alnash they say the [y] sound like in Kukmor.'

Such cases clearly show the reanalysis of the continuous past tense and the pragmaticalisation of the evidential past tense form as the construction of a present verb and *vylem* is not interpreted as a past tense, but as a present state of affair (hence the present tense verb form) which is marked in terms of its informativity (hence *vylem*).

6.6. Emphatic and emotional use of *val* and *vylem*

Val may be used for focalization: it emphasises involvement, a personal experience or emotional response to the topic discussed. In the questionnaire, the informants would often connect forms with *val* to personal involvement or emotional attitude towards the propositional content of the clause. This notion is often detected in connection with the reflexive pronoun *ačim* 'myself' (Example 26).

- (26) *Vaň na udmurt-ez dyšet-iš 9 bibliotekar-jos-y no!*
 EXS.PRS still Udmurt-ACC study-PTCP.PRS 9 librarian-PL-POSS.1SG PTC
Ta-os-yz-ly ačim čokt-i val kurs-jos-y
 this-PL-DET-DAT myself suggest-PST[1SG] EMPH course-PL-ILL
vetly-ny. (Udmurt duńńe 2/12/2013)
 come-INF

'I also have nine librarians who study Udmurt! It was me who suggested to them that they take part in the courses.'

In the combination of the present tense and *val*, aside from involvement, *val* focalises the subject's personal experience, as shown in (27).

- (27) *Gažet-jos-yš nekrolog-jos-ty učk-e no, kud/og*
 newspaper-PL-ELA necrologue-PL-ACC look-PRS.3SG PTC some
famili-os-ty pusjy-sa, šu-e: O-o-o, ta-os-ty mon
 surname-PL-ACC notice-CVB say-PRS.3SG EXCL this-PL-ACC I
todišk-o val. (Udmurt duńńe 7/30/2010)
 know-PRS.1SG EMPH

'He looks at the necrologues in the newspaper, and on some surnames, he comments: Yes, those people I knew [indeed].'

The use of the first remote past has also been attributed to frustrated or angry mental states, as shown below in (28a, b) (Saraheimo 2022; examples

¹³ It is important to mention that the listener's perspective seems to be possible not only with *vylem* but with other indirect evidential forms. However, this function is most clearly attested with the 'be'-verb.

produced by Lukeriya Shikhova). This interpretation may arise from the use of *val* as a common ground marker: common ground markers may obtain uses where the speaker “reminds” the addressee of forgotten common ground (see Evans 2006 : 100).

(28a) *Vera-j ní, no eššo ogpol vera-lo*
 say[PST]-1SG already and again once say-FUT[1SG]
 ‘I said it already, but I will say it again.’ (neutral tone)

(28b) *Vera-j ní val, no eššo ogpol vera-lo*
 say[PST]-1SG already EMPH and again once say-FUT[1SG]
 ‘I said it already, but I will say it again!’ (dissatisfied tone)

A similar use of *val* can be seen in the introductory Example (2) in Section 1, where the emphatic interpretation is supported by the presence of an emphatic particle *uk*.

Connected with the contrastive use of *vylem*, as shown in Example (18) (Section 6.2), *vylem* may also convey emotional involvement and it is often accompanied by the emphatic particles *ik* and *uk* (Kubitsch 2022). The emotional interpretation arises from the counter-expectational nature of the new information, and thus, it originates in mirativity. Typologically, mirative markers often have an emotional value (Aikhenvald 2012 : 473). In Example (29), the use of *vylem* signals an information update on the one hand, while, on the other hand, it indicates a higher degree of emotional value. This is also strengthened by the emphatic particle *ik* as well as with the modality of the sentence.

(29) *Šog ik dyr byž-e vylem!* (Main corpus,
 fast EMPH time run-PRS[3SG] EMPH inzhelka.tumblr.com 2015)
 ‘Time flies fast, indeed!’

Based on consultations with native speakers, *vylem* does not only show a higher degree of emotional involvement when it is used to express mirativity, but also with modal constructions (cf. Section 4), thus, the emotive nature is not unique to the analytic past tense forms.

