Evidentiality in Uralic Languages

Exercise book

Working Papers in Corpus Linguistics

and Digital Technologies:

Analyses and Methodology

Vol. 9.

Evidentiality in Uralic Languages

Exercise book

with selected bibliography

Sándor Szeverényi – Rebeka Kubitsch – Katalin Sipőcz –

Ditta Szabó – Bogáta Timár – Nikolett F. Gulyás

Working Papers in Corpus Linguistics and Digital Technologies: Analyses and methodology

Vol. 9

CONTENT

Foreword

In February 2019, the topic of one of the workshops of the 7th Winter School of Finno-Ugric Studies (COPIUS) was "Evidentiality in Uralic languages". Instead of providing an overview of evidentiality in all of the Uralic languages, the organizers of the workshop decided to concentrate, after an introduction to the topic, only on a few of them and to do so in an interactive and exciting way, with the help of creative tasks. The range of languages to be covered was defined, on the one hand, by the language proficiency of the organizing team, and, on the other hand, by how the various branches of Uralic were represented. This is the reason why the present volume does not discuss Finnic languages – but our hope is that a second volume will include those as well. The program of the Hamburg Winter School included Mansi, Nganasan, and Udmurt, and these are complemented by two others now: Meadow Mari and Komi-Permyak. The reason for the latter two is that the workshop included two excellent student presentations on these two languages, so we decided to include them in the volume, even though evidentiality in the two languages are very similar. This is how this collection of problems was organized, and only slight modifications were made on the material originally compiled. Participants' feedback we received after the workshop also urged us to publish the materials. In recent years, we have tested and shaped most of the exercises in several courses to make them really usable. Here they are.

The present work is a textbook, a collection of linguistic problems. Therefore, we do not want to provide a detailed overview of the evidentiality in the relevant languages in this introduction. Instead, we want to present them in such a way that they could be used, in addition to a range of courses in Uralic studies, in courses of typology and be understandable to a wider audience of scholars and students beyond Finno-Ugrists. In accordance with this aim, we provide a (very) brief introduction to evidentiality, followed by a bibliography of the most important general and language specific sources in order to assist the reader in obtaining further information. Then we provide a short summary of basic information about the languages discussed in this volume.

The structure of the linguistic problems included in this volume is the same: after an overview of information relevant to evidentiality (description of the genre and/or situation), we provide texts, excerpts, and/or individual sentences and questions connected with these. We do not provide full and detailed solutions to the problems, only hints at solving them. A bibliography of sources referenced is included at the end of the volume.

Why did we choose to address the phenomenon of evidentiality? The investigation of this phenomenon provides an opportunity for an extremely complex analysis, since it is characterized by a wide range of forms (grammatical elements, syntactic structures, and lexical elements) as well as semantic and pragmatic perspectives.

Another, perhaps puzzling issue is why we chose to publish a collection of linguistic problems in this particular series. This is because of one of the aims of this series, to provide an outlet for demonstrating practical ways of using corpora from small languages.

The authors

Evidentiality in a nutshell

Rebeka Kubitsch

Evidentiality is traditionally viewed as the linguistic marking of information source and type (Aikhenvald 2004). In the corresponding literature, several definitions can be found and there is no unanimity considering the nature of this category. One of the most prominent researchers of the topic, Aikhenvald (2004, 2014, 2018), considers evidentiality a grammatical category, just like tense, aspect and mood. In this sense, evidentiality is present only in such languages that have a grammaticalized form dedicated to mark the source of information. Others, however, define it as a semantic-functional category which can be expressed through various means, such as lexicon and morphosyntax (Diewald-Smirnova 2010). Evidentiality in the interpretation of Peterson et al. (2010) and Ekberg & Paradis (2009) is a universal cognitive category which expresses our source of information in communication.

Regardless which interpretation we accept, on the one hand, it can be seen that evidentiality reflects on the information source the proposition is based on. On the other hand, languages differ in a great deal in their ways of expressing this: some languages have dedicated grammatical elements whose primary meaning is to mark the information source, while in other languages lexical elements or the contextual reading of other categories (such as tenses, aspects, moods) can express this meaning.

Evidentiality and evidential markers in individual languages are in interaction with other concepts and categories related to knowledge, and their use can be affected by socio-cultural factors as well (Bernárdez 2017). Recent works propagate a more pragmatic, discourse-oriented approach in general. More and more languages prove that the speaker's choice of evidential is not only governed by the source of information but rather it depends on the speech-act participants' interpersonal dynamics and the respective position relative to the event in question (Bergqvist & Grzech 2023: 24).

1. Evidence types and evidential systems

Several typologies exist, the best known being those by Willett (1988), Aikhenvald (2004) and Plungian (2010). There are differences between the existing typologies in their details; however, the basic distinctions are the same: whether the speaker obtained the information in a direct or indirect way. Direct evidence is the visual experience of the speaker but non-visual sensory (hearing, smelling, touching) can also constitute direct evidence (although languages may differ in this regard). Indirect evidence typically involves inference and hearsay as well as their subtypes. The typology below is from Plungian (2001: 354, 2010: 37).

Direct/Personal evidence	Participatory/Endophoric; Common knowledge
	Visual
	Non-visual (Sensory)
Indirect/Personal evidence	Inferential (based on observed results)
	Presumptive (based on plausible reasoning); Common knowledge
Indirect/Non-personal evidence	Reported

Table 1. Types of Evidence based on Plungian

In languages with grammatical marking of the information source, evidence types can be grouped differently in respect of their marking. Aikhenvald (2004, 2018) classifies languages from a quantitative point of view (Table 2), i.e., evidential systems are established on the basis of how many evidence types are expressed with separate (primarily morphological) markers. According to this, there are small and large evidential systems. In small evidential systems, a single marker can cover several types of evidence.

-		VISUAL	NON-VISUAL SENSORY	INFERENCE	ASSUMPTION	REPORTED	QUOTATIVE
2 choices	A1	firsthand		non-firsthand			
	A1	firsthand	non-firsthand				
	A2	<no term>		non-firsthand			
	A3	<no term>				reported	
	A4	<no term>	auditory	<no term>			
3 choices	B1	direct		inferred		reported	
	B2	visual	non-visual	inferred			
	B3	visual	non-visual	<no term>		reported	
	B4	<no term>	non-visual	inferred		reported	
	B5	<no term>				reported	quotative
	B6	<no term>	non-visual	<no term>		reported	
4 choices	C1	visual	non-visual	inferred		reported	
	C2	direct (or experiential)		inferred	assumed	reported	
	C3	direct (or experiential)		inferred		reported	quotative
	C4	visual	non-visual	inferred		<no term>	
	C5	direct	inferred	assumed		<no term>	
	C6	<no term>		inferred		reported	quotative
5 choices	D1	visual	non-visual	inferred	assumed	reported	

Table 2. Semantic parameters om evidentiality systems (Aikhenvald 2018: 15)

It also has to be mentioned that there are languages in which there is an evidentially marked form but its "counterpart" (e.g., the form in the same morphosyntactic position) is evidentially unmarked, meaning, it is neutral in respect of expressing the the source of information. In such cases, it is the speaker's choice whether they choose the evidentially marked or unmarked form in the discourse (Aikhenvald 2004: 75–76). We have little knowledge what factors can affect this kind of choice of the

speaker but it safely can be assumed that it is rather guided by discourse-interactional considerations than grammatical ones.

2. The interaction of evidentiality with other categories

Morphological markers of evidentiality are typically part of the verbal paradigm. Considering the synchronic relationship of evidentiality with other grammatical categories, the following interactions can be observed (Aikhenvald 2015: 243):

1. The marking of evidentiality can fuse with the marking of another category (e.g., tense, mood, aspect).
2. The possible number of evidential specifications may depend on another category (e.g., as a tendency, more evidential specifications are possible in declarative sentences, or in the past tenses)
3. An evidential can have a specific interpretation in combination with another category (e.g., a reportative evidential can express politeness in commands, or evidentials in first person can have extensions to the domain of volition).

Another category, which cross-linguistically evidentiality shows interaction with, is mirativity. Mirativity is referred to as the grammatical marking of unprepared mind or new information that may result in the speaker's surprise (DeLancey 1997). Recently, surprise as a defining semantic component has been more widely rejected, and it is more accepted to view mirativity as the signaling of new or unassimilated knowledge (Bergqvist & Kittilä 2023: 2). Mexas (2016: 10) also defines mirativity as the marking of realization which is a transition from a state of lacking awareness to a state of awareness. Mirativity is shown to be linked to the semantics and pragmatics of evidentiality (Peterson 2010: 132), and evidential markers often have a mirative interpretation as well (cf. Slobin & Aksu 1982, DeLancey 2001, Aikhenvald 2012, Brugman & Macaulay 2015).

The relationship of evidentiality and epistemic modality is also a topic frequently addressed. Epistemic modality is the speaker's evaluation/judgment of, degree of confidence in, or belief of the knowledge upon which a proposition is based (de Haan 1999). For a long time, evidentiality was considered a subtype of epistemic modality, because both categories are related to knowledge (Palmer 1986; Willett 1988). Nowadays they are treated as distinct categories in the typology of evidentiality (Aikhenvald 2004, de Haan 1999, Plungian 2010).[1] Nevertheless, evidential markers can reflect on the degree of certainty, but this property is considered to be language specific (cf. Brugman & Macaulay 2015). Givón (2001: 326) assumes a pragmatic relationship between the two categories. According to this, evidentiality primarily marks the source of information, and, implicitly, the strength of this source. This implicit connection links evidentiality to subjective certainty. The subtype of inferential evidence is where it is especially hard, if not impossible, to separate evidential and epistemic notions, since the evaluation of a piece of evidence always involves the speaker's own judgment, too (van der Auwera & Plungian 1998).

---

[1] For an elaborate summary for the existing views on the relationship of evidentiality and epistemic modality, see (Dendale & Tasmowski 2001).

3. Evidentiality in the Uralic languages

So far, the most detailed, typology-oriented overview of evidentiality in the Uralic languages was written by Skribnik & Kehayov (2018). Nevertheless, there are plenty of individual works on almost all languages.

Considering the marking of information source, Uralic languages do not show a unified picture. In Hungarian, in the Finnic languages with the exception of Estonian and Livonian, in the Saamic languages, furthermore in Erzya and Moksha, there are no morphological evidential markers, the source of information is primarily expressed by particles, adverbials, and as a contextual extension of other categories, such as tenses and moods. It is also typical to particles and adverbials that evidential and epistemic meanings cannot be separated, therefore, these elements reflect on the speaker's degree of certainty beside marking the source of information, or they attenuate the speaker's responsibility for the truth of the proposition.

In the other Uralic languages, it is possible to express the source of information with dedicated morphological markers. We can find such elements in Estonian and Livonian (Finnic branch), in Komi Permyak/Zyrian, Udmurt (Permic branch), in Mari, in the Northern dialects of Mansi and Khanty (Ob-Ugric), and in Enets, Nenets, Nganasan and Selkup (Samoyedic) (Skribnik & Kehayov 2018: 529). It is important to mention that besides these markers, these languages also have other ways of expressing the source of information.

In these languages, almost all the evidential markers originate from non-finite constructions (Jalava 2016). Typologically, non-finite forms often become markers of evidentiality or acquire evidential meanings (Aikhenvald 2004: 117-120, Plungian 2010: 40). Based on the classification of Skribnik & Kehayov (2018), the following grammaticalized evidentials can be found in the Uralic languages.

1. reportative evidential – Estonian, Livonian
2. indirect evidential – Permic languages (Udmurt, Komi, Komi-Permyak), Mari, Ob-Ugric languages
3. complex evidential systems with the separate marking of several evidence types (e.g., auditive/non-visual sensory, indirect, inferential evidential) – Samoyedic languages

Evidentials in Uralic are assumed to be developed by various means, such as the reanalysis of tenses, nominalizations and insubordination (Skribnik & Kehayov 2018: 553). The development of evidential systems in certain Uralic languages is considered to be the result of areal effects and also innovations within the languages. We cannot reconstruct the morphological marking of information source to Proto-Uralic, and similarities between evidential systems are not in accordance with their position in the language family. The importance of areal effects is supported by the fact that the Uralic evidential systems show similarities on an areal bases - the Estonian and Livonian system is similar to the ones found on Latvian and Lithuanian (Baltic language area), the Mari and Permic evidentials show similarities to the evidentials of Tatar, Chuvash, Bashkir, i.e., to the Turkic languages spoken in the Volga-Kama area. The systems of the Ob-Ugric languages (and more or less the Selkup system as well) have in common with the evidentials of languages spoken in the Taiga region. The complex evidential systems of the Northern Samoyedic languages are typical to the languages of the Tundra (Szeverényi 2020).

References

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

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.) 2018. *Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistics* 33: 435–485

Aikhenvald, Alexandra, Y. & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds.) 2014. *The Grammar of Knowledge*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna 2015. Evidentials: their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology* 19/2: 239–277.

Bergqvist, Henrik & Grzech, Karolina 2023. The role of pragmatics in the definition of evidentiality. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals*, 76(1): 1–30.

Bergqvist, Henrik & Kittilä, Seppo 2020. Epistemic Perspectives: Evidentiality, Egophoricity and Engagement. In: Bergqvist, H. & Kittilä, S. (eds.), *Evidentiality, Egophoricity and Engagement*. Studies in Diversity Linguistics 30. Berlin: Language science press. 1–22.

Brugman, Claudia M. & Macaulay, Monica 2015. Characterizing evidentiality. *Linguistic Typology* 19/2: 201–237. DOI: 10.1515/lingty-2015-0007

de Haan, Ferdinand 1999. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries. Southwest Journal of Linguistics 18. 83–101.

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

DeLancey, Scott 2001 The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 369–382.

Dendale, Patrick & Tasmowski, Liliane 2001. Introduction: Evidentiality and related notions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 339–348.

Diewald, Gabriele & Smirnova, Elena. Introduction. Evidentiality in European languages: the lexical-grammatical distinction. In: Diewald, G. & Smirnov, E. (eds.) Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in the European Languages, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 1–15.

Ekberg, Lena & Paradis, Carita. 2009. Editorial paper: Evidentiality in Language and Cognition. In: Ekberg, P. & Paradis, C. (eds.) Functions of Language 16., Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 5–7.Givón 2001

Givón, Talmy. 2001. Syntax. An Introduction. Vol.1. Amszterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Jalava, Lotta. 2016. Evidentials based on non-finite constructions in Uralic languages. (https://www.academia.edu/28884462/Evidentials_based_on_nominalizations_in_Uralic_languages utolsó látogatás: 2022.01.07.)

Mexas, Haris. 2016. Mirativity as realization marking: A cross-linguistic study. MA Thesis, Universiteit Leiden.

Palmer, Frank R. 1996. Mood and modality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peterson, Tyler & Déchaine, Rose-Marie & Sauerland, Uli. 2010. Introduction. In: Peterson, T. & Sauerland, U. (eds.) Evidence from Evidentials, The University of British Columbia: The University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 28. 1–8.

Peterson, Tyler 2010. Examining the mirative and non-literal use of evidentials. In: Peterson, Tyler & Sauerland, Uli (eds.), Evidence from Evidentials. *The University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 28: 129–159.

https://lingpapers.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2018/01/EvidenceFromEvidentials.pdf

Plungian, Vladimir 2010. Types of verbal evidentiality marking: An overview. In: Diewald, Gabriele & Smirnova, Elena (eds.), *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin. 15–58.