7. Reflecting the results from the perspective of intersubjectivity

As it was mentioned in Section 1, intersubjective markers denote the assessment of speech-act participants about their epistemic stance and the distribution of their attention or knowledge. From the discourse-interactional functions outlined in Section 6, the marking of old and new information are the primary functions to be connected to intersubjectivity. It can be concluded that *val* is used to mark shared knowledge, information that is already part of the common ground (see Example 22) or relates to the common ground (see additive function, Examples 20, 21), while *vylem* is mostly maintained to mark information that is new or highly informative in the discourse (see Example 24, 25). It is very important to highlight that *vylem* can mark information which is known to the speaker but assumed to be highly informative to other discourse participants. Signalling old and new information (and in connection with this, shared and unshared knowledge) are such discourse-organising functions where *val* and *vylem* seem to complement each other. This is linked to the prominent use of *vylem* to express mirativity, and, broadly speaking, to the semantic and pragmatic connections between evidentiality and mirativity (see

Peterson 2010). Since *vylem* can mark a high degree of informativity and new information in the discourse, we assume that *val* has developed complementary functions to indicate a lower degree of informativity and then, ultimately, shared knowledge.

Another interesting point considering intersubjectivity is the use of the indirect evidential *vylem* in questions. As it was mentioned before (Section 6.4, Example 23), there are cases when it can be postulated that evidential forms are not only chosen because of the indirect nature of the information source, but to show the lower degree of epistemic authority over a given piece of information.¹⁴ Even though this use requires further investigations, it can be seen that *vylem* in such cases encodes asymmetry between the speaker's and the addressee's epistemic authority, which has been attributed to the marking of egophoricity (see Bergqvist, Kittilä 2020 : 10–12), just as it encodes asymmetry in common ground when it is used contrastively or marks unshared knowledge, which on its behalf is connected with engagement marking (see Bergqvist, Kittilä 2020 : 12–15; Evans, Bergqvist 2018).

Considering other discourse-interactional functions, the adversative use takes into consideration two perspectives in two consequent events: the subject before the reference time and the subject in the reference time. The two subjects may or may not be the same person, and regardless of whether they are or not, they are considered separate perspectives, where the latter includes the awareness of both the previous situation and the current state-of-affairs, whereas in the former the subject is unaware of the follow-up and acts accordingly (cf. Evans 2006 for complex perspectives). The adversative meaning of *val/vylem* may arise from the temporal and aspectual properties of the analytic forms. A future counterfactual meaning (see Section 3) is an expected development for remote pasts, as the previous, counterfactual action or event naturally precedes the following state-of-affairs. A discontinuous or 'frustrative' meaning, where a situation is irresultative in the sense that the intention of it is not fulfilled, has been connected to imperfectives (van der Voort 2004; Altshuler 2012; Koss, De Wit, van der Auwera 2022). As these two meanings are strikingly similar, we find it more plausible to assume that *val* has taken on an adversative meaning instead of the forms themselves having these meanings. Nonetheless, in the case of adversativity, the question remains whether this function should be attributed separately as discontinuous/frustrative for the continuous and future counterfactual for the remote pasts, or to *val/vylem* in general, and a more detailed analysis on the differences between the continuous and the remote past tenses is needed to answer the question.

As shown in Section 6.6, different emotional implications arise from marking a common ground (old information) as well as mirativity (new information). This is the source of the emphatic functions, although it should be noted that an emotional notion is always implied, and it is not the primary meaning of *val/vylem*. The marking of epistemic authority should also be considered a token-feature, but the conventionalisation of this kind of token-features often leads to grammaticalization of epistemic marking (Bergqvist, Kittilä 2020 : 6; Levinson 2000), which makes these observations valuable for the research of intersubjectivity in Uralic languages.

¹⁴ For the sake of completeness, it must be said that the above-described use is not exclusively associated with *vylem*, but other indirect evidential forms are also assumed to have this type of use.

8. Similar phenomena in contact languages

Past tense forms of the 'be'-verb show similar uses in the contact languages of Udmurt. Russian *было* (neuter past tense form of *быть* 'to be') participates in expressing "reversal of fortune" (30) and in such context it is analysed as a modal particle (Timberlake 2004 : 398). Note that the Russian construction is parallel to the Udmurt one (finite verb form + past tense form of the 'be'-verb), with the exception that in Russian, only past tense finite forms can occur to express false belief (cf. Evans 2006 : 107–108).

(30) Russian (Timberlake 2004 : 398):

Он пошел было прогуляться, но передумал.
 he go:PST:MASC be:PST:NEUT walk:INF but change.mind:PST:MASC
 'He was going to go out carousing but changed his mind later on.'

Also, in Russian the particle *бы* (31), which is historically the aorist form of the 'be' verb, shows similar modal use as *val* and *vylem* (cf. Section 4).