Skribnik, Elena & Kehayov, Petar 2018. Evidentials in Uralic Languages. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. 525–555.

Slobin, Dan Isaac & Aksu, Ayhan 1982. Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. In: Hopper, P. J. (ed.), *Tense-aspect: Between semantics & pragmatics*, Amszterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 185–200

Szeverényi, Sándor 2020. Az evidencialitás kulturális magyarázatának lehetséges történeti vonatkozásai az északi szamojéd nyelvekben. [Possible historical aspects of the cultural explanation of evidentiality in the Northern Samoyed languages.] *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 27: 283–306.

Van Der Auwera, Jan & Plungian, Vladimir 1998. On modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2. 79–124.

Willett, Thomas 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.

Languages analyzed in the book

Mansi

The Mansi (or Vogul) language is one of the most endangered languages of the Finno-Ugric group of the Uralic language family. It is spoken in Western Siberia by the river Ob and its tributaries (the Sosva and the Sygva) in the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous District of the Tyumen Region. Mansi also can be found by the rivers Lozva and Ivdel in the Sverdlovsk Region. The dialects of Mansi are traditionally divided into four groups: Northern, Eastern, Southern and Western. There are noticeable differences between the dialects, and they concern each level of the language (they are of phonetic, morphologic, syntactic and lexical in nature), and there are significant differences between the dialects concerning the use of grammatical evidentiality, too. The only dialect that is still spoken today is Northern Mansi, and this dialect is also the base of the Mansi literary language, and this is the only dialect included in education as well.

Hungarian

Hungarian is the largest Uralic language, with a total of about 13-14 million speakers, of whom about 9.5 million live in Hungary. Outside Hungary, it is spoken mainly in the neighbouring countries of the Carpathian Basin, in Romania (mainly Transylvania), Slovakia (Felvidék), Serbia (Vojvodina), Ukraine, Croatia, Slovenia and Austria. Hungarian became the official language of Hungary in 1836 and since 1844 it has been the country's exclusive official language. In addition, Hungarian is an official language in Vojvodina and in three municipalities of Slovenia (Dobronak, Őrihodos and Lendva). Its closest cognate languages are Mansi and Khanty, but these are also very distant relations.

Udmurt

Udmurt is a language of the Permic subgroup of the Uralic language family, which is spoken by appr. 267 000 speakers. Most of the speakers, 77,6%, live in the Udmurt Republic in the Russian Federation, which is located between the Vyatka and Kama rivers. In addition to the Udmurt Republic, the language is also spoken in the Kirov Oblast, the Perm Oblast, Bashkortostan, Tatarstan and the Mari Republic.The ethnic population is 380 000 according to the census held in 2020 (Rosstat 2020). The Udmurts form a minority in their own republic: Udmurts make up 21% of the republic's population, while the Russian population is 58%. On the EGIDS scale Udmurt is considered a threatened language (Ethnologue). Only 70% of Udmurts speak Udmurt, while all of them speak Russian (and in the southern areas usually Tatar too) (Pusztay 2022: 134). Therefore, the speakers are mostly Udmurt-Russian bilinguals (Salánki & Kondratieva 2018: 166–167). Although Udmurt is the official language of the Udmurt Republic, in the cities and in administrative life Russian is dominant, and Udmurt is often the language of home.

Udmurt is part of the Volga-Kama linguistic area, which comprises Mari, Chuvash, Tatar and Bashkir, whereas Erzya, Moksha (also known as Mordva) and Komi (Zyrian and Permyak) are on the periphery of the area. With the exception of Erzya and Moksha, evidentiality is present in the area as a

grammatical feature. In addition, it is postulated that in Udmurt evidentiality developed due to the intense contact with the Turkic languages spoken in the area (Tatar, Chuvash and Bashkir).

Komi-Permyak

Komi-Permyak is an endangered Finno-Ugric language spoken in the Perm Region of European Russia. Belonging to the Permic branch of the Uralic language family, it is closely related to Udmurt and Komi-Zyrian. Its speakers live in the Komi-Permyak District, which formerly was the titular Komi-Permyak Autonomous District until 2005, within the Perm Region. Some speakers live in neighbouring regions, notably the Kirov Region. The number of speakers has decreased in the last decades; data from the 2020 All-Russia population census indicate that nearly 40,000 people consider Komi-Permyak their mother tongue, approximately 72% of the population – a notably high figure in comparison to other Uralic-speaking communities (Rosstat 2020). In the same census, 55,000 people identified as ethnic Komi-Permyaks, marking a decline from around 94,500 in 2010. Komi-Permyak is a peripherical member of the Volga-Kama linguistic area, but Turkic influence on the language is marginal as compared to the impact of the Russian language, which dominates all the fields of communication.

Meadow Mari

Meadow Mari is a Finno-Ugric language, which is mainly spoken in the Republic of Mari El, an autonomous republic of the Russian Federation. Its closest relative is Hill Mari, which is regarded as a separate language. Dialectologists also separate Eastern Mari dialects, which are spoken by the Mari diaspora in Bashkortostan. They are considered a variation of Meadow Mari. The closest relative of the Mari languages is considered to be the Mordvin laguages (Erzya and Moksha), though the existence of a common Volgaic proto-language is rejected by most etymologists. Meadow Mari has been heavily influenced by the neighbouring Turkic languages, especially Chuvash and Tatar. According to the latest census data (Rosstat 2020), the number of Mari speakers is roughly 352 000 (including Hill Mari). However, a large amount of skepticism must be applied here due to methodological concerns pertaining to the census, and the number of speakers is probably higher. Mari is categorized as "definitely endangered" according to the UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger. Despite the relatively large number of speakers and being an official language of the Republic of Mari El, since native-language education is not secured, and the child-bearing population is reluctant to transfer the language to their children, the future of the language is worrysome.

Nganasan

Nganasan is the northernmost language of Eurasia. It is part of the Uralic language family with Tundra and Forest Nenets and the only living southern Samoyed language, Selkup. Nganasan is spoken in the Taymir Peninsula with most of its speakers living in two villages, Ust-Avam and Volochanka. There are Nganasans in cities, first of all, in Dudinka, and Nganasans live in the eastern part of the peninsula as well. The official data show a rapid decrease in the number of speakers (data are based on the official censuses of the Russian Federation). The latest census shows that the number of the speakers is appr. 300, the number of the population is 687 (Rosstat 2020). Today we can bravely state that there are no monolingual Nganasan speakers.

Selected bibliography

(1a)   EVIDENTIALITY IN GENERAL

Aijmer, Karin 2009. *Seem* and evidentiality. *Functions of Language* 16/1: 63–88.

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

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna 2012. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology* 16: 435–485.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna 2015. Evidentials: their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology* 19/2: 239–277.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna (ed.) 2018. *Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Bergqvist, Henrik & Kittilä, Seppo 2020. Epistemic perspectives: evidentiality, egophoricity, and engagement (Introduction). In: Bergqvist, Henrik & Kittilä, Seppo (eds.), *Evidentiality, egophoricity and engagement.* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics; no. 30). Language Science Press, Berlin. 1–21. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3968344

Bergqvist, Henrik & Grzech, Karolina 2023. The role of pragmatics in the definition of evidentiality. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 76(1): 1–30.

Bernárdez, Enrique. 2017. Evidentiality: a cultural interpretation. In: Sharifian, F. (ed.) *Advances in Cultural Lingustics*. Singapore: Springer. 432–459.

Brugman, Claudia M. & Macaulay, Monica 2015. Characterizing evidentiality. *Linguistic Typology* 19/2: 201–237. DOI: 10.1515/lingty-2015-0007

Cornillie, Bert 2009. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: On the close relationship of two different categories. *Functions of Language* 16/1: 44–62. DOI: 10.1075/fol.16.1.04cor

Dendale, Patrick & Tasmowski, Liliane 2001. Introduction: Evidentiality and related notions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 339–348.

de Haan, Ferdinand. 1999. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18: 83–101.

de Haan, Ferdinand 2005. Encoding speaker perspective: Evidentials. In: Frajzyngier, Zygmunt & Hodges, Adam & Rood, David S. (eds.), *Linguistic diversity and language theories.* Studies in Language Companion Series 72. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 379–397. DOI: 10.1075/slcs.72.18haa

de Haan, Ferdinand 2013. Semantic Distinctions of Evidentiality. In: Ferdinand de Haan. 2013. Semantic Distinctions of Evidentiality. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), WALS Online (v2020.3) [Data set]. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.7385533 (Available online at http://wals.info/chapter/77, Accessed on 2024-09-04.

de Haan, Ferdinand 2012. Evidentiality and Mirativity. In: Binnick, Robert I. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect.* Oxford University Press, Oxford. 1020–1046.

Davis, Christopher & Potts, Christopher & Speas, Margaret 2007. The pragmatic values of evidential sentences. In: Gibson, Masayuki & Friedman, Tova (eds.), Proceedings of SALT XVII. CLC Publications.

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

DeLancey, Scott 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(3): 369–382.

DeLancey, Scott 2012. Still mirative after all these years. *Linguistic Typology* 16(3): 529–564.Evans, Nicholas & Henrik Bergqvist & San Roque, Lila 2018a. The grammar of engagement I: Framework and initial exemplification. *Language and Cognition* 10(1): 110–140.

Evans, Nicholas & Henrik Bergqvist & San Roque, Lila 2018b. The grammar of engagement II: Typology and diachrony. *Language and Cognition* 10(1): 141–170.

Faller, Martina 2002a. *Semantics and Pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. PhD Thesis, Stanford University.

Faller, Martina 2002b. Remarks on evidential hierarchies. In: Beaver, David I. & Martinez, Luis D. Casillas & Clark, Brady Z. & Kaufmann, Stefan (eds.), *The Construction of Meaning.* CSLI Publications. 89–111.

Izvorski, Roumyana 1997. The present perfect as an epistemic modal. In: Lawson, A. (ed.), Proceedings of SALT XII, 222–239. Cornell University. DOI: 10.3765/salt.v7i0.2795

Kratzer, Angelika (1977). What 'must' and 'can' must and can mean. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1: 337–356.

Keinänen, Satu 2021. A metalinguistic analysis of the terminology of evidential categories: experiential, conjecture or deduced? *Folia Linguistica* 55/2: 547–587. DOI: 10.1515/flin-2021-2030

Kittilä, Seppo 2019. General knowledge as an evidential category. *Linguistics* 57/6: 1271–1304. DOI: 10.1515/ling-2019-0027

Kittilä, Seppo & Bergqvist, Henrik (eds.) 2020. *Evidentiality, egophoricity and engagement.* (Studies in Diversity Linguistics; no. 30) Language Science Press, Berlin.

Kittilä, Seppo 2020. Folklore as an evidential category. *Folia Linguistica* 54/3: 697–721.

Kittilä, Seppo & Jalava, Lotta & Sandman, Erika 2018. What can different types of linguistic data teach us on evidentiality? In: Foolen, Ad & de Hoop, Helen & Mulder, Gijs (eds.), *Evidence for evidentiality.* (Human Cognitive Processing; no. 61). John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 281–304. DOI: 10.1075/hcp.61.12kit

Kozintseva, Natalya Andreevna [Козинцева, Наталия Андреевна] 1994. Категория эвиденциальности (проблемы типологического анализа). [The category of evidentiality (problems of the typological analysis]. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija [Вопросы языкознания]* 1994, No 3: 92–104.

Matthewson, Lisa 2011. On apparently non-modal evidentials. In: Bonami, Olivier & Cabredo-Hofherr, Patricia (eds.), *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics 8.* 333–357. CNRS. http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss8/index_en.html

Matthewson, Lisa & Davis, Henry & Rullmann, Hotze 2008. Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St'´at'imcets. In: van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen (ed.), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 7.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 201–254. DOI: 10.1075/livy.7.07mat

Mithun, Marianne 2020. Context and consciousness: Documenting evidentials. *Folia Linguistica* 54(2): 317–342.

Murray, Sarah E. 2010. Evidentiality and the structure of speech acts. PhD Thesis, Rutgers University.

Mushin, Ilana 2013. Making knowledge visible in discourse: Implications for the study of linguistic evidentiality. *Discourse Studies* 15(5): 627–645.

Peterson, Tyler 2010. Examining the mirative and non-literal use of evidentials. In: Peterson, Tyler & Sauerland, Uli (eds.), Evidence from Evidentials. *The University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics* 28: 129–159.
https://lingpapers.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2018/01/EvidenceFromEvidentials.pdf

Plungian, Vladimir 2001. The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 349–357.

Plungian, Vladimir 2010. Types of verbal evidentiality marking: An overview. In: Diewald, Gabriele & Smirnova, Elena (eds.), *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin. 15–58.

Rooryck, Johan 2001a. Evidentiality, Part I. *Glot International* 5: 125–133.

Rooryck, Johan 2001b. Evidentiality Part II. *Glot International* 5: 161–168.

Sidnell, Jack 2012. "Who knows best?" Evidentiality and epistemic asymmetry in conversation. *Pragmatics and Society* 3(2): 294–320.

Slobin, Dan I. & Aksu, Ayhan A. 1982. Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. In: Hopper, Paul J. (ed.), *Tense-aspect: Between semantics & pragmatics*. Benjamins, Amsterdam. 185–200. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.1.13slo

Squartini, Mario 2008. Lexical vs. grammatical evidentiality in French and Italian. *Linguistics* 46–5: 917–947.

Speas, Peggy 2008. On the syntax and semantics of evidentials. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2(5): 940–965. DOI: 10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00069.x

Verhees, Samira 2019. Defining evidentiality. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 2019 № 6: 113–133. DOI: 10.31857/S0373658X0007549-2

Whitt, Richard J. 2010. *Evidentiality and Perception Verbs in English and German.* P. Lang, Bern.

Willett, Thomas 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.

(1b) RELEVANT NON-URALIC LANGUAGES

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2016. К проблеме социокультурной детерминации эвиденциальных граммем и оппозиций в языках Северной Азии. [On the problem of sociocultural determination of evidential grammemes and oppositions in the languages of North Asia.] *Языки и фольклор коренных народов Сибири.* 30/1: 20–29.

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2020. Грамматикализованная сенсорная эвиденциальность как типологическая особенность языков северной азии. [Grammaticalized sensory evidentiality as a typological feature of the North Asian languages.] *Языки и фольклор коренных народов Сибири* 40/2: 78–88.

Khrakovsky, Viktor Samuilovich (red.) (2007) *Эвиденциальность в языках Европы и Азии. Сборник статей памяти Наталии Андреевны Козинцевой.* [Evidentiality in the languages of Europe and Asia. Collection of articles in memory of Natalia Andreevna Kozinceva.] СПб.: Наука

Skribnik, Elena & Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna 2024. Evidentiality in Northern Asia. In Edward Vajda (ed.), *The languages of Northern Asia*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 1006–1063.

(2) URALIC

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.* Oxford University Press, Oxford. 904–923. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198767664.003.0046

Kubitsch, Rebeka & Szeverényi, Sándor 2023. Az evidencialitás fogalma uralisztikai szempontból. [The concept of evidentiality from a Uralistic point of view.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 119: 7–53.