(31) Russian (Timberlake 2004 : 381):

надо бы
 need PTC
 'needed'

In Tatar, the third singular past tense form of the 'be'-verb *ide* participates in attenuating commands and necessary clauses, much like *val* in Udmurt (Poppe 1963 : 104). The analytic past tenses in Tatar follow a slightly different form, where the auxiliary *ide* 'be' inflects in person and combines with either the present or past stem of the main verb (Burbiel 2018 : 566–578). Except for some dialects, the past participle form of the 'be'-verb, *ikän*, does not participate in the formation of the analytic tempora (Burbiel 2018; Bereczki 1993). Burbiel (2018 : 407–411) describes *ikän* as a modal word with various different meanings, expressing, among others, the speaker's evaluation of the reliability of the statement, indirect evidentiality, inferentiality and mirativity, with a variety of emotional implicatures. The mirative use of *ikän* is shown below in (32).

(32) Tatar (Burbiel 2018 : 410):

I, bolar täräzä-lär-e-nä yaña tyül al-gan-nar
 INJ they window-PL-3POSS-DAT new curtain buy-PTCP.PST-3PL
ikän, karaçı
 be.PTCP.PST look.IMP
 'Oh, they have bought new curtains, look.'

Mari uses analytic tempora morphologically similar to those of Udmurt¹⁵ (Saarinen 2022 : 449). Spets (forthcoming) proposes that the Mari 'be'-verb *äl'e/ulmaš* should be analysed as a deictic particle instead of an auxiliary in analytic past tenses. Spets points out that a juxtaposition of two finite forms, of which the 'be'-verb appears uniform regardless of the person, is susceptible to a reanalysis of the particle-like auxiliary. In (33), Spets describes the 'was'-element as a deictic particle that locates the sequence into a past temporal frame. The scope of the particle is not only the predicate, but the entire statement: Spets points out that it is not a question of ellipsis, as the empty slot is filled

¹⁵ In Mari, the present tense and the evidential second past tense may combine with either the non-evidential or the evidential past form of the 'be'-verb. A combination of the first (non-evidential past) and the 'be'-verb is unknown.

later in the sequence, not vice versa. According to Spets, the particle has consequently also developed functions as an egophoric and modal discourse marker.

(33) Meadow Mari (Spets, forthcoming):

ača-m erdene er-ak eŋer-əš k a j a da
 father-POSS.1SG in.the.morning always-ENC fishing.rod-ILL go.3SG and
murda-že-vlak-əm ońc-en t o l e š ə l' e.
 trap-POSS.3SG-PL-ACC check-CVB.INS come.3SG Ə́LE

'Always in the mornings my father went fishing and came back having checked the traps.'

A similar development has also occurred in Chuvash, where the past form of the 'be'-verb is reduced into a clitic *-čče*. The clitic typically combines with participle forms used as predicates, and it alters the meaning aspectually, temporally, or modally depending on the participle in question (Landman 2014 : 69–70). The clitic may also attach to some finite verb forms "without affecting the meaning of the form" (Landman 2014 : 70).

As the phenomena presented in this chapter much resemble the discourse-interactional and intersubjective functions of *val* and *vylem* in Udmurt, the notions concerning similar phenomena in contact languages serve as supportive evidence for the results of the study. While we do not suggest the phenomena in Udmurt to have been borrowed from neighbouring languages — such claims would require a much more detailed study with different data and methods — we do assume the phenomenon to be areal to some extent, as there was no evidence to be found for a typological tendency of the grammaticalization of a 'was'-element to pragmatise in such manner. The existence of morphologically and functionally similar particles in Russian increases the complexity of the matter, and until further research we restrain from making elaborate claims concerning the origins of the phenomenon.

9. Conclusions

In our paper we proposed that the past tense forms of the 'be'-verb, *val* and *vylem* can acquire various discourse-interactional functions in the analytic past tenses. Taking into consideration the other non-temporal uses of these forms (such as their modal use, or the grammaticalisation of *vylem* to mark mirativity), the pragmatise of the 'be'-verb can be postulated. This process naturally leads to the reanalysis of the analytic past tenses as a verb in simple past and particle, too. The observation is supported also by the conclusion of the questionnaire: the use of *val* and *vylem* does not necessarily have an effect on temporal relations, they do not change the propositional content of the utterances but the emotional or epistemic status of the speaker, and they provide implications about the relation of the utterance to the discourse context. Table 3 summarises the discourse-interactional functions attributed to *val* and *vylem*.