Skribnik, Elena & Kehayov, Petar 2018. Evidentials in Uralic Languages. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. 525–555.

Szeverényi, Sándor 2020. Az evidencialitás kulturális magyarázatának lehetséges történeti vonatkozásai az északi szamojéd nyelvekben. [Possible historical aspects of the cultural explanation of evidentiality in the Northern Samoyed languages.] *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 27: 283–306.

Szeverényi, Sándor 2022. Az evidencialitás alakulásának egy lehetséges forgatókönyve az uráli nyelvekben. [A possible scenario of the development of evidentiality in the Uralic languages.] In: Forgács, Tamás & Németh, Miklós & Sinkovics, Balázs (eds.), *A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei XI.* Szegedi Tudományegyetem Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék, Szeged. 403–415.

Tamm, Anne & Argus, Reili & Suurmäe, Kadri 2018. Uralic perspectives on experimental evidence for evidentials. In: Foolen, Ad & de Hoop, Helen & Mulder, Gijs (eds.), *Evidence for Evidentiality*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 145–172.

Tamm, Anne 2014/08/15: The Partitive Concept versus Linguistic Partitives: From Abstract Concepts to Evidentiality in the Uralic Languages. DOI: 10.1515/9783110346060.89

(3) SAMOYED

3.1. GENERAL

Gusev, Valentin 2013. Селькупско–нганасанские параллели в области глагольной морфологии [Selkup-Nganasan parallels in the domain of verbal morphology]. In: Кибрик А. Е. (eds.), *Лингвистический беспредел-2: Сборник научных трудов к юбилею А. И. Кузнецовой.* Moscow University Publishing House, Moscow. 67–73.

Gusev, Valentin 2017. On the etymology of Auditive in Samoyedic. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 41: 131–152.

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2006. Эволюция эвиденциальных высказываний в самодийских языках. [Evolution of evidential utterances in Samoyed languages.] *Языки коренных народов Сибири.* 79–119

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2010. Самодийская глагольная граммема аудитива и ее юкагирский аналог. [The Samoyedic verbal marker of auditive and

its Yukaghir analogue.] *Материалы 3-й международной научной конференции по самодистике.* Novosibirsk. 99–106.

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2013. Идентичность генетической структуры глагольной категории засвидетельствованности в самодийских и юкагирских языках. [Identity of the genetic structure of the verbal category of attestation in the Samoyed and Yukaghir languages.] *Лингвистический беспредел – 2: Сборник научных трудов к юбилею А. И. Кузнецовой.* Moscow University Publishing House, Moscow. 32–47.

Siegl, Florian 2016. Evidentiality in the Samoyedic Languages – a reply to Usenkova. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher NF* 26: 190–214.

Szeverényi, Sándor 2020. Az evidencialitás kulturális magyarázatának lehetséges történeti vonat-kozásai az északi szamojéd nyelvekben. [Possible historical aspects of the cultural explanation of evidentiality in the Northern Samoyed languages.] *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 27: 283–306.

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna. [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2016. На границе модальности и эвиден-циальности: кодирование презумптива в самодийских языках. [On the border of modality and evidentiality: coding of the presumptive in Samoyedic languages.] В книге: *Грамматические категории в языках мира: иерархия и взаимодействие. Материалы докладов.* Институт лингвистических исследований РАН. 2016. 121–127.

Usenkova, Elena 2015. Evidentiality in the Samoyedic languages: A study of the auditive forms. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 62/2: 171–217.

3.2. NENETS

Burkova, Svetlana Igorevna [Буркова, Светлана Игоревна] 2004a. Эвиденциальность и эпистемическая модальность в ненецком языке. [Evidentiality and epistemic modality in the Nenets language.] In: В. А. Плунгян и др. (ред.), *Исследования по теории грамматики. Вып. 3: Ирреалис и ирреальность.* Moscow. 353–374.

Burkova, Svetlana Igorevna [Буркова, Светлана Игоревна] 2004b. Образцы текстов на лесном диалекте ненецкого языка (пуровский говор). [Samples of texts in the forest dialect of the Nenets language (Purovsky dialect).] *Языки коренных народов Сибири 13. Экспедиционные материалы.* Novosibirsk. 149–162.

Burkova, Svetlana Igorevna [Буркова, Светлана Игоревна] 2008. Аналитические глагольные формы сказуемого с модальным значением в текстах на лесном диалекте ненецкого языка. [Analytical verbal forms of the predicate with modal meaning in texts in the forest dialect of the Nenets language.] Научный вестник Ямало-Ненецкого АО. Вып. 6 (58): Уральские языки севера Сибири. Salekhard. 104–138.

Burkova, Svetlana 2022. *Nenets.* In: Bakró-Nagy, Marianne & Laakso, Johanna & Skribnik, Elena (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the Uralic languages.* Oxford University Press, Oxford. 674–708.

Jalava, Lotta 2017. Grammaticalization of modality and evidentiality in Tundra Nenets. In: Hengeveld, Kees & Narrog, Heiko & Olbertz, Hella (eds.), *The Grammaticalization of Tense, Modality and Evidentiality. Trends in Linguistics -Studies and Monographs (TiLSM).* De Gruyter, Berlin. DOI: 10.1515/9783110519389-006

Kuznetsova, N. G. & Usenkova, Elena. V. [Кузнецова, Н. Г. & Усенкова, Е. В.] 2006. Инферентиал в ненецком языке. [Inferential in the Nenets language.] *Linguistica uralica* XLII/4: 276–296.

Lyublinskaya, Marina Dmitrievna. & Malchukov, Andrej Lvovich [Люблинская, Марина Дмитриевна & Мальчуков, Андрей Львович] 2007. Эвиденциальность в ненецком языке . [Evidentiality in the Nenets language.] В сборнике: *Эвиденциальность в языках Европы и Азии. сборник статей памяти Наталии Андреевны Козинцевой.* Российская академия наук, Институт лингвистических исследований; ответственный редактор В. С. Храковский. Saint Petersburg. 445–468.

Nikolaeva, Irina 2014. *A Grammar of Tundra Nenets. Mouton Grammar Library 65.* De Gruyter, Berlin. DOI: 10.1515/9783110320640

3.3 NGANASAN

Gusev, Valentin 2007. Эвиденциалность в нганасанском языке. [Evidentiality in the Nganasan language.] In: *Эвиденциальность в языках Европы и Азии. Сборник статей памяти Н. А. Козинцевой, СПб.* Наука, 415–444.

Szeverényi, Sándor 2016. Egy nganaszan episztenciális finit ige lexikalizációja. [Lexicalization of a Nganasan epistential finite verb.] In: Forgács, Tamás & Németh, Miklós & Sinkovics, Balázs (eds.), *A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei IX.* SZTE Magyar Nyelvészeti Tanszék, Szeged. 303–317.

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2018. Сходство нарративных стратегий нганасанского языка и среднетазовского говора селькупского (о возможной корреляции лингвистических и этнографических данных). [The similarity of narrative strategies of the Nganasan language and the Middle Taz dialect of Selkup (about a possible correlation between linguistic and ethnographic data).] *Tomsk Journal of Linguistics and Anthropology* 2018. No. 1 (19): 59–68. DOI: 10.23951/2307-6119-2018-1-59-68

Vojter, Kitti 2023. The functions of inferential evidential in first and second person in Nganasan. *Finnisch-ugrische Mitteilungen* 47: 97–130.

Wagner-Nagy, Beáta 2019. *A Grammar of Nganasan.* Leiden, Brill. Chapter 9.

3.4. ENETS

Khanina, Olesya & Shluinsky, Andrey 2016. Enets perfect: discourse-based uses of an evidential-admirative perfect gram. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 12(2): 425–474.

Künnap, Ago 2002. On the Enets evidential suffixes. *Linguistica Uralica* 38/2: 145–153.

Siegl, Florian 2013. *Materials on Forest Enets, an indigenous language of Northern Siberia (Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran toimituksia/Mémoires de la Société finno-ougrienne 267).* Société finno-ougrienne, Helsinki.

Sorokina, Irina Petrovna [Сорокина Ирина Петровна] 1980. Энецкий перфект. [Enets perfect.] *Советское финно-угроведение* XVI: 212–215. DOI: 10.3176/lu.1980.3.08

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2016. Аналитические формы «модального инферентива» в лесном энецком. [Analytical Forms of the "Modal Inferential" in Forest Enets.] *Linguistica Uralica* LII: 122–140.

3.5. SELKUP

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2002. Эволюция глагольной категории эвиденциальности (системно-диахроническое моделирование на материале селькупского языка). [Evolution of the verbal category of evidentiality (systemic-diachronic modelling based on the material of the Selkup language).] http://cheloveknauka.com/v/65072/

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2013. Селькупская глагольная граммема «косвенной зрительной засвидетельствованности»: исключение или типологическая закономерность? [The Selkup verbal grammeme of "indirect visual evidence": an exception or a typological pattern?] Институт филологии СО РАН, Novosibirsk.

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2002. Эвиденциальность и время в диахронии селькупского языка. [Evidentiality and tense in the diachrony of the Selkup language.] *XXIII Дульзоновские чтения. Сравнительно-историческое и типологическое изучение языков и культур.* 251–258.

Ilyina, Lyudmila Alekseevna [Ильина, Людмила Алексеевна] 2002. Аудитивная форма глагола в селькупском языке: традиционные функции и эволюция. [Auditive form of the verb in the Selkup language: traditional functions and evolution.] *Гуманитарные науки в Сибири.* 31–34

Orlova, Svetlana A. 2018. Semantics of evidential particles in Northern Selkup. In: Семёнова, К. П. (ред.), *Малые языки в большой лингвистике.* Буки Веди, Moscow. 159–166.

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2014. Эвиденциальные показатели селькупского языка: соотношение семантики и прагматики в описании глагольных граммем. [Evidential markers of the Selkup language: the relationship between semantics and pragmatics in the description of verbal grammemes.] *Вопросы языкознания* 2014/4: 66–86.

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2015. Как грамматическая система управляет семантической эволюцией показателей (на примере эвиденциальной системы тазовского селькупского). [How much impact can a grammatical system have on the semantic evolution of markers (a case study on the Tas Selkup system of evidential markers).] *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 6: 54–77.

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2015. От имперфективности к эвиденциальности (на материале тазовского диалекта селькупского языка). [From imperfectivity to evidentiality (based on the Taz dialect of the Selkup language).] *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana.* Труды института лингвистических исследований. 11/1: 199–220.

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2017. Употребления эвиденциального показателя, компенсирующие утрату исходного механизма ДОМ в селькупском. [Uses of the evidential marker, compensating for the loss of the original mechanism of the DOM in Selkup.] *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Transactions of the Institute for Linguistic Studies* Vol. XIII, part 3: 322–335.

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2021. Квотативные и цитативные формы в северных селькупских говорах: от исконных к заимствованным. [Quotative and quotative forms in northern Selkup dialects: from original to borrowed ones.] *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana.* Труды института лингвистических исследований. 17/2: 229–276. DOI 10.30842/alp23065737172229276

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2019. Нарративные стратегии как свидетельство возможного контакта: тазовский селькупский и нганасанский. [Narrative strategies as evidence of possible contact: Taz Selkup and Nganasan.] *Вопросы языкознания* № 3: 84–100.

(4) PERMIC

Baker, Robin W. 1983. Komi-Zyrian's second past tense. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 45: 69–81.

Kubitsch, Rebeka 2023. Evidencialitás az udmurt nyelvben [Evidentiality in Udmurt]. PhD Thesis. University of Szeged.

Kubitsch, Rebeka 2022. The Semantic Profile of the Past Evidential in Udmurt in Contemporary Texts. In: de Saussure, Louis & Baranzini, Laura* (eds.), *Aspects of Tenses, Modality, and Evidentiality.* Brill, Leiden. 262–287.

Kubitsch, Rebeka 2021. The indirect evidential marker in interrogatives in Udmurt. *Tipologija Morfosintaktičeskiji Parametrov/Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters* 4/2: 62–80.

Kubitsch, Rebeka & Németh, Zoltán 2019. Evidential forms as politeness strategies in Udmurt from a pluricentric point of view. In: Muhr, Rudolf (ed.), *European Pluricentric Languages in Contact and Conflict.* Peter Lang Verlag, Berlin. 207–221.

Kubitsch, Rebeka 2019. Az evidencialitás és az első személy kapcsolata az udmurt nyelvben. [The relationship between evidentiality and first person in Udmurt.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 115: 85–108.

Kubitsch, Rebeka 2019. Az udmurt indirekt evidenciális miratív jelentésárnyalata. [The mirative extension of the Udmurt indirect evidential.] In: Scheibl, György (ed.), *LingDok 18. Nyelvészdoktoranduszok dolgozatai.* Szegedi Tudományegyetem Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskola, Szeged. 25–40.

Leinonen, Marja. 2000. Evidentiality in Komi Zyryan. In: Johanson, Lars & Utas, Bo (eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin. 419–40.

Leinonen, Marja & Vilkuna, Maria 2000. Past tenses in Permic languages. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin – New York. 497–514. DOI: 10.1515/9783110197099.3.495

Leinonen, Marja & Cypanov, E. A. [Лейнонен, М. & Цыпанов, Е. А.] 2009. Грамматическая семантика эвиденциальности в коми языке (на материале модального перфекта). [Grammatical semantics of evidentiality in the Komi language (based on the material of the modal perfect).] *Linguistica Uralica* XLV/2009/1: 23–35.

Németh, Zoltán & Kubitsch, Rebeka 2019. Az evidencialitás udvariassági stratégiaként történő használata az udmurtban. [Evidentiality as a politeness strategy in Udmurt.] In: Tóth, Bianka

(ed.) *Tudományos eredmények a nagyvilágból - bővített kiadás: Válogatás a Campus Mundi ösztöndíjasok tanulmányaiból.* Tempus Közalapítvány, Budapest. 87–94.

Popova, Darya Pavlovna [Попова, Дарья Павловна] 2011. Второе прошедшее время в Ижемском диалекте коми-зырянского языка. [The second past tense in the Izhem dialect of the Komi-Zyrian language.] https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/vtoroe-proshedshee-vremya-v-izhemskom-dialekte-komi-zyryanskogo-yazyka/viewer

Serebrennikov, B. A. [Серебренников, Б. А.] 1960. *Категории времени и вида в финно-угорских языках пермской и волжской групп* [The category of tense and aspect in the Permic and Volgaic group of the Finno-Ugric languages]. Moscow : Издательство академии наук СССР.

Siegl, Florian. 2004. The 2nd past in the Permic languages. MA Thesis. University of Tartu, Tartu.

Szabó, Ditta 2020. On evidentiality marking in Udmurt and its representation in LFG. In: Kubínyi, Kata & Nagy, Judit & Tamm, Anne (eds.), *In Memoriam of Anne Vainikka. Conference Contributions 2. November 22-23, 2019.* Károli Gáspár Református Egyetem Néderlandisztika Tanszék, Budapest. 105–142.