As shown in Table 3, *val* is used to mark additive and old information, whereas *vylem* marks contrastive and new information. In these functions, the two forms of the 'be'-verb seem to be complementary in use with *val* and *vylem* marking old and new information respectively. Regarding marking old information, it must be mentioned that *vylem* may in some cases be used to refer to common ground, and in such a case, the use of it can be motivated by the type of information source, while it also signals a lower degree of epistemic authority over the content. Considering the additive and contrastive functions,

Discourse-interactional functions of *val* and *vylem*

	<i>val</i>	<i>vylem</i>
adversative	+	+
additive	+	–
contrastive	–	+
old information	+	(+)
new information	–	+
emphatic	+	+

the additive links the utterance to common ground, whereas the contrastive disconnects the utterance from it. Both forms may be used to mark adversativity, in which case the difference in the use of the forms lies in encoding evidentiality. Thus, aside from relating utterances to the discourse context, the functions can signal the knowledge status of the discourse participants in relation to each other. As such, the use of *val* and *vylem* is strongly linked to intersubjectivity and offers intriguing prospects for further research.

Acknowledgements. Until 2022 August the research was Supported by the ÚNKP-21-4-SZTE-189 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund. From September 2022 the research was funded by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, Hungary – NKFIH, "Evidentiality in the Uralic languages" (K139298, 2021–2024). During spring 2023, the research was also funded by the Finno-Ugrian Society (Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura).

The publication costs of this article were covered by the Estonian Academy of Sciences and the Estonian Research Council grant PUT 1290.

Addresses

Mari Saraheimo
University of Helsinki
E-mail: mari.saraheimo@helsinki.fi

Rebeka Kubitsch
University of Szeged
E-mail: kubitsch.rebeka.judit@szte.hu

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — first, second, third person; ACC — accusative; ADD — additive; ADDR — addressee; ADV — adverbialis; AVDS — adversative; ATT — attenuator; AUX — auxiliary; CAR — caritive; CAUS — causative; CNG — connegative; CTR — contrastive; CVB — converb; DAT — dative; DET — determinative; ENC — enclitic; ENGAG — engagement; ELA — relative; EMPH — emphatic; EV — evidential; EXCL — exclamative; FUT — future tense; GEN — genitive; IMP — imperative; INF — infinitive; INAN — inanimate; INE — inessive; INS — instrumental; ILL — illative; MASC — masculine; MIR — mirative; NEC — necessitive; NEG — negation; NEUT — neuter; NEW — new information; NMLZ — nominaliser; OLD — old information; PRF — perfect; PRS — present tense; PST — past tense; PL — plural; PN — proper noun; POSS — possessive; PP — postposition; PTC — particle; PTCP — participle; SG — singular; SPKR — speaker.

REFERENCES

- A i k h e n v a l d, Alexandra Y. 2012, The Essence of Mirativity. — *Linguistics* 33, 435–485.
A i j m e r, Karin, S i m o n - V a n d e n b e r g e n, Anne-Marie 2011, Pragmatic Markers. — *Discursive Pragmatics*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 223–248.