Szabó, Ditta 2022a. A komi-permják evidencialitás vizsgálata elicitált adatokon keresztül. [Analysing evidentiality in Komi-Permyak by questionnaire] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 118: 137–162. DOI: 10.15776/NyK.2022.118.4

Szabó, Ditta 2023a. Coding of evidentials (Komi-Permyak). In Havas, Ferenc & Asztalos, Erika & F. Gulyás, Nikolett & Horváth, Laura & Timár, Bogáta 2023. Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages (VolgaTyp). Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. volgatyp.elte.hu/?feature=100&code=koi

Szabó, Ditta 2023b. Coding of evidentials (Udmurt). In Havas, Ferenc & Asztalos, Erika & F. Gulyás, Nikolett & Horváth, Laura & Timár, Bogáta 2023. Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages (VolgaTyp). Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. volgatyp.elte.hu/?feature=100&code=udm

Szabó, Ditta 2023c. Evidentiality (Komi-Permyak). In Havas, Ferenc & Asztalos, Erika & F. Gulyás, Nikolett & Horváth, Laura & Timár, Bogáta 2023. Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages (VolgaTyp). Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. volgatyp.elte.hu/?feature=99&code=koi

Szabó, Ditta 2023d. Evidentiality (Udmurt). In Havas, Ferenc & Asztalos, Erika & F. Gulyás, Nikolett & Horváth, Laura & Timár, Bogáta 2023. Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages (VolgaTyp). Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. volgatyp.elte.hu/?feature=99&code=udm

Szabó, Ditta 2023d. Az evidencialitás történeti-tipológiai vizsgálata az udmurtban [Evidentiality in the Udmurt language from a historical–typological point of view]. PhD-thesis. Eötvös Loránd University.

Tsypanov, Evgeni Aleksandrovich [Цыпанов, Евгений Александрович] 2002. К вопросу о факторах, определяющих употребление I и II прошедших времен в коми языке. [On the question of the factors determining the use of I and II past tenses in the Komi language.] *Linguistica uralica* 2002 (XXXVIII). № 3: 165–175.

Tsypanov, Evgeni Aleksandrovich [Цыпанов, Евгений Александрович] 2002: Система аналитических прошедших времен в коми языке. [System of analytical past tenses in the Komi language.] *Вестник Удмуртского университета.* № 7: 150–155.

(5) UGRIC

5.1. KHANTY

Csepregi, Márta 2014. Evidentiality in Dialects of Khanty. *Linguistica Uralica* 50(3): 199–211. DOI: 10.3176/lu.2014.3.04

Csepregi, Márta 2014. Evidencialitás a hanti nyelvjárásokban. [Evidentiality in the Khanty Dialects.] In: Havas, F. et al. (eds.), *Nyelvben a világ. Tanulmányok Ladányi Mária tiszteletére. Segédkönyvek a magyar nyelvészet tanulmányozásához 160.* Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest. 99–109.

Csepregi, Márta 2019. Igeneves szerkezetek a déli hanti nyelvjárásokban. [Non-finite constructions in the Southern Khanty dialects.] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 115: 33–83.

Kaksin, Andrei Danilovich. [Каксин, Андрей Данилович] 2012. Роль частиц в выражении модальности и эвиденциальности (на примере хантыйского языка). [The role of particles in the expression of modality and evidentiality (using the example of the Khanty language).] *Вестник Тихоокеанского государственного университета.* 27/4: 259–268.

Nikolaeva, Irina 1999. The Semantics of Northern Khanty Evidentials. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 88: 131–159.

5.2. MANSI

Sipőcz, Katalin. 2014. A manysi evidenciálisról. [Evidentiality in Mansi.] *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 21. 121–141. http://finnugor.arts.unideb.hu/fud/fud21/fud21.pdf

Skribnik, Elena & Janda, Gwen 2012. Northern Mansi Miratives. Eurobabel Final Conference, Leiden. (presentation) https://www.babel.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/media/downloads/ grammar/NorthernMansi/Syntax/Northern_Mansi_Miratives.pdf

Skribnik, Elena 1999. Zum Modussystem im Nordwogulischen (in modum speculativum). In: Hasselblatt, Cornelius & Jääsalmi-Krüger, Paula (eds.), *Europa et Sibiria. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 51.* Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. 401–411.

Skribnik, Elena Konstantinovna [Скрибник, Елена Константиновна] 1988. К вопросу о неочевидном наклонении в мансийском языке (структура и семантика). [On the issue of the non-eyewitness mood in the Mansi language (structure and semantics).] *Языки коренных народов Сибири 4.* Novosibirsk. 197–215.

Urmanchieva, Anna Yurievna [Урманчиева, Анна Юрьевна] 2020. Эвиденциальные формы северного мансийского: дискурсивные функции в ареальной перспективе. In: Кибрик, А. А. [Kibrik, A. A.] et al. (eds.), *ВАПросы языкознания:* Мегасборник наностатей. Сборник статей к юбилею В. А. Плунгяна. Буки Веди, Москва. 665–671.

5.3. HUNGARIAN

É. Kiss, Katalin 2023. Evidencialitás a moldvai magyar nyelvváltozatban. [Evidentiality in the Moldavian variety of Hungarian.] In: Cser, András & Nemesi, Attila László (eds.), *Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia 5*. Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem Bölcsészet- és Társadalomtudományi Kar, Budapest. 9–30.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2023. From narrative past to mirativity and direct evidentiality: the case of Moldavian (Csángó) Hungarian. *Folia Linguistica* 57(3): 661–687. DOI: 10.1515/flin-2023-2009

Kugler, Nóra 2003. *A módosítószók funkciói*. [Functions of disjunct.] *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 152*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Kugler, Nóra. 2015. *Megfigyelés és következtetés a nyelvi tevékenységben*. [Observation and inference in language activity.] Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest.

Kugler, Nóra 2014. The dynamic construal of epistential meaning. *Argumentum* 10: 403-420.

Kugler, Nóra 2017. Evidencialitás. [Evidentiality.] In: Tolcsvai-Nagy, Gábor (ed.), *Nyelvtan*. Osiris, Budapest. 474–480.

Kugler, Nóra 2013. A vizuális észleléssel összefüggő lexikalizálódott evidenciajelölő és episztemikus-inferenciális. [Lexicalized evidential and epistemic-inferential expressions concerning visual perception.] *Magyar Nyelv* 109/4: 393–408.

Kugler, Nóra 2020. Szükséges-e mérni a modális erőt, és ha igen, hogyan? [Is it worth measuring modal force? If it is, how?] *Magyar Nyelv* 116/4: 429 − 441.
DOI: 10.18349/MagyarNyelv.2020.4.429.

Mohay, Zsuzsanna 2021. Múlt idők a középmagyar kori levelekben. [Past tenses in Middle Hungarian letters.] Szépirodalmi Figyelő, Budapest.

Pomozi, Péter 2014. A magyar múltidő-rendszer térben és időben az evidencialitás tükrében. [The old Hungarian past-tense system in the mirror of the evidentiality – An areal-typological approach] In: Fazakas, Emese & Juhász, Dezső & T. Szabó, Csilla & Terbe, Erika (eds.), *Tér, idő és kultúra metszéspontjai a magyar nyelvben. A 7. Nemzetközi Hungarológiai Kongresszus két szimpóziumának előadásai*. Nemzetközi Magyarságtudományi Társaság, Budapest–Kolozsvár. 76–92.

Pomozi, Péter 2018. Igeidők és evidencialitás a TAM(E)-modell tükrében az ősmagyartól az ómagyarig. [Tenses and evidentiality in the light of the TAM(E) model from Proto-Hungarian to Old Hungarian.] In: Balázs, Géza & Minya, Károly & Pölcz, Ádám (eds.), *Az idő szemiotikája*. Magyar Szemiotikai Társaság, Budapest. 231–241.

(6) FINNIC

Erelt, Matti 2002: Evidentiality in Estonian and some other Languages. Introductory Remarks. *Linguistica Uralica* 38/2: 93–97. DOI: 10.3176/lu.2002.2.02

Jaakola, Minna 2012. Displaying knowledge in journalistic texts: A contrastive analysis of an evidential particle in Estonian and Finnish. Lähivõrdlusi. Lähivertailuja 22, 43–70.

Jaakola, Minna 2018. Finnish evidential adverbs in argumentative texts. In: Foolen, Ad & de Hoop, Helen & Mulder, Gijs (eds.), *Evidence for Evidentiality*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 121–141.

Jaakola, Minna 2021. Marking one's own viewpoint: The Finnish evidential verb + kseni 'as far as I understand' construction. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 44(3): 255–280. DOI: 10.1017/S0332586520000244

Kaiser, Elsi 2022. Evidentiality in Finnish: On the communicative functions of the reportative evidential *kuulemma* and the dubitative marker muka. *Journal of Uralic Linguistics* 1: 67–120.

Kaiser, Elsi 2024. Evidentials and dubitatives in Finnish: perspective shift in questions and embedded contexts. *Folia Linguistica* DOI: 10.1515/flin-2024-2002

Kehayov, Petar 2002. Typology of grammaticalized evidentiality in Bulgarian and Estonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 38: 126–145.

Kehayov, Petar 2004. Eesti keele evidentsiaalsussüsteem mõne teise keele taustal. Morfosüntaks ja distributsioon. [The Estonian evidentiality system in contrast with some oth-er evidentiality systems. Morphosyntax and distribution.] *Keel ja Kirjandus* 2004(11): 812–829.

Kehayov, Petar 2008a. An areal-typological perspective to evidentiality: The cases of the Balkan and Baltic linguistic areas. PhD Thesis. University of Tartu, Tartu.
DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.12152.85769

Kehayov, Petar 2008b. Interactions between grammatical evidentials and lexical markers of epistemicity and evidentiality: a case study of Bulgarian and Estonian. In: Plungian, Vladimir A. & Wiemer, Björn (eds.), *Lexikalische Evidenzialitäts-Marker in slavischen Sprachen*. Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 72, Wien. 165–201.

Kehayov, Petar & Lindström, Liina & Niit, Ellen 2011. Imperative in interrogatives in Estonian (Kihnu), Latvian and Livonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 2011/2: 81–93.

Kehayov, Petar & Metslang, Helle & Pajusalu, Karl 2012. Evidentiality in Livonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 48: 41–54.

Kehayov, Petar & Siegl, Florian 2007. The evidential past participle in Estonian reconsidered. *Études finno-ougriennes* 38: 75–117.

Kittilä, Seppo 2015. Remarks on the secondary uses of the Finnish evidential particles. In: *Congressus Duodecimus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum, Oulu 2015. Book of Abstracts.* 359–60. University of Oulu, Oulu.

Kittilä, Seppo 2019. Evidentiality. In: Östman, Jan-Ola & Verschueren, Jef (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics Online. Handbook of Pragmatics, vol. 22.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 93–114. DOI: 10.1075/hop.22.evi1

Kittilä, Seppo 2024. Inference versus assumption in light of the Finnish evidential-modal adverbs *näköjään* and *varmaan*. *Folia Linguistica* 58(1): 119–155. DOI: 10.1515/flin-2023-2043

Metslang, Hell & Karl Pajusalu 2002. Evidentiality in South Estonian. *Linguistica Uralica* 38/2: 98–109. DOI: 10.3176/lu.2002.2.03

Taran, Iuliia 2013. Perfect in Ingrian Finnish. In: Surányi, Balázs (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second Central European Conference in Linguistics for Postgraduate Students.* Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest. 246–258. http://cecils.btk.ppke.hu/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Taran_Perfect-in-Ingrian-Finnish_REVISED_v5_fin_corr1.pdf

(7) MARI

Bradley, Jeremy & Jorma Luutonen 2023. Mari. In: Daniel Abondolo & Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi (eds.) *The Uralic Languages* (2nd edition). Routledge, London/New York. 546–549.

Golosov, F. V. & Kozlov, A. A. [Голосов, Ф. В. & Козлов, А. А.] 2018. Наблюдатель в системе прошедших времен горномарийского языка. [The observer in the system of past tenses of Hill Mari.] *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana.* Труды Института лингвистических исследований, 2018, т. XIV, ч. 2: 154–194.

Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva 1959. Tšeremissin perfekti. [The Perfect in Cheremis.] [Verkkojulkaisu.] Sananjalka. https://docplayer.fi/18556115-Tseremissin-Perfekti.html

Lavrentev, Guriy Ivanovich [Лаврентьев Гурий Иванович] 1972. 'Генетические вопросы второго прошедшего времени в марийском языке. [Genetic questions about the second past tense in тхе Mari language.] *Советское финно-угроведение* 1972(4): 257–264.

Nelson, Diane & Vedernikova, Elena 2017. Evidentiality in Meadow Mari. Esitelmä seminaarissa Soul Budapest. (Conference presentation) Budapest, 28.6.2017. https://slideplayer.com/slide/13483325/ (22.2.2019).

Riese, Timothy & Jeremy Bradley & Tatiana Yefremova 2022. *Mari (марий йылме): An Essential Grammar for International Learners.* [Version 1.0] Vienna: University of Vienna. [published online at grammar.mari-language.com] 204–218.

Spets, Silja-Maija 2020. *Marin kielten menneen ajan tempusten evidentiaalisuus ja sen alustavaa vertailua tšuvassiin.* [The evidentiality of the Mari past tenses and its comparision to Chuvash] MA Thesis. University of Turku, Turku. https://www.utupub.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/149375/opinn%C3%A4ytety%C3%B6.pdf;jsessionid=7CBAEC140A7CA47EAC16C1CAAF52932F?sequence=1

Spets, Silja-Maija 2021. Marin kielten menneen ajan tempusten evidentiaalisuudesta ja modaalisuudesta. [On the Evidentiality and Modality of the Past Tenses in the Mari Languages.] *Virittäjä* 125(2): 248–257. DOI: 10.23982/vir.103170

Timár, Bogáta 2023a. Coding of evidentials (Meadow Mari). In Havas, Ferenc & Asztalos, Erika & F. Gulyás, Nikolett & Horváth, Laura & Timár, Bogáta 2023. Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages (VolgaTyp). Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. volgatyp.elte.hu/?feature=100&code=mhr

Timár, Bogáta 2023b. Evidentiality (Meadow Mari). In Havas, Ferenc & Asztalos, Erika & F. Gulyás, Nikolett & Horváth, Laura & Timár, Bogáta 2023. Typological Database of the Volga Area Finno-Ugric Languages (VolgaTyp). Budapest: ELTE Finnugor Tanszék. volgatyp.elte.hu/?feature=99&code=mhr

Toldova, Svetlana Yurievna & Serdobolskaya, Natalya Vladimirovna [Толдова, Светлана Юрьевна & Сердобольская, Наталья Вадимовна] 2014. Глагол речи *manaš* в марийском языке: особенности грамматикализации. [The verb of speech *manaš* in the Mari language: features of grammaticalization.] *Вопросы языкознания* №6: 66–91.

(8) MORDVIN

Kazaeva, Nina & Kubitsch, Rebeka & Szeverényi, Sándor 2024. On Evidentiality in Erzya. *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 6/1: 81–103. https://doi.org/10.1163/25898833-20240057

Kehayov, Petar 2020. Between Facts and Speech Acts: the Conditional and Conditional-Conjunctive in Moksha Mordvin. *Linguistica Uralica* 56/1: 18–44. DOI: 10.3176/lu.2020.1.03

Teptiuk, Denys 2021. Quotative indexes in Erzya: a typological overview. *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 44: 47–78.

Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ADJ	adjective
ADMON	admonitive
ADV	adverb
ALL	allative
AUD	auditive (non-visual sensory)
CAUS	causative
CNG	connegative
COMP	comparative
COND	conditional
CVB	converb
DAT	dative
DEF	definite
DET	determiner
DIM	diminutive
DST	destinative
DU	dual
ELA	elative
EMPH	emphatic
EXCL	exclamative
EV	evidential
FREQ	frequentative
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
ILL	illative
IMP	imperative
INCL	inclusive
IN	inessive
INF	infinitive
INFER	inferential
INTER	interrogative
IPFV	imperfective
LAT	lative

LIM	limitative
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
NMLZ	nominalizer
NOM	nominative
O	objective conjugation
ORD	ordinal suffix
PASS	passive
PCL	particle
PF	perfect
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PP	postposition
PROL	prolative
PRS	present
PST	past
PST1	first past
PST2	second past
PTCP.ACT	active participle
PTCP	participle
R	reflexive
REP	reportative
RES	resultative
S	subjective
SG	singular
SUP	supine
SUPL	superlative
TRL	translative
VBLZ	verbalizer

TASK 1. Evidentiality and its cultural explanation

Sándor Szeverényi

Here is a summary of Bernárdez' (2017: 452) hypothesis on the cultural explanation of evidentiality:

„The factors influencing the keeping and/or development of a complex system of evidentiality (…) can be summarised as follows:

• **Small groups living in isolated environments** enhance the probability of developing evidentials.

• **Difficulties in accessing the world around** enhance the probability of developing evidentials; such difficulties can be the impenetrability of the forest, as is the case in the Amazon and also the rainy forest inhabited by the Chachi. They can also be due to the impossibility of easy travel even over short distances due to weather conditions, etc. As we saw above, absence of literacy, as in the case of Quechua, is another fundamental factor.

• **Very tight relations within the group** and with neighbouring groups also enhance the probability of developing evidentials."

(…)

„A small set of culturally determined principles are at work here:

(1) Every member of the community knows – to a greater or lesser degree – all, or most other members.

(2) Members of the community trust each other -except perhaps in a few cases.

(3) Sincerely telling (what one believes to be) the truth is a basic principle of behaviour in the community.

(4) Whenever someone cannot say that something has been directly experienced, s/he will say that what is being told is indirect experience, inference, etc.

The central point is of course the need to guarantee the group's cohesion: as loss of cohesion leads to conflict and eventually to the disaggregation of the group, strategies were developed to avoid it. These strategies came to be incorporated (embodied) in the individuals' minds, in such a way that the whole community has at its disposal a number of common strategies, learnt, accepted and used by everyone, with the same purposes."

(Bernardez 2017: 454)

QUESTIONS

What can you say about the following languages in the light of the hypothesis? Do they confirm the hypothesis?

Nganasan

Udmurt

Mansi

Hungarian

Use data from Uralic languages (e.g. Skribnik & Kehayov 2018)! Illustrate your view with examples or counterexamples!

SUGGESTED SOLUTION

Nganasan and Hungarian definitly confirm the hypothesis. Udmurt is a in-between case. In the case of Mansi, we could expect a greater degree of grammaticalization in the light of the cultural explanation.

Nganasan	complex evidential system	small group, isolated environment
Udmurt	indirect evidential	relatively small group, not isolated environment
Mansi	indirect evidential	small group, relatively isolated environment
Hungarian	no grammatical evidential	large population, not isolated environment

References

Bernárdez, Enrique 2017. Evidentiality – a cultural interpretation. In: *Advances In Cultural Linguistics* (Ed. Sharifian, Farzad), Springer, 433–460.

TASK 2. "Create a story, apply evidentiality!"

Sándor Szeverényi

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Compile and perform a story (10-15 sentences) following the instructions below!
- Imagine a language and define your relationship to the world through evidentiality!
- How could you express your relationships to your information about the world if evidentiality was an obligatory category in your language?

(1) Choose a scene/frame/situation:

A) The story-teller tells a real story about his/her grandfather. S/he never met him.
B) Yesterday/Saturday there was a great party in your dormitory/university/home with friends/relatives etc. You, the story-teller, took part at the party. It was your best friend's birthday party that was a surprise for your friend. All of you drank a lot. You too… Today/On Sunday morning you wake up, and do not remember what happened on Saturday night. Try to tell your mother what could have happened. Your party mates are also in that room, and the circumstances can serve as basis for inference and assumption.
C) You have always planned to keep a unicorn. So one night, in your dreams you meet a ghost who give advice how to take care a unicorn. Next morning you tell the story to your mum.
D) You want to attend the final of Champions League/concert of Lady GaGa/Tosca in Budapest Opera/Superbowl in Atlanta etc. with your friends. You have got tickets, but your seats are in the worst place: you can not see the stage, just hear the music.
E) You are a blind person. Please, say something about your ordinary days.
F) Any other idea… Feel free to make up a story!

(2) Choose a genre:

A) a conversation with a friend
B) a speech to an unknown audience
C) an oral monologue, personal story, life story
D) a written monologue (e.g., blog)
E) a tale (folklore)
F) song, poem etc.
G) other kind of narrative

(3) Choose (or „create") a type of evidentiality:

A) system or strategy
B) suffixal and/or lexical and/or other means
C) binary or extended

Example:

Yesterday, I drank-**blublu** a lot. When I woke up in my room today morning, my room was so messy. There was-**tsuptsup** a party yesterday, I do not remember what happened-(**tsuptsup**). Paul, my roommate, told: You drank-**tsuptsup** a lot! I have never seen you drunken!

Yesterday I drank-**REPORTATIVE** a lot. When I woke up in my room today morning, my room was so messy. There was-**INFERENTIAL** a party yesterday, I do not remember what happened-(**INFERENTIAL**). Paul, my roommate told: You drank-**MIRATIVE** a lot! I have never seen you drunken!

indicative	VISUAL, FIRST-HAND
inferential	INDIRECT, FIRST-HAND
	+ mirative
reportative	INDIRECT, HEARSAY, REPORTATIVE-QUOTATIVE

TASK 3. Nganasan 1

Sándor Szeverényi

I. DESCRIPTION

PARTICIPANTS:	a current speaker (= narrator/story-teller)
	a quoted speaker (an old man)
	two children
SITUATION:	An old man meets two unknown children. The story was told by the original speaker (= the old man).
MEANS:	lexical elements to express epistemic modality/inferential evidentiality

II. QUESTIONS

(A) Why does the old man use lexical elements besides the suffix of the inferential-evidential mood?

(B) Does UNCERTAINTY play a role in the choice of between lexical and morphological marking?

(C) What is/can be the function of AUD in (288)?

(D) What kind of moods appear in the sentences? What about evidential moods?

(E) Can we draw a straight line between epistemic modality and inferential evidentiality in Nganasan?

III. TEXT

(Source: Brykina et al. 2018 – MVL_090807_Bebtie_flk.288-292)

(288)

Tə,	**munu-munu-t'ü:**
well	**say-AUD-3SG**

∂i?,	*taharia*	*əməniə,*	*bəjku-naŋku-əi,*	*əməniə*	*taharia*
oh	now	this.ACC	old_man-DIM-EXCL	this.ACC	now

n'intuu	*n'aagəə-məni*	*n'ili-tiə-gəj*	*s'iði*	*n'üə*	*kat'əmi-?ə-m.*
not	good-PROL.SG	live-PTCP.PRS-DU	two. ACC	child.ACC	see-PF-1SG.S

'He **says**: Hey, old man, I saw two children there, not well living.'

(289)

Ŋəndi?ĩaĩ?	*n'intuu*	*kərutəndi*	*i-t'üə-gəj*	*n'üə-gəj.*
probably	not	ordinary	be- PTCP.PRS-DU	child-DU

'**Probably**, they are not simple children.'

(290)

Əməniə-gəi-t'ə	*nəŋhə-mənɨ*	*n'ilɨ-tɨə*	*n'üə-gəj*	***n'andɨ-tɨ-gəj***.
this-DU-NOM.PL.2SG	bad-PROL.SG	live-PTCP.PRS	child-DU	**seem-**PRS-3DU.S

'They **seem** to be poor living children.'

(291)

Kat'əməkəi-t'ə,	*kat'əmi-n'ə,*	*tə*	*nəmbə-ʔ*	*maðu-t'ɨ*
see-ADMON-2SG	see-IMP.2SG	well	bad-NOM.PL	tent-NOM.PL.3DU

kuə-d'üəd'əə-ʔ	*əku*	*mint͡iagənɨ.*
die-PTCP.PST-NOM.PL	**maybe**	**probably**

'Look, ask, **maybe** they are from those camps where people have died.'

(292)

Mint͡iagənɨ	*is'atə-mti*		*n'ilu-tə-mti*
probably	be-NMLZ-DST-ACC.SG.3DU		herd-DST-ACC.SG.3DU

huu-rɨə-gəj		*n'üə-gəj*	*əku.*
look_for-PTCP.PRS-NOM.DU		child-NOM.DU	**probably**

'**Maybe**, they, these two children are looking for their parents, probably.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) There are several reasons for using inferential/epistemic lexemes. One is that grammatical evidentials, especially the inferential, rarely occur in quoted speech. Another reason may be that the reasoning is verbally explicit.

(B) In the text, there are inferences and statements of probability, which point to the direction of epistemic tools. It also shows indirectly that evidentials are not likely to be epistemic in themselves.

(C) The exact function is not known. It probably could be to emphasize the fact that a quotation was made.

(D) The speaker does not use verbal moods, neither epistemic (e.g., irreal) nor evidential (e.g., inferential). This emphasizes probability, but also shows that the speaker infers and make predictions.

(E) It seems that, although there are epistemic mood suffixes in Nganasan, Nganasan prefers to use lexical devices to express epistemic content, or in cases where the basis for the inference is explicit.

References

Brykina, Maria & Valentin Gusev & Sándor Szeverényi & Beáta Wagner-Nagy. 2018. Nganasan Spoken Language Corpus (NSLC). Archived in Hamburger Zentrum für Sprachkorpora. Version 0.2. Publication date 2018-06-12. http://hdl.handle.net/11022/0000-0007-C6F2-8.

TASK 4. Nganasan 2

Sándor Szeverényi

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE:	folklore, tale
SPEAKER:	a storyteller (current speaker) and a metanarrator (the "Mouth")
SITUATION:	In Nganasan folklore, there is a so-called metanarrator: *ŋa* or *ŋalaa* 'the Mouth'. The Mouth typically appears at the beginning of the story, as the storyteller. Furthermore, it can appear (or it is quoted) when the scene of the story changes.

II. QUESTIONS

(A) Why is there a need for a metanarrator? What is its role from the viewpoint of information source?

(B) What could the speaker use as an alternative strategy?

III. TEXT

(Source: Brykina et al. 2018 – KES_080721_Disease_flkd)

(1)

tə	*ŋa-laa-rə*		*munu-ntu:*	*sənhəl'aŋkə*	*maðəʔəə*	*malə-baða-təʔ*
well	mouth-LIM-DET		say-PRS.[3SG.S]	five	tent	build_a_tent-INFER-3PL.R

'The mouth says: "Five tents, they built a nomad camp." '

(2)

birkīaiʔ	*bərə-ðu-tuə*		*maðə*	*ma-tənu*	*taharīa*	*bətənini*
the_most	edge-VBLZ-PTCP.PRS.[GEN]		tent.[GEN]	tent-LOC	now	there

birkīaiʔ	*bərə-ðu-tuə*	*maða-ŋku*	*nən'd'i-tɨ*		*n'intuu-t'ə*	*aniʔə*
the_most	edge-VBLZ-PTCP.PRS	tent-DIM	stand-PRS.3SG.S		not-EMPH	big

'There is a small tent at the edge of the camp.'

(3)

əiʔ	*s'iba-ʔku-ŋuðu-ðuŋ*	*n'üʔ*
oh	worker-DIM-DEF-GEN.PL.3PL	probably

'Servants live in this tent, probably."'

(4)

tə	ŋa-laa-rə	munu-ntu	təndə	ma-tə	tahari͡aa
well	mouth-LIM-DET	say-PRS.[3SG.S]	that.[GEN]	tent-LAT	now

ŋaŋ	t'ii-ʔə
mouth	come_in-PF.[3SG.S]

'The mouth says, the mouth came into this tent.'

(5)

ŋaŋ	t'ii-d'a	munu-ntu	əiʔ	əm-kümü-rə	təʔ
mouth	come_in-INF	say-PRS.[3SG.S]	oh	this- EMPH-DET	you_know

ŋuʔəiʔ	kuəd'ïmu	n'üə-ʔkü-ði
one	man	child-DIM-POSS.3DU

'As the mouth came in, and said: Ah, they only have a boy.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) It is important that the narrator has to mark whether they did or did not see the events narrated. In folktales, the 'mouth' is often used as a metanarrator, which gives the storyteller the opportunity to present events from this fictional perspective. In other words, the story-teller uses this meta-viewpoint to avoid having to indicate the type of information, because this meta-narrator can be everywhere, experiencing and seeing everything.

(B) In a non-folklore text, if the speaker wants to indicate that they cannot see what is happening in the tent, for example, they can use the inferential or a reportative suffix, depending on the situation.

TASK 5. Nganasan 3

Sándor Szeverényi

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE:	Personal story, based on the speaker's own experience.
PARTICIPANTS:	1 current speaker (= narrator)
	2 original speakers (the narrator + the narrator's mate)
SITUATION:	The speakers of the situation will be taken to Paris. They want to get more information about the journey. The whole (15-24) sample is told by the narrator.

II. QUESTIONS

(A) How many types of quotation can be recognized? What is the difference?

(B) In this sample, the Reportative suffix is translated as 'they say'. Is it plausible to translate it as 'it is said'? What is the difference?

(C) Who is/are the referent(s) of the endings:

> first person: …………………………………………….
> second person: …………………………………………….
> third person: …………………………………………….

III. TEXT

(Source: Brykina et al. 2018 – NSLC: KES_031115_Paris_nar.15-25)

(15)

Tə,	*miŋ*	*munu-ntu-muʔ:*	*Maa*	*Bələt'anka*	*t'erə-ʔ*	*kuniʔia͡*
well	we	say-PRS-1PL.S	what	Volochanka.[GEN]	resident-PL	how

i-hua͡-ʔ	*n'i-bi͡a-ʔ*	*heðiti-ʔ ?*
be-REP.INTER-3PL.S	NEG-REP.INTER-3PL.S	go-CNG

'Well, we say: Won't the people from Volochanka also travel?'

(16) (

N'i-bi͡ahi-ʔ.
NEG-REP-3PL.S

'No, they say.'

(17)

Abamu	*t'erə-raa-ʔ*	*i-bahu-ʔ.*
Ust'-Avam.GEN	resident-LIM-PL	be-REP-3PL.S

'Only the people from Ust-Avam, they say.'

(18)

Kanə	*mətüʔ*	*ŋanaʔsa-ruʔ*	*ti-l'ia-tiʔ*	*n'akələ-ri-ʔki-ʔi-tiʔ*	*i-bahu.*
how_many	six	person-2PL	you-LIM-2PL	take-PASS-RES-PF-2PL.R	be- REP.[3SG.S]

'How many, they say, only six persons will be travelling.'

(19)

Təʔə,	*kaŋgə*	*təu-tə-hia͡-niʔʔ*
after_all	when	fly-REP.INTER-1PL.R

'Well, what do they say: when do we depart?'