- A l t s h u l e r, Daniel 2012, Aspectual Meaning Meets Discourse Coherence: A Look at the Russian Imperfective. — *Journal of Semantics* 29, 39–108.
- A r k h a n g e l s k i y, Timofey 2014, Clitics in the Beserman Dialect of Udmurt. Basic Research Program. Working Papers. <https://wp.hse.ru/data/2014/10/02/1100269480/10LNG2014.pdf>.
- — 2019, Corpora of Social Media in Minority Uralic Languages. — *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Computational Linguistics for Uralic Languages*, Tartu, 125–140.
- B a r t e n s, Raija 2000, *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*, Helsinki (MSFOu 238).
- B e r e c z k i, Gábor 1993, The Character and the Scale of Turkic Influence on the Structure of Finno-Ugric Languages. — *Comparative Historical Linguistics, Indo-European and Finno-Ugric, Amsterdam—Philadelphia (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 97)*, 509–520.
- B e r g q v i s t, Henrik, K i t t i l ä, Seppo 2020, Epistemic Perspectives: Evidentiality, Egophoricity and Engagement. — *Evidentiality, Egophoricity and Engagement*, Berlin (*Studies in Diversity Linguistics* 30), 1–22.
- B r u g m a n, Claudia M., M a c a u l a y, Monica 2015, Characterizing Evidentiality. — *Linguistic Typology* 19 (2), 201–237.
- B u r b i e l, Gustav 2018, *Tatar Grammar. A Grammar of the Contemporary Tatar Literary Language*, Stockholm—Moscow.
- C o r n i l l i e, Bert 2018, On Speaker Commitment and Speaker Involvement. Evidence from Evidentials in Spanish Talk-in-Interaction. — *Journal of Pragmatics* 128, 161–170.
- D j e n a r, Dwi Noverini, E w i n g, Michael C., M a n n s, Howard 2018, Interactional Particles and Perspective Management. — *Style and Intersubjectivity in Youth Interaction*, Berlin (*Contributions to the Sociology of Language* 108), 64–104.
- E v a n s, Nicholas 2006, View with a View. Towards a Typology of Multiple Perspective Constructions. — *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley, 93–120.
- E v a n s, Nicholas, B e r g q v i s t, Henrik, S a n R o q u e, Lila 2018, The Grammar of Engagement I. Framework and Initial Exemplification. — *Language and Cognition* 10, 110–140.
- F a l l e r, Martina 2002, *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidential in Cuzco Quechua*. PhD Dissertation, Stanford.
- F r a n k - J o b, Barbara 2006, A Dynamic-Interactional Approach to Discourse Markers. — *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Amsterdam (*Studies in Pragmatics* 1), 359–374.
- H a s e l o w, Alexander 2012, Subjectivity, Intersubjectivity and the Negotiation of Common Ground in Spoken Discourse. Final Particles in English. — *Language and Communication* 32, 182–204.
- H o r v á t h, Laura 2015, Habitualitás kifejezése udmurt nyelvjárásokban. — *Nyelvelmélet és dialektológia* 3, 99–125.
- K a m i o, Akio 1997, *Territory of Information*, Amsterdam (*Pragmatics and Beyond New Series* 48).
- K e l m a k o v, Valentin, H ä n n i k ä i n e n, Sara 2008, *Udmurtin kielioppia ja harjoituksia*, Helsinki (*Apuneuvoja suomalais-ugrilaisten kielten opintoja varten* XIV).
- K o s s, Tom, D e W i t, Astrid, v a n d e r A u w e r a, Johan 2022, The Aspectual Meaning of Non-Aspectual Constructions. — *Languages* 7: 143, 1–20.
- K o z m á c s István 2002, *Udmurt nyelvkönyv*, Szeged.
- K u b i t s c h, Rebeka 2020, A létige múlt idejű alakjai mint modális partikulák az udmurt nyelvben. — *NyK* 116, 97–137.
- — 2021, Past Tense Forms of the Verb 'be' in Modal Constructions in Udmurt. — *Ежегодник финно-угорских исследований. «Yearbook of Finno-Ugric Studies»* 15 (4), 599–618.
- — 2022, Evidencialitás az udmurt nyelvben. Doktori (PhD) értekezés, Szeged.
- L a b o v, William, F a n s h e l, David 1977, *Therapeutic Discourse. Psychotherapy as Conversation*, New York.
- L a n d m a n n, Angelika 2014, *Tschuwaschische Kurzgrammatik*, Wiesbaden.