(20)

Maa,	*biiðə*	*t'islo-təni*	*təutə-bia͡hi-ndiʔ.*
what	ten.GEN	date-LOC	fly-REP-2PL.RS

'Well, they say you will travel on the tenth.'

(21-22)

Əm-kətə,	*Nəril'iskə-gitə.*	*Küðia͡-hüʔ*	*təu-ʔki-ʔə-riʔ.*
this-ABL	Norilsk-ABL.PL	get_up-COND	fly-RES-PF-2PL.S/O

'From here, from Norilsk. You will travel tomorrow.'

(23)

Miŋ	*munu-ntu-muʔ:*	*Tə-tə,*	*kuniʔia͡*	*kət'i*	*təu-gu-nuʔ*	*tagaʔa.*
we	say-PRS-1PL.S	well-well	how	let_it_be	fly-IMP-1PL.R	from_here

'We say: Well, we are going to travel.'

(24)

Bənsə	*latü-ʔə-muʔ*	*taharia͡iʔ*	*küðia͡-ta-ʔku-d'aa-ria͡i-ʔ*
all	get_ready-PF-1PL.S	now	get_up-NMLZ-DIM-ALL-LIM-ADV

ŋamia͡jt'ümə	*t'asə-tənu*	*norbu-btu-ra-ʔa-muʔ.*
nine.GEN	hour-LOC	bustle-CAUS-PASS-PF-1PL.S/O

'We packed, they woke us early in the morning, at nine.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) How many types of quotation can be recognized? What is the difference?
- reportative suffix as quotative – (20-23). The speaker used it for direct quotation.
- direct speech – (23)
- direct speech with the interrogative reportative suffix (15)
- reportative suffix in (17) having quotative function – the exact source of the information is clear from the context, namely the organizers of the journey.

(B) 'It is said' could express hearsay. In this text, the source of the information is known from the context: the organizers.

(C) first person: The narrator and her mates (15, 19, 23, 24).

second person: The narrator and her mates in the quoted speech of the narrator. Notice that the current speaker is talking about themself in the second person, not using the indirect speech (there is no shift in person!), e.g., in (20-22).

third person: The source of information: the organizers of the journey.

TASK 6. Hungarian 1

Sándor Szeverényi

I. DESCRIPTION

(Based on Nóra Kugler's works 2014, 2015. Source: Kugler 2015: 125–126)

SITUATION: Storytelling: The speaker had to watch a short (cc. 30 sec) video about a boy. Then, the speaker must tell the interviewer what they saw, what the video was about.

In a nutshell: A young man runs into a room. He is nervous and busy. He is in a hurry. He is looking for something on the table, under the books, etc.

(link to the video: Kivi film,
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ouo5zV70tlQ)

II. QUESTIONS

Collect lexical or morphological elements from the text a single element can belong to several categories) for:

VISUAL EVIDENCE
INFERENTIAL
LIKELIHOOD
EPISTEMIC UNCERTAINTY
EVALUATION

Collect elements for epistemic modality! Do they also express inference?

III. TEXT

(A) (interviewer's question:)

– Ki ez a fiú? (Whos is that boy?)

– *Hát* **elég** *fiatal* **volt**,
well **quite** young **was**
'well he was quite young'

úgyhogy	***valószínűleg***	*egy*	*tanuló, meg*	*vagy*	*mondjuk*	*ee*
so	**probably**	a	student, and	or	nearly.so	eh

'so he is probably a student, and, or nearly so, eh…'

minthogyha	*egy*	*iroda*	***lett volna***	*a*	*helység,*
as if	a	office	**would͜ have been**	the	place/room

'as if there hadbeen an office that place'

amibe *berohant,* *tehát* *inkább* *hasonlított* *egy* *irodára,*
that ran_into so more be_alike a office
'which he ran into, so it was more like an office'

mint *egy* *mondjuk* *egy* *szobára* *valakinek,* **úgyhogy**
than a nearly_so a room for.someone **so**
'than, perhaps, a room for someone, so'

az *is* **lehet***,* *hogy* *fiatalabb* *tanár*
that too could_be that younger teacher
'or **maybe** he is a younger teacher'

esetleg *tanársegéd* *vagy* *ilyesmi,*
maybe assistant or like_this
'maybe an assistant or something like that'

de *mindenképp* *valamilyen* *mm* *tehát* *vagy* *tanuló,*
but in_any_case some_kind_of mm so or student
'but in any case some kind of mm either a student'

aki *ugye* *sok* *irattal* *kerül kapcsolatba [laughing],*
who really many document be in contact with
'who has been in contact with a lot of paper (laughing)'

vagy *valamilyen* *tanár,* *vagy* *vagy* **nem** **tudom***,*
or some_kind_of teacher or or **not** **know**
'or some kind of teacher or or I do not know'

de *nem* *nem* *irodának* *vagy* *hát* *mm*
but not not office or well mm
'but not an office, or, well'

tehát *nem* *egy* *egyszerű* *szobának* **tűnt***,*
so not a simple room **seemed**
'so it didn't seem like a simple room'

de *nem* *is* *egy* *ilyen* *hivatalos* *helynek,*
but not too a such official place
'but neither an official place'

mer *mondjuk* *nem* *is* *úgy* *volt* *öltözve,*
because nearly_so no too that.way was dressed
'because he was not dressed like that'

úgyhogy *nem* **nem** **tudom** *nagyon* *eldönteni,*
so not **not** **know** really decide
'so I can not really decide it.'

43

de	*hát*	*vagy*	*tanuló, vagy*	*egy*	*tanár*	**lehetett**
but	well	or	student or	a	teacher	**could_have_been**

'but he could have been either a student or a teacher'

Szerintem.

in_my_opinion

'I think'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTION

Collect lexical or morphological elements from the text (a single element can belong to several categories):

VISUAL EVIDENCE	*elég fiatal volt* ('quite – young – was')
	tűnt ('seemed')
INFERENTIAL	*úgyhogy* ('so')
	lehetett ('could have been')
	valószínűleg ('probably')
	esetleg ('possibly')
LIKELIHOOD	*valószínűleg* ('probably')
	esetleg ('possibly')
EPISTEMIC UNCERTAINTY	*minthogyha* ('as if')
	nem tudom ('I do not know')
	esetleg ('possibly')
	tűnt ('seemed')
EVALUATION	*elég fiatal volt* ('quote – young – was')
	tűnt ('seemed')

In Hungarian, there is no grammatical evidentiality, it is primarily expressed by lexical means. These have both inferential and epistemic meanings: *lehet, lehetett, esetleg, valószínűleg*.

References

Kugler, Nóra 2014. The dynamic construal of epistential meaning. *Argumentum* 10: 403–420.

Kugler, Nóra. 2015. *Megfigyelés és következtetés a nyelvi tevékenységben.* [Observation and inference in language activity.] Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest.

TASK 7. Hungarian 2

Sándor Szeverényi

I. DESCRIPTION

The sample and argumentation is based on Nóra Kugler's works (2014, 2015).

There are some examples for epistential lexemes, ***szemlátomást, szemmel láthatóan*** 'apparently, obviously (to the eye)'. The noun *szem* means 'eye' and the verb *lát* 'to see'.

(In this exercise, morphological glossing was not applied for better understanding.)

II. QUESTIONS

(A) Why 'eye' and 'see' play a role in the lexicalization of inferential/epistemic lexemes?
(B) What is the role of VISUAL/SENSORY EXPERIENCE?
(C) Which examples express POSSIBILITY, ASSUMPTION, INFERENCE?

III. TEXT

(Source and solution: Kugler 2014: 414.)

(11)

A gondos előkészítés	*megtette hatását:*		*a kormányzó*	*német*
careful planning	did the trick:		the ruling	German

keresztyéndemokraták	*belső ellenzéke*	***szemlátomást***	
Christian_Democrats	internal opposition	**obviously** (lit. obviously to the eye)	

elhallgatott	*és*	*így*	*nem veszélyezteti*	*az egységdemonstrációt.*
has_fallen_silent,	and	so	poses no threat	to the demonstration of unity

'Careful planning did the trick: the internal opposition of the ruling German Christian Democrats has **obviously** (lit. obviously to the eye) fallen silent, and so poses no threat to the demonstration of unity.'

(12)

Clinton	***szemlátomást***		*hosszú*	*küzdelemre*	*igyekezett*	*felkészíteni*
Clinton	**obviously_to_the_eye**,	(for a)	long	fight	attempted	to_prepare

amerikaiakat	*a terrorizmus*	*elleni*	*harcban*
Americans	terrorism	against	in_the_war

'**Obviously to the eye**, Clinton attempted to prepare Americans for a long fight in the war against terrorism.'

(14)

Bár	*a zavarkeltés*	***szemlátomást***	*[Személynév]*
Although	causing_confusion	**obviously to the eye**,	[person's name],

egyik	*célja*	*lehet,*	*mégis*	*korábbi*	*kiállításaiban*	*az egyes sorozatok*
one_of	goal	may_be	but	previous	in his exhibitions	constellations

jóval	*összetartóbbnak*	***tűntek.***
more	convergent	**seemed**

'Although **obviously to the eye**, causing confusion may be one of the goals of [person's name], the constellations of his previous exhibitions **seemed** to be more convergent.'

(15)

A gyorsuló	*infláció*	*közepette*	*ez*	*az álláspont*
accelerating	inflation	in_the_midst_of,	this	stance

szemlátomást	*nem tartható.*
obviously to the eye	no longer tenable

'In the midst of accelerating inflation, this stance is no longer tenable, **obviously to the eye**.'

(17)

Így	*a*	***látszólag***	*továbbra*	*is*	*ötajtós*	
this way		the	**seemingly**	still		too	with five doors

kocsi	*négyajtóssá*	*alakult.*
car	with four doorw	has become

'This way the **seemingly** still five-door car has become one with four doors.'

(18)

A tulajdonos	***látszólag***	*belement az üzletbe,*	*majd*
The owner	**seemingly**	agreed on the deal,	then

a látogatók	*távozása*	*után*	*értesítette*	*a rendőrséget.*
the visitors	leaving	after	he informed	the police

'The owner **seemingly** agreed on the deal, then after the leaving of the visitors he informed the police.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(See details in Kugler 2014!)

(11) The extension in meaning and use typically profile perception/experiencing while keeping the source of sensory information unspecified (allowing for non-visual sources). In (11), whose processing is not hindered by the fact that the utterance profiles the lack of auditory stimuli, or at a more abstract level, the lack of any form of overt political action.

(12) Experience-based inference (inferentiality of the result type).

(14) These two excerpts are examples of epistential modality. In (14), *szemlátomást* may indicate the speaker's observations, but the verb form *lehet* 'may be' makes it clear that the observation is based on unspecified experience, the speaker is voicing their opinion on the goals of the artist, which they have no direct access to.

(15) *szemlátomást* profiles the speaker's personal views and commitments rather than the basis of her inference.

(17) and (18) are based on unreliable perception or inference, the expression is primarily interpreted as a counterfactual marker of deceptive experience (17) or purposeful deception (18).

References

Kugler, Nóra 2014. The dynamic construal of epistential meaning. *Argumentum* 10: 403–420.

Kugler, Nóra. 2015. *Megfigyelés és következtetés a nyelvi tevékenységben.* [Observation and inference in language activity.] Tinta Könyvkiadó, Budapest.

TASK 8. Udmurt 1

Rebeka Kubitsch

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE:	narrative (real events)
PARTICIPANT(S):	speaker
SITUATION:	The speaker's father was on a trip to Moscow but did not pick up his phone and the speaker was nervous. Later it turns out, he lost his phone.

II. QUESTIONS

(A) What is the interpretation of the second past tense forms in this extract?

(B) What is the motivation for the use of the second past tense?

(C) Consider the particle *pe* at the end of sentence (1). What could be the function of this particle in this sentence?

III. TEXT

(Source: vuflower.blogspot.ru; 11/03/2015; last accessed:07/01/2020)

(1)

Kuke	*soku*	*mama*	*zvońit'*	*kar-i-z*	*no,*	*Votkinsk-yn*	*ńi,*	***pe.***
when	then	mom	call.INF	do-PST1-3SG	PCL	PN-IN	already	QUOT

'Some time then mom called me, he was already in Votkinsk, reportedly.[2]

(2)

T'el'efon-ze	*Krasnoj*	*plośśad'-e*	*yšty-sa*	***kel't-em.*** [...]
phone-ACC.POSS.3SG	red	square-ILL	lose-CVB	**leave-PST2 [3SG]**

'He lost his phone in the Red Square.'

(3)

Pumiśk-em-my	*bere,*	*jua-śk-i*	*ińi*	*ot duši.*
meet-NMLZ-POSS.1PL	as	ask-FREQ-PST1[1SG]	already	sincerely

'As we met, I asked him sincerely.'

---

[2] Votkinsk is a town in the Udmurt Republic.

(4)

Už-ze	*leśt-em*	*no,*	*myn-em*	*so*	*Krasnoj ploššad-'e.*
job-ACC.POSS.3SG	do-PST2[3SG]	PCL	go-PST2[3SG]	he	red square-ILL

'He did his job, and went to Red Square.'

(5)

Kotyrsk-em.
go.around-PST2[3PL]

'He went around.'

(6)

Sere	*mil'ym-en*	*ćaj*	*ju-em.*
then	pancake-INST	tea	drink-PST2[3SG]

'Then he had tea with pancakes.'

(7)

Mil'ym-ze	*t'el'efon-az*	*tus*	*pukt-em,*
pancake-ACC	phone-ILL.POSS.3SG	picture	put-PST2[3SG]

karman-az	*ut'alt-em.*
pocket-IN.POSS.3SG	keep-PST2[3SG]

'He made a picture of the pancake with his phone, and then he kept it in his pocket.'

(8)

Sere	*eššo*	*porja-m*	*na.*
then	more	walk-PST2[3SG]	more

'Then he walked more.'

(9)

B.	*Ńemcov-ez*	*bydt-em*	*vyž*	*vyl-e*	*no*	*vuy-l-em.*
PN	PN-ACC	kill-PTCP.PRF	bridge	PP-ILL	PCL	arrive-FREQ-PST2[3SG]

'He even reached the bridge, where B. Nemtsov had been killed.'

(10)

Karman-az	*pyr-e*	*no –*	*t'el'efon-ez*	*övöl.*
pocket-ILL.POSS.3SG	dive-PRS.3SG	PCL	phone-DEF	NEG

'He dives into his pocket and the phone is not there.'

(11)

Utća-m -	*utća-m –*	*övöl*	*šed't-em.*
search-PST2[3SG]	search-PST2[3SG]	NEG	find-PST2[3SG]

'He was looking for it but could not find it.'

(12)

Vokzal	*pala*	*myn-yny*	***kariśk-em,***
station	PP	go-INF	**do-PST2 [3SG]**

pojezd-leś	*kyl'-ez*	*šusa*	*kyška-sa.*
train-ABL	miss-POSS.3SG[3]	COMP	be.afraid-CVB

'Then he headed towards the railway station because he was afraid of missing the train.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) Hearsay - the speaker acquires the information from their mother and then retells it.

(B) The speaker has only indirect evidence, they can only rely on the words of someone else.

(C) It is a quotative particle and it shows that this piece of information originates from someone else (from the speaker's mother, in this case). It is often used for quoting someone else's words.

---

[3] Grammatically, it should be *kyl'emez,* with an *-m* nominalizer.

TASK 9. Udmurt 2

Rebeka Kubitsch

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE:	narrative (real events)
PARTICIPANT(S):	speaker
SITUATION:	The speaker wanted to visit a festival but overslept and missed some programs.

II. QUESTIONS

(A) How would you explain the use of first person second past tense forms in sentence (3) and (8)?

(B) What is the interpretation of the second past tense forms in sentence (9)? What is the information source of the speaker?

(C) Considering sentence (5), what possible interpretations does the second past tense form have?

(D) What is the motivation for using the second past tense form in sentence (7)?

III. TEXT

(Source: udmurto4ka.blogspot.ru; 13/12/2014; last accessed: 25/02/2021)

(1)

Juri	*kyl'-i*	*ta-jaz*	*arńa-je*	*gorod-e,*
intentionally	stay-PST1[1SG]	this-ILL.POSS.3SG	week-ILL	city-ILL

ćtoby	*vetl-yny*	*"Voršud"*	*fest'ival'-e.*
so_that	visit-INF	vorshud[4]	festival-ILL

'I deliberately stayed in the city this week, so I could visit the Vorshud festival.'

(2)

I	*mar?*	*Mon*	*prospala.*
and	what?	I	oversleep:PST:FEM

'And what? I overslept.'

(3)

Pervoj	*ćas-oź*	***iźi-śkem***	*uk.*
first	hour-TERM	**sleep-PST2.1SG**	PCL

'I slept till 1 o'clock.'

---

[4] Vorshud is the guardian spirit of the family or the clan.

(4)

Sajka-sa	*t'el'efon-me*	*paźge-m*	*pote ńi*	*val*	*kad'.*
wake_up-CVB	phone-ACC.POSS.1SG	smash-NMLZ	want already	be.PST1	as_if

'Waking up, I was already close to smashing my phone.'

(5)

Zarjadka-je	*no*	*pukty-sa,*	*zarjad'it'śa*	**kariśky-mte,**	*öčkes.* [...]
charger-ILL	PCL	put-CVB	recharge:INF:REFL	**do-NEG.PST2 [3SG]**	stubborn

'I put it on the charger but it did not charge, stubborn.'

(6)

A	*mar?*	*Xot'*	*žyny-ze*	*ke*	*no*	*adź-o.*
and	what?	even_if	half-ACC.POSS.3SG	if	PCL	see-FUT[1SG]

'And what? It's good if I will see the half of it.'

(7)

Kak raz	*vu-i,*	*ku*	*pereryv*	**vyl-em.**
exactly	arrive-PST1[1 SG]	when	intermission	**be-PST2 [3SG]**

'I arrived exactly during the intermission.'

(8)

Samoj	*tunsyko-ze*	**kel'ti-śkem.**
most	interesting-DEF.ACC	**miss-PST2.1SG**

'I missed the most interesting one [programmes].'

(9)

Brangurt	*peśanaj-jos*	**kyrźa-l'l'am**	*ińi*	*(vuž*	*sostav-ez),*
PN	grandmother-PL	**sing-PST2 [3PL]**	already	old	lineup-DET

povśedńevnoj	*trad'icionnoj*	*mot'iv-jos-yn*
everyday	traditional	motive-PL-INST

diś-en	*pokaz*	**vyl-em**	*ńi*
clothes-INST	presentation	**be-PST2 [3SG]**	already

trad'icionnoj	*no*	*kost'um-jos-yn*	*pokaz*	**vyl-em**	*ińi...*
traditional	PCL	costum-PL-IN	presentation	**be-PST2 [3SG]**	already

'Buranovskiye Babushki have already sung (the old lineup), the presentation of clothes with everyday and traditional patterns has already taken place, the presentation of traditional costumes has already taken place...'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) The speaker acted unintentionally and realized their own actions at a later point (deferred realization).

(B) Here, the second past tense indicates that the speaker was not present during these events, they have not witnessed them. The exact information source cannot be determined as the speaker could see the programme and learnt that they had been over, or, just by knowing the time they could infer about missing these programs. The speaker could also have multiple information sources.

(C) Inference - as the speaker looks at the phone and sees that it has not charged. Or it could be mirative as we would expect a phone to charge if it is on charger, so the actual experience contradicts the expectations. Inferential and mirative interpretations often intertwine.

(D) The motivation could be mirative - since the speaker has just arrived, they are actually present during this intermission, therefore the "standard" evidential interpretation is less likely as it primarily indicates that the speaker has no direct evidence about the events.

TASK 10. Udmurt 3

Rebeka Kubitsch

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE: educative dialogue for teaching Udmurt
PARTICIPANTS: buyer, seller
SITUATION: the buyer wants to buy currant

II. QUESTIONS

(A) What is the interpretation of the 'be' verb in the second past tense in line (3)?

(B) How does correlate the morphological structure of the 'be' verb in line (3) and the meaning of the sentence?

(C) How is this use different from the ones observed in TASK 8 and TASK 9?

III. TEXT

(Source: Udmurt online corpus, social-media subcorpus.)

(1)

Suter-dy	*köńa*	*syl-e*	*(stoit)?*
currant-POSS.2PL	how.much	stand-PRS.3SG	cost:PRS.3SG

'How much does your currant cost?'

(2)

Śu	*kyź*	*mańet.*
hundred	twenty	ruble

'120 rubles.'

(3)

O!	*Duno*	**vyl-em.**	*Kytyn*	*ulti-ges*	*meda?*
EXCL	expensive	**be-PST2 [3SG]**	where	cheap-COMP	PCL

'Oh! It's expensive. Where could it be cheaper?'

(4)

Duno	*övöl.*	*Ulti.*	*Baśt-e.*	*Tabere duno-ges*	*lu-o-z.*
expensive	NEG	cheap	buy-IMP[2PL]	after expensive-COMP	become-FUT-3SG

'It's not expensive. It's cheap. Take it. Later it's going to be more expensive.'

(5)

Paket-ty	*vań-a?*	*Kyk*	*kilo*	*merta-le!*
bag-POSS.2PL	exist-Q	two	kilo	weigh-IMP[2PL]

'Do you have a bag? Weigh me 2 kilos.'

(6)

Til'eśtyd	*kyk*	*śu*	*ńyl'don*	*mańet.*
from_you	two	hundred	forty	ruble

'It will be 240 rubles.'

(7)

Tau.
'Thanks.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) Mirative - the information (the price of the currant) is a novelty to the speaker.

(B) The morphological structure of the 'be' verb is past tense and indirect evidential but the interpretation concerns the present. The indirect evidential interpretation is not possible either as the speaker is present and has direct, immediate experience about the price.

(C) In TASK 8 and TASK 9 the 'be' verb had always past time reference in accordance with its morphological structure. In this task, however, it refers to the current state of affairs.

TASK 11. Mansi 1

Katalin Sipőcz

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE: short story, mononarrative
PARTICIPANT(S):   storyteller, his mother and father
SITUATION: The storyteller travels home for the holidays from Leningrad, where he studies, and enters his home.

II. QUESTION

Why does the speaker use the evidential forms in (2)?

III. SAMPLE

(Kálmán 1976: 146)

(1)

juw	*śalt-s-əm.*
in	enter-PST-1SG

'I entered.'

(2)

nosatĭm	*āŋk-əm*	*takket*	***ōl-əm,***	*āś-əm*	*χūlpaj-aŋke*	***min-əm.***
it_seems	mother-POSS.1SG	alone	be-EV.PST.3SG	father- POSS.1SG	fish-INF	go-EV.PST.3SG

'It seems my mother is alone, my father has gone fishing.'

(3)

am	*tawen*	*potərt-as-əm,*	*χumos*	*ōl-s-əm,*	*χumos*	*χańistaχt-as-əm.*
I	she.DAT	tell-PST-1SG	how	be-PST-1SG	how	study-PST-1SG

'I told her how I had lived, how I had learnt.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOULTION

The past evidential forms are used when the speaker was not present during the event, only perceiving its outcome (his father has gone and mother has left alone at home) – resultative, non-witness function. In example (2), speaking about the mother, the mirative function is also conceivable.

TASK 12. Mansi 2

Katalin Sipőcz

I. DESCRIPTION

GENRE: mythological tale
STORY: A tale about the ancestor of the Munkes people (a Mansi tribe), who was
                             killed by his own mother.

II. QUESTION

How can you explain the use of the given evidential forms?

III. SAMPLE

(Kálmán 1976: 76)

(1)

akwnakt	*oma-m*		*t̆itiγla-s-ləm,*		
once	mother- POSS.1SG		ask-PST-SG.1SG		

muwŋt̆es	*māχəm*	*pāstər*	*māχəm-iγ*	*manriγ*	*lāw-awe-t.*
Munkes	people	Pastər	people-TRL	why	say-PASS-3PL

'Once I asked my mother why the people of Munkes were called Paster People.'

(2)

taw	*lāw-i:*	*pēs*	*pora-t*	*akw*	*ēkwa*	***ōl-əm.***
she	say-3SG	old	time-LOC	one	woman	be-EV.PST.3SG

'She said: A long time ago there was a woman.'

(3)

matm-e	*ōrəm-t*	*piγ*	***ōńś-əm.***
old-3SG	time-LOC	boy	have-EV.PST.3SG

'She gave birth to a son when she was getting old.'

(4)

ti	*piγ-e*	*χūrəm-ńila*	*χōtal*	*janiγm-əm,*	
this	son-3SG	three-four	day	grow-EV.PST.3SG	

akwaγ	*χōt-āt̆i*	*jalasa-n*	*janit-iγ*	*ta*	***jēmt-əm.***
quite	where-NEG	walk-PTCP.PRS	size.of-TRL	PCL	became-EV.PST.3SG

'Her son grew for three or four days and you see, he became so big he could walk anywhere.'

(5)

maxəm	*lāw-ēɣət:*	*tamľe*	*śāń*	*ta*	***ōl-əm!***
people	say-3PL	such	mother	PCL	be-EV.PST.3SG

takwi	*piɣ-e*	*takwi*	*ta*	*al-as-te.*
own	son-3SG	own	PCL	kill-PST-SG.3SG

'She killed her own son.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTION

The past evidential forms are used to describe events of the distant past in tales and mythological texts. In sentence (5), the mirative use is also conceivable.

TASK 13. Mansi 3

Katalin Sipőcz

II. QUESTIONS

There are three evidential paradigms in Mansi: present, past and past passive. The past evidential paradigm has subjective and objective forms, the former paradigm refers only to the person and number of the subject, the latter refers to the number of the object, too. The main function of the present-tense evidential forms is to express mirativity, while past evidential forms serve various functions. (Historically, the evidential markers are based on non-finite forms.)

	EV.PRS (MIR)	EV.PST	EV.PASS
1SG	-ne + -m	-m + -əm	-ima + -m
2SG	-ne + -n	-m + -ən	-ima + -n
3SG	-ne + -te	-m + Ø	-ima + Ø
1DU	-ne + -men	-m + -əmen	-ima + -men
2DU	-ne + -n	-m + -en	-ima + -n
3DU	-ne + -ten	-m + -iɣ	-ima + -ɣ
1PL	-ne + -w	-m + -uw	-ima + -w
2PL	-ne + -n	-m + -en	-ima + -n
3PL	-ne + -nəl	-m + -ət	-ima + -t

The objective paradigm of the past evidential:

EV.PST SG.O	EV.PST DU.O	EV.PST PL.O
-m + -l-əm	-m + -aɣ-əm	-m + -an-əm
-m + -l-ən	-m + -aɣ-ən	-m + -an-ən
-m + -te	-m + -aɣ-te	-m + -an-e
-m + -l-amen	-m + -aɣ-men	-m + -an-men
-m + -l-en	-m + -aɣ-en	-m + -an-en
-m + -ten	-m + -aɣ-en	-m + -an-anen
-m + -l-uw	-m + -aɣ-uw	-m + -an-uw
-m + -l-en	-m + -aɣ-en	-m + -an-en
-m + -anəl	-m + (-aɣ)-anəl	-m + -an-anəl

59

(A) What types of evidential forms can you recognize? Write in the missing glosses!

(B) How could you explain the use of the given evidential forms in the examples above?

III. SAMPLE

(1)

ēkwä	*kwonä*	*kwāl-əs,*
woman	out	go-PST.3SG

kit	*liliŋ*	*pirwä*	***pūwmät-əm***
two	alive	duck	catch-_____

jū	*tūl-s-aɣe,*	*alə-s-aɣe*
in	bring-PST-DU.3SG	kill-PST-DU.3SG

'The woman went out, caught two living ducks, brought them in and killed them.' (VNGY I. 29)

(2)

kwona	*kwal-s-əɣ,*	*kuṫuw-en*	*śama*	***pur-ima***
out	go-PST-3DU	dog-SG.3DU	to.death	bite-____

'They (two) went outside, their dog was bitten to death.' (OUDB 1234)

(3)

suns-i:	*nāj*	*ta-ṫem*	***pālt-ima,***	*por-ne*	***joχt-əm***
watch-3SG	fire	so	light-___	por_ne	arrive-____

'She watches: the fire is burning („has been lighted"), the Por woman has arrived.' (Kálmán 1976)

(4)

*Мāньщи кол щёвалыл вāрманыл, таве тирпащ ёт пōщгуманыл, татем тāкыг ōлнэтэ, посым
ювле ат харты.*

mańśi	*kol*	*śowal-əl*	***wār-m-anəl,***
Mansi	house	stove-INSTR	do-_____

tawe	*ṫirpaś*	*jot*	***pōsɣ-əm-anəl,***
that.ACC	brick	with	smooth-_____

taṫem	*tāk-iɣ*	***ōl-nē-te,***	*posim*	*juwle*	*at*	*xart-i*
so	strong-TRL	be-____	smoke	back	NEG	pull-3SG

'They also made a stove for the Mansi house, reinforced it with bricks, very sturdy, the smoke doesn't come back.'

(LS 2022.1)

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(1) EV.PAST.3SG

The past evidential form is used because the speaker was not present during the event (the woman went out and performed the action outside), the speaker only perceives the outcome of the action (she brought in the ducks) – resultative, non-witness function.

(2) EV.PASS.3SG

The past passive evidential form is used because the speaker was not present during the event, only perceives its outcome and speaks about the object (the dog) the action was directed to – resultative, non-witness function.

(3) EV.PASS.3SG / EV.PST.3SG

Again resultative, non-witness function: first, the speaker speaks about the object of the action (the fire) – the passive form is used, then the speaker speaks about the woman who has already arrived – the active evidential form is used.

(4) EV.PAST.SG3PL / EV.PST.SG3PL / EV.PRS.3SG

In the first two clauses, the speaker talks about non-witnessed actions performed earlier and directed towards an object (stove) – past evidential objective forms are used (3PL subject and SG object), while in the third clause, the speaker expresses surprise – the present evidential is used in mirative function.

References

Kálmán, Béla 1976. *Wogulische Texte mit einem Glossar.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

LS = *Lujima Seripos*. Mansi newspaper. Khanty-Mansiysk. (http://www.khanty-yasang.ru/)

OUdb: Ob-Ugric Database: analysed text corpora and dictionaries for less described Ob-Ugric dialects. (https://www.babel.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/)

VNGy = Munkácsi, Bernát 1892–1896. *Vogul népköltési gyűjtemény* I–IV. [Vogul folklore collection, vols. 1–4] Budapest: MTA.