- Leinonen, Marja, Vilkuna, Maria 2000, Past Tenses in Permic Languages. — Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe, Berlin (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, EUROTYPE 20-6), 495–514.
- Levinson, Stephen 2000, Presumptive Meanings. The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature, Cambridge.
- Niva, Heidi 2022, Suomen progressiivirakenne intentioiden ja ennakkoinnin ilmaisuissa. Akateeminen väitöskirja, Helsingin yliopisto.
- Peterson, Tyler 2010, Examining the Mirative and Nonliteral Uses of Evidentials. — Evidence from Evidentials, Vancouver (University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 28), 129–159.
- Poppo, Nicholas 1963, Tatar Manual, The Hague (UAS 25).
- Saarinen, Sirkka 2022, Mari. — The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages, Oxford (Oxford Guides to the World's Languages), 432–469.
- Saraheimo, Mari 2018, Aikamuodot muutoksessa. Udmurtin menneen ajan liittotempukset. Pro gradu -tutkielma, Helsingin yliopisto.
- — 2022, The Finite Remote Past in Udmurt. From Temporal to Modal and Pragmatic Functions. — FUF 67, 161–203.
- Siegl, Florian 2004, The 2nd Past in the Permic Languages. Form, Function and a Comparative Analysis from a Typological Perspective. M. A. Thesis, University of Tartu.
- Skrjabin, Elena, Kehayov, Petar 2018, Evidentials in Uralic Languages. — The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality, Oxford (Oxford Handbooks), 525–553.
- Spets, Silja-Maija [forthcoming], Perspective and Its Formal Background. An Explanation for Aspectual Synonymy between Simple and Analytic Past Tenses in Mari. — JSFOu 99.
- Timberlake, Alan 2004, A Reference Grammar of Russian, Cambridge.
- Uusikoski, Risto 2016, Concepts of Tense. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Helsinki.
- vander Voort, Hein 2004, A Grammar of Kwaza, Berlin (Mouton Grammar Library 29).
- Winkler, Eberhard 2011, Udmurtische Grammatik, Wiesbaden (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 81).
- Zeevat, Henk 2006, A Dynamic Approach to Discourse Particles. — Approaches to Discourse Particles, Amsterdam (Studies in Pragmatics 1), 133–148.
- Zimmermann, Malte 2011, Discourse Particles. — Semantics. Volume 2, Berlin—Boston (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft. Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 33.2), 2012–2038.
- Загуляева, Б. Ш. 1984, Сложные формы давнопрошедшего времени в некоторых удмуртских диалектах. — Вопросы грамматики удмуртского языка, Ижевск, 45–58.
- Серебрянников, Б. А. 1960, Категории времени и вида в финно-угорских языках пермской и волжской групп, Москва.
- Тараканов, И. В. 1998, Условное наклонение, его значения и происхождение суффикса *-сал* в удмуртском языке. — Исследования и размышления об удмуртском языке. Сборник статей, Ижевск, 168–180.
- — 2011, Каронкыл. — Удмурт кыллэн вераськонлокетгодосез (морфология), Ижевск, 138–254.

MARI SARAHHEIMO (Helsinki), REBEKA KUBITSH (Szeged)

**ДИСКУРСИВНО-ИНТЕРАКТИВНЫЕ ФУНКЦИИ
ФОРМ ПРОШЕДШЕГО ВРЕМЕНИ ГЛАГОЛА 'БЫТЬ'
В УДМУРТСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ (*вал* И *вылэм*)**

В статье рассматриваются дискурсивно-интерактивные функции форм прошедшего времени глагола 'быть' в удмуртском языке (*вал* и *вылэм*). В центре внимания авторов аналитические формы, в которых формы 'быть' традиционно анализируются как вспомогательные. Цель авторов — охарактеризовать эти дискурсивно-интерактивные употребления и их отношение к другим формам и функциям прошедшего времени. Мы утверждаем, что эти дискурсивно-интерактивные функции скорее следует отнести скорее к формам прошедшего времени глагола 'быть', чем к самим аналитическим временам. Это позволяет постулировать прагматизацию *вал* и *вылэм*. Предполагаем, что использование их как инструментов организации дискурса тоже связано с интересубъективностью. Статья построена так: сначала вводятся понятие интересубъективности и теоретическая модель для категоризации дискурсивно-интерактивных функций. После обсуждения материала рассматриваются другие труды о нетемпоральном употреблении аналитических прошедших времен и форм прошедшего времени глагола 'быть'. Авторы предлагают понятия дискурсивно-интерактивных функций (противительной, контрастивной, аддитивной, функции маркирования старой информации, функции маркирования новой информации, эмфатической) и рассматривают их связь с интересубъективностью. Статью завершает обсуждение аналогичных феноменов в контактных языках.

MARI SARAHEIMO (Helsinki), REBEKA KUBITSCH (Szeged)

**UDMURDI MINEVIKUVORMIDE *val* JA *vjlem*
DISKURSUSE- JA SUHTLUSFUNKTSIOONID**

Artiklis käsitletakse udmurdi 'olema'-verbi minevikuvormide *val* ja *vjlem* diskursuse- ja suhtlusfunktsioone. Keskendume analüütilistele minevikuvormidele, milles traditsiooniliselt peetakse neid vorme abitegusõnadeks. Meie põhieesmärk on iseloomustada nende kasutusviise ning seoseid teiste minevikuvormidega ja nende funktsioonidega. Väidame, et need diskursuse- ja suhtlusfunktsioonid ei ole omased analüütilistele minevikuvormidele, vaid pigem just abisõnadele *val* ja *vjlem*. Seoses sellega võib täheldada vormide *val* ja *vjlem* pragmatiseerumist. Oleme seisukohal, et nende kasutamist diskursuse korraldamise vahenditena saab seostada ka intersubjektiivsusega. Vormidel *val* ja *vjlem* on mitmesuguseid diskursuse- ja suhtlusfunktsioone, millele on vasteid ka kontaktkeeltes.