TASK 14. Komi-Permyak 1

Ditta Szabó

I. DESCRIPTION

Independent sentences from language corpus: Komi Kyv Korpus – Perem Komi Jukön (http://perem.komicorpora.ru/)

II. QUESTIONS

In the sentences in group A, the use of the second past tense refers to indirect evidentiality, while in the sentences of group B, the verbal form denotes resultativity (an action in the past with a result in the present). Consider the syntactic features of the sentences belonging to the different groups. What syntactic features appear in group A and in group B related to the different functions of the second past tense?

III. TEXT

A1
(1)

Magellan	***mun-öm***	*asyvlań-ö,*	***vetlöt-öm***	*veľdyr,*
Magellan	**go-PST2.3SG**	East-ILL	**go-PST2.3SG**	for_a_long_time

a	*sybör-yn*	***lokt-öm***	*pytlań-śań.*
and	after_that	**come-PST2.3SG**	West-DEL

'Magellan went to the East, went for a long time, and came from the West.'

(2)

Syśań	*otir*	*pond-i-s*	*töd-ny:*	*mu-ys – šar.*
from_that	human	begin-PST-3SG	know-INF	Earth-DET rounded

'From this time. humans began to understand that the shape of the Earth is rounded.'

> (География / Сторожов А. М. // Сторожов А. М. География. 3-öт во (1932))

A2
(1)

A	*aćys*	*Ćapajev-ys*	*kresťańin,*	*bedńacköj*	*pod-iś,*
but	himself	Chapajev-DET	farmer	poor	kind-ELA

Balašovsköj	*ujezd-iś,*	*Saratovsköj*	*guberńija-iś.*
Balašov	district-ELA	Saratov	province-ELA

'But Čapajev himself was a farmer, form the poor kind, from Balašov district, Saratov province.'

(2)

Ućöt	*god-dez-śań*	*uǯav-ny*	**mun-öma.**
little	year-PL-DEL	work-INF	**go-PST2.3SG**

'He started to work in his childhood.'

(Ойся баитӧм / А. Кононов (комиӧдіс В. Ф. Савельев) // А. Кононов. Чапаев йылісь рассказзэз (1941))

A3

(1)

Kyǯ	*šu-öny*	*orgańizator-rez,*	*učastĭk-kez*	**löśötć-ömaś**	*bura.*
how	say-3PL	organizer-PL	participant-PL	**prepare-PST2.3PL**	well

'As the organizers say, the participants prepared well.'

(Ветераннэз ӧзтісӧ «Таланттэзлісь енӧшка» / Kinko // vk.com (2023-10-12))

B1

(1)

Ötik	*pustöj*	*kerky*	**remontĭrujt-ömaś**	*i*	**ker-ömaś**	*setćö*	*muzej.*
one	empty	house	**renovate-PST2.3PL**	and	**do-PST2.3PL**	to_there	museum

'An empty house was renovated and a museum was founded there.'

(Синтомова деревняись вичкуын / А. М. Старцева // vk.com (2022-09-15))

B2

(1)

Sek	*tatiś*	**vijś-ömaś**	*una*	*Firsov-vez-ös,*	*top*	*pö*	*ny*
Then	from_here	**kill-PST2.3PL**	a_lot_of	Firsov-PL-ACC	until	PCL	well

vylyn	*völi*	*kytšömkö*	*prokljatťo.*
on	be.PST1	some_kind	curse

'Then a lof of Firsovs were killed there, it is said, some kind of curse had been on them so far.'

(Быдыс пуктіс ассис пай / Kinko // vk.com (2021-10-28))

B3

(1)

Aktovej	*zal*	**basökśöt-ömaś**	*śaköj*	*röm-a*	*šar-rez-ön,*
hall	room	**become_beautiful-PST2.3PL**	all	colour-ADV	ball-PL-INS

gerd	*flažok-kez-ęn,*	*plakat-tez-ęn.*
red	bannerette-PL-INS	poster-PL-INS

'The hallroom was decorated with balls in all kinds of colours, red bannerettes and posters.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

In group A, there are atelic verbs, and the subject of the sentence appears in the position of the subject.

In group B, there are telic verbs, and a valency change can be observed, in which the object of the sentence appears as a subject.

TASK 15. Komi-Permyak 2

Ditta Szabó

Here is the paradigm of the verb *munny* 'to go' in second past tense:

	Sg	Pl
1	–	–
2	*mun-öm-yt / mun-öm-at*	*mun-öm-nyt / mun-ömaś*
3	*mun-öm(a)*	*mun-ömaś*

QUESTION

What do you think, what is the reason of the missing first person forms in standard Komi-Permyak?

ANSWER

One of the main functions of the second past tense in Komi-Permyak is the expression of indirect evidentiality. As it covers non-witnessed events, logically, the form should not appear in first person. It has to be noted that some dialects have second past tense first person forms though.

TASK 16. Komi-Permyak 3

Ditta Szabó

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE:	short story, mononarrative
PARTICIPANT(S):	Komi, Russian and Mansi people
SITUATION:	The storyteller talks about his own home village, and the names of the village, the rivers, and lakes.

II. QUESTIONS

(A) What is the type of the text (e.g., tale, legend, article in a journal, fictional text, etc.)?

(B) Which tenses appear in the story? What is the function of the second past tense on the basis of the text?

III. TEXT

(Based on Klimov, Ponomareva 2010: 158.)

(1)

Kosa	*ju-lö*	*ńim-sę*	***śet-ömaś***	*ńe*	*Komi-es.*
Kosa	river-DAT	name-ACC.3SG	**give-PST2.3PL**	NEG	Komi-PL.3SG

'It's not the Komi people who gave the name Kosa to the river.'

(2)

Kosa	*kyv*	*em*	*roć*	*otïr-lön,*	*no*	*sylön*	*veźörtas-ys*
kosa	word	be.PRS	Russian	people-GEN,	but	it.GEN	meaning-3SG

(ćikiś,	*yčkiśan)*	*ju-ys*	*ponda*	*oz*	*lęśav.*
(sickle,	scythe)	river-DET	for	NEG.PRS.3SG	suit.CNG

'Russian people have the word *Kosa*, but its meaning (sickle, scythe) does not suit for the river.'

(3)

Da	*i*	*roć-ćes*	*oʒ́-ʒ́yk*	*setćin*	*abu*
yes	and	Russian-PL.3SG	early-COMP	there	be.NEG.PRS

ov-l-ęmaś.
be-FREQ-PST2.3PL

'Yes, and the Russians had not been there before.'

(4)

A	*vot*	*Mańśi*	*jęz-lęn*		*em*	*sečöm*	*kyv,*	*köda*
but	PCL	Mansi	peolpe-GEN		be.PRS	such	word,	that

ju-ys	*ńim-lö*	*löśalę-źyk:*	*Khosa*	*(mijan*	*moz – kuź).*
river-DET	name-DAT	suitable-COMP	Khosa	(we.GEN	like – long)

'But well, the Mansi people have such a word that is more suitable to be the name of the river: [that is] Khosa (for us, it's long).'

(5)

A	*Kosa*	*byliś*	*ena*	*mesta-ez-yn*	*med-kuź*	*ju.*
but	Kosa	really	this	area-PL-IN	SUP-long	river

'But in this area, Kosa is indeed the longest river.'

(6)

I	*Mańśi-es*	*sy*	*gögör-yn*	**ovl-ęmaś**	*(ńeľki Mańśi*
and	mansi-PL.3SG	that	around-IN	**be-FREQ-PST2.PL3**	(even Mansi

(Manći)	*ďerevńa*	*em).*
(Mansi))	village	be.PRS).

'And the Mansi people have lived there (there is even a village called Mansi).'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) Legend, origin of the name of the river Kosa.

(B) Second past tense, present tense. The function of the second past tense in this story is to denote that the event happened in the past and the speaker was not a witness of it. The second past tense form is also a feature of folklore texts marking that the source of the information is unknown.

References

Ponomareva, Larisa 2010. *Komi-permják nyelvkönyv*. ELTE Finnugor Tanszék: Budapest. (Manuscript)

TASK 17. Komi-Permyak 4

Nikolett F. Gulyás

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE**:**   fictional short story
PARTICIPANT(S)**:**   storyteller

II. QUESTIONS

(A) What is the function of the particle *pö* in sentence (2)?
(B) Why do you think the particle is not used in other parts of the text?

III. TEXT

(Source: based on Ponomareva 2010)

(1)

Menam	*ďed*	*siź*	*vištaś-l-i-s.*
I.GEN	grandfather	so	tell-FREQ-PST1-3SG

'My grandfather used to tell it like this.'

(2)

Körkö	***pö***	*völ-öm*	*kymör,*	*kymör*	*i*	*kymör.*
sometime	PCL	be-PST2.3SG	cloud,	cloud	and	cloud

'Back in the day, there were clouds, clouds, and clouds.'

(3)

Mu	*abu,*	*vör*	*abu.*
land	be.NEG.SG	forest	be.NEG.SG

'There is no land, no forest.'

(4)

Lebź-a-s	*kyčömkö*	*kaj,*	*košš-ö*	*pukśy-ny,*	*a*	*pukśy-ny*
fly-FUT-3SG	some_kind_of	bird	search-PRS.3SG	sit_down-INF	but	sit_down-INF

ńem	*vylö.*
nothing	onto

'Some kind of a bird is flying, looking for a place to sit down, but there was nothing to sit on.'

(5)

Kaj	*oröt-a-s*	*bordtyv-sö*	*da*	*ćapk-a-s ky*	*mör-ok*	*vylö.*
bird	tear_off-FUT-3SG	wing-ACC.3SG	and	throw-FUT-3SG	cloud-DIM	onto

'The bird tears off its wings and throws them onto a small cloud.'

(6)

Kymor-ys	*ćorź-a-s*	—	*mutor*	*lo-a-s.*
cloud-3SG	harden-FUT-3SG		piece_of_land	became-FUT-3SG

'The cloud hardens – a piece of land forms.'

(7)

Sy	*vylö*	*kaj-ys*	*pukś-a-s,*	*ov-ny*	*pond-a-s.*
that	onto	bird-3SG	sit_down-FUT-3SG	live-INF	start-FUT-3SG

'The bird sits down on it and starts living (there).'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) The particle *pö* is often used as a quotative particle, it expresses a piece of information that was reported to the speaker. In this sense, it expresses hearsay evidence.

(B) By the use of the particle *pö* (together with the 2nd past tense) the storyteller frames the story which was reported by the grandfather. After this setting, they might not consider it important that the events took place in the mythical past.

References

Ponomareva, Larisa 2010. *Komi-permják nyelvkönyv*. ELTE Finnugor Tanszék: Budapest. (Manuscript)

TASK 18. Meadow Mari

Bogáta Timár

I. DESCRIPTION

TYPE: dialogue
PARTICIPANT(S):   Eastern Mari grandmothers
SITUATION: the grandmas gossip about common acquaintances

II. QUESTIONS

(A) Why is the second past used with the verb of being (*lijǝn*)?

(B) Why is the first past used in examples (1) and (7)?

(C) What does *maje* mean in Example 4 and why is it in the first past?

III. TEXT

(Source: based on Saypasheva 2018)

(1)

Erikavaj	*Balerjik*	*dek*	*mar-lan*	**kaj-ǝš**
Erikavaj	Balerjik	to	husband-DAT	**go-PST1.3SG**

a	*tǝvečǝnak*	*Nästä-m*	*nal-ǝn*	**kaj-ǝš.**
and	from_there	Nästä-ACC	take-CVB	**go-PST1.3SG**

'Erikavaj married Balerjik, then she took Nästä and left.'

(2)

Vot,	*kuatle*	*kuva*	**lij-ǝn.**
see	strong	woman	**be-PST2.3SG**

'See, she was a strong woman.'

(3)

Tǝge	**kalas-en:**	*mǝj*	*Balerjik-lan*	*üčü-m*	*ǝšt-en*	*gǝna*
this_way	**tell-PST2.3SG**	I	Balerjik-DAT	revenge-ACC	make-CVB	only

süan	*den*	*Toljik-lan*	*mar-lan*	**tol'-ǝ-m,**	*manǝn.*
wedding	with	Toljik-DAT	husband-DAT	**come-PST1-1SG**	in_order_to

'That's what she told: I only married Toljik to have revenge on Balerjik.'

(4)

Kə̂zə̂t	*Kolomb-ə̂što*	*il-a,*	*marij*	*ul-o,*	***maj-e.***
now	Kolomb-INE	live-3SG	husband	be-3SG	**say-PST1.3SG**

A	*žü-š-an,*	***maj-e,***	*kokton*	*žü-üt,*	***maj-e.***
but	drink-PTCP.ACT-DER.ADJ	**say-PST1.3SG**	together	drink-3PL	**say-PST1.3SG**

'Now she lives in Kolomb, she has a husband, she said. But they are drunkards, she said, they drink together, she said.'

(5)

Tudo	*kö*	*tu*	*Balerjik*	*tuɡaj*	***lij-ə̂n?***
he	who	this	Valerjik	such	**be-PST2.3SG**

'Who was this Balerjik?'

(6)

Gennadij-ə̂n	*ača-že,*	*oš*	*üp-an.*
Gennadij-GEN	father-3SG	white	hair-DERIV.ADJ

'Gennadij's father, blonde man.'

(7)

Gennadij-lak	*tu*	*pört*	*ɡə̂č*	*tu-š*	***kajə̂-št***	*varšə̂m*
Gennadij-PL	that	house	from	there-ILL	**go-PST1.3SG**	then

Banjuš-ə̂m	*šket-š-ə̂m*	***kodo-št.***
Banjuš-ACC	alone-3SG-ACC	**leave-PST1.3SG**

'Gennadij and his family went from this house to another, then left Banjuš alone.'

(8)

Kunam	*Säjnävij*	*kovaj*	*den*	*aza-m*	***onžo-š-na***	*me,*	*tunam*	*iktaž*
when	Säjnävij	aunt	with	baby-ACC	**see-PST1-1PL**	we	then	some

kodlo	*šə̂mle*	*ijaš*	*ɡaj-rak*	***lij-ə̂n***	*də̂r.*
sixty	seventy	years.old	like-COMP	**be-PST2.3SG**	maybe

'When we went to Aunt Säjnävij to see the baby, he was maybe sixty-seventy years old.'

IV. SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS

(A) The second past is used for marking imperfective, a state persisting for a longer period of time. It is the preferred tense for descriptions.

(B) When multiple consecutive events are being told, the first past tense is used.

(C) The speaker emphasizes that she heard the information first-hand from the source, she's not making it up herself.

References

Riese, Timothy & Jeremy Bradley & Monika Schötschel & Tatyana Yefremova 2018. Mari (Марий йылме). An Essential Grammar for International Learners. Koneen Säätiö. Vienna. Manuscript.

Saypasheva, Anastasiya 2018. Az I. és II. múlt idő funkciói a baskíriai mariban. In: Fazekas, Boglárka & Kaposi, Diána & P. Kocsis, Réka (eds.) Félúton 12 : Tanulmánykötet a 12. Félúton konferencia előadásaiból. ELTE Magyar Nyelvtudományi és Finnugor Intézet. Budapest.